

December 2018

Complete Issue 13(3)

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



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

Recommended Citation

(1976). Complete issue 13(3). *Speaker & Gavel*, 13(3), 33-52.

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Speaker & Gavel* by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

per

PN 9011, 56

speaker and gavel

PERIODICALS SECTION
JUL 13 1976
MINNESOTA STATE
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

| | |
|---|----|
| Rhetoric, Oratory and Life: The DePauw Forensic Program—Robert O. Weiss | 33 |
| Maintaining the Logical Dimension: A Response to Kurt Ritter's "Recapturing the Rhetorical Dimension"—John F. Schunk | 38 |
| Debate as an Instrument for Democracy: A Rejoinder to John Schunk—Kurt W. Ritter | 41 |
| Chapter News | 44 |
| List of Chapters and Sponsors | 49 |

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 quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring and Summer. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

NATIONAL OFFICERS OF DSR-TKA

President: GEORGE W. ZIEGELMUELLER, Wayne State University
Vice President: NORMA C. COOK, University of Tennessee
Secretary: BERTRAM W. GROSS, University of Georgia
Treasurer: JACK H. HOWE, California State University-Long Beach
Trustee: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico
Historian: HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: RICHARD ROTH, University of Rhode Island; JAMES J. HALL, St. John's University; JOHN MORELLO, Madison College; JOSEPH C. WETHERBY, Duke University; ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University; VERNON R. McGUIRE, Texas Tech University; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; LARRY SCHNOOR, Mankato State College; WAYNE CALLAWAY, University of Wyoming; JOHN DeBROSS, University of Southern California.
Members at Large: NICHOLAS M. CRIFE (Past President), Butler University; BETTIE HUDGENS, Spring Hill College; RONALD J. MATLON, University of Massachusetts.
ACHS Representative: JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California.
Representative on SCA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: JOHN GREG, St. John's University.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Standards Committee: NORMA COOK, University of Tennessee
National Conference Committee: THOMAS KANE, University of Pittsburgh
Research and Publications Committee: ROBERT COX, University of North Carolina
Distinguished Alumni and Service Awards Committee: CULLY CLARK, University of Alabama.
Speaker of the Year Committee: KASSIAN KOVALCHECK, Vanderbilt University.

STUDENT OFFICERS

President: HOWARD STEINBERG, University of Massachusetts
First Vice President: PETER QUIST, University of Georgia
Second Vice President: CHRISTOPHER FARRELL, St. Anselm's College
Secretary: MARYANNE URTCZEK, Wayne State University

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: KENNETH E. ANDERSEN, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.
Associate Editors: BERNARD L. BROCK, Wayne State University; KURT RITTER, University of Illinois; CHRISTOPHER FARRELL, St. Anselm's College.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 13

Spring 1976

Number 3

RHETORIC, ORATORY AND LIFE: THE DEPAUW FORENSIC PROGRAM

ROBERT O. WEISS

Generations of DePauw University students entering Meharry Hall for convocations have passed a striking bronze plaque dedicated by his grateful pupils to Joseph Carhart, "Professor of Rhetoric, Oratory and Life," in the 1880's.

A patina of tradition enriches forensic activity at DePauw. Any description of the program must include some obeisance to the bands, wagons and cannons with which an exultant crowd met Carhart's student, Albert Jeremiah Beveridge, upon his return from winning the Interstate Oratorical Contest in 1885; to other DePauw debaters and orators such as Charles A. Beard and David Lilienthal; and to a series of dedicated professors (including my father) who have been instrumental in maintaining these activities.

Tradition enters into the DePauw forensics amalgam as one of the ingredients determining its nature and quality at any given time. Other ingredients are the needs and attitudes of the students, the personalities and objectives of the faculty, the supportiveness of the university, and the opportunities provided by the forensics and public communities.

DePauw University is a privately-endowed, residential university located in Greencastle, Indiana. Its 2300 students, most of whom are enrolled in the college of liberal arts, are midwestern, academically well-prepared, and pre-professionally oriented. The forensics program at DePauw is under the direct jurisdiction of the Speech Department. The following account describes the DePauw forensics program, a program which I visualize as moderate in scope, stable, continuous, student-centered, sometimes innovative, and always rather relaxed.

Our more fundamental philosophical objectives are ones appropriate to the liberal arts college: to promote thorough investigation, clear reasoning, discriminating judgment, and effective communication. We are attracted toward integration and a little wary of too intense specialization. Since the individual student is important, we exercise some care in maintaining a program which meets the needs of the students rather than maintaining students who meet the needs of the program. These aims are abstract, but they are not empty: decisions regarding personnel, training procedures, sponsorship of events, and entries in competitive events are actually made with such values in mind. My own evaluation of the success of the program as well as my personal satisfactions are based largely upon the degree to which such goals are being met.

Robert O. Weiss (Ph.D., Northwestern) is director of forensics, professor of speech, and department chairman at DePauw University.

To be more concrete, I will provide a factual description of the DePauw program. Recognizing that no year is entirely typical, this account is based on the 1975-76 school year. It describes our program components, budget, staff, participants, publicity, the role of DSR-TKA and plans for the future.

Program components. The basic activities constitute four "clusters" overlapping with one another in personnel and events.

We still devote a considerable proportion of our energies to intercollegiate tournament debating. An "on-topic" squad of fourteen students took part in five two-or-three-day, essentially varsity, tournaments, and five one-day, essentially junior varsity and novice, tournaments this year. This squad met regularly on Monday nights and scheduled other practices and meetings during the week.

Individual events competition has been growing in attractiveness at DePauw as well as nationally. A dozen students on the individual events team, most of whom prepared individually rather than in group meetings, attended five tournaments and one noncompetitive festival. During the year four traditional intramural contests, including an endowed sermon contest, were conducted on the campus.

An off-topic and audience "squad," most of whose members also did on-topic debating, met irregularly. It took part in BYD events, the University of Illinois parliamentary debates, three other intercollegiate open forums, five debates at high schools, and one off-topic tournament.

Finally, a "legislative" group, eight more students, took part in three intercollegiate congresses, including the DSR-TKA National Conference, and a mock-trial event.

