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Hands went up all over the hall indicating that a sizable majority of the students favored the idea.

"Since many women do not, cannot, or will not respond to the counter-image created by the women's liberation movement, the future of the movement seems to depend largely on whether another much more positive replacement for the old image can be created."

"Lindsay had to get himself perceived by voters as more trustworthy than Muskie, more dynamic than Humphrey, cleaner than Kennedy, and less radical than McGovern."

The very top debaters and floor speakers in the Florida House of Representatives were also those who had previous experience in scholastic debate or public speaking-type forensic activity.

The very top debaters and floor speakers in the Florida House of Representatives were also those who had previous experience in scholastic debate or public speaking-type forensic activity.

Twenty essays which appeared in the Current Criticism department of Speaker and Gavel between 1966 and 1970 have been reprinted as a paperback book by Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

These studies provide a lively panorama of the significant themes to which contemporary speakers address themselves. The agonies of the Vietnam decisions and the emergence of the "black power" issue strikingly dominate the concerns of speakers and critics alike, but other issues as well are given rhetorical analysis in this volume.

Copies of Current Criticism may be obtained for $2.50 from Theodore Walwik, National Secretary, DSR-TKA, Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock, Penna. 16057. They are also available from the Speech Communication Association, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y. 10001.
CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE

JOSEPH O’ROURKE

“If you are of the opinion,” said James McBatli at the National Conference of DSR-TKA in 1970 “that improvements can be made, then Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is the best instrument to translate informed opinion into action.” 1 McBatli, who looks on inertia as sin to be avoided, was challenging our society to live up to its tradition of innovation. But McBatli wasn’t the only one who called for a change. Over the past few years our journal has featured critical articles by Brockriede, 2 Manning, 3 Barefield, 4 Parsloe 5 (the wandering Oxonian) and several others measuring our forensic practices against our educational goals and our philosophy. Then there was that spirited open meeting of the whole society at the 1971 conference in Terre Haute. Several of our members, students and faculty members, charged that intercollegiate debate had little relevance to our times and called upon Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha to examine its goals, ideals and philosophy in promoting the activity. More specifically it was suggested that the National Conference Committee “should provide a section of non-national debate in the National Conference.” 6 Nothing came of that proposal at the Terre Haute meeting, but this year at the banquet in Albuquerque Student Vice President Paul Rashkind asked “How many here would prefer an off-topic proposition for the National Conference?” Hands went up all over the hall indicating that a sizable majority of the students supported the idea.

Immediately after the banquet President McBatli, President-elect Cripe, National Conference Committee Chairman Adamson, Professor Kenneth Anderson and I met to review plans for the 1973 conference at the University of Illinois. After some discussion we agreed we should create a new division that would feature debate on a proposition other than the national topic. More discussion followed concerning the scheduling of this event and the possible effects this addition would have on other contests at the meeting. I was asked to serve as chairman for the new division and to draft a set of rules. I accepted the assignment, and after the meeting and during the weeks that followed I solicited suggestions from debaters, my fellow committee members and my colleagues in DSR-TKA, particularly Professor Kovalcheck of Vanderbilt University who has agreed to serve on the committee this first year. In this issue of Speaker and Gavel you will find the proposed rules for the new event.

Joseph O’Rourke is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at Wabash College.

The name of the division will be Contemporary Issues Debate, and as the title suggests the focus will be on a proposition of policy, fact, or value that is timely and important to the individuals involved in the debates. Ten weeks before the Conference, members of chapters who enter this event will be asked to submit propositions from selected problem areas; these propositions will be screened by the faculty-student committee responsible for administering the division and three will be selected. These three propositions will be sent back to the chapters for ranking and the one receiving the lowest score will be designated as the topic. Four weeks prior to the conference each school will be notified of the selection. But as we all know debate propositions are neither perfect nor final. Frequently a change in a word or a phrase can rescue a debate from becoming little more than an articulatory exercise. I still recall listening to audience debates in 1968 on United States withdrawal from Vietnam. Affirmative and negative agreed on the desirability of withdrawal but the key issue was when to withdraw. By adding the words “now” or “within ninety days” the clash was discovered. Then, too, all of us recall the action of the National Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate last year when they felt compelled to change the wording of the national proposition after the season began. To guard against being tied to a topic with discovered weakness, the participants in Contemporary Issues Debate will meet after the first three rounds for the purpose of amending the proposition if necessary. At this meeting the student member of the committee will preside, Robert’s Rules of Order will govern the procedure and if the group decides to change or modify the proposition, the amended version will be the topic for the following five rounds.

As you will note in the rules for Contemporary Issues Debate, the basic format is similar to four-man debate. But with an eye to holding down expenses, participating schools will have the option of entering either a four-man unit or a two-man team. Should a school elect to enter only two men, the chapter sponsor will be asked to join his team with one from another chapter to form a unit. Therefore the affirmative team from Siwash U. may join with the negative team from Backlash College and their joint entry would probably be called the Back-wash unit. Arrangements for this type of entry must be made by the chapters concerned prior to the final registration. Since this provision has been included, awards will be made to teams rather than units.

So we have a new event for the National Conference. It won’t revolutionize intercollegiate debate nor satisfy all of our critics, but it does offer change in a program that has been altered only slightly since the merger of the two societies. Let us hope that this attempt to translate informed opinion into action is successful.
One day, in the context of a classroom discussion, I made an undetailed, noncommittal comment about women’s liberation. Later that day, I was approached by a young man (barely an acquaintance) who said something like, “Say, did I detect that you’re a women’s libber?” I chuckled to myself and hesitantly responded, “Well, I suppose.” To that he replied, “Gee, I’m really surprised!” I began to wonder about just what had surprised him. Was it that I didn’t wear a grey T-shirt, blue jeans, denim jacket, and “Dingo” boots every day? Was he surprised because I was not screaming, ranting, and raving about liberation? Or perhaps it was my eye make-up, my occasional concern for coiffeur, or a lingering scent of perfume. Whatever it was, I did not conform to his image of a women’s libber. While talking to a young woman later the same day, I was again confronted with similar attitudes. She responded to my interest in Ms. magazine with a cute smile and a curt, “Does that stuff really interest you? Those gals are all so uptight and sexless!” I began to have suspicions that my notion of women’s liberation and theirs were somewhat different.

The image of women’s liberation that I encountered in both of those conversations is, I think, the image that is most prevalent. It seems futile to argue whether or not this image is “accurate,” because the notion of image is really not a verifiable construct. Rather, an image, according to Kenneth Boulding, represents, essentially, what is believed to be true; it is that which is subjective truth.1

If we look at the role and place of women in American society through the perspective of the concept of “image,” three image stages or configurations are apparent. The focus here is on public image, or what Boulding describes as “an image the essential characteristics of which are shared by the individuals participating in the group.”2 Broadly speaking, there has been a prevalent and traditional image of women that has existed as part of our social and cultural fabric. Several years ago, we witnessed the first contemporary assault on that image, and with that assault evolved a counter-image, the image of the women’s libber—the image that I apparently did not conform to in the interactions alluded to above. My concern in this essay is with yet a third image, one that is less clearly developed, one that is presently being shaped and articulated, and one that seeks to replace the traditional image of the American female, while at the same time countering the prevalent image of the liberated woman. In this rhetorical criticism, I will look specifically at how Ms. magazine, a new publication for and about women, portrays this third and new image.

Images that have been supported and that have enjoyed reaffirmation are difficult to counter simply because they are part of the cultural heritage. “A public image,” says Boulding, “almost invariably produces a ‘transcript’; that is, a record in more or less permanent form which can be handed...
down from generation to generation.” Indeed the role distinctions between male and female in our society have had such a “transcript.” Yet, society is not static, and change in public images can and does occur. Even the traditional image of the woman has changed through time, although this change has been more evolutionary than revolutionary.

What the women’s liberation movement has sought is a disintegration of the old image through revolutionary change. The type of image disintegration that must necessarily occur is roughly a three-stage process: (1) there is an “unself-conscious stage” when people simply believe in the image; (2) the second stage occurs when the image functions at a conscious level and people “believe in believing in it”; but (3) once the image has become consciously considered, “it is a short step to not believing in it at all.”

For the most part, the image of the female existed at stage one until the voices of women’s liberation began to be heard. When the traditional image became the substance of consciousness and became challenged, most people defended it, believed in it, and operated at stage two. Only a minority of people moved to stage three and to total rejection of the traditional image, but this minority did succeed in establishing and developing a counter-image. The traditional image and the counter-image, existing side-by-side, gravitating toward polarities, can best be described as a battle of competing images. Because of the strength of the traditional image, the counter-image of women’s liberation was necessarily antithetical and stereotypically opposite to the prevailing image of the woman. To those people committed to the traditional image, the counter-image was almost grotesque. Perhaps the “grey T-shirt, blue jeans, denim jacket, and dingo boots” outfit captures part of that perceived grotesqueness, but there is more to it than that. Distaste for the counter-image of the women’s liberation often culminates in a view of her that focuses on the perverse and villainous. Look published an article that contends that “establishment” women deal with the movement by stressing “. . . adamantly that it is by and about those others—commies, freaks, lesbians, neurotics” (emphasis added). Further evidence of the discomfort felt about the counter-image comes from the results of a Psychology Today questionnaire on women’s lib:

Many respondents oppose the movement because they associate it with “the crazies.” As one young woman explained: “My aloofness to WL [women’s liberation] is due to the press coverage given to the organization. Although I know better, I don’t want to be thought of as a neurotic lesbian.”

