speaker and gavel

volume 11, number 1

November, 1973

Published by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato,
SPEAKER and GAVEL

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

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS
By ALLEN PRESS, INC.

Second-class postage paid at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 66044
issued in November, January, March and May. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

NATIONAL OFFICERS OF DSR-TKA

President: NICHOLAS M. CRIPE, Butler University
Vice President: GEORGE ZIEGELMUELLER, Wayne State University
Secretary: THEODORE J. WALWIK, Slippery Rock State College
Treasurer: ROBERT HUBER, University of Vermont
Trustee: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico
Historian: HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: JOHN A. LYNCH, St. Anselm's College; RAYMOND BEARD, State University of New York at Cortland; CLARK KIMBALL, Madison College; JOSEPH C. WETHERBY, Duke University; ROBERT FRIEDENBERG, Miami University; VERNON R. McGUIRE, Texas Tech University; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; LARRY SCHNOOR, Mankato State College; WAYNE CALLOWAY, University of Wyoming; JOHN DeBROSS, University of Southern California.

Members at Large: KENNETH ANDERSEN, University of Illinois; NORMA COOK, University of Tennessee; DONALD McCONKEY, Madison College.

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

Representative on SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: DAVID ZAREFSKY, Northwestern University.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Standards Committee: FORREST CONKLIN, University of Northern Iowa
National Conference Committee: KENNETH ANDERSEN, University of Illinois
Research and Publications Committee: JAMES McBATH, University of Southern California
Distinguished Alumni Awards Committee: ANNABEL HAGOOD, University of Alabama
Speaker of the Year Committee: PETER E. KANE, State University of New York at Brockport

STUDENT OFFICERS

President: STEVE McDONALD, Samford University
First Vice President: GREGORY METGE, Northern Iowa University
Second Vice President: ROBERT TANENBAUM, University of Miami
Secretary: MAY JEAN GO, University of Tennessee

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 46135
Associate Editors: BERNARD L. BROCK, Wayne State University; ROBERT FRIEDENBERG, Miami University; ROBERT TANENBAUM, University of Miami.
President's Page—Nicholas M. Cripe

What is the Current Condition of the American Dialogue?—Robert D. Clark

"I do not sound the knell of public discourse. It will remain as important in the affairs of this nation as it has ever been; crises will arise and men with the power of speech will help to make, direct, or end them."

LeRoy Collins Comments

CURRENT CRITICISM

The Presidency and Speeches on International Crises:
Repeating the Rhetorical Past—Theodore Otto Windt, Jr.

"Presidential speeches are repetitive, the lines of argument a President chooses come from the office of Presidency and from tradition, and genres of Presidential speeches exist which every President uses. Aside from particular policies, what President Nixon has done rhetorically is to rely on lines of argument which other modern Presidents have used in similar situations."

Treating the Ills of Academic Debate—Arthur N. Kruger

"I do not agree that the solution to the current ills of academic debate lies in utilizing the findings of speech communication research or in orienting the activity in that direction."


Legislation Adopted by DSR-TKA Congress: 1973

Minutes of the DSR-TKA National Council

New Initiates of DSR-TKA 1972–73

Distinguished Alumni Committee

Apology

Chapters and Sponsors

Plan To Attend!

DSR-TKA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

University of Massachusetts

March 27–30, 1974
This is to report that ten years after the merger and after one year of the present office holders, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is very much alive and moving.

Our fraternity exists because people like George Adamson serve it long and well. George Adamson’s name first appears as a chapter sponsor in the January, 1947, issue of The Speaker. For ten years he has been Governor of Region IX and a member of the National Conference Committee, being chairman the past four years. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha owes a deep debt of gratitude to George Adamson who, until his recent retirement, served the organization so faithfully. Kenneth Andersen has accepted the appointment as National Conference Committee Chairman.

However, if we are to continue to be an active society, much needs to be done. Honorary societies have lost their prestige status on many campuses. “Debate” has become a dirty word in many Communication departments and is obviously suspect in other areas. A new generation of forensic people has not been an integral part of DSR-TKA and feels no ties to it. To start coping with these situations several things have been done: Vice-president Ziegelmueller has been given the assignment of re-establishing close contact between the national office and the chapter sponsors, and is doing so; to involve more of the young forensics people in the workings of the society, many have been appointed to committees and several have been appointed Regional Governors; a constitution revision committee chaired by Gifford Blyton will be reporting at the November meeting of the council and hopefully will have a revised constitution for membership consideration at the National Conference in 1974. The goal of the latter committee will be to put more responsibility for the society with the chapter sponsors, though there is still the problem of the non-participating chapter to be faced.

It seems to me three features of DSR-TKA argue for an active chapter on campus. First, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha has one primary purpose for being, to honor outstanding students for a job well done scholastically and in forensic activities. It is a distinctive honor because we do recognize not only scholarship, as do all honoraries, but achievement outside the classroom as well.

Our second distinctive feature is Speaker and Gavel. Robert Weiss has made it a journal providing our students and faculty sponsors a prestigious little magazine in which to publish. A real effort has been made to encourage student contributions.

A third factor is our National Conference—a truly national meet. The national conference committee recognizes that many chapters are desirous of something else than a high pressure two-man debate tournament. And while the two-man division is one of the prestige national events, the four-man division is probably one of the largest and best of its kind in the country. This year, a third debate division was added, off-topic debate. The persuasive and extemporaneous speaking events are of national champion calibre. The Congress is, as for so many years, an annual feature.

A decade ends for DSR-TKA, a first year in office ends for the new national officers, and I feel it can be truly said, DSR-TKA is very much on the move.
WHAT IS THE CURRENT CONDITION OF THE AMERICAN DIALOGUE?

ROBERT D. CLARK

What is the current condition of the American dialogue? In summary, the role of the populist and the rabble rouser has markedly diminished, the drama has gone out of the clear, calm voice of reason, and the major figures of the public platform are tossed about by events like flotsam on a tidal wave. It was always thus in the history of public address.

For populist or statesman, forms of government, crises in the affairs of men or state, the role of religion and the church provide the matrix in which those who are masters of the language and the platform—and even those whose only gifts are passion and a loud voice—can mold the opinions and shape the action of their fellow men.

A half dozen years ago the crises were war, race—the voiding of the American creed for reason of skin color—, the oppression of the poor, the despoliation of the environment, materialism in an affluent society, the conspiracy of the Establishment. But above all, the war.

The young are often tender of conscience, well schooled in a nation's ideals, clumsy in the arts of self-deception, unpracticed in the skills of rationalized evasion or indifference. The war exposed them or their friends to death or injury; it committed their generation to acts of destruction against a people whom they did not know and whom they did not regard as enemy. They wanted not courage but a cause. And they were ripe for the rabble rouser or the statesman. They found their cause in anti-war. When few statesmen stepped forth to lead them, they drew their leaders from their own ranks, or from the ranks of the nonconforming literati. The angry fever of social conflict spreads like an epidemic, but like an epidemic it soon spends its violent course. The war began to wind down; there was some amelioration of injustice to the blacks, some relaxation of the rules governing student conduct. It was a matter of degree. The problems remained, but the tragedy of Kent State served as a catharsis, purging the anger of rebelling students. The rousing clichés, "Down with the Fascist pigs," "All power to the people," and the antiphonal chorus, "Right-on," emptied of passion, were perceived as trite and hollow phrases. Opposition and reform may be sustained by the broadly-based political career of a George Norris. Or it may be sustained by the politically unattached eloquence of a Wendell Phillips. Phillips made a career out of agitation, moving from cause to cause. He was a zealot in his dedication to causes, but his advocacy was sustained by his mastery of language. Only one eloquent voice cried out in the recent social upheaval, that of Martin Luther King, and he was cut down by the assassin's bullet. In the current American dialogue the voice of the populist or the rabble rouser is no longer commanding.

The voice of reason is dramatic only against the cacophony of loud and angry emotion. And so it was that a handful of university presidents, Kingman Brewster chief among them, had their brief day of eloquence.

Robert D. Clark is President, University of Oregon, and 1971 recipient of the Speaker of the Year Award. These remarks were submitted at the request of the editor.
Sympathetic to the cry of the young for compassion, justice, and change in the social structure and responsible to the elders for preservation of the inherent values in the political system, they sought to reconcile the divergent views: not by compromise, but by understanding, not by angry response to threats but by recognizing the values that militant rhetoric obscured, by championing change, by tempering the anger of the Establishment, by urging the elders to know and accept and rejoice in their sons and daughters. They argued with conviction and restrained passion, but passion nonetheless. And the people listened. With the passing of the angry rebellion, reason has lost its dramatic force. And the temptation of the university president is to return to pedagogical platitudes.

Television, the new element in public discourse, has dramatically amplified the relationship of orator to events. That relationship has always been precarious, often capricious. The one may enhance or diminish the other. With television the element of caprice is greatly augmented. The televised event may sweep the speaker to new heights of popularity, but it may in a moment destroy him. It was television that gave student populists a national audience, that made student unrest a national epidemic. The televised presentation of Edmund Muskie’s poised election eve speech in 1970, contrasted with the hysteria of war and the election campaign, made him a front-running candidate for the presidency. The televised war gave credibility and substance to the McGovern campaign; the Eagleton affair, dramatized by TV, disillusioned even the true believers.

I do not sound the knell of public discourse. It will remain as important in the affairs of this nation as it ever has been; crises will arise and men with the power of speech will help to make, direct, or end them. And a few will be strong and eloquent enough and sufficiently favored by events to make the medium of television serve them well.