The intercollegiate events sponsored on the DePauw campus annually include the Intercollegiate Legislative Assembly in November and an invitational debate tournament, now in its 28th year, in February. This year we also hosted the BYD district contests and the contests of the Indiana Oratorical Association and the Indiana Peace Speech Association.

Budget. The "debate" budget, which is part of the Speech Department budget, amounted to \$2750 this year, up from \$2500 last year and from \$1400 ten years ago. These funds amount to a travel budget in forensics. A breakdown of this year's expenditures reveals that we spent \$760 for transportation, \$685 for lodging, \$475 for food, \$465 for tournament fees (which included some meals), \$215 for hosting events at DePauw, and \$150 for other expenses, such as league dues. About 70% of the budget was spent on debate and 30% on individual events. Some postage, phone and duplicating costs were absorbed in other budgets.

The university usually pays all expenses on forensics trips, although some of the costs of meals or cars are occasionally borne by debaters or myself. Reimbursement is on the basis of receipts furnished to the comptroller's office. University cars, available about half the time, are charged to the debate budget at the rate of 15 cents per mile. Faculty, student and rental cars and public transportation are also used.

Staff. Two Speech faculty members are involved in forensics. Serving as director of forensics, I supervise the debate work and attend approximately twelve events per year. Dr. Walter Kirkpatrick directs the individual events team and attends five events per year. Neither of us receives any teaching load credit or extra remuneration for this work. DePauw's failure to follow the teaching load equivalency guidelines of the Association of Communication Administrators (which I helped to draw up) is of some embarrassment to me. When I keep a record, I find that I spend

on the average about twenty hours per week on forensics. However, with many other faculty responsibilities, neither of us can claim to give full-time attention to forensics.

The use of senior debaters as coaches of the novice squad originated one year when one of the debaters who was preparing to teach volunteered for the assignment as a senior project in speech. Since then, a series of very helpful senior students (and a few duds) have assumed the position of novice coach, receiving academic credit and valuable experience. (We have no graduate assistants.)

Participants. Thirty-five students participated directly in intercollegiate forensics this year. On-campus participation is harder to estimate because it depends on what you count. Some made forensics their main activity; others took part in only one or two events. Ten were speech majors. None of them received academic credit for participation and none had forensic scholarships. Of the fourteen debaters, seven debated in high school. I estimate that half of all our participants including most of the more active ones had high school experience.

We do not do any direct high school forensics recruiting. When students evince an interest in DePauw through letters or campus visits, we encourage them to continue their interest in these activities and provide them with information about the program. In the fall we have meetings, post notices, and contact some special groups such as pre-law students, but many of our students arrive because of personal contact with other students. Although we do have debate try-outs, these are largely *pro forma*, eliminating only those who fail to show up for their try-out speeches.

Our training program for participants is not nearly as systematic as we would like it to be, partly because we are admittedly over-extended. We try to provide elementary instruction in various events to inexperienced students; then rely upon peer-group criticism and informal sessions to help the more advanced ones. Much tournament preparation is frankly *ad hoc* and sometimes merely desperate. During DePauw's January Winter Term a debate workshop is conducted, encompassing both neophytes and advanced debaters. At some point, most participants enroll in various speech courses which provide relevant conceptual frameworks and techniques.

The program is a voluntary activity, for the benefit of those students who want to take advantage of it. We try very hard not to be coercive, and have neither grades nor money to use as rewards. If students are not available for a particular meet, we simply do not attend. After an entry has been sent in, however, a student must keep his commitment.

Participants at DePauw do not fall into any set mold; we encourage them to follow paths which they find meaningful. For example, one dimension of discourse which a number of our students have explored during the past ten years is the discussion of values. The program has provided leeway for an effort to determine how values, especially personally-held values, might play a more substantial part in forensic discourse. No doubt to the bemusement of some debate judges and to the manifest irritation of others, these students have explored the limits of argumentation and persuasion. This effort has been directed not toward the despised trick case or finding precious ways to win, but toward leading the debate or other event into support or challenge of fundamental values. One especially conscientious team sent questionnaires to every judge who had heard them during the year, and we learned a great deal from the surprising range of responses which they received.

Publicity. Although we do not see ourselves as a public relations arm of the university and do not feel ourselves under pressure to win trophies and acclaim, publicity does have some function in the DePauw program. Almost all publicity designed for off-campus consumption is channeled through the DePauw News Bureau which provides items for near-by media and home-town papers, admissions and alumni office publications on the basis of information we provide them. On-campus publicity includes the campus radio station, campus newspaper, posters, and other announcements handled through the staffs of those enterprises or directly by student participants. The News Bureau seems to work more happily with news of winning records than losing ones, so we sometimes do not bother them with those events which have produced educational benefits rather than extraneous rewards. Basically, when newsworthy activity occurs, we will try to make it known, on the assumptions that it tends to produce support for the program, has some morale value among the participants, and sometimes creates a better understanding of our program.

DSR-TKA. Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha and its predecessor society, Delta Sigma Rho, have played a significant role in the program since the establishment of the chapter in 1913. There has never been a year in which one or more members were not initiated into DSR-TKA. The organization exists primarily as an honor society rather than as an operating club, but the chapter sponsors the annual February debate tournament and members take an active part in its administration. Furthermore, we attend the National Conference every year.

Forensic directions. Insofar as we retain an intercollegiate element in our program, we are dependent upon the larger forensics community. We have been blessed over the years by the strength and durability of the programs in a number of near-by colleges. Geographically, west-central Indiana is a congenial place in which to engage in forensic activity. The last time DePauw went to the NDT it was still being held at West Point. To the extent that the debate and individual events worlds are obsessed with this model they do not particularly meet our needs.

Our response has been two-fold. For one thing, we try to adjust the forensic world to ourselves, largely through the medium of lighting candles in the darkness. When intercollegiate debate was barren of cross-examination, we maintained cross-exam debating at our tournament, even at the expense of entries from schools who regarded this as too unorthodox. We saw a need for the student congress as another format for forensics skills and have been sponsoring an annual intercollegiate legislative assembly for the past five years, with a gradually increasing clientele. We have tried to be supportive of off-topic debating, individual events, one-day tournaments, and innovative formats generally. Occasionally we have even engaged in guerrilla debate to try to adapt tournaments to our needs.