Publications of women’s liberation groups have, apparently, compounded the problem of the counter-image. Newsweek describes the feminist press as “polemical, highly emotional, anti-male and full of radical rhetoric.” The philosophy of the publication seems to make little difference in the counter-image:

While their philosophies range from middle-class liberalism to revolutionary Marxism, most women’s lib publications are produced by small

---

3 Boulding, p. 64.
4 Boulding, p. 62.
5 Betty Rollin, “Backlash Against Women’s Lib—They’re a Bunch of Frustrated Hags,” Look, XXXV (March 9, 1971), 15.
cells of radical feminists whose shrill tenor is reflected in the names of their papers: Off Our Backs . . . , It Ain’t Me Babe . . . , and Goodbye to All That . . . .

Since many women do not, cannot, or will not respond to the counter-image created by the women’s liberation movement, the future of that movement seems to depend largely on whether another much more positive replacement for the old image can be created. It is precisely to that end that Ms. magazine is directed. To one acquainted with women’s liberation literature, the first issue of Ms. looks different. Although attractive in format, the magazine at first glance seems to present a philosophical inconsistency. The purpose of the prose and poetry is clear, but much of the advertising seems alien to that purpose. A closer examination, however, reveals a new, and consistent image.

The essence of this new image is best captured in an article by editor, Gloria Steinem:

Women are human beings first, with minor differences from men that apply largely to the act of reproduction. We share the dreams, capabilities, and weaknesses of all human beings, but our occasional pregnancies and other visible differences have been used to mark us for an elaborate division of labor that may once have been practical but has since become cruel and false.

In a comment prior to the first publication of Ms., Steinem envisioned the magazine “as a nonsexist ‘how to’ magazine ‘for the liberated female human being—not how to make jelly but how to seize control of your life.’”

A careful examination of the contents of the magazine reveals a host of new-image material. An article on “Sisterhood” written by Gloria Steinem is accompanied by a picture of ten females, none resembling “the crazies,” all resembling “women.” By “sisterhood” Steinem means a sharing “with each other [of] the exhilaration of growth and self-discovery, the sensation of having the scales fall from our eyes”; she means “understanding” that ignores “barriers of age, economics, worldly experience, race, culture.” But she never mentions the more common image of man-hating “sisters” demonstrating en masse with shrill voices and clenched fists.

Contrary to the part of the counter-image created by women’s liberation that suggests the feminists are out to break up the family, Letty Cottin Pogrebin writes an article that suggests just the opposite. The new image of women that she portrays places a strong emphasis on family and its importance in human development:

. . . living with Abigail and Robin, age six, is an ongoing consciousness-raising session for my husband and me. In them, and in their three-year-old brother David, we see ourselves. They mirror our attitudes and mimic our relationship. They are constant reminders that lifestyles and sex roles are passed from parents to children as inexorably as blue eyes or small feet.

---

10 “For the Liberated Female: Ms. Magazine,” Time, XLVIII (December 20, 1971), 52.
11 Steinem, 48.
13 Pogrebin, 18.
Pogrebin's most powerful statement comes later in the article when she puts women's liberation into the realm of human liberation:

If we win, human liberation is the prize. Our daughters and sons gain the freedom to develop as persons, not role-players. Relationships between the sexes can flourish without farce and phoniness. And dignity can be the birthright of every child.14

Although space does not permit a detailed analysis of the entire magazine (128 pages), the overall image created is one of a responsible, comprehensive exploration of just about every major issue facing women. The magazine is definitely not benign and flaccid in its statements, but neither does it rant, rave, or present an image of "commies, freaks, lesbians or neurotics" of "shriek tenor." An article on "De-sexing the English Language"15 offers a concrete proposal. A female endocrinologist (who bears the credentials of a "professor of physiology and biophysics at Georgetown University Medical School") explains "Men's Cycles."16 The abortion issue is broached with a straightforward statement demanding repeal of abortion laws which is signed by fifty-three women who have had abortions—among them, Judy Collins, Lee Grant, Lillian Hellman, Jill Johnston, Billie Jean King, and Gloria Steinem.17 "Daniel Ellsberg Talks About Women and War."18 A well documented article appears explaining "Why Women Fear Success."19 The presidential hopefuls are compared and analyzed and evaluated in terms of their positions on women.20 Jane O'Reilly explains very clearly what the feminists would like the housewife to be aware of in relation to role differentiation and discrimination.21 Two articles deal with the black family and feminism, with one particularly addressing the issue of welfare.22 In an interview with a feminist involved in a love relationship with another woman, women are urged not to hastily enter homosexual relationships.23 So the articles are comprehensive and diverse. The image of women is one rich in responsibility and hopeful for humanity.

But how does one account for the ads for beautiful clothes, "Nice'n Easy" hair color, expensive liquor, perfume that will "drive him wild," "Pretty Body" figure salon, and a "Hotray" so that a woman can "do an unheard of thing at dinner time. Sit Down" (it still implies that she has fixed the dinner)? In the prospectus for Ms., Steinem said that "ads will have to be

---

14 Pogrebin, 28.
15 Kate Miller and Casey Swift, "De-Sexing the English Language," Ms., Preview Issue (Spring, 1972), 7.
16 Estelle Ramey, "Men's Cycles (They Have Them Too, You Know)," Ms., Preview Issue (Spring, 1972), 8 ff.
17 "We Have Had Abortions," Ms., Preview Issue (Spring, 1972), 34-35.
20 Brenda Feigen Fastau and Bonnie Lobel, "Rating the Candidates—Feminists Vote the Rascals In or Out," Ms., Preview Issue (Spring, 1972), 74 ff.
23 Anne Koedt, "Can Women Love Women?" Ms., Preview Issue (Spring, 1972), 117 ff.
presented in a manner that . . . ‘respects women’s judgment and intelligence’ . . . and that are not insulting.”\textsuperscript{24} Considered in the context of the material in the magazine, considered in the context of the image presented in the magazine rather than in the context of the counter-image of women’s liberation heretofore prevalent, these ads are not insulting or irresponsible of women’s judgment and intelligence. They respect the ability of a woman to be a \textit{total} person who cares about how she looks because she is a person who is social, who is sexual without participating in sexism, who is integrated and aware. Granted, the appeal of the ads is not to the impoverished, but then most of the opposition to women’s liberation probably does not come from the impoverished. The appeal is to those who might have been perplexed and put off by the notion of what it means to be associated with women’s liberation. The proposed new image with its emphasis on personal and human dignity may potentially reach many more women—and may turn off fewer men, too. Whether or not the new image will become prevalent is only speculation at this time, as is the success of \textit{Ms.} magazine. What we do know is that the first issue sold well and that the editor of \textit{McCall’s} magazine has resigned “to become editor in chief and publisher of \textit{Ms.”}\textsuperscript{25} This suggests that \textit{Ms.} might seriously contend for the popular audience.

With the magazine yet a neophyte, we’ll just have to wait and see what happens. Until then:

Marcia and Marvin live next door to each other.
Marcia likes to climb.
So does Marvin.
Marcia likes to play the drums.
Marvin is taking piano lessons.
They both help their mothers set the table.
And they both help their fathers clear the dishes away.
Marcia likes to move things.
Marvin is a good cat-sitter.
Sometimes Marvin dreams of being a zoo-keeper, or a conductor, or an architect designing a city in the sky.
Those are Marcia’s dreams, too.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{24} “For the Liberated Female: \textit{Ms.} Magazine,” 52.
\textsuperscript{25} “A New Ms. at Ms.,” \textit{Newsweek}, LXXIX (March 13, 1972), 50.
\textsuperscript{26} Eve Merriam, “Boys and Girls, Girls and Boys,” \textit{Ms.}, Preview Issue (Spring, 1972), 97.
THE RHETORICAL STRATEGIES OF JOHN LINDSAY

CHARLES N. WISE

No problem with glamour here. That, in fact, is his only hope. There is little in his record to inspire much confidence among voters. But his charisma is beginning to stir up excitement. A good horse, as the polls say, even if a dark one. He is every advance man's dream candidate—sensitive to the shifts in place and mood. He knows when to roll up his shirtsleeves and loosen his tie and when to button up again. . . . But whether they turn out to gawk at him as a celebrity or as a presidential candidate is a matter of debate—TIME, March 6, 1972.

The academic suitability of the language above is suspect, but its central message is not. Other candidates, the press, and an unknown proportion of the electorate do appear to perceive John Vliet Lindsay as a "shallow" political figure, incongruously blessed with public media magic. Lindsay was given little chance in 1972, an accurate prediction. Even "one of our own," speech-writer Robert Schrumm, had defected from Lindsay to the Muskie camp.

Still, one got the feeling that other candidates and their staffs were watching Lindsay very nervously, if only over their shoulders. The apparent lesson contained in The Selling of the President, 1968 had not been forgotten, and Richard Nixon was admittedly not the same caliber of "raw material" for the media in 1968 that John Lindsay appeared to be in 1972.

This paper will sample the rhetorical techniques and strategies employed by John Vliet Lindsay to project his political image in the years leading to the 1972 Democratic national convention. The author's brief definition of rhetoric(al) is "spoken symbolic interaction." Accordingly, the analysis will utilize pertinent communication transactions, whether public or private, whether in formal speech contexts or not in such contexts. The analysis is somewhat limited by its data, which are confined to public record. Personal access to Lindsay or close associates has not been possible.

At least two implicit assumptions which affect conclusions drawn in the paper should be made explicit. The assumptions are:

1. That the entities called "rhetorical strategies and techniques" are the result of a complex chain of interactions involving the rhetorical figure; his friends, associates, and enemies; the public media, especially the press; and listeners in their own complex network of communication flows.

2. That an "image" is like an expensive diamond: each is multi-faceted; both are susceptible to differential perception, depending upon the viewer's vantage point; and the real perception of either is tested ultimately in the market place, not by the critic.

Charles N. Wise, Ph.D., Oklahoma University, 1966, is Associate Professor of Speech and Theatre Arts at Texas Tech University. This paper is revised from a presentation at the convention of the Texas State Speech convention, October 8, 1971.