Now Available
CURRENT CRITICISM

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.
SPEAKER AND GAVEL

LEROY COLLINS COMMENTS

(Editor's Note: Recently we invited all former DSR-TKA Speakers of the Year to contribute to a symposium evaluating the current condition of the American dialogue. We were delighted to receive Dr. Clark's reply, printed above. The full projected symposium failed to materialize because the other replies, although universally polite, were generally unresponsive to the question posed. An exception was a letter from LeRoy Collins, Speaker of the Year for 1963, and we would therefore like to quote several thoughtful paragraphs from that letter.)

An idea, as important as it is, must be communicated effectively if it is to have any influence beyond the individual mind where it is conceived. We have varied means of communicating our ideas, but the two most important are the printed word and speech. Of course, each of these complements the other. Regardless of how well a judge may think, he cannot be an adequate judge unless he can express his views with clarity and persuasiveness. Neither can the lawyer, nor the preacher, nor the salesman, nor the merchant. While they possess many other valuable tools, the best lawyers are those who crown their other talents with the ability to speak best.

I do not believe that the quality of discourse is as high now as it has been in past years, the prime reason being that in our day people are so burdened by the quantity of things which engage their concerns that they have neither the time nor the disposition to think carefully on how they can best express themselves. I have been told that more books are being published and bought annually now than ever before, but that fewer of them are being read than 50 years ago. The reason for such a paradox must be essentially the same.

I think there are some offsetting advantages now over the past. Speakers are learning how to express more in fewer words. The speech that a few years back would have been expected to be delivered in an hour or more is now expected to take not more than 20 minutes. This has forced more concentrated effort in the preparation of the speaker.

LeRoy Collins

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.
THE PRESIDENCY AND SPEECHES ON INTERNATIONAL CRISES: REPEATING THE RHETORICAL PAST

THEODORE OTTO WINDT, JR.

1.

Over a century ago Alexis de Tocqueville made an acute observation about the American political orator that is apt today:

He . . . presents to the mind of his auditors a succession of great general truths (which he himself comprehends and expresses only confusedly) and of petty minutiae, which he is but too able to discover and point out. The inhabitants of the United States seem themselves to consider [speech-making] in this light; and they show their long experience of parliamentary life, not by abstaining from making bad speeches, but by courageously submitting to hear them made. They are resigned to it as to an evil they know to be inevitable.¹

If the people tolerate bad speeches as one of the many evils they have to bear, many journalists and scholars do not feel such a theological burden. During the first term of Mr. Nixon's administration we were treated to a series of essays that showed scorn for the rhetorical devices he and his spokesmen use.² The result of this criticism has been extraordinary. During those four years the rhetoric of the administration—frequently apart from any policy—became a major issue. How various members of the administration, especially Vice President Agnew, spoke about policies became as important in the minds of many as what they said. In fact, critics sometimes condemned the administration as much for its rhetoric as for its policies. These criticisms have their value. However, they are often predicated on the romantic assumption that a speech is a unique personal experience. Most critics imply that the lines of argument used by President Nixon and Vice President Agnew are unique to them.

The basic assumptions of this essay are that Presidential speeches are repetitive, that the lines of argument a President chooses come from the office of Presidency and from tradition, that genres of Presidential speeches

exist which every President uses. Aside from particular policies, what President Nixon has done rhetorically is to rely on lines of argument that other modern Presidents have used in similar situations. To substantiate these assumptions, I want to examine a particular genre of Presidential rhetoric: speeches on international crises. But if I am correct in arguing that these speeches come primarily from the office and from tradition, especially from the mystique surrounding the Presidency, rather than from a particular man, I must first examine the nature of crises and the ethos of the office of Presidency.

The nature of crises. "Crisis" is one of those words that became popular during the Kennedy years as an inflated description of the making of hard decisions. If one reads Sorensen's or Schlesinger's account of the Kennedy administration, he will soon learn about the Laos crisis, the Berlin crisis, the balance of payments crisis, the Cuban missile crisis, the steel crisis, the crisis in the Congo, and so on and on. Richard Nixon followed this trend, as is his habit, by entitling his remarkable autobiography, Six Crises. But what are the characteristics of crises pertinent to this essay?

First, political crises are primarily rhetorical. The President announces to the people, usually over national television, that a situation critical to the United States exists. He contends that the situation requires that he act decisively and calls upon the public to support him fully. Invariably, the policy he advocates is elevated from a political decision to an issue involving world peace (in foreign affairs) or an issue synonymous with the public interest (in domestic affairs). The so-called steel crisis would not have been a domestic crisis to the public had not President Kennedy attacked the $6 per ton increase by U.S. Steel with such vehemence in his press conference of April 11, 1962. Perhaps, the events of August 2 and 4, 1964 in the Gulf of Tonkin would have remained as minor as they were had not the President interrupted a television show to denounce the attacks on American ships and to order reprisals. Situations do not create crises. Rather, the President's perception of the situation and the rhetoric he uses to describe it mark an event as a crisis. Because the President has immediate access to television and because neither Congress nor the public has alternative sources of information that can quickly verify or question the President's account of the facts, a President usually can implement a policy with a minimum of opposition.

The second characteristic of a crisis is that the President can depend on tremendous public support for whatever policy he pursues in a situation he has deemed "critical." Nelson Polsby observed: "Invariably, the popular response to a President during international crises is favorable, re-

---

3 In Nixon Agonistes Gary Wills notes the similarities between Nixon's first Inaugural Address and Kennedy's Inaugural Address even to the point of stylistic similarities. See Nixon Agonistes (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970), pp. 402-404. Scholars of the Presidency are not surprised to learn that Presidents, often so different in ideology and temperament, use the same lines of argument to justify their policies. In fact, Presidents or their aides often admit that they model Presidential addresses after some previous President. To analyze fairly a Presidential speech, I would argue, requires that the critic understand the historical model upon which it is based.

4 One of my graduate students has developed this idea more fully than space allows me in this essay. Cf. Richard E. Vatz, "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation," Philosophy and Rhetoric (Summer, 1973), 154–161.
gardless of the wisdom of the policies he pursues." Letters and telegrams will range from 2–1 upwards in support of the President. People support the President overwhelmingly in these situations because they see the President as the personification of the country.

Thus, a crisis that does not involve an external military attack on the United States is a political event rhetorically created by the President in which the public predictably rallies to his defense.

The Ethos of the Presidency. The American Presidency, originally intended as a democratic executive office, has evolved into an elected monarchy, a striking example of Caesarism. The multitude of writings about the office has created a reverence for the Presidency to the point that the office and the man who occupies it are frequently confused with the true destiny of the nation.

In the popular mythology, and even in scholarly circles, the President is different from any other political official. More is expected of him even as less is suspected about him. He personifies American government. He is "President of all the people." In the words of Clinton Rossiter: "He reigns, but he also rules; he symbolizes the people, but he also runs their government." There is a reverence that surrounds the Presidency, and much of this reverence comes from the fact that people believe that the President has superior information and knowledge about national affairs. James MacGregor Burns and Jack W. Peltason, certainly not unsophisticated scholars of the Presidency, wax romantic about this aspect of the Presidency:

The President has not only the authority but the capacity to act. For example, he has at his command unmatched sources of information. To his desk come facts channeled from the entire world. Diplomatic missions, military observers, undercover agents, personal agents, technical experts gather tons of material which are analyzed by experts in the State Department and elsewhere. Since the President draws on the informed thinking of hundreds of specialists, his pronouncements have a tone of authority. 

Inherent in these descriptions of the President, regardless of who he is, is a predisposition to believe the President, a predisposition that does not exist in the same extreme degree for any other official. In the words so often used in letters to newspapers, "the President knows best." The psychology persistent here makes the President's decisions seem wise and prudent even when they turn out to be stupid. The aura of reverence


6 Andrew Jackson was the first President to proclaim himself President of all the people. That conception of the Presidency apparently was not in the minds of the writers of the Constitution.


shapes a will to believe the President when he speaks, and places the burden of disproving any Presidential statement upon those who disagree.

2.

When a man assumes the office of President, he quickly learns that his rhetorical options are limited by precedent, tradition, and expediency. In the sense that literary forms are stylized, so too are Presidential speeches. Genres of Presidential rhetoric exist. My purpose in this essay is to examine one genre of Presidential speeches through a comparison of speeches by a liberal Democrat and a conservative Republican on international affairs. John F. Kennedy’s speech on the Cuban missile crisis and Richard M. Nixon’s speech on the invasion of Cambodia provide the raw materials for this comparison.

Presidential speeches about international crises begin with an assertion of the President’s control over the facts of the situation and an acknowledgment that the New Facts which occasion the speech constitute a New Situation—a crisis for the United States. President Kennedy opened his address with these ominous words:

This Government, as promised, has maintained the closest surveillance of the Soviet military buildup on the island of Cuba. Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere.

President Nixon began his speech in like manner:

Ten days ago, in my report to the Nation on Vietnam, I announced a decision to withdraw an additional 150,000 Americans from Vietnam over the next year. I said then that I was making that decision despite our concern over increased enemy activity in Laos, in Cambodia, and in South Vietnam.

At that time, I warned that if I concluded that increased enemy activity in any of these areas endangered the lives of Americans remaining in Vietnam, I would not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation.

Despite that warning, North Vietnam has increased its military aggression in all these areas, and particularly in Cambodia.

After full consultation with the National Security Council, Ambassador Bunker, General Abrams, and my other advisers, I have concluded that the actions of the enemy in the last 10 days clearly endanger the lives of Americans who are in Vietnam now and would constitute an unacceptable risk to those who will be there after withdrawal of another 150,000.