Our second response has been to follow new directions within our own program. This has meant generally looking beyond tournament activities to the campus, high school, and the community. Although we see tournaments as highly useful and convenient for certain kinds of training, we are exploring ways in which we can develop individuals who are more responsible, more communicative, and generally more human. We also expect to assume a greater role in the examination and clarification of significant issues on the campus and in the community.

Thus, new perspectives and innovations as well as tradition are a part of the DePauw forensics amalgam. This year we have moved into a new

Performing Arts Center with our own forensics squad room. The Speech Department expects to become the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences. With new directions and activities, a new building, a new name, we expect to draw upon tradition as well. The DePauw forensic program continues to be directed, as it was in 1885, to "rhetoric, oratory and life."

SUGGESTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *Speaker and Gavel* is anxious to receive quality manuscripts related to its area of interests. At the moment there is a minimal backlog of articles for publication so submissions will receive prompt evaluation and response from the Editorial Board.

The Editorial Board is particularly interested in receiving articles which deal with current criticism, descriptions of innovative forensics procedures, descriptions of ongoing forensics programs, and essays by student members. For a more detailed description of editorial policy, see pages 3-5 of the Fall 1975 *Speaker and Gavel*, Volume 13, Number 1.

Materials submitted for publication should conform to *The MLA Style Sheet*, 2nd ed. A ribbon copy and a second copy should be submitted. All copy should be typed double-spaced including footnotes which should be typed separately from the body of the essay.

MAINTAINING THE LOGICAL DIMENSION:

A Response to Kurt Ritter's "Recapturing the Rhetorical Dimension"

JOHN F. SCHUNK

The Fall, 1974 issue of *Speaker and Gavel* included a series of essays which, in general, offered some excellent suggestions for the humanization of forensics. The lead article, entitled "Recapturing the Rhetorical Dimension: Debating in Campus Forums," by Kurt Ritter, however, advocated an action in the name of humanizing forensics which, instead, would lead to its devitalization and probable demise.

Basically, Ritter's thesis is that "public debating should become the model for college debaters." While remarking that some tournament experience may be desirable as training for the public forum, he calls for the return of debate from the competitive tournament to the campus audience.

The thesis of this response is that Ritter advances a false dilemma, the acceptance of which would be disastrous. There is absolutely no reason for the college forensics program to be exclusively tournament competition or exclusively public forum. Even though the latter setting may entail some benefits less well-afforded by the former, what the tournament has to offer should not be sacrificed for the on-campus setting. The purpose of this essay is not to advocate an exclusively intercollegiate program: the public and tournament settings differ in the demands they place on debaters, and students need opportunities for exposure to both environments.

This essay argues that (1) Ritter's criticisms of intercollegiate competition are insufficient grounds for deactivating tournament activity, and (2) there are critical strengths of tournament debate which are not found in the on-campus setting.

Ritter appears to advance three main ways in which tournament debate has lost its relevance to the real world and become "an elaborate game with pseudo-arguments and specialized tactics which operate to impede, if not prohibit, realistic debate." First, Ritter deplors the "squirrel" case—the unusual affirmative interpretation of the topic. He is by no means alone in this concern, for the wildly unreasonable affirmative definition is a tactic to be deplored. The basic fault for whatever acceptance of unusual affirmatives there may be, however, rests with the wording of the debate resolution rather than with anything inherent in tournament debate. In recent years, topics of increasing breadth have been selected and worded with increasing ambiguity. It may be that the greater range of affirmative cases, as a function of wider topics, merely reflects a desire for greater variety and challenge; but this trend can always be reversed through selection of narrower topics or greater rigidity on the part of tournament judges as to what will be found reasonable. Clearly, turning our backs on tournament debate is not the required solution.

Ritter's second indictment of tournament irrelevance concerns the "pseudo-issue" of inherency. It should be observed that inherency issues do not deal with questions of whether the status quo can *become* the affirmative's policy but with questions of whether the status quo can achieve the same benefits

John F. Schunk is Director of Forensics at California State University, Fresno.

that are alleged for the affirmative's policy *without* adopting it. Thus, the debater asking if the status quo has the potential to be the affirmative plan exhibits a misunderstanding of inherency. The problem rests not with the relevance of inherency issues to policy questions, but with a debater's misanalysis of it; the solution is not to change the setting for the debate but to correct the debater's misinformation.

Ritter demonstrates a more accurate understanding of inherency and, at the same time, offers an incomprehensible dismissal of its value, when he makes the following statement: "The debaters race 'down the flow' disputing whether we could conceivably control energy or end poverty without the particular plan of the affirmative team, while fundamental questions of value and policy go ignored." Are the basic questions of "the merits of the policy" being ignored by a negative who demonstrates merits of the status quo (the values it can achieve) and the absence of any comparatively greater value achieved by the affirmative policy? Is it more "realistic," for example, for the negative to deny the value of ending poverty rather than attacking the affirmative on the inherency issues? Are not the latter—the questions over which policy is best in meeting a desired goal—the more controversial and realistic issues, frequently far more so than the desirability or undesirability of the goal itself?

Third, Ritter concludes his discussion of the irrelevance of tournament debate with a one-line dismissal of "such nonsense issues as 'uniqueness,' 'attitudinal inherency,' 'quantitative significance,' *ad nauseam*." It should be observed, if with equally perfunctory treatment, that the ability of an affirmative plan to end poverty when the status quo cannot (uniqueness), the necessity of federal action because of state and local unwillingness to tax for fear of business loss (attitudinal inherency), and the demonstration that less income means more crime, as *measured* empirically rather than estimated unscientifically (quantitative significance) typify the vital nature of these issues to policy considerations.