To paraphrase an imitation, in studying John Vliet Lindsay one began to hear a persistent echo: "Let me make one thing perfectly clear. I am (running for) the President. Make no mistake about that!" Lindsay seems always to have been running for the ultimate office, whatever the particular race in his fifteen-year political career. As Oliver Pilat phrased it:

THURSDAY, May 13, 1965—John Lindsay began running today for president by way of New York's City Hall. Naturally he did not disclose his ultimate goal. His immediate prospects are dim enough without an unnecessary handicap.\(^2\)

The Lindsay family had its goal firmly in sight. On election night, 1964, when Lindsay was reelected the 17th District congressman, Woody Klein, a reporter later to be Lindsay's press secretary, asked Mary Lindsay if her husband should aim higher. "Of course he should go on," she replied matter-of-factly, "John has brought integrity and decency into politics in New York."\(^3\)

Illustrating rhetorical strategies used by John Lindsay to project his political image requires two generalizations: what "is" John Vliet Lindsay's political image, and what was the rhetorical situation which Lindsay confronted in his abortive attempt for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1972?\(^4\)

Methods of describing an image are as numerous as the describers. All methods might be divided into two broad categories, Qualitative (intuitive) or Quantitative (by the numbers). The author's method may loosely be considered a combination. The process was as follows: (1) the author inventoried his previous personal "experience" with Lindsay; (2) the author read all items under "Lindsay" listed in The Readers Guide to Periodical Literature from October, 1962 to the present; and (3) other works were read, such as Woody Klein, Lindsay's Promise: The Dream that Failed; Oliver Pilat, Lindsay's Campaign; Barbara Carter, The Road to City Hall; Daniel Button, Lindsay, and William F. Buckley, Jr., The Unmaking of a Mayor. This input was augmented, of course, by continuing information from the mass media and interpersonal discussions with colleagues.

Given the input, the author drew his conclusions about Lindsay's political image into tabular form. Table 1 represents the author's attempt to perceive Lindsay's political image through the eyes of different groups.

This report of Lindsay's image reinforces a commonly known phenomenon: the beholder's beholding is mediated by a host of variables, including self-characteristics, political loyalties, pressure group commitments, and ethnic group identifications and strivings.

To a Lindsay disciple or enthusiast, the image is one of strength, warmth, sincerity, concern, unselfishness; a man above petty ambition and party politics. Lindsay's dedicated opponents and others perceive the ex-Yalie, ex-naval officer, ex-Congressman as inconsistent, incompetent, untrustworthy, and opportunistic. But even his bitterest critics acknowledge the personal "charm" which is surely Lindsay's greatest asset. William F. Buckley, Jr., the conservative writer, TV personality, and mayoral candidate has observed that Lindsay is "classically Grecian" and "a Cecil B. DeMille

---

\(^2\) Oliver Pilat, Lindsay's Campaign: A Behind-the-Scenes Diary, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 3.

A political image of John Vliet Lindsay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Characteristic</th>
<th>CL</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive ___________</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active ____________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak _____________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong ____________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold _____________</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm ______________</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest ____________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest __________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere __________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insincere __________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent __________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent __________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid _____________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible __________</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winner ____________</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loser _____________</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The groups are (CL) Conservative Laymen; (LL) Liberal Laymen; (DP) Democratic Politicians; (RP) Republican Politicians; (J) Jewish Voters; and (B) Black Voters, including other non-white. A minus score (-) is a tendency toward the left-hand adjective; a plus (+) score is a tendency toward the right-hand adjective. "0" is the midpoint, and a three (3) is a maximum tendency.

Another critic, following his initial personal meeting with Lindsay, commented that "I can understand why he is almost impossible to defeat. He is a man of almost indescribable personal attractiveness." Murray Kempton, not an opponent but a perceptive mass media commentator, wrote of Lindsay in 1965 that "You're never safe in running against simple charm. He has the face that could make New Yorkers hope again." What was the rhetorical situation faced in 1972, as perceived by Lindsay and ourselves? The temptation was strong for Lindsay to draw an analogy between his two mayoralty campaigns and his effort for the 1972 democratic presidential nomination, to consider New York city elections as a "microcosm" of a national convention and election. Philip Tracy's description of a New York City mayoral election echoes beyond the Hudson in supporting such an analogy:

Most New Yorkers understand that little can be done to rectify the chaos that engulfs the city each working day and most weekends. Consequently, the election of a New York mayor is never decided on the basis of which candidate will best be able to solve the problems that beset us. Instead, people instinctively choose the man they feel will least damage the delicate balance of conflicting forces which allows the city to survive.

Other evidence supported an analogy between New York and national politics, including the distributions of parties, pressure groups, ethnic groups, and general political attitudes.

By way of the analogy, the rhetorical situation Lindsay faced can be summarized as in Figure 1, which superimposes 1972 updating upon the rhetorical situations Lindsay confronted in his two mayoralty elections.

---

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Philip Tracy, *Commonweal*, October 24, 1969, p. 98.
8 See William F. Buckley, Jr., *The Unmaking of a Mayor*, particularly Section VI (New York: The Viking Press, 1966).
According to Fig. 1, Lindsay had to project his positive image to liberal members of both parties, since conservatives in both parties, other things being equal, were not "his people." Even though his prime target was the Democratic national nomination, Lindsay, like the other candidates, was really campaigning nationally even when nominally campaigning in a state primary. The total pattern of primary voting, Republican, Democratic, and minor parties, is important to a primary contestant. A nominee's effect upon the opposition party is often equally as important as his effect upon his own party.  

In this situation Lindsay found himself in a disadvantageous position relative to the other candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination, Muskie, Humphrey, Kennedy, and McGovern. Those candidates had not only liberal "credentials" but also strong party identifications and political I.O.U.'s due and payable. Of course, a shifting kaleidoscope of variables, mind-boggling to predict, affected all candidates, all primaries, and the convention itself. Ultimately, new procedural rules in the Democratic convention, certain candidate stands on certain issues, and superior grass roots organization brought to the fore one of the darkest horses in American political history.

9 Perhaps a candidate shows capability at attracting larger numbers of actual voters, or neutralizes opposition party members who will neither vote for him or the nominee of their own party. And, of course, there remain the "independents," said to be the largest and growing segment of the electorate. Primary results showing such trends for a candidate thus become national "trial heats" for a national convention.

10 General Semantics colleagues may now throw away all previous examples and concentrate upon the Kennedy phenomenon. Was he, or wasn't he a candidate for the nomination? For the paper, he was considered a viable candidate.

11 During the fall, 1971, numerous weekly magazines, especially Time and Newsweek, printed lengthy articles analyzing the relationships between major Democratic candidates and state and local party officials. The articles sought to assay the effect of help and favors given by the major candidates to those party officers.

12 The author's personal judgment. Many theses, dissertations, articles, and books remain to be written before any consensus is likely to emerge.
Assuming the given image and rhetorical situation, how did John Vliet Lindsay attempt "to link himself with the voters through the use of symbols, especially oral symbols." As in Lindsay's earlier campaigns, the strategies following were employed. To succinctly summarize the thrust of the strategies, Lindsay had to get himself perceived by voters as "more trustworthy than Muskie," "more dynamic than Humphrey," "'cleaner' than Kennedy," and "less 'radical' than McGovern."

STEP ONE: "The superordinate candidate strategy." Muzafer and Caroline Sherif appear to have shown that discordant groups can occasionally be unified for common action when certain mutually desirable objectives appear that transcend the groups' normal divisions, a process labeled "development of superordinate goals." By analogy, Lindsay presented himself as the "superordinate candidate"—a candidate who, "in this emergency," can command working support from all, regardless of political affiliation.

Lindsay developed the strategy in 1965, by stressing his individuality as a mayoral candidate rather than his (then) Republican party membership. Lindsay had also refused to publicly or privately support the 1964 national candidacy of Goldwater and Miller. The most basic statement of independence came in Lindsay's public insistence that "I'm running as Lindsay." At a 1965 news conference in Washington Lindsay was asked if he planned to enlist Republican governor Nelson Rockefeller for the mayoralty campaign. Lindsay replied that he was not excluding the Governor, since "he is a New Yorker," but that "I don't need officialdom to hold me up. I'm sure New Yorkers will not vote for me on the basis of what some important persons and officials say about me."

The strategy was continuously reinforced by appeals aimed at super-ordination. For example, Lindsay stressed that "principle" must survive partisan politics in New York:

In an appeal often repeated, Lindsay, reminiscent of an early McCarthy, urged voters to elect him in order to confront the "Power Brokers" of all political allegiances who were holding back city progress. Lindsay, often pressed by reporters to name the "brokers," would invariably smile and reply, "They know who they are!"