Such authoritative statements of Presidential control over the situation are intended to draw upon what Thomas Cronin has called the public’s image

---


10 All quotations from Nixon’s speech on the Cambodian invasion are from the transcript of the speech published in Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents (May 4, 1970), 596–601.
of the "President as Superman." The President possesses "unmistakable evidence" or has been advised by high-ranking experts about the New Situation. He, therefore, understands the New Situation better than anyone else. At this point, political leadership is personalized; the course of national policy is rhetorically concentrated in one man. Each President emphasized that he was keeping his compact with the people (and thus to identify this policy as the people's policy) to study the situation carefully and to report to the people once a decision had been made. Under study mandated by the President's compact with the people New Facts emerged. These New Facts pointed to a New Situation and thus constituted a crisis demanding decisive action.

Having established his mastery of the New Situation, each President then turned to a narration of the New Facts. Kennedy told the public about the Soviet missile build-up in Cuba. Nixon, using a chart as well as words, described the increased North Vietnamese military activity in Cambodia. Intertwined in this narration is the second major line of argument: a comparison between the patience and honesty with which the United States handled the Old Situation versus the enemy's record of duplicity and secrecy in creating the New Situation. Kennedy recounted in detail how he had tried to learn the truth about the Soviet missiles in Cuba only to realize that Foreign Minister Gromyko among others was lying to him. He concluded: "Neither the United States of America nor the world community of nations can tolerate deliberate deception and offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small." President Nixon recounted that the United States had continually respected the sovereignty of Cambodia while the North Vietnamese had persistently used Cambodia as a sanctuary for more than five years. He concluded: "North Vietnam in the last 2 weeks has stripped away all pretense of respecting the sovereignty or the neutrality of Cambodia. Thousands of their soldiers are invading the country from the sanctuaries . . . ." The purpose of this line of argument is to introduce a devil-angel interpretation into the narration of facts. The enemy is duplicitic and secretive; the United States is open and trusting. Melodrama replaces politics as each President delves into the sinister motives of the enemy even as he accentuates the pure motives of the United States.

To intensify the either-or/devil-angel nature of the New Situation created by the enemy, each President reminded the public that this incident was only one in the continual battle between the Free World and the Communist World. President Nixon stated late in his address that he would not take the "easy political path" in resolving a conflict that transcended his personal political ambitions because the United States would be obliged:

to desert 18 million South Vietnamese people, who have put their trust in us and to expose them to the same slaughter and savagery which the leaders of North Vietnam inflicted on hundreds of thousands of North Vietnamese who chose freedom when the Communists took over North Vietnam in 1954; to get peace at any price now, even though I know that a peace of humiliation for the United States would lead to bigger war or surrender later.

In speaking directly to the Cuban people, Kennedy also drew upon major melodramatic features of the anti-communist ideology as an implicit reason for intervention:

And I have watched and the American people have watched with deep sorrow how your nationalist revolution was betrayed, and how your fatherland fell under foreign domination. Now your leaders are no longer Cuban leaders inspired by Cuban ideals. They are puppets and agents of an international conspiracy which has turned Cuba against your friends and neighbors in the Americas . . .

Each President elevated his particular policy to a struggle between the Free World and the Communist World, one in which ideological angels do mortal and moral combat with ideological devils. Melodrama. Each drew upon the language and assumptions permeating the anti-communist ideology of the public. Nixon spoke disparagingly about “peace at any price” as a consequence of dissenting from his policy. Kennedy reminded his hearers that they ought to have learned their lesson about thwarting aggression from the events of the nineteen-thirties, an obvious reference to Munich and “peace at any price.”

Understanding this part of the rhetoric is crucial to interpreting responses to Presidential speeches on international crises. Insofar as the people believe that the particular issue is truly an ideological issue between the Free World and the Communist World or that any decisive action is preferable to any inaction, they will be disposed to support the President. Insofar as people no longer believe that the issue is ideological or insofar as they ask that action be deferred until more facts are presented from contrary sources, they will not be disposed to support the President.

Sometime during the course of his arguments the President announces what policy he has decided upon. President Nixon listed alternatives to his policy—a rhetorical habit he has acquired as a means for anticipating objections. After rejecting two policies, Nixon announced that he was sending American and South Vietnamese forces into selected areas of Cambodia. President Kennedy did not discuss what other options were open to him, but rather concentrated on describing the quarantine of Cuba and the seven initial steps to be taken by the United States against Cuba. Each President argued briefly that the policy was enacted through the power of the President as Commander-in-Chief and instituted primarily to protect American lives. Kennedy went into more specific detail about how American lives were endangered than did Nixon.

Even as each President announced his policy, he also attempted to shift the issue from its obvious military and political context to an ethical context; that is, from the consequences of war to a question of American character. Nixon asked plainly whether the United States was a “pitiful, helpless giant?” He asked: “Does the richest and strongest nation in the history of the world have the character to meet a direct challenge by a group which rejects every effort to win a just peace, ignores our warning, tramples on solemn agreements, violates the neutrality of an unarmed people, and uses our prisoners as hostages?” Kennedy also stressed the necessity for testing American character:

12 For one analysis of the language and symbols of the anti-communist mythology, see Michael Parenti, The Anti-Communist Impulse (New York: Random House, 1969).
Let no one doubt that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out. No one can foresee precisely what course it will take or what costs or casualties will be incurred. Many months of sacrifice and self-discipline lie ahead, months in which both our patience and our will will be tested, months in which many threats and denunciations will keep us aware of our dangers.

The path we have chosen for the present is full of hazards, as all paths are, but it is the one most consistent with our character and courage as a nation and our commitments around the world. The cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it.

Thus, a political decision is transformed for a third time. It began as a simple, if potentially dangerous, American policy in response to a President’s perception of extreme danger to American vital interests. Then, it became a melodramatic test between the Free World and the Communist World, between Good and Evil, between pure motives and sinister motives. Finally, it evolved rhetorically into a mark of character and honor for the American people to support the President’s decision. This last transformation is the “bear any burden, pay any price” part of the appeal. The essence of the problem, according to two Presidents, is no longer political or military, but ethical. Those who support the President have character and courage for that is what standing steadfast with him in his (and now our) hour of crisis means; those who oppose him lack these virtues. Deliberative rhetoric gives way first to melodrama and then to epideictic.

Finally, each President indulged in snatches of Newspeak. War is peace; peace is war. Kennedy described the military blockade of Cuba as a “quarantine,” denied that this act of war was actually an act of war, but insisted instead that the blockade was a step toward “peace and freedom.” Nixon forthrightly denied that the invasion of Cambodia by American and South Vietnamese troops was an invasion. “This is not an invasion of Cambodia,” he stated. No, it was not if one believes what President Nixon said: “We take this action not for the purpose of expanding the war into Cambodia but for the purpose of ending the war in Vietnam and winning the just peace we all desire.” Thus, the American people—at least those accustomed to Newspeak—can rationalize the possibility of nuclear war or rationalize the expansion of the American-Vietnamese War into Cambodia. They can do so because political language has become so distorted and mangled that words have lost traditional or even legal meanings. They can do so because they are so sincerely committed to another symbolic battle with Communism. They can do so because they want to prove dramatistically that they have character and courage in the wake of this latest threat. They can do so in order to demonstrate their patriotic support of the President of the United States. They can do so because the President has enacted a policy that they cannot change. They can do so because they have no alternative. War is peace; peace is war.

The purpose of these three basic lines of arguments in “Crisis Rhetoric” is to unify the people behind a particular policy announced by the President. In more succinct form, President Roosevelt used these three arguments when he asked Congress to declare war on the Japanese on December 8, 1941. President Truman outlined in detail these same three arguments in his announcement of the Truman Doctrine of March 12, 1947. In each case,

13 All of the accounts that I have read of the Cuban missile crisis suggest that Kennedy realized that what he was doing might lead to nuclear war.
the policy has been enacted; the rhetoric is primarily explanatory. In the words of Senator Vandenberg the purpose of “Crisis Rhetoric” is “to scare hell out of the country.” The effect of this genre is to limit, if not destroy, reasonable public discussion of policy. The President draws upon his enormous prestige to squelch or discredit dissent. He continually casts his policy in abstract or analogical terms, thereby hoping to shift attention away from the very real possible consequences of his act to the circumstances that produced it. The need to confront, rout, or destroy the evil enemy overrides practical considerations. For the public it is an either/or choice. Either you support the President or you do not. Either you are on the side of the Free World or you are not. Either you have courage and character or you do not. What the President is asking, covertly or overtly, is “What kind of citizen are you?” A profound existential question. But he does not want one to ponder that question because he readily provides an absolute answer. Those who support him and his policy are courageous, possess character, and are loyal Americans. Those who oppose him are none of these and may be worse.

The problems of answering these speeches are obvious. The opponent is constantly open to ad hominem attacks because those are the terms in which the President has cast the issue. Thus, an opponent of a Presidential policy in foreign affairs must first attack the terms for argument before he can begin to argue the merits of the particular policy. He must demonstrate to the American public that his dissent from the President’s policy is not an act of cowardice or disloyalty or conceit. He must immediately present contrary evidence that is believable to the American public. He must convince people that the issue is not as simple as the President has presented it. He must show that the other side had reasons for doing what it did, even if he disapproves of those actions. He must, in fact, attempt to lift the issue out of the right/wrong-angel/devil moral context in which the President has placed the problem. The prospects for effective opposition are not favorable. George Reedy, former assistant to President Johnson, concluded: “The President’s ability to place his views before the public is important primarily because he can usually set the terms of the national debate—and anyone who can set the terms of debate can win it.”