While concluding from these largely unsupported indictments that public debate is a superior model, Ritter makes the surprising admission that tournament debate may serve some purpose after all: "New students should continue to attend local tournaments in order to learn the fundamentals of debate and to acquire experience; but they should debate as if an audience were present." However, this rationale hardly justifies tournament travel to learn "debate fundamentals." If the debater is to conjure up an imaginary audience to replace the judge who is present, why have the debater go to the tournament? Could not he gain just as much "experience" staying home and debating to a blank wall while envisioning the presence of an audience? Why travel to be heard by a judge who will be applying the "wrong" set of standards?

The second purpose of this essay is to delineate a rationale for maintaining intercollegiate competition as the core of a forensics program. Tournament debate clearly offers educational opportunities in areas where audience debate is more limited—primarily in the area of argumentation skills (analysis, use of evidence, reasoning, and refutation). It is these skills for which debate is generically most valuable; other speaking activities can also teach research, organization, delivery, and style but cannot train the student in argumentation nearly so well as can debate. Ritter recognizes the concern which has been voiced that the quality of argumentation will deteriorate when it is meant for public ears, but he expresses his faith in the debate director's ability to arrest this decline. Yet, Ritter's basic rationale for the

public forum is to return the debate to the arena of "common sense." In light of research findings that subjects make invalid and unwarranted inferences in line with their prejudices and agreement or disagreement with the material,¹ "wishful thinking" may be a more descriptive term for this approach. That there is greater effect of prejudices and prior predispositions on decisions in the public arena than in the tournament setting (no matter how fallible tournament judges may be in not achieving complete objectivity) seems patently undeniable. Consequently, what the audience debate setting fosters is a different sort of communication skill—not necessarily a more important one and certainly not a superior one in terms of argumentation. The statement that "along with the audience will come an insistence on rational discussion of human problems and ideals" simply does not ring true.

There are other benefits of tournament debate which supplement its primary educational objectives of developing argumentation skills. One of these is the greater opportunity for audience adaptation, a feature which runs considerably counter to the notion that the tournament is "unconnected with reality." To view tournament debate as an artificial setting without a real audience is to misunderstand its nature. There is, instead, extensive audience adaptation, facilitated and encouraged by such developments as the National Debate Tournament's *Booklet of Judges*, which can take place far more readily in the one-to-one debater-to-judge setting than can be done with the heterogeneous campus crowd for whom appeals must be kept more general and less differentiated. Thus, tournament and public debate promote different values; both are necessary parts of a complete forensics program.

Too often when the audience program supplants the competitive program rather than complementing it, the brightest, most diligent, and most motivated debaters are frustrated and disenchanted, and audience debates are too frequently reduced to shallow and unsupported presentations. It is the excitement and challenge of the tournament which certainly infuses the initial motivation and enthusiasm into most debate program participants, particularly those who are most difficult to challenge intellectually.

To claim an irrelevance of tournament debate to the intellectual pursuits of a campus and to hope that its de-activation will revitalize the forensics program is misguided but, unfortunately, not harmless thinking. When the voice of reason is increasingly needed to guide public policy-making in an ever-shrinking world, to shy away from the responsibility for educating students in the rigors of argumentation may entail the destruction of far more than college debate.

¹ See, for example, the discussion and references in Erwin P. Bettinghaus. *Persuasive Communication*, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973), pp. 157–158.

DEBATE AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR DEMOCRACY:

A Rejoinder to John Schunk

KURT W. RITTER

Professor Schunk's reply to my article on reforming forensics is both gratifying and instructive—gratifying, because an author is always pleased when a colleague takes his arguments seriously; instructive, because his response indicates how completely current "national circuit" contest debating has abandoned the instructional and academic goals of the liberal arts tradition. At root, we disagree not about the administration of forensic programs but about the very definition of rhetoric. The advocates of contest debating adopt the viewpoint of the sixteenth-century logician Peter Ramus, making an artificial separation of logical processes from rhetoric and promoting what Father Walter Ong has aptly described as the "decay of dialogue."¹ We who view forensics as training for public deliberation embrace the full-bodied classical definition of rhetoric which includes not just invention (the discovery and selection of arguments) but rather the full range of rhetorical arts. To those who still cling to Ramus' long discredited decree that dialectic and rhetoric must be disengaged once and for all, we bid farewell.

On a more specific level, Professor Schunk seems to misunderstand the thesis of my original article, for he claims that I have not demonstrated that contest debate should be "deactivated." My point was that the isolation of contest debate from the arena of public deliberation has given rise to a closed system of questionable value. My goal is to reform, not "deactivate." Contest debate unnecessarily restricts its interest to an extremely narrow and unique type of dialectic. Indeed, it does not even do justice to that narrow interest. Professor Schunk's detailed defense of the peculiar practices of "national circuit" contest debating begs the question. These defects, we are told, are not inherent in a tournament. Presumably, if we could just change the debate propositions, change the debaters, and change the judges, then the defects would be removed! But, the very reforms that Professor Schunk seems to desire—clarifying national debate propositions and valid uses of the concept of inherency—will not be instituted so long as debate contests are hidden from public view. These changes could be best effected by clarifying the pedagogical goal of forensics and explicitly rejecting, as did the 1974 National Developmental Conference in Forensics, the notion that contest debate is "information processing."² Instead, the concept of a public audience should be central to a contest debate, so that the activity will contribute to what the late Professor Karl Wallace called the unity of "rhetoric, politics, and the education of ready man."³ In light

Kurt Ritter is an Assistant Professor and the Director of Debate at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

¹ See Walter J. Ong, S. J., *Ramus—Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958).

² James H. McBath, ed., *Forensics as Communication* (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Company, 1976).

³ "Rhetoric, Politics, and the Education of the Ready Man," in *The Rhetorical Idiom*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 71-95.

of the failure of present contest debating to serve these traditional, humane goals, it is hardly surprising that such institutions as the University of Wisconsin at Madison and the University of California at Santa Barbara have suspended their tournament debating programs.

Professor Schunk's defense of debate contests as superior to public debating does an injustice to both activities. Nowhere does he mention the real value of contests—that tournaments permit intensive practice for less experienced debaters and that local tournaments which involve a larger number of debaters are more efficient and economical than “home and home” exchanges of public debates. These benefits cannot derive from “national circuit” contest debating, which necessarily expends tens of thousands of dollars sending a small number of students on trips crisscrossing the nation.