The strategy, with an apparently proven "track record" of success, was brought forward for the 1972 national campaign. Lindsay has been very active in several groups of city mayors, with attendant publicity. He has, for example, put together a bi-partisan group of mayors from upstate New York called the "Big Six." Although laughed at initially by some power

---

13 A paraphrase from Conceptual Frontiers . . . , p. 19.
15 Common knowledge, noted in Button, p. 38.
17 Pilat, p. 33.
18 New Yorker, October 4, 1969, p. 34.
19 Klein, p. 95.
groups in New York and Washington, the laughter died away when at least eleven more New York state mayors asked to join the group. According to one commentator, "the mayors haven't hesitated to 'zero in' on 'the enemy' in Washington, whether it be the Republican in the White House or the Democrats who hold key chairmanships in Congress."\(^{20}\)

STEP TWO: "The declaration of emergency strategy." To be a successful superordinate candidate requires an emergency sufficient to arouse the process. Although a traditional strategy in American politics, the declaration of emergency strategy does not appear to debilitate with age. The strategy was particularly appropriate for Lindsay in 1965 and 1969, and seemed indicated for the national campaign. Faced in 1965 with an entrenched opposition election apparatus, Democratic registration majorities, his own Republican regulars who seemed content to live off Democratic crumbs,\(^{21}\) and a lack of personal city-wide campaign machinery, Lindsay needed to arouse prospective campaign workers and voters alike. Fear and its derivatives are the prime ingredients of the emergency strategy. Declaration of the emergency permeated the "set speeches" delivered to various groupings in the city: "We are witnessing the decline and fall of New York City. . . We are at the crossroads. This is the test. Either we meet it or we don't. . . It's now or never—the last chance in your lifetime."\(^{22}\)

The national emergency for 1972 (other than the possible reelection of Richard Nixon) was construed to be "selfishness" and "apathy" in Washington, a theme pursued heavily by Lindsay in the Arizona and Florida primaries. One writer, somewhat cynical about the mayor's motivation and sincerity, described the 1972 version of the strategy in this way:

"The mayor has lately been trying out a theme borrowed from Governor George Wallace and cleaned up a bit. He's decided to run against Washington, not against the "pointy heads with briefcases" who inhabit Wallace's rhetoric, but against the men who "grow remote" while in residence on the banks of the Potomac."\(^{23}\)

STEP THREE: "The four-minute miler strategy." Given a voter perception of imminent danger and a mounting predisposition to "vote for the man" rather than for party loyalty, Lindsay sought to reinforce in voters the existing image of youthfulness and inexhaustible energy, a John F. Kennedy image facet copied assiduously by political candidates since 1960. Significantly, the predominant poster for Lindsay in 1965 proclaimed, "He's fresh—all the rest are tired."\(^{24}\) Photographs published of Lindsay, even those by enemies, usually show exuberance and spirit. Calculated publications remind those (of the proper age) of the fiftyish "Il Duce" bobsledding, the seventyish Chairman Mao swimming down the Yangtze. A widely circulated example has Lindsay in a seemingly perfectly-executed swan dive from a five meter diving board, before an admiring group of teenagers.\(^{25}\)

Lindsay has been always an exciting candidate, with shrewd press management. Consequently, it must have appeared to New York (and na-

---

\(^{21}\) Pilat, p. 14.
\(^{22}\) Printed in many sources, but taken in this instance from a unique set of photographs with the quoted remarks as captions. From Carter, pp. 41–42.
\(^{23}\) Wieck, p. 19.
\(^{24}\) Pilat, p. 164.
\(^{25}\) Carter, p. 133.
tional) voters, deluged with word-of-mouth and media accounts of Lindsay happenings, that Lindsay did possess the capacity and ability to cope with extraordinary demands upon his physical and emotional reserves. Those constituents certainly thought so when, in moments of city crisis, they observed the mayor in a television address at 2:30 a.m., followed by press conferences at 6:00 a.m. The 1972 “Eagleton Affair” has, of course, underscored the importance voters appear to place on stamina or the appearance of stamina. Like Caesar’s wife, a candidate must be above suspicion with respect to physical and emotional health.

Mayor Lindsay continued his reinforcement of the image deep into his presidential nomination race. As one New York writer noted, whether city or primary, “The mayor went wherever he’d find people and the press. In a matter of days (after announcing national candidacy), he was on the 6 p.m. and 11 p.m. broadcasts regularly.” He has since relaxed.

This paper has sampled the rhetorical techniques and strategies used by John Vliet Lindsay to project his political image. To facilitate analysis generalizations were necessary with respect to Lindsay’s political image and the rhetorical situation he confronted. Numerous other strategies were not explored, and, for that matter, readers and other writers might well choose other labels for the strategies which were explored. Additional studies might consider (1) why decisions were made to communicate directly with some groups, but not others; (2) how the decisions were made with respect to form and media for certain items of communication; (3) in what ways and for what reasons rumor campaigns were employed; or (4) in what ways a delicate mix of concreteness and ambiguity was achieved with certain groups.

Actually, Lindsay’s hope probably isn’t in coalition building, be it in Florida or Wisconsin. McGovern has already shown himself adept at that. Nor in building from a party base. Muskie is nailing that one down. Or in labor’s leadership. They like Jackson and Humphrey too well. Or even in the rural poor who’ll gravitate toward a Wallace. For Lindsay, the hope lies in being able to evoke an excitement that will rip off voters in every category, (or) In his sex appeal. Given the malaise that has spread over rank-and-file Democratic voters in recent months, its not to be discounted.

New Republic, January, 1972

26 Klein, pp. 51–52.
27 Wieck, p. 19.
THE RELATIONSHIP OF A BACKGROUND IN SCHOLASTIC FORENSICS TO EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Aet Pollock

In a democracy, the most powerful application of oral communication is frequently found in the legislative branches of constitutional government. There, the spoken interaction of today often dictates the law of the land tomorrow. In this study, focused upon the Florida State House of Representatives, an attempt was made to discover whether or not participation in scholastic forensics contributed to communication effectiveness in the legislative body. For the study, two general questions were formulated for the relationship the author sought to test:

1. Who are the most effective oral communicators in the Florida House of Representatives?
2. What is the scholastic forensic background (high school and/or college) of these most effective oral communicators?

PROCEDURES

All eighty-seven members of the Florida House, with experience prior to the 1971 Regular Session, were polled via a one-page questionnaire. The return was accomplished by a series of two mailouts, the second of which was sent to all who had not responded after an initial three-week period.

The survey questionnaire was constructed in two sections. The first asked members to circle the level of participation applicable (high school, college or both) to all or any of thirteen individual forensic activities as they may have been sponsored, promoted or held under the auspices of a speech communication department or school forensic group. The extensive list of forensic events included: debate, oratory, extemporaneous speaking, impromptu speaking, persuasive speaking, expository speaking, parliamentary speaking, declamation, after-dinner speaking, group discussion, group action, student congress and oral interpretation. The second section called for members to rank order three of their House colleagues in each of four areas of oral communication effectiveness: (1) floor debate, (2) floor speaking, (3) group discussion (as in committee), and (4) person-to-person communication.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sixty-one of eighty-seven experienced House members, or seventy per cent, responded to the survey. Categorical ratings of communication effectiveness were tabulated on the basis of awarding three points for a first place ranking, two points for a second place ranking and one point for a third place ranking in each individual communication category.

Mr. Pollock (M.S., The Florida State University, 1971) is a doctoral candidate in communication at The Florida State University.
Those legislators collectively accounting for a clear majority of the total points awarded in each of the four categories established a basis for the discussion of results in each individual communication category. For example, the potential relationship of experience in educational debate to effectiveness in floor debate in the legislative assembly was obvious. Two of the three House members preponderantly listed by their colleagues as most effective in floor debate were former scholastic debaters. The top-rated member, in fact, was an ex-Harvard team member.

Three of the five members outstanding in the second category, floor speaking, were active in such forensic endeavor as debate, extempor speaking and oratory. All three were participants in student congress, a forensic activity designed to bring together the skills of debate, discussion, oratory, extemporaneous speaking and related oral communication forms.

A third category of oral communication effectiveness, group discussion, was designed to discover the relationship of a forensic background to success in committee work, an activity familiar to all legislators. Only one of the seven members rated outstandingly high in this area was devoid of a forensic background. The forensic experience of the remaining six covered a wide range of activities. It is interesting to note, however, that of the six, only one legislator could list participation in two group-oriented forensic events sparingly used today, group action and group discussion.

The final category, effectiveness in person-to-person communication, found only two of the eleven top-rated communicators lacking in forensic participation in high school or college. Virtually all forensic events were represented in this most basic area of oral communication, and the range of persons judged most effective was the narrowest among those named.

CONCLUSIONS

While it is difficult to measure so nebulous a thing as effective oral communication in any area, this legislative survey was a concrete attempt, based on the concept of peer evaluation. In speculating what role forensic activity plays in the attainment of oral communication success in legislative halls, some positive conclusions can be inferred. For example, the correlation ran high in this survey that the very top debaters and floor speakers in the Florida House of Representatives were also those who had previous experience in scholastic debate or public speaking-type forensic activity.

Persons with oral communication skills honed by varied forensic events were also regarded highly by their colleagues in group discussion activity.

Indeed a concrete justification of the value of forensics as a co-curricular activity in speech communication may be inferred from these survey results. As a case in point, virtually every legislator accorded high ratings in the basic category of interpersonal communication, listed forensic experience as a student.

In summary then it is most reasonable to conclude that participation in scholastic forensic activities can make a demonstrated contribution to the practical communication effectiveness of the legislator within the deliberative body.
LEGISLATION ADOPTED BY DSR-TKA CONGRESS: 1972

(Note: The following bills and resolutions were passed by participants in the Student Congress at the 1972 DSR-TKA National Conference at the University of New Mexico. The Speaker of the Assembly was Bruce' Beye, Kansas State University, and the Clerk of the Assembly was Jan Underhill, University of Hawaii.)

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 1
Majority Bill by Joint Committee on population problems of underdeveloped countries.

Alex Shumate, Ohio Wesleyan
Thomas Cooley, Murray State
Chris Berwanger, Creighton
Mike Hobart, Murray State
Nancy Ramsey, DePauw
Joe Zimmerer, Creighton

Be it resolved that this body is in favor of providing assistance in the control of the population of underdeveloped countries.

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

Section 1: That the United Nations appoint a commission on world population.

Section 2: That the commission shall study, with the full cooperation of internal commissions within each individual nation, the respective religious and cultural attitudes which tend to influence family size and/or inhibit or aid population control.

Section 3: That the internal commission of each underdeveloped nation shall formulate, based on the above study, a specific population control program.

Section 4: That based upon the economic criteria set by the United Nations and by the population progression within these countries funding shall be established as follows:

1. The allocation of these funds shall be at the discretion of the internal commission within each underdeveloped nation, with the approval of the United Nations Commission.

2. All countries within the United Nations will be assessed for the funding of the commission according to their Gross National Product and their population progression.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 2
Majority Bill by Main Committee 1-A on United States population problems.