In essence, when a President employs “Crisis Rhetoric,” the question before the public is not whether the policy is a reasonable one or not, but rather whether one supports the President or not.

In this essay I have attempted to outline the major lines of argument used by Presidents in situations they declare to be crises. First, the President tells the people that a dangerous new situation exists that requires that he act decisively. Second, he states that this new situation is only one more in an ongoing greater battle between incompatible ideologies. Finally, he calls for the public to realize that the enactment of his policy and support for it are moral acts. In such speeches the policy is not proposed but declared. The President does not ask for debate but for support. And the rhetoric accompanying these situations is one of declaration, not one of discussion.

During the debates about the Federal Constitution, Mr. Pickney stated that he supported a strong Federal Executive, but he feared that extending to the President the powers over war and peace “would render the Executive a monarchy, of the worst kind, to wit an elective one.” Mr. Pickney’s worst fears have come true. Successive Presidents’ greater control over the powers of war and peace have made the Presidency into an elected monarchy, into Caesarism, in international affairs. “Crisis rhetoric” has become a potent force in consolidating this power.

The result of this generic form of rhetoric is that the President qua monarch enjoys considerable support on occasions that he deems critical. Using this genre of persuasion the President demands that the people forfeit their right to judge for themselves the propriety of a policy. He calls upon the people to invest in the President more wisdom than most Presidents exhibit. He speaks the name of freedom even as he works to undermine freedom of speech. He speaks about reasonableness even as he casts potential opponents in positions that are a priori unreasonable.

In situations the President perceives as critical, the President sees himself as Caesar and therefore uses an aristocratic form of rhetoric to justify his declarations of action. This perception and this use of rhetorical forms are unsuitable to a democratic society.


APOLOGY

In the March issue of Speaker and Gavel a grave misrepresentation was presented in the paper entitled “Collegiate Debate: The Confessions of a Frustrated Debater.” On pages 66-67 an illustrative example of the Toulmin Model is presented to elucidate and clarify the central point in the previous paragraph. The author’s first acquaintance with this illustration came in a debate class in which this example was presented as a classic paradigm used to convert syllogistic arguments to the Toulmin Model. In including this example in my paper, a combination of insipience and carelessness led me not to discover the true originator of that paradigm and to subsequently request his permission to include the illustration in the article. I have been informed that the illustration can be found on page 144 of Argumentation and Debate (3rd ed.) by Dr. Austin J. Freeley, Director of Forensics at John Carroll University. Full credit for the illustration must be given to Dr. Freeley, without whose unsolicited help that section of the paper would not have achieved any significant amount of clarity.

Although the illustration is an example and, at best, a peripheral part of my paper, and though the formulation of such a “conversion model” requires little ingenuity, the act of plagiarism, voluntary or accidental, is a serious one. There was no deliberate attempt on my part to present that example as of my origination and I must accept full responsibility for not discovering the true source of the paradigm when it was included in my paper. Hopefully the reader, the editorial board of Speaker and Gavel and Dr. Freeley will accept my sincere apologies for this responsibility. My special thanks to Dr. Robert O. Weiss for bringing this issue to my attention.

Herman J. Marino
TREATING THE ILLS OF ACADEMIC DEBATE

ARTHUR N. KRUGER

In criticizing contemporary forensic practices, many critics are now beginning to deplore the "estrangement" between speech communication research and debate. Robert D. Kully, for example, recently devoted an entire article to proving "that speech communication scholars lack respect for forensics as an academic field." 1 William H. Bennett recently emphasized that "speech communication scholars seem to avoid the communication aspects of debate. Most seem . . . to ignore debate as a speech development activity." 2 While I would agree with Kully that there is much wrong with tournament debating today, that significant changes are needed, and that directors of forensics must seek a broader base of support from their colleagues if academic debate is to remain viable, I do not agree that the solution to the current ills of academic debate lies, as he suggests, in utilizing the findings of speech communication research or in orienting the activity in that direction. The purpose of this paper will be to show why and to suggest where the solution really lies.

Although the defects of academic debate as practiced today have been frequently alluded to, let me briefly indicate what I believe they are:

1. Debaters speak much too fast to be understood by anyone except other debaters and the debate coaches who judge them.
2. Debaters rely heavily on stock phrases which lead to an inelegant style and a certain amount of obfuscation.
3. Debaters often define their terms unrealistically and construct cases which bear little resemblance to those which might be expected from realistic definitions.
4. Debaters often resort to stratagems or trick devices, like certain comparative advantage cases.
5. Debaters often try to overwhelm their opposition by using cases with many more points than can be suitably handled in the time allotted. Hence, debaters often deal with complex problems in very simplistic terms, devoting a sentence or two to concerns which normally require careful explanation and analysis.
6. Debaters are often careless about their use of evidence, usually failing to identify it properly, often taking it out of context, and occasionally manufacturing it.

Although college debaters are undoubtedly guilty of other malpractices, these six, I believe, constitute the primary reasons why debate, in the words of Bruce Markgraf, "has been attacked so frequently by members of the speech field." 3 When taken together, the result for most people, including many who once vigorously supported or coached debate, is an activity which is often incomprehensible, trivial or unrealistic, illogical or sophistic, and unethical. The once noble rationale for debate—as an effective means
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3 As quoted by Kully, 192.
to rational decision-making—has, in the words of W. Scott Nobles, given way to a concept of tournament debating as "a separate art and end in itself."^4

Having seen what the problem is, let us try to put it into some perspective. Faults (1) and (2), which pertain to delivery, are undoubtedly responsible for the most persistent of the complaints. Long before speech communication research came on the scene, debaters were criticized for speaking too fast. Unfortunately, with prescribed time limits, rapid speech seems to be an inherent defect of academic debate. Apparently most college debaters would rather accept the disadvantage of rapid-fire delivery than forego the advantage of increasing the number of points with which they can deal. This is understandable and, by itself, is not as serious an indictment of tournament debating as many in the past have contended. Although debaters are undoubtedly guilty of excessive rates of delivery, these are not always so extreme as imagined. If we consider 150 to 170 words a minute as ideal, and 180 words as acceptable, as do many experts,^5 we find that debaters don't always exceed these limits by appreciable margins. Otto Bauer, for example, calculated the following rates for each of the eight speeches of the final round of 1963 NDT: 1st affirmative constructive, 167; rebuttal, 242; 1st negative constructive, 177; rebuttal, 200; 2nd affirmative constructive, 207; rebuttal, 250; 2nd negative constructive, 177; rebuttal, 223. The average rate for all eight speeches was 205 words per minute.® Although some of these rates are deplorable, particularly 242 and 250 words per minute, the average for all speeches, 205, is only about 13% faster than the acceptable maximum of 180. Although this may be a moot point, from my own experience I have found that, when the need arises, most debaters have little difficulty adapting their rate of speech to a public audience.

Concerning the use of jargon, this too was not a very serious problem in the past, and debaters generally could make adjustments when addressing a public audience. The problem today, however, seems much more serious and has grown, I believe, as a result of some of the stratagems which today's debaters have adopted. In other words, I believe that this problem is a symptom of more deeply rooted ills, which, if mitigated, would significantly reduce the problem. What I am saying is, faults (1) and (2) have been with us for a long time, and I do not believe that they have caused the present criticism. They add to the criticism, surely, but the latter, I believe, stems mainly from faults (3) to (6).

Looking more closely at faults (3) to (6), we see that they are essentially logical failings that strike at the very heart of debating. Fault (3), unrealistic definitions, is generally due to either ignoring the context in which words are used—social, political, and economic as well as verbal—or to violating the criterion of equivalence, a practice which results in definitions' being either too broad or too narrow. For example, to interpret "the gathering of information about U.S. citizens by government agencies" as the information that is gathered by school systems, draft boards, or federal hospitals is to ignore almost totally the social and political context out of which the debate proposition (1971-1972) arose, this context being the

---

^4 Ibid., 193.


outcry of prominent Congressmen like Senators Muskie and Erwin, the Civil Liberties Union, and the news media against the growing surveillance by the Army and F.B.I. of citizens engaged in protest or voicing criticism of then current governmental policies, especially with regard to the Vietnam War. To ignore this context makes a mockery of debate. This type of fallacious definition is basically a form of equivocation. The second fallacious type, violating the criterion of equivalence, results, as we have said, in definitions which are either too broad or too narrow, or sometimes both. For example, to define "price and wage controls" as controls for migrant workers is to offer a definition that violates the criterion of equivalence by being too narrow. This would be like defining "a hat" as a headpiece made of straw, a definition which obviously excludes many hats, just as the aforementioned definition of "price and wage controls" excludes many types of controls. Such errors in logic cannot be compared with other types. They are the most drastic type a debater can commit, for they totally undermine the activity and reduce it to a kind of silly word game. Thus do we hear, and rightly so, the charge of "reality gap."