The defense of contests over the public forum seems to rest essentially with the assertion that public audiences make “invalid and unwarranted inferences” and therefore encourage debaters to make shallow arguments. Such a claim ignores one of the three major functions of a debater—that of a teacher. If debate training is to produce leaders who can address pressing world problems, as Professor Schunk and I both hope it will, then student debaters must develop the ability to explain to their listeners why their arguments have greater validity than their opponents' claims.⁴ To deny this pedagogical function of the debater is to cling to a hopelessly elite, if not fatalistically antidemocratic, view of public deliberation. Moreover, this low estimation of the citizen ignores the great variation among audiences. Certainly, a student will have to take care to explain and clarify his arguments before a high school assembly. On the other hand, the audience of one hundred professors at the University of Illinois Faculty Forum would probably take great exception to Professor Schunk's assertion that they could not evaluate the debate over social welfare presented by Princeton and Illinois in January 1976. In any event, a debate judge can easily be added to a public forum.⁵ Without an audience, the judge easily becomes a referee in “debate gamesmanship”; with an audience, the judge becomes a critic of public deliberation.

The notion that contest debate teaches audience adaptation to specific judges perfectly illustrates the closed nature of the activity. Instead of learning to argue from the basic values, assumptions and premises of the audience relative to the proposition under debate, contest debaters are encouraged to select their “debate strategies” according to the particular rules of contest debate used by individual “national circuit” judges. Finally, Professor Schunk offers the unsupported claim that “the best and the brightest” students will not be intellectually challenged by public debating. Certainly this assertion will come as a surprise to the many outstanding members of the student debating societies at the University of Chicago, Princeton University, the University of Texas, Wabash College and other excellent schools that encourage public debating.

Apparently in an attempt to promote a well-intended but false sense

⁴ Vernon Cronen, “The Functions of the Debater: Orator, Critic, Pedagogue,” *Central States Speech Journal*, 20 (Winter 1969), 261–268.

⁵ At Illinois many faculty members have volunteered their services as critics, including Professors Kenneth Andersen, Joseph Wenzel, Jesse Delia, David Swanson, Ruth Anne Clark, John Patton, Fred Hilpert, and Roger Nebergall.

of common ground, Professor Schunk endorses limited opportunities for public debate, while at the same time advocating that orthodox contest debating should be the heart of forensics programs. In fact, such a compromise is not possible, for the assumptions of today's "national circuit" tournament debating are incompatible with public discussion. Contest debate, as presently practiced, scorns effective public communication. As John Morley has observed, "to disparage eloquence is to depreciate mankind."

CHAPTER NEWS

Ball State University

Chapter members are participating in an active year of tournament competition, campus and community activity, and fund-raising activities. On November 5, two members of the Ball State University chapter participated in an audience debate against the British team from Oxford University before an audience of about 250. Through February of this year, DSR-TKA members have contributed substantially to the total of 111 awards won in debate and individual events competition. DSR-TKA won the university's Activity Night competition.

Members participated in the management of the Cardinal Novice Debate Tournament and Age of Aquarius-VII Individual Events Tournament in November and the High School Debate and IE Tournaments in January. Members have assisted in the coaching of area high school debate and individual events teams, judged at area high school speech tournaments, and provided demonstrations and entertainment at area high schools and civic clubs.

Two fund-raising activities have been held to date for the purpose of sending speech team members to IE Nationals to defend B.S.U.'s 3rd place finish among 103 schools at last year's nationals.

Berea College

Forensic activities have been dormant for some time; however, we are trying to revitalize extracurricular speech activities and hope to organize a debate team for next year. We are planning a speech festival this spring for freshman students. This festival (tournament) will feature competition open to all freshmen in the areas of modified debate, symposium-discussion, and original oratory. Winners will receive prizes and the entire campus is invited to attend.

Butler University

Butler DSR-TKA members and prospective members have played an active role in Department of Speech sponsored forensics activities. Events sponsored included the High School Debate Clinic in September, an Individual Events Festival in October, the 23rd Annual Butler Novice Debate Tournament in December, and the Butler Invitational Debate Tournament in February. Two chapter members who graduated in 1975 are in graduate school: Steve Householder at Harvard Law School and Cindy Proctor in Audiology at Ball State University. Randy Loser, chapter president, won the Bicentennial Youth Debates Sectional Contest in Extemporaneous Speaking.

Dr. Cripe, chapter sponsor, was the luncheon speaker on the final day of the Annual Council Meeting of the Association of College Honor Societies held in Indianapolis, February 26-28.

University of Chicago

Four members of the University of Chicago Debating Society received awards at the University of Illinois' Courtroom Conference: Jeff Gruen second-best lawyer, Don Bingle best defense witness, Clifford Ennist best prosecution witness, and Kathleen Bauersfeld second-best defense witness. Four Chicago debaters attended the first Transatlantic Debating Competi-

tion, held at the University of London on January 5-9. The Law School team of Joseph Morris and Leon Bronfin was the best American team overall and won the overall team championship. Joe Morris was the second-best speaker in debate and finished third in extemporaneous speaking. The College team of Don Bingle and Tom DiStefano finished third in parliamentary debate. At the McGill Debating Union's International Winter Carnival Debating Tournament, the team of Clifford Ennist and Paul Hudson won the championship and Mr. Ennist was best speaker. Finally, Don Bingle received one of the three top speakers' awards at the University of Illinois' Bicentennial Student Congress.

In October our second annual High School Student Congress drew twenty participants from area high schools. In April we held our fifth annual Chicago International Parliamentary Debating Tournament, Joseph A. Morris Farewell Edition, which is one of the major American parliamentary debate tournaments. Finally, with the help of our Alumni Association, we are hosting two debaters from Oxford University for a series of debates during the first week of June.