Ernest Beal, Wabash College
Jon Benson, Mankato State College
Jim Carr, Murray State University
John Fuller, University of New Mexico
Aubrey Miller, Samford University
Gary Tomaszewski, Creighton University

An act to establish a Nationwide Program to promote population control education.
BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1: That the Office of Education encourage through subsidies the further development of educational materials concerned with population control. The Office of Education shall determine criteria by which subsidies will be allocated and shall determine the eligibility of persons or organizations applying.

Section 2: Every public or private secondary school shall be required to provide a three-hour lecture concerning the correct use and potential dangers and comparative advantages and disadvantages of the various means of contraception. The Office of Education shall distribute to accredited schools upon their request educational material dealing with population control.

Section 3: That the Office of Education establish criteria for school programs and courses dealing with population control. Upon request, the Office of Education will subsidize programs and courses meeting such criteria.

Section 4: That the funds for this program will come from Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 3
Majority Bill by Main Committee 1-B on United States population problems.

Originaly submitted by the University of Hawaii
Mike Lumstrom, Mankato
Dave Lanier, University of New Mexico
Pamela Motter, DePauw
Kevin Bower, Ohio Wesleyan
Renee Tatro, Kansas State
Clay Boeltz, University of North Dakota

An act to deal with contraceptive regulations and devices.

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

Section 1: That no law shall abridge the right of the people to possess, transport, promote, sell and use contraceptive devices and drugs which have been approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

Section 2: That companies contracted by the United States government to produce said contraceptive devices shall certify to the United States government the cost of said devices and that these devices may not be sold to the United States government at more than ten per cent above the costs to the producers of the contraception devices.

Section 3: That said contraceptive devices are to be distributed at no cost to the recipients.

Section 4: That state, county, and local Boards of Health shall be responsible for providing upon demand birth control methods, devices, and drugs.
Section 5: No law shall deny a person who has reached the age of majority, which in this matter shall be 16 years of age, the right to be sterilized for the purpose of preventing conception.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 4
Majority Bill by Main Committee 1-B on United States population problems.

Mike Lumstrom, Mankato
Dave Lanier, University of New Mexico
Kevin Bower, Ohio Wesleyan
Renee Tatro, Kansas State
Pamela Motter, DePauw
Clay Boeltz, University of North Dakota

An Act to provide an economic incentive to control United States population.

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

Section 1: That tax exemption shall be limited to the first two natural-born children.

Section 2: That all natural-born in the family thereafter shall receive no tax exemption.

Section 3: That all adopted children will qualify for tax exemption.

Section 4: That a multiple birth occurring before two children have been born shall be tax exempt.

Section 5: This bill will take effect April 16, 1973.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 5
Individual Bill on United States population problems.

Aubrey Miller, Samford University

An Act to provide higher incomes to prostitutes.

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

Section 1: That prostitution shall be legalized according to standards to be set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 6
Majority Bill by Main Committee 1-A on United States population problems.

Gordon Haas, University of Hawaii
Jan Underhill, University of Hawaii
Karen Nakano, University of Hawaii
Raymond Kato, University of Hawaii
Jon Benson, Mankato State College
Jim Carr, Murray State University
Ernest Beal, Wabash College
John Fuller, University of New Mexico
Aubrey Miller, Samford University
Gary Tomaszewski, Creighton University

An Act to guarantee the right of the people for termination of a pregnancy.
BE IT ENACTED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1: That no law shall abridge the right of a non-married woman who has reached the age of majority to terminate her pregnancy within ninety days after conception.

Section 2: That no law shall abridge the right of a non-married woman under the age of majority with the consent of her parents to terminate her pregnancy within ninety days after conception.

Section 3: That no law shall abridge the right of a married woman with the concurrence of her husband to terminate her pregnancy within ninety days after conception.

Section 4: That this act shall not preclude any state from enlarging the right of its citizens to control their own reproductive systems by whatever means they choose.

Section 5: That all termination of pregnancies shall be done in a licensed hospital.

SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS

Congress Special Resolution Number 1

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

Section 1: That the University of New Mexico be thanked for hosting the 9th annual DSR-TKA National Forensic Conference. More specifically, that the University be thanked for their gracious hospitality and the financial support given the convention.

Section 2: That Professor Wayne G. Eubank, Tournament Director, be commended for his outstanding job in coordinating this 9th annual DSR-TKA National Conference. Furthermore, that he be commended for his efforts to provide superior accommodations and convenient transportation facilities.

Section 3: (a) That Professor Kenneth E. Andersen and Professor Robert O. Weiss be commended for their instrumental assistance in the execution of the 9th annual DSR-TKA Student Congress. Without their help this Student Congress would not have been possible. (b) That Professor Kenneth E. Andersen be commended for his influence in the outstanding progress that the DSR-TKA Student Congress has made in the last 9 years.

Substitute Resolution for Resolution Number 2

A Minority Resolution by Main Committee #3 concerning population control in developed nations.

Tonnie Bennie, Creighton
Raymond Kato, Hawaiii
Mark Guenin, Wabash
Whereas: Population Stabilization can best be determined by the individual nations themselves and trends toward population stabilization are self-evident in many developed nations including Britain, France, Germany, and Japan.

Whereas: Data and resources can best be analyzed within the framework of each individual nation; it should not be the function of any world organization to dictate population control standards to other developed nations.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

That all developed nations should adopt a laissez-faire policy towards population control of the other developed nations.

Congress Special Resolution Number 3

Whereas: Jan Underhill, Clerk of the Assembly, is an accomplished hula dancer, and

Whereas: The entire assembly was not fortunate enough to witness the extraordinary demonstration of this example of ancient Hawaiian culture which took place on the night of March 30th in the lounge of the Desert Sands, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

That Miss Underhill be asked to repeat the above mentioned demonstration at the Conference Banquet on the night of March 31st.

Congress Special Resolution Number 5

Whereas: oral caucasing during a legislative session is unmannerly and noisy, and

Whereas: communication between members of one's party and one's delegation is crucial to the legislative process.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA:

That this assembly respectfully request next year's DSR-TKA national conference director to make adequate provision for the presence of pages during the legislative session.

Congress Special Resolution Number 6 (An open letter voted to be recorded in the minutes)

No one can deny the fact that there exists a racial problem in America today. The Black Caucus firmly believes that the fact that there is a substantial disproportionate numerical balance between whites and non-whites is a major cause of this dissension between the races. Consistently and blindly, white America has closed its eyes to this one possible area as a solution, i.e., the redistribution of power. The Caucus maintains (and the vote today seems to verify our premise) that white America closes its eyes
because it feels intimidated and threatened. (Legislative precedence was the cop-out used today. If that would have been unavailable, white America would have surely found another “rationale” to be blind!)

If we seriously want to solve America’s racial problem we must put our personal prejudices and paranoia aside.

Our resolution was not an effort to threaten you, but to open your eyes.

In hopes of a better society,

/s/ Alex Shumate
/s/ Aubrey S. Miller
/s/ Micheal E. Burleigh
/s/ Wayne J. Wilson, Jr.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha National Council has established a standard subscription rate of $5.00 per year for Speaker and Gavel.

Present policy provides that new members, upon election, are provided with two years of Speaker and Gavel free of charge. Life members, furthermore, who have paid a Life Patron alumni membership fee of $100, likewise regularly receive Speaker and Gavel. Also receiving each issue are the current chapter sponsors and the libraries of institutions holding a charter in the organization.

Other individuals and libraries are welcome to subscribe to Speaker and Gavel. Subscription orders should be sent to Allen Press, P. O. Box 368, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.
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TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS
1973 NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Note: The National Conference Committee consists of George Adamson, University of Utah, chairman; Kenneth Andersen, University of Illinois, Cully Clark, University of Alabama, James Benson, Ball State University, and John Bertolotti, University of Alabama. Suggestions for improvements or changes in the schedule or rules may be addressed to Professor Adamson.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1973
3:00–6:00 p.m. NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING
3:00–6:00 p.m. STUDENT COUNCIL MEETING
6:00–8:00 p.m. REGISTRATION
8:15–9:15 p.m. OPENING ASSEMBLY

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1973
7:45 a.m. Breakfast for participants in Two-Man Debate and in the Student Congress
8:15 a.m. Breakfast for participants in Four-Man Debate
8:30 a.m. ROUND I—TWO-MAN DEBATE
8:30–10:00 a.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Party Caucuses
9:00 a.m. ROUND I—FOUR-MAN DEBATE
9:00 a.m. ROUND I—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
10:00 a.m. ROUND II—TWO-MAN DEBATE
10:30 a.m. ROUND II—FOUR-MAN DEBATE
10:30 a.m. ROUND II—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
10:30–11:30 a.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Opening Legislative Assembly
11:30 a.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Main Committee Meetings
11:45–12:45 p.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Main Committee Meetings
12:00 Noon ROUND III—FOUR-MAN DEBATE
12:00 Noon ROUND III—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
1:15–2:30 p.m. Lunch
2:30–4:00 p.m. ROUND I—EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING
2:30–4:00 p.m. ROUND I—PERSUASIVE SPEAKING
4:00–5:00 p.m. ROUND IV—TWO-MAN DEBATE
4:00–5:15 p.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Main Committee Meetings
5:30–6:30 p.m. MODEL INITIATION
7:00 p.m. DINNER PARTY FOR FACULTY
FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 1973