What, then, is the solution? Clearly, it does not lie in consulting the findings of speech communication research, for the latter apparently is not concerned with prescribing norms for rational discourse. Its interest primarily is in what is, what happens, or what works—not in what should be done if one wishes to be reasonable. To find the solution, we must look to the cause. And this, I believe, consists of four main factors: 1. Many debate coaches apparently have only the most rudimentary knowledge of what constitutes a logical definition. Perhaps they should be encouraged to read a few books on the subject or to take a course in logic. 2. Apparently some of those responsible for phrasing the national debate proposition think it is a good idea to have ambiguous propositions; that ambiguity stimulates the imagination and presents a challenge to debaters. Nothing could be more mistaken. Debaters should be stimulated and challenged by issues, not by definitions. The solution here would be greater care in selecting those who are given the task of phrasing the various propositions. Along with this, it might be a good idea to consult experts in the field before any final decision is made on proper phrasing. Or perhaps debaters should be told explicitly what the framers have in mind as to the meaning of key terms. 3. Many students apparently think that winning a debate is all that matters and that tricky definitions are an effective means to that end. Judging from the final rounds of the NDT of the past few years, little apparently has been done to disabuse them of this notion. But disabuse them of it, we must. Those who coach and judge debate must begin to crack down hard on such tactics. One procedure might be to stop the debate at the end of the first negative speech and declare the negative team the winner if the negative speaker has logically refuted an affirmative's weird

---

7 The criterion of equivalence requires that the term defined, or *definiendum*, must be equivalent to the definition, or *definiens*. In other words, a sound definition is an equation, from which it follows that its two parts are interchangeable in a sentence. Thus, in a valid definition such as "A triangle is a three-sided plane figure," it is also true to say, "A three-sided plane figure is a triangle." However, a definition such as "A square is a four-sided plane figure" is seen to be faulty when we reverse the terms, since not all four-sided plane figures are squares. Hence, the definition is too broad, since it covers figures other than squares.
definition of terms. Markgraf suggested something along these lines several years ago, as did Anapol and Towne more recently. Personally, I think it's a good idea and should be tried. If it were, I believe it would soon bring affirmative teams to their senses, and we would begin to hear debates on the significant issues intended. Very broad topics are apparently required at times if they are to stand up for an entire year. Such topics invite equivocation. Perhaps it is time that we abandoned the single proposition and substituted a series of more specific propositions. A topic, for example, like "Greater controls should be imposed on the gathering and utilizing of information about U.S. citizens by government agencies" could be broken down into three or four separate topics, one dealing perhaps with the collection and use of electronic data, one with the data collected by the FBI, one with the data collected by the Army, and so on. Different tournaments could be allocated different topics. As side benefits, more students might be encouraged to debate; some perhaps might be encouraged to do research only, if this were their preference. Along with this, an effort might be made to grant full academic credit for debate, making it equivalent, say, to a three-credit course each semester. In this way not only would academic debate address itself to significant issues once more, but the activity might grow, as it should.

Fault (4), using stratagems such as a comparative advantage case, which bypasses the need issue, results from an imperfect understanding of the logical requirements for a case on a controversial policy. This particular stratagem commits several fallacies. It fails to deal with the logical presumption favoring the status quo, it assumes the existence of a problem without developing one and hence begs the question, and it fails to provide sufficient justification for removing the status quo even though such removal is implicitly called for in the position it advocates. Looking for help in the work of speech communication theory would be as futile here as with the previous problem. If a speech communication scholar ever did research on such matters, he would undoubtedly report that most audiences couldn't care less about whether the affirmative case was organized or logically structured, or indeed had very much evidence to support its contentions. Attitude change, we would be told, is more dependent upon the speaker's appearance, his choice of words, the intensity of his language, the prejudices of his audience, his reputation, or similar factors. It is unlikely that the speech communication scholar would ever prescribe reasonable arguments in debate, or in any other form of discourse for that matter. His task, after all, is not to prescribe anything but merely to report. What he would report in this case is that most people can't reason or recognize a logical argument. (By implication, of course, why all this concern about being logical?) Hence, a solution to (4) must be sought elsewhere. As to where, frankly I cannot say at the moment. In a series of articles I have tried to explain why any case which advocates a significant change yet admits that the status quo is adequate is an inconsistent case, an illogical case, and is deficient in meeting its proof requirements, but

---

apparently to little avail. One possible solution might be the publication of articles by others, both in and outside the field of academic debating.\footnote{Apparently there are others who deplore the use of the comparative advantage case as commonly interpreted but do not take the trouble to say so in print. At the recent speech convention of the Eastern States, for example, two very experienced coaches expressed the view that the present decline of academic debate started with the introduction and acceptance of the comparative advantage case.}

Fault (5), the shot-gun case, causes debaters, affirmative and negative, to deal with complex problems in simplistic terms. To illustrate what I am talking about, in the 1963 final round of the NDT, the affirmative dealt with involved economic and political problems in such terms as these:

In some countries there might be unemployment and then we're going to build a plant. We can solve that problem, can't we?\footnote{See Kruger and Windes, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 93.}

If \{the underdeveloped nations\} have irresponsible government, we'd suggest they elect someone else.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 98.}

The reason why \{controls\} have failed in the past is because they've been national controls. We've got international controls.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 94.}

Again, curing such ills lies not in consulting communication research but in severely penalizing debaters for such tactics and telling them why. The same may be said of fault (6), the misuse and abuse of evidence. To cite just one type of abuse—and by no means the most serious—in the final round of the 1966 NDT, out of 77 pieces of evidence used by both teams, in 52 instances, or 70%, the source was omitted. And in 44 instances, or more than 50%, the date was omitted. Adding 15 pieces with incomplete dates, three-fourths of the evidence was improperly dated.\footnote{Data taken from A. N. Kruger, "Objectionable Trends in Contemporary Debate," \textit{LISA Express}, V (January, 1968), 20.} If debate judges refused to accept such evidence and penalized debaters accordingly, the latter would soon enough mend their ways.

In conclusion, despite the low esteem in which academic debate is held today, the problem of treating what ails it is not insoluble. This treatment can come only from those in the field and not from anyone else. Rather than throw up our arms in despair, as many have done, it is worth remembering that debate is one of the most worthwhile of intellectual activities, one that is essential to the proper functioning of a democratic society, and hence one which is deserving of every effort to make it healthy and keep it growing. Since we have a pretty good idea of what is wrong with it, we must now have the determination and the will to make it well again. It is time that we began to take some of the steps that are needed to do so.
Delta Sigma Rho, founded in 1906, and Tau Kappa Alpha, founded in 1908, merged in 1963 to found the present society. A short history of the first four years was printed in 1967 and presented to initiates thereafter. The next chapter in the history appeared in Speaker and Gavel in 1968. The account which follows covers the years 1969 to 1972. A revised history is being printed and will be available for all new initiates.

Dr. McBath assumed the presidency of the society in a paradoxical academic situation. With over 7,000,000 students in college, only 15,000 were engaging in forensic activities yet forensic budgets were still running about $8,000,000 a year. Realizing the financial difficulties being experienced by all institutions of higher learning, Dr. McBath was fearful that too many debate programs were stressing only quantitative achievements measured by trophies and wins which he characterized as the society’s "recognizing" and "informing" functions without stressing the "innovative" function of a qualitative nature: the developing of student leaders, scholarly achievement, successful alumni and recognition by other members of the Association of College Honor Societies.

Dr. McBath was not only concerned with the place of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha in the academic community and its positive contributions to higher education, but he also recognized that the society had an internal problem of real concern: with approximately 200 chapters on campuses on which there were thousands of debaters, membership was dropping at an alarming rate. True, almost all of the honor societies were having the same experience. A widespread student attitude depreciated the value of honors and recognitions. Memberships in prestigious societies were declining. Ritualistic initiations were decried. As a consequence, fewer and fewer students were interested in memberships. This, in turn, meant less and less income from initiation fees, which had always been a principal source of income for all such societies. In the case of DSR-TKA an anticipated budget amount of at least $4,000 was not being realized. The National Council began to wrestle with the problem. Raising or even doubling the initiation fee might meet the required budget; on the other hand the number initiated might shrink even more. As a solution which might raise the money needed but not decrease the number of memberships, the chapters were assessed $25 each annually but the initiation fee was reduced from ten to six dollars. At the end of the first year of this experiment, a number of chapters had failed to pay the assessment and the income was only $2,000. Reconsidering the situation, the Council voted to rescind the chapter assessment and to ask each chapter to assume a $20 obligation which might be met in any one of three ways: by initiating two students at $10 a membership; by initiating one student for $10 and paying a like sum to the society; or by paying in to the society the $20.

Initiation fees were, of course, only one factor in the budget picture. Other income had also fallen off. The original financial structure which at one time had reached an estimated value of $85,000 had now shrunk...
to $65,000. The college text, *Argumentation and Debate*, continued to bring in about $900 annually but the society had accumulated a deficit of almost $10,000. The Council, therefore, empowered its financial committee to buy, sell, trade, invest, or reinvest the entire capital structure in order to preserve as many values as possible. To augment the revenue, the Council asked the president to develop an Alumnus Life Patron Plan and to bring it to the attention of all DSR-TKA alumni.

Despite its concern with finances, the Council took two actions which would contribute to the speech profession. It voted a contribution of $150 to the Speech Communication Association’s Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion for the purpose of researching proposed debate propositions. It also approved a plan whereby the Editor of the *Speaker and Gavel*, Dr. Robert Weiss, would edit and publish a paperback reprint of outstanding articles in the periodical, under the title of *Current Criticism*.

In their deliberations, the National Council also took several actions aimed at making the society more attractive to the collegiate members. In 1970 the Student Council had presented a report divided into three parts:

1. There is some sentiment among students for a movement away from the “honorary” concept toward a “union” of forensic people. For example, the initiation ceremony is regarded as an anachronism.
2. The division between faculty and students in DSR-TKA is unrealistic and inappropriate. Students should serve on all committees of the society.
3. We must improve the involvement of the students in the society’s decision-making process.