Last summer, in cooperation with the Alumni Association, we founded the Alumni Association Special Debating Program which presented a series of public debates before alumni audiences to raise money for the College and the Debating Society. This program led to a series of debates with the University of Illinois on the abolition of the CIA in September, culminated in a televised public debate. In addition, our Debating Society founded a campus-wide Political Union, which has had two meetings: a debate with the University of Illinois on American involvement in the Middle East and a debate on Zionism with Princeton University. Other highlights of the year included a formal luncheon with Baron Ramsey, former Archbishop of Canterbury, who once debated against the University of Chicago fifty years ago; and the beginning of our film series with the showing of "Doctor Strangelove." We are planning a campus-wide intramural debate and speech tournament for the spring quarter.

DePauw University

At DePauw University, thirty-four student delegates representing nine colleges participated in the fifth Intercollegiate Legislative Assembly, deliberating on the subject of first amendment rights. This fall event has become an established part of the DePauw forensics program. Another annual event, the debate tournament sponsored by the DSR-TKA chapter, was held for the 29th time in February. Other intercollegiate events hosted by DePauw during the current school year were the BYD district contests and the state contests of the Indiana Oratorical Association and the Indiana Peace Speech League.

University of Illinois

University of Illinois debaters presented a series of four Bicentennial Parliamentary Debates during the 1975-76 school year, including public programs with Oxford University, DePauw University, Princeton University, and Victoria University of New Zealand. Each debate attracted an audience of 250 to 600 who functioned as "members of the House" and joined in the deliberations.

Two Illini debaters were among the semi-finalists in the Rhodes Scholar competitions: Carl Fisher in 1974 and Fred Tietze in 1975. Both DSR-TKA members are past participants in the National Conference.

The highlight of over fifty community forums during the school year was a televised debate between the University of Chicago and Illinois on the proposition "Resolved: That the CIA Should Be Abolished," broadcast on WTTW-TV in Chicago on October 19.

Illinois hosted its second annual intercollegiate mock trial with Professor Kenneth E. Andersen serving as the judge. Top honors for performance as a lawyer went to Western Kentucky University while other awards were won by the University of Missouri, Illinois State University, Indiana University, DePauw University, Loyola University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Illinois.

The team of Carl Fisher (now at the University of Illinois Law School) and Mike Brandwein (now at the University of Chicago Law School) won second place at the University of Chicago's North American Parliamentary Debate Tournament in January, 1975. Fisher and Brandwein lost to Colgate University in the final debate on the topic "Resolved: That Politics is an Art and not a Science."

Indiana State University

The Indiana State University Individual Events team has been reactivated by faculty members, Sue Davis, Marjorie Hesler, and Sherry Pattison. The 1975-76 season has been a successful one.

Terri Jenkins and Mark Mech were finalists in poetry and extemp at Illinois State University. We entered the commercial events for the first time at Kenosha, Wisconsin. Anita Cooper and Tony Perry won first and third respectively. Pat Bailey's Readers Theatre production of "An Invitation," a collection of poems by Shil Silverstein, earned second place in competition at Kenosha. Brent Meyer, a freshman talent grant holder, won first at DuPage College in informative speaking.

University of Iowa

Two Delta Sigma Rho members were chosen to represent the University of Iowa at the first Transoceanic Conference held at the University of London in January of 1976. Rick Cerwitz won first place honors in extemporaneous speaking. Cerwitz and Ray Rexner were second to Cambridge in the debate competition. The students spoke on a variety of international topics, primarily having to do with U.S.-British relations. Thirty teams from Canada, the states and Great Britain participated in the week long competition.

King's College

King's debaters attended such major tournaments as Northwestern, Emory, Dartmouth, and many others in the East and the South. The debaters won several team honors and individual awards.

King's sponsored its 27th annual high school debate tournament, its 10th annual debate clinic with Michael Wiler of Pittsburgh and Tom Harris of Rutgers proving very popular with high school debaters and coaches, and the 26th annual Garvey Intercollegiate debate tournament which attracted 21 colleges and 42 teams. Johns Hopkins emerged the winner.

The 22nd Basil Antoine Moreau International Debate between King's debate alumni and debaters representing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will prove to be a great draw if current indications hold up. King's and the Russians will exchange views on the topic: To what extent have revolutions brought about fundamental changes in societies?

Mankato State University

The Mankato State University chapter sponsored three college tournaments during the 1975-76 school year: the River Bend in November, the Minnesota Valley in January and the Spring Flood in March. As the names indicate, local geographical land forms and happenings provide the source of the tournament labels. On March 6th, the chapter sponsored for the second year a tournament which was attended by 600 high school students. Deadra Longworth, a participant in the 1975 DSR-TKA tournament finals in both oratory and oral interpretation was selected as the Winter Quarter Commencement Speaker for Graduation activities at Mankato State University.

Murray State University

The Murray State University chapter hosted the Second Annual Alben W. Barkley Forensics Tournament on February 12-14, 1976. Debate honors and the Sweepstakes award went to Harding University, Searcy, Arkansas.

The Murray varsity team of John Riley and Rick Maxedon captured the debate championship of the Ohio Valley Conference. Morehead State University was second, while another Murray team of Keith Russell and Ike Thacker won third. The forensics unit from Murray State will attend nineteen tournaments this year.

University of San Francisco

In addition to sponsoring two high school tournaments, the chapter will be hosting (for the second time) the California State High School Championships the end of April with about 1200 participants. July will bring the annual high school forensics institute and the high school coaches institute. If interested in participating in any of these, contact Mr. Brandmeir at USF.

University of Southern California

The University of Southern California chapter of DSR-TKA was named the National Sweepstakes Champion for schools with enrollments over 8000 for the 1974-75 forensic year. It was the third time since 1970 the USC chapter earned this honor.

Trojan debaters established a school record in 1975 by winning 1451 competition debates as a squad. The 1976 Trojan speakers won 75 place awards in individual events during the first semester and 571 debates.

This is the 17th straight year that John DeBross' teams have qualified for the NDT. Larry Solum—Mike Devlin qualified as one of the first round at-large teams for the 1976 NDT in Boston.

The 20th session of the Western Forensic Institute, the oldest summer program for high school students in the West, will be June 20-July 17. Instruction includes debate, extemporaneous and impromptu speaking, oratory, and interpretation.