7:45 a.m. Breakfast, participants in Two-Man Debate and in the Student Congress
8:15 a.m. Breakfast, Participants in Four-Man Debate
8:30 a.m. ROUND V—TWO-MAN DEBATE
9:00 a.m. ROUND IV—FOUR-MAN DEBATE
9:00 a.m. ROUND IV—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
8:30–10:00 a.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Main Committee Meetings
10:00 a.m. ROUND VI—TWO-MAN DEBATE
10:30 a.m. ROUND V—FOUR-MAN DEBATE
10:30 a.m. ROUND V—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
10:15–11:15 a.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Joint Committee Meetings
11:15–12:00 a.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Steering Committee
11:30 a.m. ROUND VII—TWO-MAN DEBATE
12:00 Noon ROUND VI—FOUR-MAN DEBATE
12:00 Noon ROUND VI—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
12:30–2:00 p.m. Lunch
1:15–2:15 p.m. STUDENT CONGRESS, Legislative Session
2:30–4:00 p.m. ROUND II—EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING
2:30–4:00 p.m. ROUND II—PERSUASIVE SPEAKING
4:00–5:00 p.m. ROUND VIII—TWO-MAN DEBATE
5:00 p.m. ELECTION OF STUDENT OFFICERS
7:00 p.m. CONFERENCE BANQUET
9:30 p.m. FACULTY SOCIAL HOUR

SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 1973

7:45 a.m. Breakfast, participants in Two-Man Debate and in the Student Congress
8:15 a.m. Breakfast, participants in Four-Man Debate
8:30 a.m. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, TWO-MAN DEBATE
8:30 a.m. OCTO-FINAL ROUND, TWO-MAN DEBATE
8:30–12:00 Noon STUDENT CONGRESS, Legislative Assembly
9:00 a.m. ROUND VII, FOUR-MAN DEBATE
9:00 a.m. ROUND VII—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
10:00 a.m. QUARTER-FINAL ROUND, TWO-MAN DEBATE
10:30 a.m. ROUND VIII, FOUR-MAN DEBATE
10:30 a.m. ROUND VIII—CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE
11:30 a.m. SEMI-FINAL ROUND, TWO-MAN DEBATE
11:45–1:30 p.m. Lunch
1:00–2:30 p.m. FINALS, EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING
1:00–2:30 p.m. FINALS, PERSUASIVE SPEAKING
2:00–4:00 p.m. FINALS, TWO-MAN DEBATE
4:00–4:45 p.m. AWARDS ASSEMBLY
RULES FOR NATIONAL CONFERENCE EVENTS

I. TWO-MAN DEBATE
1. The national intercollegiate debate proposition shall be used.
2. Each chapter may enter one or two teams who shall be prepared to
debate on both sides of the proposition.
3. There shall be eight preliminary rounds of debate for all teams en-
tered in this event. The sixteen teams with the best records shall
be chosen to enter the octafinal rounds. This shall be followed by
quarterfinal rounds, semifinal rounds, and a final round to deter-
mine a champion.
4. Debates shall be standard type (i.e., ten-minute constructive
speeches and five-minute rebuttal speeches). There shall be no
intermission between constructive and rebuttal speeches.
5. Each chapter participating in this event must provide a qualified
critic judge. As a condition of entering a team in this event, the
judge undertakes to be available for judging assignments through
the quarterfinal rounds; judges whose teams enter the octafinal
round undertake to be available for judging assignments through
the final round.
6. Any team more than fifteen minutes late for any round shall for-
feit that round of debate. Their scheduled opponent shall be
 credited with a win for that round and shall be credited with the
average rank and points they have earned in their other rounds.
7. If a judge is more than fifteen minutes late in meeting a judging
assignment, his team shall forfeit that round. Their opponent
shall be credited with a win, rank, and points as provided in Rule
I, 6.
8. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha certificates shall be awarded
to the eight highest ranking debaters on the basis of their achieve-
ment in the eight preliminary rounds of debate. Trophies shall be
awarded to the winner of the event, to the second place team,
and to the two other semifinalist teams. The winner shall also
be awarded possession, for one year, of the rotating trophy.
9. The American Forensic Association Form C Debate Ballot shall
be used for all debates.
10. Judges may give a critique after each debate, but they may not
announce a decision.

II. FOUR-MAN DEBATE
1. The national intercollegiate debate proposition shall be used.
2. Each chapter may enter one affirmative team and one negative
team (a total of four students) in this event.
3. There shall be eight rounds of debate for all teams entered in
this event.
4. Debates shall be standard type (i.e., ten-minute constructive
speeches and five-minute rebuttal speeches). There shall be no
intermission between constructive and rebuttal speeches.
5. Each chapter participating in this event must provide a qualified
critic judge who, as a condition of entering his teams, undertakes
to be available for judging assignments throughout all eight
rounds.
6. Any team more than fifteen minutes late for any round shall forfeit that round of debate. Their scheduled opponent shall be credited with a win for that round and shall be credited with the average rank and points they have earned in their other rounds.

7. If a judge is more than fifteen minutes late in meeting a judging assignment, his affirmative team shall forfeit that round. Their opponents shall be credited with a win, rank, and points as provided in Rule II, 6.

8. DSR-TKA certificates shall be awarded to the four highest ranking affirmative debaters and to the four highest ranking negative debaters on the basis of their achievements in the eight rounds of debate. Trophies shall be awarded to the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th ranking four-man units. The 1st place unit shall also be awarded possession, for one year, of the rotating trophy.

9. The American Forensic Association Form C Debate Ballot shall be used for all debates.

10. Judges may give a critique after each debate, but they may not announce a decision.

III. PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

1. Each chapter may enter one or two student speakers. Men and women shall compete in the same division. Students entering persuasive speaking cannot enter extemporaneous speaking.

2. Each contestant shall participate in two rounds of speaking. The final round shall consist of eight speakers chosen from Rounds I and II on the following basis: (a) high total number of superior ratings, (b) low total rank (if ratings are tied), (c) high total percentage points (if ranks are tied). In all rounds the order of speaking shall be determined by random drawing.

3. Each speaker shall deliver a speech on a subject of his choosing. The speech must be original and of the speaker's own composition. The speech must be persuasive in nature, designed to inspire, convince, or actuate.

4. The speech must not be more than ten minutes in length.

5. The speech may be delivered with or without notes.

6. Each chapter participating in this event must provide a qualified critic judge who, as a condition of entering his students, undertakes to be available for judging assignments for all three rounds. NOTE: Judges may be assigned to either persuasive speaking or extemporaneous speaking or both at the discretion of the chairmen of these events. NOTE: If a chapter enters speakers in both persuasive speaking and extemporaneous speaking, it must provide judges for both events.

7. At least three judges shall be used in each section.

8. Any speaker more than fifteen minutes late in meeting his speaking assignment shall forfeit that round and shall be assigned zero rating, rank, and points.

9. If a judge is more than fifteen minutes late in meeting a judging assignment, his contestant shall forfeit that round and shall be assigned zero rating, rank, and points. If a judge has two contestants, this forfeit shall apply only to the contestant whose last name comes first alphabetically.
10. In each round each judge will rank the first four speakers 1, 2, 3, and 4. All the remaining speakers shall be assigned a rank of 5. The judge shall rate each speaker as superior, excellent, good, or fair. These ratings shall be given a numerical value on the following scale: superior 90 or higher; excellent 85 to 89; good 80 to 84; and fair 75 to 79.

11. The four highest ranking speakers in the final round shall receive Certificates for Superior Achievement and trophies. The other four speakers shall receive Certificates of Excellence. These two classifications shall be determined by the method provided in Rule III, 2. No announcement of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. place shall be made.

12. Members of the National Council are requested not to enter students in persuasive speaking unless they will have another faculty member available to serve as judge. This contest is scheduled at the same time as the meeting of the National Council.

IV. EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

1. Each chapter may enter one or two student speakers. Men and women shall compete in the same division. Students entering extemporaneous speaking cannot enter persuasive speaking.

2. Each contestant shall participate in two rounds of speaking. The final round shall consist of eight speakers chosen from Rounds I and II on the following basis: (a) high total number of superior ratings, (b) low total rank (if ratings are tied), and (c) high total percentage points (if ranks are tied). In all rounds the order of speaking shall be determined by random assignment made by the Chairman.

3. Speakers shall draw their topics in the order listed on the schedule prepared by the Chairman thirty minutes before their speaking time. Each speaker shall receive three topics from which he shall select one. The topic shall be handed to the chairman-timekeeper who shall announce it to the judges before the speaker begins.

4. The speech must not be more than seven minutes in length.

5. The speech may be delivered with or without notes.

6. The topics shall be chosen from major current events of the six months immediately preceding the Conference. They shall be significant subjects meriting serious consideration. Facetious subjects shall not be used.

7. Each chapter participating in this event must provide a qualified critic judge who, as a condition of entering his students, undertakes to be available for judging assignments for all three rounds. NOTE: Judges may be assigned to either extemporaneous speaking or persuasive speaking or both at the discretion of the chairmen of these events. NOTE: If a chapter enters speakers in both persuasive speaking and extemporaneous speaking, it must provide judges for both events.

8. At least three judges shall be used in each section.

9. Any speaker more than fifteen minutes late in meeting his speaking assignment shall forfeit that round and shall be assigned zero rating, rank, and points. NOTE: If a speaker is late in drawing
his topic he may still proceed to his speaking assignment; but he must speak on schedule or forfeit.

10. If a judge is more than fifteen minutes late in meeting a judging assignment, his contestant shall forfeit that round and shall be assigned zero rating, rank, and points. If a judge has two contestants, this forfeit shall apply only to the contestant whose last name comes first alphabetically.

11. In each round the judge shall rank the first four speakers 1, 2, 3, and 4. All the remaining speakers shall be assigned a rank of 5. The judge shall rate each speaker as superior, excellent, good, or fair. These ratings shall be given a numerical value on the following scale: superior 90 or higher; excellent 85 to 89; good 80 to 84; and fair 75 to 79.

12. The four highest ranking speakers in the final round shall receive Certificates for Superior Achievements and trophies. The other four speakers shall receive Certificates of Excellence. These two classifications shall be determined by the method provided in Rule IV, 2. No announcement of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. shall be made.

13. Members of the National Council are requested not to enter students in extemporaneous speaking unless they will have another faculty member available to serve as judge. This contest is scheduled at the same time as the meeting of the National Council.