To meet the problem posed in the first section of the report, the National Council voted to change and shorten the ritual. A committee was authorized to do this; its revision of the ritual was tried out at the Albuquerque conference and it will be reevaluated for future use. The second action taken was to consider again the name for the society. Should it be retained, shortened or changed? After three questionnaires had been circulated to all of the chapters, the present name was reaffirmed and retained.

To meet the criticism of the second section of the report, the National Council voted to authorize the National President to appoint students to all committees where it could be done under the Constitution. Finally, since the involvement of students in the decision-making process seemed to center on a student movement to include at the national conferences sections in which the participants would use a “non-national debate topic” or use “non-topical debate” the National Council passed a resolution authorizing the National President to appoint a committee of faculty and students to set up rules for this type of competition at the national conference to be held at Urbana, Illinois in 1973.

In 1971 the National Council recognized the desirability of establishing a Distinguished Service Award to be presented to members of the teaching profession who had served the society and their students with distinction as supporters of the goals and ideals of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. In 1971 the awards were made to Professor Otis Aggertt of Indiana State University and to Professor Albert Tracy of Murray State University. In 1972 the recipients were Professor Clayton Schug of Pennsylvania State University, Professor George Adamson of the University of Utah, Professor Merrill Christopherson of the University of South Carolina and Professor Donald C. Olson of the University of Nebraska.
LEGISLATION ADOPTED BY DSR-TKA CONGRESS: 1973

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 1

Majority Bill by: Ed Lasky, Mercer University; Marianne Moody, Brigham Young University; Paul Fields, Wabash College; Henry Woloson, Wayne State University; Tony Thomas, Slippery Rock State College.

An Act to equalize campaign television time among candidates.

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

The student representatives to the Congress of the DSR-TKA National Forensic Conference, being dedicated to the development of an informed electorate and seeking to create optimal conditions under which such an electorate might be created, support measures of regulation which might bring to bear the legislative and regulatory resources of our nation in seeking to dissolve obstructions to the possibility of such an achievement.

1) Effective January 1, 1975, no candidate for President will be able to have television commercial time for his campaign.

2) Television campaigning in primary elections will be limited to the following:

   Section 1. Twelve hours of television time will be purchased to have the candidates present their viewpoints.

   Section 2. Participation will be limited to candidates who obtain at least 1% of the signatures of all voters registered in the previous congressional election.

   Section 3. The format of the programs will be panel discussion, debate, or question-answer based on the preference of the majority of candidates involved.

3) Television campaigning in the November election will be limited to the following:

   Section 1. Eight hours of television time will be purchased to have the candidates present their viewpoints.

   Section 2. Participation will be limited to candidates who obtain the nomination of political parties who receive at least 10% of the vote cast in primary elections.

   Section 3. The format of the programs will be panel discussion, debate, or question-answer based on the preference of the majority of the candidates involved.

   Section 4. These television programs will be held following the conventions of the political parties.

4) These programs will be paid for from a national campaign fund of federal tax funds equivalent to $1 per citizen. This fund is similar to that provided in the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971.
5) Effective January 1, 1975, no candidate for U.S. Senator or Representative will be able to purchase television time for his campaign.

Section 1. Television time will be limited to four hours prior to primaries and two hours before the final election.

Section 2. Participation will be limited to candidates who qualify according to Section Two of the provisions regarding presidential elections but with the percentages applying to the registered voters in the candidate's potential district.

Section 3. Television exposure will be limited to only those potential voters for those candidates.

6) The above provisions regarding restrictions on media time will be extended to cover radio stations. Programs will be similar to those provided above regarding television.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 5

Referred to the Committee on Problems concerning Unfair Campaign Practices by: Stephen Pagel, Creighton; Sally Jackson, Illinois; Sarah Berlin, Manchester; Hal Langford, Clemson; Gwen Mounsey, Mankato.

An Act to Establish an Independent Agency for the Regulation of all National Elections.

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

Section 1: That an independent, regulatory agency be established with quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative, and quasi-executive powers to oversee the National Elections Commission (N.E.C.)

A. That the board shall be made up of seven members appointed by the President and approved by Congress.

B. That each major political party shall have one nonvoting member of the N.E.C.

C. Major Party—All parties polling equal to 5% of the popular votes for President in the last presidential election, or presenting a petition equal to 1% of popular vote for President in the last election shall have national recognition. Those parties polling 5% of the gubernatorial votes in the last election, or presenting a petition equal to 1% of the vote for governor, shall be recognized within that state.

Section 2: That the board shall provide judgement and review in the following areas:

A. Media-Liaison with the FCC to provide distribution and enforcement of fair and equitable time distribution for all major parties.

B. Financial resources—Provide for disclosure of contributions of funds and shall keep public all allotments of funds, (i.e. check off funds) and shall keep public record of expenses and receipt of or in favor of candidates. This public disclosure shall include an extensive publicity campaign directed at informing the general public of methods for obtaining the reported information under the provisions for disclosure of Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.
Section 3: That conviction of violation of the act shall result in the restraining of a person from holding or campaigning for a federal office for a period of not less than five (5) years and not more than ten (10) years from the time of conviction.

A. That this agency shall act to prevent bribery, espionage, discrimination, libel, slander, and all other unfair campaign practices.

B. That this agency shall also review alleged misuse of funds or expenditures of or in favor of a candidate or group of candidates.

C. That this agency shall act to levy penalties in fines against political parties, organizations, and individuals not to exceed $50,000 and/or imprisonment of up to five (5) years or both.

CONGRESS BILL NUMBER 6

Referred to the committee on Problems concerning Unfair Campaign Practices by: Stephen Pagel, Creighton; Hal Langford, Clemson; Gwen Mounsey, Mankato; Sally Jackson, Illinois; Sarah Berlin, Manchester.

An Act to establish a National Primary System.

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

Section 1: That the N.E.C. (National Elections Commission) shall establish a National Primary System, within the following guidelines:

A. That this primary will be open to all political parties.

B. That all expenses incurred during the establishment and operation of this primary will be borne by the Federal Government.

C. That a nation-wide primary will be held on the last Tuesday of July, in Presidential Election Years and will be preceded by a campaign period of 60 days before which no media campaigning may take place.

D. Media to be defined as television, radio, newspaper, circulars, and posters.

Section 2: That beginning on September 1 the nominees of the various political parties will be allowed to engage in campaign activities.

Section 3: That the N.E.C. will be empowered to enforce the rules established.

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 Illinois be thanked for hosting the 10th annual DSR-TKA National Forensic Conference. More specifically, that President John Corbally and Chancellor Jack Peltason be thanked for their gracious hospitality. Furthermore, that Roger E. Nebergall, Head of the Department of Speech be thanked for his cordiality.

Section 2: That Professor Kenneth Andersen, Tournament Director, be commended for his outstanding job in coordinating the 10th 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 James Benson and Professor Robert Weiss be commended for their instrumental assistance in the execution of the 10th DSR-TKA Student Congress. Without their help this Student Congress would not have been possible.

(b) That Professor Kenneth Andersen be commended for his influence in the outstanding progress that the DSR-TKA Student Congress has made in the last 10 years.

Section 4: That Professor Joseph O'Rourke be commended for his innovation of the Contemporary Issues Debate Category and his role in its success.

Section 5: That Barbara Matthews be thanked for the convenience, comfort and hospitality extended as a result of her efforts as the Ramada Convention Coordinator.

Section 6: That Ed Campbell, General Manager of Champaign Ramada Inn Convention Center, be thanked for the overall coordination of the conference, and its success.

CONGRESS SPECIAL RESOLUTION NUMBER 2

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

Section 1: That Sunday forensics competition curtails the forensic participation of many academic communities in this nation.

A. Sunday forensics competition violates some religious mores.
B. Due to time in transit to and from forensics tournaments prohibits participation for some academic communities.

Section 2: That also, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha has traditionally recognized the diversity and academic orientation of its membership across the nation.

Section 3: That also the goals of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha include the highest ideals in forensics and oratorical activities.

Section 4: That the inability of any college or university to participate in speech or debate tournaments by virtue of Sunday forensics activities hinders the achievement of these goals.

Be it resolved that this body supports the elimination of Sunday Forensics competition.
MINUTES OF DSR-TKA NATIONAL COUNCIL
Champaign, Illinois, April 19, 1973

Convened at 11:00 A. M.

Present for all or part of the meeting: Cripe, Walwik, Bertolotti, Andersen, Hagood, Kimball, McConkey, Wetherby, Friedenberg, Moorhouse, Blyton, Ross, Weiss, Cook, Ziegelmueller, Conklin, Corey, Eubank, O'Rourke, Zarefsky.

President's Report, Nicholas Cripe

Good cooperation has been obtained from persons asked to accept special responsibility. Particularly good work was done by the committee chaired by Norma Cook to selected a DSR-TKA representative to N.D.T.

Vice-President Ziegelmueller has been charged with the responsibility of liaison with Regional Governors.

Gifford Blyton has been appointed chairman of the Constitutional Revision Committee and Kathy Corey was appointed Governor of Region X.

Student President's Report, John Bertolotti

There is a need to regularize procedures for selection of the Student Speaker of the Year.

Motion; Bertolotti, Weiss: The Student President should serve as a member of the National Conference Committee; the Student First Vice-President and Secretary should serve on the Speaker of the Year Board; the Student Second Vice-President should serve as Associate Editor of Speaker and Gavel; and the Student First Vice-President is responsible for conducting the selection of the Student Speaker of the Year. Passed.

Report of the Secretary, Theodore Walwik

Motion; Walwik, McConkey: Approve minutes of the December, 1972 meeting as corrected to show McConkey present. Passed.