USC debaters and speakers earned their second straight Sweepstakes championship at the Great Salt Lake Tournament in January while John DeBross received the special award for "Distinguished Coaching" given each year to a director from the Western States for his contributions to forensics.

Steve Bloom, a senior, majoring in speech communication, and a pre-law student at the university, is the 1975-76 Trojan Debate Squad Captain.

The elected Captain of the squad is a tradition dating back to 1923. Mike Gates is vice-president and Gleam Davis, secretary.

The Trojan Debate Squad is the oldest student activity at USC. In addition to DeBross and Bloom, the current debate faculty includes Lee Garrison, Assistant Director; King Schofield, Tom Hozduk, Anita James, and Pam Gray. Special projects for the USC chapter this year included: the annual hosting of the Alan Nichols National Debate and Speech Tournament; the Trojan High School Invitational Debate Tournament; the USC-Loyola Spring Debate Tournament; the District I NDT Qualifier; and district and sectional contests for the Bicentennial Youth Debates. Next year, USC will host the California State High School Tournament.

On campus, the USC chapter sponsors competitions for students enrolled in the argumentation classes and, under the direction of Lee Garrison, many of these students represent the university in the Cross-Examination Debate Association tournaments.

Syracuse University

Our chapter has been involved with running the local and district events for the Bicentennial Youth Debates. One of our members, Terry Hartman, placed first in the sectional BYD contest in extemporaneous speaking.

We are considering starting an annual tournament here at Syracuse.

Wichita State

Until after the conference in Knoxville the Wichita chapter has but one undergraduate member. That member, Kathy Mueller, has recently been twice-honored being tapped for Mortar Board at WSU and elected to a national office in the Speech and Hearing Association.

Region V

Region V has added a second chapter sponsors' meeting to the schedule for next year. In addition to the meeting held in conjunction with the Miami University debate tournament in January, there will be a meeting at the Butler University individual events tournament, October, 1976.

Ten Region V DSR-TKA schools were represented at the Miami tournament in January, where special awards were given to the highest four-man preliminary round records among those schools. The results were as follows:

| | | |
|--------|------------------------|------|
| First | Wayne State University | 10-6 |
| Second | Ohio University | 9-7 |
| Third | Miami University | 9-7 |

Chapters and Sponsors

Note: DSR-TKA chapters are listed below in the regions to which they belong. Please notify the regional governors of any errors in the list. Chapter sponsors and forensics directors are named for each school. Unless otherwise indicated, the individual named serves both functions.

REGION I

Governor: Richard Roth, University of Rhode Island

| Chapter and Address | Chapter Sponsor and Forensics Director |
|------------------------------|--|
| Bates, Lewiston, ME | Robert Branham |
| Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT | Margaret Aydelotte (Sp.) |
| Brown, Providence, RI | Barbara Tannenbaum (Sp.) |
| Connecticut, Storrs, CT | |
| Dartmouth, Hanover, NH | Herbert L. James |
| Emerson, Boston, MA | John C. Zacharis |
| Hartford, Hartford, CT | Joyce Milliken (Sp.); Roger Sherman (Dir.) |
| Massachusetts, Amherst, MA | Ronald J. Matlon |
| New Hampshire, Durham, NH | W. L. Sims |
| Rhode Island, Kingston, RI | Richard W. Roth |
| St. Anselm's, Manchester, NH | John A. Lynch |
| Vermont, Burlington, VT | Robert Huber |
| Wesleyan, Middletown, CT | James Fuller |
| Yale, New Haven, CT | Rollin O. Osterweis |

REGION II

Governor: James J. Hall, St. John's University, Jamaica, NY

| | |
|---|--|
| Brooklyn, Brooklyn, NY | Charles E. Parkhurst |
| Bucknell, Lewisburg, PA | Frank W. Merritt (Sp.) |
| Carlow, Pittsburgh, PA | Thomas Hopkins (Sp.); Richard L. Schoen (Dir.) |
| Colgate, Hamilton, NY | H. G. Behler (Sp.) |
| Cornell, Ithaca, NY | Arthur W. Rovine (Sp.) |
| C. W. Post College of Long Island U., Greenvale, NY | Arthur N. Kruger (Sp.) |
| Dickinson, Carlisle, PA | David Brubaker (Sp.) |
| Elizabethtown, Elizabethtown, PA | Jobie E. Riley |
| Hamilton, Clinton, NY | Warren E. Wright (Sp.) |
| Kings, Wilkes Barre, PA | Robert E. Connelly |
| Lehigh, Bethlehem, PA | John A. Schnaible (Sp.) |
| New York U., New York, NY | David Leahy (Sp.) |
| Pace, New York, NY | Frank Colburn |
| Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA | Stephen Miller |
| Pennsylvania State, University Park, PA | Jeanne Lutz |
| Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA | Thomas Kane |
| Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY | Joseph Fitzpatrick (Sp.) |
| Rutgers, New Brunswick, NJ | H. James Godwin |
| St. John's, Jamaica, NY | James Hall |
| St. Lawrence, Canton, NY | Joan Donovan |
| Scranton, Scranton, PA | Edward F. Warner |
| Slippery Rock State, Slippery Rock, PA | Theodore Walwick |
| SUNY at Albany, Albany, NY | Richard W. Wilkie (Sp.) |
| SUNY College, Cortland, NY | Raymond S. Beard |
| Susquehanna, Selinsgrove, PA | Larry D. Augustine |
| Syracuse, Syracuse, NY | Alice Cummings (Sp.); Fred Agnir (Dir.) |

| Chapter and Address | Chapter Sponsor and Forensics Director |
|--|--|
| Temple, Philadelphia, PA | Ralph Towne |
| Ursinus, Collegeville, PA | |
| Washington and Jefferson, Washington, PA | James G. Greenwood |
| Westminster, New Wilmington, PA | Walter E. Scheid |
| Yeshiva, New York, NY | David Fleisher |