V. STUDENT CONGRESS

1. Each participating college shall be entitled to a maximum of four participating delegates to the Student Congress. A delegate to the Student Congress will not participate in debate events at the Conference, but he may enter one of the individual events contests.

2. The problem area for consideration at the Student Congress will be announced by the Director of the Student Congress not less than three months prior to the National Conference.

3. The official business sessions of the Student Congress will include the following: (a) caucuses, (b) the opening legislative assembly, (c) main committee meetings, (d) joint conference committee meetings, and (e) legislative assemblies.

4. Advance registration shall be completed not later than 15 days before the opening of the Conference. The advance registration shall include the names of the student delegates, their party affiliation ("liberal" or "conservative"), their subtopic preference, and names of nominees for major legislative positions.

5. 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.

6. Awards to participants will be made in accordance with procedures established by the National Conference Committee.

7. A complete set of the Rules of the DSR-TKA Student Congress may be found in Vol. VI, No. 3 (March, 1969), of Speaker and Gavel. Reprints may be obtained from Dr. Kenneth E. Andersen, Speech Department, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 61801, or Dr. Theodore Walwik, Speech Department, Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock, Penna. 16057.
VI. A. CONTEMPORARY ISSUES DEBATE

1. The administration of this division will be the responsibility of a committee composed of a chairman, co-chairman and a student member. The faculty members will be appointed by the National Conference Chairman and the Student President will appoint the student member of the committee.

2. The proposition will be selected by the schools in Contemporary Issues Debate. Each chapter entering this division will be asked to submit a proposition ten weeks before the conference. From these the Contemporary Issues Debate Committee will select three for a ballot. This ballot shall be returned to the chapters for a vote calling for first, second and third choices. The proposition with the lowest ranking will be selected. The chosen topic will be announced four weeks prior to the Conference.

3. Each chapter may enter one affirmative and one negative team (a total of four students) in this event.

   Special Note: Two chapters may join forces to provide a four-man unit with an affirmative team representing one chapter and a negative team representing another chapter. Arrangements for a combined unit must be made before final registration for the conference.

4. There shall be eight rounds of debate for all teams entered in this event. After the first three rounds all participants will be asked to attend a meeting to consider amendments to the proposition. The student member of the committee shall preside at this meeting, and Robert’s Rules of Order shall be the parliamentary authority. Any amendments adopted by the participants shall be in effect for remaining five rounds of debate.

5. Debates shall be standard type (i.e., ten-minute constructive speeches and five-minute rebuttal speeches).

6. Each chapter participating in this event must provide a qualified critic judge who, as a condition of entering his teams, will be available for judging assignments throughout all eight rounds. Chapters submitting a joint entry must supply a qualified critic judge from one of these chapters.

7. Any team more than fifteen minutes late for any round shall forfeit that round of debate. Their scheduled opponent shall be credited with a win for that round and shall be credited with the average rank and points they have earned in other rounds.

8. If a judge is more than fifteen minutes late in meeting a judging assignment, his affirmative team shall forfeit that round. Their opponents shall be credited with a win, rank, and points as provided in Rule II, 7.

9. DSR-TKA certificates shall be awarded to the four highest ranking affirmative debaters and to the four highest ranking negative debaters on the basis of their achievements in the eight rounds of debate. Trophies shall be awarded to the 1st and 2nd place affirmative teams and to the 1st and 2nd place negative teams.

10. The American Forensic Association Form “C” Debate Ballot shall be used for all debates.

11. Judges may give a critique after each debate, but they may not announce a decision.
NEW INITIATES OF DSR-TKA 1971–72

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
Delores Rosetta Boyd
James Edward Culpepper
Ronald Drayton Green

ALBION COLLEGE
Judith Ann Blackwell
Lee Alan Stevens

ALMA COLLEGE
Jeffery Foran
Bruce Plackowski
Dennis Valkanoff

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
Paula Prober
N. Scott Sacks
David H. Schreiber
Joseph A. Stone

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
Rebecca June Arbaugh
Margaret Frances Bleeke
Robert Leslie Branigan
Jacqueline Lee Dudley
James F. Kriz
Terry Wayne McCorvie
David Neil Patterson
Lisa Ellen Uhrig
Ellen R. Welker

BATES COLLEGE
Jeffery J. Day
Randolph H. Erb
Jane Pendexter

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
Sharon Lynne Hollingworth
Linda Kay McCarter
James William Stewart

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
Richard Howard Greenberg
Lance Stuart Roza

BROWN UNIVERSITY
Morris Edward Yaraus

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Lee Barry Ackerman

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE
John Dennis Krieger

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Betty Jean Black
James G. Jackson
David Lawrence Rowe
Samuel F. Williams, Jr.

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
Mary Christine Berwanger
Gary Lee Tomaszewski

DAVIDSON COLLEGE
Daniel G. Clodfelter
Jean N. Cornell
John M. Douglas
William Nichol Eskridge, Jr.
Thomas I. Kent, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
Kenneth Klein
John C. Ufford

DENISON UNIVERSITY
Christine E. Amsler
K. William Hulligan

DePAUW UNIVERSITY
Philip George Heyde

DICKINSON COLLEGE
Kimberly Davis Borland
Stephen Leslie Dunn
Kenneth Robert Marvel
Sanford Bruce Weinberg

DUKE UNIVERSITY
John Aubrey Howell
Benn Harrison Logan III
Alfred Owen Peeler

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
Anne Colton Porterfield

GRINNELL COLLEGE
Phillip Sasich
George T. Shybut

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
Peter M. Jolinck
Gordon W. Mass
Joel L. Stahmer
Janice M. Underhill
Robert W. Wechsler
HIRAM COLLEGE
Peter A. Allen
Thomas W. Brown
Dennis B. Carr
Linda L. Pierce
Mason D. Wager

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
Daniel John Homick

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Jane K. Coder
Janet E. Fink
Danny A. Martin, Jr.
Brian M. Vazquez

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Gerald L. Angst
Gerald Joseph Black
Michael Thomas Nigro
Ellen Christine Rundquist
Paul Stanley Rundquist

MADISON COLLEGE
David F. Bottenfield
Robert D. Makofsky
Jane C. Reiser
Donna Will

MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
Christine Ann Lehrer
Richard Edward Murray
Valerie Ann Stolze
Michael Anthony Wolfe

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Judy A. Bennett
Diane M. Buckley
Therese Marie Hofmann
John Michael Hogan
Mary-Elizabeth Kohler
James Michael Lane

MERCER UNIVERSITY
Willis Newton Moore

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
John Craig Moppert
Linda Joyce Rosenfeld
Elliott H. Scherker
Robert S. Tanenbaum

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
Kent Edward Eschenberg
John Edward Mohr

MUSKINGUM COLLEGE
Timothy Schirack

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
James Harold Dodson
Patricia Louise Mitchell
David Eugene Morrison
Sarah Jane Shofstall
Robin Ann Waller
Thomas Albert Weist

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA
Joan Elizabeth Hedahl
Rita Bernadette Kroeber
Mark Steven Schaffner
Donald William Shields
Warren Jay Tobin
Rebecca Ann Zander

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
David Lee Schiller

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
Paul D. Clote
Ronald L. Marmer
Elliot M. Minnberg
Christ T. Troupis

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
George Kevin Bower

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
Donald Klawiter

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Michael Gordon Day
Lois Jane Einhorn
Stuart Jay Scheffler
James Francis Shigley
Carol Ann Stefanko
Faith Shellie Witkin
Lynn Michelle Witkin

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Stephen Ward Dillon
Robert Pryor

SAMFORD UNIVERSITY
William T. Carlson, Jr.
Georgia Virginia Fleming
Steven Charles McDonald
Aubrey Sidney Miller
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE
Kathleen J. Decter
David Allen Droge
John Franklin Gay
Ruth Ellen Haber
Darrell Handy
C. Erik Hanson
Edwin Ross Palmeri
R. Gene Redens
Stephen Condon Segel

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Julius Boggs Drake, Jr.
Julia Mary Kimmey
Charles Tucker Smith

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA
Christopher Barry Bacon
Robert Lee Levell
Robert Leslie Ryken
Stephen Joseph VanGoor

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN ALABAMA
Ruth Ann Brady
Carolyn Lee Driscoll
Pat Lynn Finnegan
Angela Joyce Maxwell

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
Peter Clinco
Michael Corey
John Charles Crum
Geoff Goodman
Tom Hozduk
Jack Martin
King Schofield
Steve Swander

TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Patty Elaine Holyfield
Thomas Charles Rebstock
Carol Elaine Sparks

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Janet L. Patterson

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
James Bartly Farnsworth
Kristi Ann Heisel
Bruce H. Jensen
Peter Scott Spaw
Brent Grant Thompson

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
Robert Preston Hamilton

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY
Janice Lynn Gruber

WASHINGTON & JEFFERSON COLLEGE
James Goldsmith
Gregory Heidt
Neil Marcus
Brian Orr

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
Ted T. Amsden
Edward Francis Gehring
Jack Kay
George Alexander Lechler
Lawrence Stephen Paruch
Lois Mary Zuccarini

WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY
Val R. Smith
Kay Stanford
Francis Ray Wheeler

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Leonard R. Mathen
Edward Norman Sims, Jr.