Motion; Walwik, Wetherby: Dean Rusk, Spencer, and Branch are approved as members-at-large at the request of the Davidson chapter. Passed.

We note with sadness the passing of sponsors Herbert Wing, Jr. of Dickinson College and C. F. Evans, Jr. of the University of Bridgeport.

Reports of the Regional Governors

III—Clark Kimball reports an attempt to establish new contact with each chapter.

IV—Joseph Wetherby reported on the Regional Conference held in Tuscaloosa. Motion; Hagood, Wetherby: All chapters in Kentucky should be considered a part of Region IV. Passed.

There is interest in chapters at West Georgia, Florida Tech, and Citadel.
Motion; Ziegelmueller, Moorhouse: The Standards Committee should investigate the status of chapters at Lincoln Memorial, Birmingham-Southern, Rollins, Memphis State, and Tampa and report to the Council in New York. Passed.

V—Robert Friedenberg. Eleven schools attended the Regional Tournament last year.

VI—Vernon McGuire—appended.

VII—Mel Moorhouse

X——Kathy Corey suggested vigorous, low pressure regional conference. Appealed for effort to lower cost of National Conference.

Report of the National Conference Committee, Ken Andersen

Mrs. George Adamson passed away recently.

Motion; Andersen, Moorhouse: National Council wire George Adamson expressing our regret at the passing of his wife and extending our best wishes for the future. Passed.

Motion; Ziegelmueller, Bertolotti: The “ten minute rule” will be imposed in all debate rounds. Passed.

Report of the Standards Committee, Forrest Conklin

The committee is reorganizing and is seeking applications for charters from interested schools.

Report of the Distinguished Alumni Committee, Annabel Hagood

Report appended.

Motion; Hagood, Ziegelmueller: Adopt the recommendations contained in the report. Passed.

Report of the Speaker of the Year Board, N. M. Cripe for Peter Kane

Shirley Chisholm has been named Speaker of the Year for 1972.

Report of the Publications and Research Committee, James McBath

The committee is attempting to find a publisher for a revised edition of the textbook.

Report of the Representative to A. C. H. S., Henry Ewbank

Report appended.

Report of the Historian, Herold Ross

A new history of the society has been prepared and printed.

Report of the Editor, Robert Weiss

We still have a large supply of Current Criticism, and we encourage its purchase.
Treasurer’s Report, Robert Huber

Report appended.

Motion; McConkey, Eubank: Authorize payment of $142.67 to H. L. Ewbank, $92.00 to Annabel Hagood, and $350.00 to David Zarefsky. Passed.

Motion; Ziegelmueller, Blyton: Appoint a committee of Eubank, Hagood and Huber to review the proposed budget and report to the Council. Passed.

Report of the Representative to the SCA Committee on Discussion and Debate, David Zarefsky

Consideration is being given to selecting multiple propositions for 1973-1974.

Motion; Walwik, Wetherby: President be instructed to approach the other honor societies and the Forensics Division of SCA with a view to including the operating expenses of the Committee on Discussion and Debate in the budget of SCA. Passed.

At 6:00 P. M., the Council recessed and reconvened at 8:30 P. M.

The Budget Review Committee recommended a budget for 1973-1974 (copy appended).

Motion; Hagood for the committee: Adopt the proposed budget. Passed.

Motion; Hagood, McConkey: Any person authorized to spend money under a budget line item may not incur indebtedness beyond the sum specified in the budget line without the prior approval of the Finance Committee. Passed.

Motion; Hagood, Wetherby: The Editor of Speaker and Gavel and the Publications Committee be authorized to develop policy for the Fall, 1973 issue and to develop recommendation for subsequent issues to present to the National Council at its November meeting. Passed.

Report of the Trustee, Wayne Eubank

Current estimated values of our mutual fund holdings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected American</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$71,000

Recommends no change at this time and suggests we consider the performance of Eddle Securities during 1973.
Report of the Constitutional Revision Committee, Gifford Blyton

Work is just beginning. It is the intention of the committee to examine every aspect of the constitution, and to report to the Council in November.

Adjourned at 10:30 P. M.

April 20, 1973

Convened at 1:30 P. M.

Present for all or part of the meeting: Cripe, Walwik, McBath, Friedenberg, McConkey, Wetherby, Cook, Hagood, Corey, Weiss, Andersen, Bertolotti, Moorhouse.

President Cripe and the Council confirmed the following appointments:

National Conference Committee: Ken Andersen of the University of Illinois as Chairman and James Hall of St. John's as Committeeman.

Larry Schnoor of Mankato State College as Governor of Region VIII.

Wayne Calloway of Wyoming as Governor of Region IX.

John DeBross of the University of Southern California as Governor of Region X.

Peter Kane resigned as Chairman of the Speaker of the Year Board.

Motion; Friedenberg, McBath: Authorize President Cripe to appoint a new chairman of the Speaker of the Year Board with the provision that the person selected should understand his responsibility to attend the National Conference. Passed.

Adjourned at 1:55 P. M.
NEW INITIATES OF DSR-TKA 1972—73

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
Susan Louise Cloud
Charles Edwin Richardson III

ALMA COLLEGE
Thomas McCaughna
Morgan Ohwovoriole
Ann Sarnes

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
Beth Susan Bennett
Karen Bruner
Temple Loretta Carlton
Paul Jerome Hanft

UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT
Julia DiCocco
Robert Joseph Musso

BRIDGEWATER COLLEGE
G. Harlow Flory
James W. Mays

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
Jeanne A. Grow
Charles Mac Haddow
Richard B. Johnson
Marianne G. Moody
Todd S. Vinegar

BUTLER UNIVERSITY
Stephen L. Householder
Carl Dean Ullman

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, LONG BEACH
Brian D. Eyres
Theresa L. Wall

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA
Richard Lewis Francis

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY
William Vaughn Baltzly
Mark Robinson Chinnis
Douglas Eric Graff
Gary Raymond Rhinesmith
Michael Robert Thomas
Paul Harold Zietlow

CARLOW COLLEGE
Deborah Ellen Grimes
Linda Louise Zarecky

DAVIDSON COLLEGE
William Harllee Branch, Jr.
Richard B. Damewood
George Alexander Kaneklides

Paul Mitchell
Dean Rusk
Samuel R. Spencer, Jr.

DENISON UNIVERSITY
James M. Giffin
Wayne A. Jenkins
Margaret A. Polanski

DePAUW UNIVERSITY
Mark Anthony Filippell
Philip Michel Pochon

EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Kathy Paris

ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE
Garrett Anthony Bozylinsky
Thomas G. Bradley
Robert V. Hanle
Michael H. Payne
Rosemary Alice Wolf

EMERSON COLLEGE
Kevin Francis Greeley

EMORY UNIVERSITY
Robert Stephen Frank
Gregory John Malovance
Lawrence Kurt Nodine
Timothy Joseph Warfel

FAIRMONT STATE COLLEGE
Sara Frances Butler
Stephen Graham Engle
Mary Barbara Klaus
Karen Jean Winter
James Purdy Woolfitt

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
Michael John Cooper
John V. Lee
Frank John Lower
Amy Sue Phillips
Don Edward Wiener

GRINNELL COLLEGE
Thomas Alden Knapp
James Anthony Skarzynski

HAMILTON COLLEGE
Robert Damien Rooney

HANOVER COLLEGE
Kenneth L. Gladish
James Lee Redfield

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Michael David Campbell
Kathy Lou Dean
Kathy Lee Dunnegan
Kathleen Ann Gibson
Donita Grace Hadley
Paula Beth Hannum
Mary Laura Harden
Johnny Elwood Henderson
Robert Howard Jerry II
Mark Robert Lange
Joseph Charles Pendleton
Kristine Ann Royster
Linda Ann Sparks
David Arthur Walls
Paul David White

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
Dennis James Langer

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Jim Flegle
Karl G. Merchant

KING’S COLLEGE
Michael Donald Klein
Nicholas Francis Krutz
Timothy Joseph O’Neill
Eugene M. Twardowski
Joan Diana
Joseph Balz
Ted Schoen

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
Susan Marie Barton
Anthony Stanley DiVincenzo
Michael A. D. Jirasek

MADISON COLLEGE
Thomas David Clark
Gary Thompson Gerber

MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
Jon Benson
Michael Lundstrom

MERCER UNIVERSITY
Edward Heath Deveaux, Jr.
Michael Linn Streetman
Robert Scott Walker

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
John Stuart Harper
Harlan Ray Muntz
Valerie Brook Noon
Patricia Lynn Rieth
Gary Owen Turner

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Brandon Charles Becker
Leonard Vincent Crowley
Bryan Lee Hanson

MUSKINGUM COLLEGE
Douglas Duff Waugh

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
Michael Wayne Bailey
Paul Thomas Henshaw, Jr.
Albert Michael Rodriguez
Michael Ross Woods

NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS UNIVERSITY
George Manwell Bradley
Michael D. C’de Baca
Alonso L. Lucero
Michael P. Martinez

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
Cole C. Campbell
Kathryn Kernodle
H. Brent McKnight
A. Hewitt Rose, III

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
Peggy J. Hamrick
Daniel Alan Seaman

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
Dana Cox
Gregory Eugene Metge
Roger Carl Peterson
Neil Phillips

Occidental College
Gayle Ann Brunson

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Richard Scott Babich
Bruce Howard Meizlish
Joseph William O’Neil
James William Purcell

PACE COLLEGE
Vincent Manuel Di Lorenzo

Pennsylvania State University
Barbara Ann Bare
Sandra Frances Skowron

Purdue University
Thomas Kevin Delaney
Steven Leslie Jackson

University of Richmond
John M. Daniel, III
Robert L. Elwood
Bonnie M. Mason
Leslie Osborn
Hal S. Watkins
ST. ANSELM'S COLLEGE
Jon Hisgen Beck
David R. Chisholm
David Lynn Lowery
Dennis Michael Lynch

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY
David Walter Bruce
Katharine Mary McDonald

SAMFORD UNIVERSITY
David Hill Chestnut

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA
John M. Tyson, Jr.

SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY
Richard Keith Renn

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA
Michael P. Kehoe
Kim Elsmer Kilpatrick

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
David Alexander Burkhalter
Mae Jean Go
William Howard Haltom, Jr.
Bruce Timothy Pirtle
Linda Morrow Sanford

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Rebecca Jean Chesko
Terrence Lee Chmielewski
Michael Wayne Cox
Catherine A. Piper

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
Timothy Mitchell Ashmore
Edwin S. Darrell
David Dembitz
Gary I. Moss
Jim W. Riley
Tim Lynn Weiler

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT
Jonathan Baron Lash
Daniel Michael Mulcahy
Jan Elizabeth Murray
Karen Ann Olio
Paul Jeffrey Potash
Patrick James Ringer
Michael L. Schwartz

WABASH COLLEGE
Paul Lemuel Fields
Mark C. Guenin
David C. Worrell

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY
William Lewis Davis
Lynne Jane Eickholt
Marcus Eugene Ethridge, III
Beverly Jane Myers

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY
Curtis Boswell
Thomas Peard
Sterling Smith

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
David Henry Haan
Nancy E. Hovorka
Ronald Emery Lee
Robert William McBroom
Michael John Nolan
Robert Joseph Torgerson

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
Kathleen K. Adams
Dennis DeBerry
Christine Anne Luchok
Jon B. Pees
Valerie Lyn Smouse
Barbara Ann Trubilowicz

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Ronnah Lynn Childress
Michael Wayne Howell

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
James Paul Markan

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
Timothy Dugan
Charles D. Hoyt

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
Timothy Lester Decker
John David Dotts

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY
Allen William Hayward
Thomas Matthes
Terry Michael Plummer

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
Marcia Kate Carl
Glen Wilmer Clatterbuck
Daniel William Gepford
William Douglas Harpine
James Clifford Weekley, Jr.

COLLEGE OF WOOSTER
James H. McComas
Ronald J. Ruskan

XAVIER UNIVERSITY
Thomas Anthony Coz
Donald Paul Flynn, Jr.
DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI COMMITTEE

TO: The members of DSR-TKA
FROM: The Distinguished Alumni Awards Committee

We invite your participation in identifying those among our alumni meriting recognition by DSR-TKA. In 1974, the Awards Committee will receive nominations for two categories of awards.

SERVICE AWARDS
1. No more than four Service Awards will be presented to persons currently making an active contribution to forensics. Each recipient must be a member of DSR-TKA.
2. Nominations may be made by any active member of the Society.

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARDS
1. No more than four Distinguished Alumni Awards will be presented to members of DSR-TKA whose personal and professional life merit the highest recognition of the Society.
2. Nominations may be made by the Chapters or by any active member of the Society.

The deadline for nominations for 1974 awards is December 15, 1973. The committee will be pleased to receive nominations at any time prior to that date. Your nomination should be accompanied by a statement indicating why your candidate merits the award for which you are nominating him. We shall need some information about your nominee but a xerox copy of a Who's Who or similar listing will be satisfactory.

Send a copy of your nomination to each member of the committee.

Annabel Hagood
University of Alabama
Box 1367
University, Al. 35486

Wayne Calloway
Department of Speech
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

Mike Cronin
Department of Speech
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vt. 05401

William Dresser
Department of Speech
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023

Kathy Corey
Department of Speech
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106
### 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, Mich.</td>
<td>Jon Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma, Alma, Mich.</td>
<td>Kenneth Plaxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Jerome B. Polsky</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, Ky.</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></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>Charles Parkhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Providence, R.I.</td>
<td>Barbara Tannenbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucknell, Lewisburg, Penna.</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, Penna.</td>
<td>Thomas Hopkins</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson, Clemson, S.C.</td>
<td>Charles L. Montgomery</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 Scarcist</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. Stromer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton, Omaha, Nebr.</td>
<td>Rev. H. J. McAuliffe, S.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Post College of L. I. University, Greenvale, 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>Mary C. Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison, Granville, Ohio</td>
<td>William R. Dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Denver, Colo.</td>
<td>Robert O. Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw, Greencastle, Ind.</td>
<td>David Brubaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson, Carlisle, Penna.</td>
<td>Joseph C. Wetherby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke, Durham, N.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky, Richmond, Ky.</td>
<td>Max B. Huss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabethtown, Elizabethtown, Penna.</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>Melissa Maxey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont State, Fairmont, W. Va.</td>
<td>Mike Overking</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>
<tr>
<td>Georgia, Athens, Ga.</td>
<td>Bertram W. Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell, Grinnell, Iowa</td>
<td>William Vanderpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Clinton, N.Y.</td>
<td>J. Franklin Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Name, Address</td>
<td>Faculty Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</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 Parhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover, Hanover, Ind.</td>
<td>Stanley B. Wheater</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, Ida.</td>
<td>Albert Whitehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois, Urbana, Ill.</td>
<td>Kenneth Andersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.</td>
<td>Eugene C. Chenoweth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State, Terre Haute, Ind.</td>
<td>Karen M. Olson</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, Kan.</td>
<td>Donn W. Parson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State, Manhattan, Kan.</td>
<td>Vernon Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.</td>
<td>J. W. Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings, Wilkes Barre, Penna.</td>
<td>Robert E. Connelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox, Galesburg, Ill.</td>
<td>Robert Seibert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh, Bethlehem, Penna.</td>
<td>John A. Schnaible</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, 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, Minn.</td>
<td>Larry Schnoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette, Milwaukee, Wis.</td>
<td>John Lewinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, College Park, Md.</td>
<td>J. D. Maynard</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, Ga.</td>
<td>Gerre G. Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.</td>
<td>J. Robert Olen</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, Mich.</td>
<td>C. William Colburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.</td>
<td>Donald P. Cushman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.</td>
<td>James T. Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri, Columbia, Mo.</td>
<td>James Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State, Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>Harold B. Chinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State, Murray, Ky.</td>
<td>Jerry Mayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum, New Concord, Ohio</td>
<td>Judson D. Ellerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.</td>
<td>Jackson Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada, Reno, Nev.</td>
<td>Gordon Zimmerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.</td>
<td>W. L. Sims</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>Jack Hasch</td>
</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>J. Robert Cox</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>William Semlack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa</td>
<td>Lillian R. Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Name, Address</td>
<td>Faculty Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.</td>
<td>David Zarefsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio</td>
<td>Daniel J. Goulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental, Los Angeles, Calif.</td>
<td>Gage Capel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio, Athens, Ohio</td>
<td>Ted J. Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>J. Michael Sproule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio</td>
<td>Ed Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.</td>
<td>Paul Barefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon, Eugene, Ore.</td>
<td>Gary Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State, Corvallis, Ore.</td>
<td>Thurston E. Doler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace, New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>Frank Colbourn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific, Forest Grove, Ore.</td>
<td>Albert C. Hingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penna.</td>
<td>Stephen Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University Park, Penna.</td>
<td>Jeanne Lutz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penna.</td>
<td>Thomas Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue, Lafayette, Ind.</td>
<td>Henry L. Ewbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.</td>
<td>Robert M. Batscha</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 Graebner</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. Graunke</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. Mc Cleary</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>University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.</td>
<td>James Dempsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.</td>
<td>James I. Marteney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton, Scranton, Penna.</td>
<td>Edward F. Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock State, Slippery Rock, Penna.</td>
<td>Theodore Walwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Alabama, Mobile, Ala.</td>
<td>Howard Pelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.</td>
<td>Merrill G. Christopherson</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 McBeth, John DeBross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Methodist, Dallas, Tex.</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>Bettie Hudgens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.</td>
<td>Gary Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Univ. of N.Y. at Albany, Albany, N.Y.</td>
<td>Richard W. Wilkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Univ. of N.Y., Harpur College, Binghamton, N.Y.</td>
<td>Eugene Vasilew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U.N.Y. College, Cortland, N.Y.</td>
<td>Raymond S. Beard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna, Selinsgrove, Penna.</td>
<td>Larry D. Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y.</td>
<td>Alice J. Cummings</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>
<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>Chapter Name, Address</td>
<td>Faculty Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane, New Orleans, La.</td>
<td>Pamela Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Naval Academy</td>
<td>Phillip Warken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.</td>
<td>Joseph E. Vannucci</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>Michael Dugaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State, Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td>George W. Ziegelmuelger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State, Ogden, Utah</td>
<td>John B. Hebestreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan, Middletown, Conn.</td>
<td>Marguerite G. Petty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky State, Bowling Green, Ky.</td>
<td>William L. Davis</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 M’ Rourke</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>

**TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS**

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them to: "The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha."

The membership fee is $10.00. The official key of 10K (size shown in cut on this page) is $10.50, or the official keypin of 10K is $11.75. A lapel button is available for $7.00. Prices include Federal Tax. Individual key orders add 50¢.

The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of SPEAKER and GAVEL. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive SPEAKER and GAVEL for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive SPEAKER and GAVEL may subscribe at the standard rate of $5.00 per year.