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
Stephanie Rae Boaef
Coleen Lenore Cook
Donald LeRoy Redfoot

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
Sandra Perine Carruth
Michael Frank Pezzulli
Gerard Ray Stowers

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Larry Dean Carter
Michael Dean Hastings

THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER
William H. Kaempfer
Lynn S. Hamilton
Garth D. Wilson

XAVIER UNIVERSITY
Thomas E. Shipp

YALE UNIVERSITY
Jan Clifford Costello
### Chapters and Sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Name, Address</th>
<th>Faculty Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama, University, Ala.</td>
<td>Annabel D. Hagood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion, Albion, Michigan</td>
<td>Jon Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma, Alma, Michigan</td>
<td>Kenneth Plaxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Jerome B. Polisky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, Auburn, Ala.</td>
<td>Frank B. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State, Muncie, Ind.</td>
<td>David W. Shepard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates, Lewiston, Me.</td>
<td>Thomas Moser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea, Berea, Kentucky</td>
<td>Margaret D. McCoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham-Southern, Birmingham, Ala.</td>
<td>Robert A. Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.</td>
<td>C. F. Evans, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater, Bridgewater, Va.</td>
<td>Roger E. Sappington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young, Provo, Utah</td>
<td>Jed J. Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>Donald Springen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>Jim Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell, Lewisburg, Pa.</td>
<td>Frank W. Merritt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>Nicholas M. Cripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State, Long Beach, Calif.</td>
<td>Jack Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Harold Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlow, Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>William Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-Western Reserve, Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Ken Seminatore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>Richard L. LaVarnway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Donald Shields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson, Clemson, S. Carolina</td>
<td>Arthur Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate, Hamilton, N.Y.</td>
<td>H. G. Behler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado, Boulder, Colo.</td>
<td>Robley Rhine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.</td>
<td>James A. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.</td>
<td>Joseph Seacrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell, Ithaca, N.Y.</td>
<td>Arthur W. Rovine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa</td>
<td>Walter F. Strome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton, Omaha, Nebaska</td>
<td>Rev. H. J. McAuliffe, S.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Post College of L.I. Univ. Greeneval, N.Y.</td>
<td>Arthur N. Kruger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth, Hanover, N.H.</td>
<td>Herbert L. James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, Davidson, N.C.</td>
<td>Jean H. Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware, Newark, Del.</td>
<td>Patricia Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison, Granville, Ohio</td>
<td>W. R. Dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>Glen Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw, Greencastle, Indiana</td>
<td>Robert O. Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson, Carlisle, Pa.</td>
<td>Herbert Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke, Durham, N.C.</td>
<td>Joseph Cable Wetherby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky State, Richmond, Ky.</td>
<td>Max Huff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethtown, Elizabethtown, Pa.</td>
<td>Jobie E. Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson, Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>John C. Zacharis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory and Henry, Emory, Va.</td>
<td>H. Alan Pickrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory, Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>Glenn Pelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville, Evansville, Ind.</td>
<td>Lynne J. Miday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont State College, Fairmont, W. Va.</td>
<td>Suzanne Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida, Gainesville, Fla.</td>
<td>Donald E. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State, Tallahassee, Fla.</td>
<td>Gregg Phifer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Name, Address</th>
<th>Faculty Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, Athens, Georgia</td>
<td>Richard C. Huseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa</td>
<td>William Vanderpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Clinton, N.Y.</td>
<td>J. Franklin Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, Va.</td>
<td>D. M. Allan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.</td>
<td>Sidney Parham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover, Hanover, Indiana</td>
<td>Stanley B. Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Hartford, Conn.</td>
<td>Joyce Milliken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>Dean Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram, Hiram, Ohio</td>
<td>Linda Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Washington, D. C.</td>
<td>Noel Myrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho, Moscow, Idaho</td>
<td>Tom Jennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois, Urbana, Ill.</td>
<td>Kenneth Andersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.</td>
<td>E. C. Chenoweth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State, Terre Haute, Ind.</td>
<td>Otis J. Aggertt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State, Ames, Iowa</td>
<td>James Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa</td>
<td>Robert Kemp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll, Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>Austin J. Freeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas</td>
<td>Donn W. Parson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State, Manhattan, Kansas</td>
<td>Vernon Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky</td>
<td>Gifford Blyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings, Wilkes Barre, Pa.</td>
<td>Robert E. Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, Galesburg, Ill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh, Bethlehem, Pa.</td>
<td>H. Barrett Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Memorial, Harrogate, Tenn.</td>
<td>Earl H. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, La.</td>
<td>Harold Mixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola, Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>L. Morgan Lavin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola, Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>Elaine Bruggemeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va.</td>
<td>Donald McConkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester, North Manchester, Ind.</td>
<td>Ronald L. Aungst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankato, Mankato, Minnesota</td>
<td>Elizabeth Morehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette, Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td>John Lewinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, College Park, Maryland</td>
<td>Bonnie Buenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.</td>
<td>Ronald J. Matlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State, Memphis, Tenn.</td>
<td>Erma Clanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer, Macon, Georgia</td>
<td>Gerre G. Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.</td>
<td>J. Robert Olian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Oxford, Ohio</td>
<td>Robert V. Friedenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Middleton, Ohio</td>
<td>Sue DeWine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan</td>
<td>C. William Colburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State, East Lansing, Michigan</td>
<td>Donald P. Cushman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>Bernard L. Brock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri, Columbia, Missouri</td>
<td>James Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State, Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>Harold B. Chinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State, Murray, Kentucky</td>
<td>James Albert Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum, New Concord, Ohio</td>
<td>Judson D. Ellerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska</td>
<td>Donald O. Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada, Reno, Nevada</td>
<td>Robert S. Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.</td>
<td>William O. Gilfordso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico, Albuquerque, N.M.</td>
<td>Wayne C. Eubank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, N.M.</td>
<td>Walter F. Brunet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, (University Heights) New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>Norman Puffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, (Wash, Sq.) New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>David Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.</td>
<td>Bert F. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina-Greensboro, Greensboro, N. C.</td>
<td>L. Dean Fadely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota, Grand Forks, N.D.</td>
<td>Wm. Semlock and Bernard Brommel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa</td>
<td>Lillian R. Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.</td>
<td>David Zarefsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.</td>
<td>Leonard Sommer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio</td>
<td>Daniel J. Goulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental, Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>Gary K. Paben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio, Athens, Ohio</td>
<td>Ted J. Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Don Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio</td>
<td>Ed Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma</td>
<td>Paul Barefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon, Eugene, Ore.</td>
<td>C. Richard Keil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State, Corvallis, Oregon</td>
<td>Thurston E. Doler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace, New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>Frank Colbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific, Forest Grove, Oregon</td>
<td>Albert C. Hingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State, University Park, Pa.</td>
<td>Jeanne Lutz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.</td>
<td>Thomas Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue, Lafayette, Indiana</td>
<td>Henry L. Ewbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.</td>
<td>Howard I. Streifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph-Macon, Ashland, Va.</td>
<td>Edgar E. MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.</td>
<td>Richard W. Roth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Richmond, Va.</td>
<td>Max Graeber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke, Salem, Va.</td>
<td>William R. Coulter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N.Y.</td>
<td>Joseph Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollins, Winter Park, Fla.</td>
<td>Dean F. Grauken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, New Brunswick, N.J.</td>
<td>H. James Godwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anselm's, Manchester, N.H.</td>
<td>John A. Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cloud State, St. Cloud, Minn.</td>
<td>William R. McCleary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y.</td>
<td>James Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence, Canton, N.Y.</td>
<td>Joan O. Donovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.</td>
<td>Brad Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif.</td>
<td>Henry E. McCueckin, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>James Dempsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.</td>
<td>Kathy Corey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock State, Slippery Rock, Pa.</td>
<td>Theodore Walwic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama</td>
<td>Howard Pelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.</td>
<td>Merrill G. Christophersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.</td>
<td>James Lancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>James McBath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist, Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>Richard Sinzinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, Mo.</td>
<td>Richard Stovall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill, Mobile, Ala.</td>
<td>Betty Hugdens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.</td>
<td>Kenneth Mosier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Univ. of N.Y. at Albany, Albany, N.Y.</td>
<td>Jeanine Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Univ. of N.Y., Harpur College, Binghamton, N.Y.</td>
<td>Eugene Vasiilew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. U. N. Y. College, Cortland, N. Y.</td>
<td>Raymond S. Beard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna, Selinsgrove, Pa.</td>
<td>Larry D. Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y.</td>
<td>Paul Ray McKee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>Hugh Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.</td>
<td>Ralph Towne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee</td>
<td>Norma C. Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas, Austin, Texas</td>
<td>John Schunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech, Lubbock, Texas</td>
<td>Vernon R. McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, Toledo, Ohio</td>
<td>Donald Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane, New Orleans, La.</td>
<td>Ralph Calderaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Naval Academy</td>
<td>Phillip Warken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.</td>
<td>Joseph E. Vannucchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>Jack Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State, Logan, Utah</td>
<td>Rex E. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State, Valdosta, Ga.</td>
<td>Helen Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Kassian Kovalcheck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont, Burlington, Vt.</td>
<td>Robert Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.</td>
<td>John Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, Va.</td>
<td>E. A. Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash, Crawfordsville, Ind.</td>
<td>Joseph O'Rourke, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, N.C.</td>
<td>Merwyn A. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Saint Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>Herbert E. Metz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Seattle, Wash.</td>
<td>Dr. Donald Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State, Pullman, Wash.</td>
<td>George W. Ziegelmueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State, Ogden, Utah</td>
<td>John B. Heberstreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.</td>
<td>Marguerite G. Petty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky State, Bowling Green, Ky.</td>
<td>Randall Capps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, Michigan</td>
<td>Charles R. Helgesen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster, New Wilmington, Pa.</td>
<td>Walter E. Scheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.</td>
<td>James E. Pirkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier, Whittier, Calif.</td>
<td>Gerald G. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State, Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>M. P. Moorhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette, Salem, Oregon</td>
<td>Howard W. Runkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.</td>
<td>Patrick Micken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Winston Brembeck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Ruth McGaffey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg, Springfield, Ohio</td>
<td>Ernest Dayka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster, Wooster, Ohio</td>
<td>Gerald H. Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming</td>
<td>B. Wayne Callaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier, Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Mark A. Greenberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale, New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>Rollin G. Osterweis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva, New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>David Fleisher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>