Region III

Governor: John Morello, Madison College

Effective September—Halford Ryan, Washington and Lee College

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| American, Washington, DC | Jerome B. Polisky (Sp.); N. Scott Sacks (Dir.) |
| Bridgewater, Bridgewater, VA | Dale Mekeel |
| Emory and Henry, Emory, VA | |
| Delaware, Newark, DE | Judith Runkle |
| Fairmont State, Fairmont, WV | Mike Overking |
| George Washington, Washington, DC | William Reynolds (Dir.) |
| Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, VA | John L. Brinkley |
| Hampton Institute, Hampton, VA | Catherine A. Howe |
| Howard, Washington, DC | Noel Myrick (Sp.) |
| Loyola, Baltimore, MD | Fr. James Dockery |
| Madison, Harrisonburg, VA | John Morello |
| Maryland, College Park, MD | Terrance Doyle |
| Morgan State, Baltimore, MD | Claudette McF-Walker |
| Randolph-Macon, Ashland, VA | Ritchie Watson |
| Richmond, Richmond, VA | Robert L. Frank |
| Roanoke, Salem, VA | William R. Coulter |
| U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD | Phillip Warken |
| Virginia, Charlottesville, VA | Craig Smith |
| Virginia Polytechnic, Blacksburg, VA | |
| Washington and Lee, Lexington, VA | Halford R. Ryan |
| West Virginia, Morgantown, WV | James McCroskey (Sp.); Charles Adams (Dir.) |
| William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA | Patrick Micken |

REGION IV

Governor: Joseph B. Wetherby, Duke University

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Alabama, University, AL | Annabel D. Hagood |
| Auburn, Auburn, AL | Bert Bradley (Sp.); John Stone (Dir.) |
| Berea, Berea, KY | George B. Ray |
| Birmingham-Southern, Birmingham, AL | Robert A. Dayton (Sp.) |
| Clemson, Clemson, SC | Harold L. Goodall, Jr. |
| Davidson, Davidson, NC | Jean Cornell |
| Duke, Durham, NC | Joseph B. Wetherby |
| East Tennessee, Johnson City, TN | Richard Dean |
| Eastern Kentucky, Richmond, KY | Max B. Huss |
| Emory, Atlanta, GA | Melissa Wade |
| Florida, Gainesville, FL | Donald E. Williams (Sp.) |
| Florida State, Tallahassee, FL | Greg Phifer (Sp.); Marilyn Young (Dir.) |
| Georgia, Athens, GA | Bertram W. Gross |
| Kentucky, Lexington, KY | J. W. Patterson |
| Lincoln Memorial, Harrogate, TN | Earl H. Smith (Sp.) |
| Memphis State, Memphis, TN | Erma Clanton (Sp.) |
| Mercer, Macon, GA | Gerre Price (Sp.); Fay Gillham (Dir.) |
| Miami, Coral Gables, FL | Fraser White (Sp.); Bunny Gillen (Dir.) |

| Chapter and Address | Chapter Sponsor and Forensics Director |
|---|--|
| Mississippi Southern, Hattiesburg, MS | Sidney R. Hill, Jr. |
| Murray State, Murray, KY | Ray Carter |
| North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC | J. Robert Cox |
| North Carolina-Greensboro, Greensboro, NC | L. Dean Fadely |
| Samford, Birmingham, AL | Fred McLean |
| South Alabama, Mobile, AL | David Buckley |
| South Carolina, Columbia, SC | |
| Spring Hill, Mobile, AL | Bettie Hudgens |
| Tampa, Tampa, FL | Hugh Fellows |
| Tennessee, Knoxville, TN | Norma C. Cook |
| Valdosta State, Valdosta, GA | Woodrow W. Leake, Jr. |
| Vanderbilt, Nashville, TN | Kassian Kovalcheck |
| Wake Forest, Winston-Salem, NC | A. Tennyson Williams |
| Western Kentucky, Bowling Green, KY | Larry M. Caillouet |

REGION V

Governor: Robert Weiss, DePauw University

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Albion, Albion, MI | Al Moore |
| Alma, Alma, MI | Kenneth Plaxton (Sp.); Barry McCauliff (Dir.) |
| Ball State, Muncie, IN | James Benson |
| Butler, Indianapolis, IN | Nicholas M. Cripe |
| Capital, Columbus, OH | Harold Lawson |
| Case-Western Reserve, Cleveland, OH | |
| Chicago, Chicago, IL | Charles D. O'Connell (Sp.); Joseph A. Morris (Dir.) |
| Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH | Francis M. Kunkler |
| Denison, Granville, OH | William A. Dresser |
| DePauw, Greencastle, IN | Robert O. Weiss |
| Hanover, Hanover, IN | Stanley Wheeler (Sp.); Lloyd Rohler (Dir.) |
| Hiram, Hiram, OH | Linda Pierce (Sp.) |
| Illinois, Urbana, IL | Kenneth Andersen (Sp.); Kurt Ritter (Dir.) |
| Indiana, Bloomington, IN | Eugene Chenoweth (Sp.); Roy Gentry (Dir.) |
| Indiana State, Terre Haute, IN | Sharon Pattison |
| John Carroll, Cleveland, OH | Austin J. Freeley |
| Loyola, Chicago, IL | Elaine Bruggemeier |
| Manchester, North Manchester, IN | Ronald Aungst |
| Miami, Oxford, OH | Robert Friedenbergl (Sp.); Gary Owen Turner (Dir.) |
| Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI | C. William Colburn |
| Michigan State, East Lansing, MI | Donald Cushman |
| Muskingum, New Concord, OH | Judson D. Ellertson |
| Northwestern, Evanston, IL | David Zarefsky |
| Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN | John Borkowski (Dir.) |
| Oberlin, Oberlin, OH | Daniel Goulding (Sp.); Joni R. Freedman (Dir.) |
| Ohio, Athens, OH | Raymond Beaty (Sp.); Ted Foster (Dir.) |
| Ohio State, Columbus, OH | Jerry Roemisch |
| Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, OH | Edward Robinson |
| Purdue, Lafayette, IN | Henry L. Ewbank |
| Toledo, Toledo, OH | James Godbey (Dir.) |
| Wabash, Crawfordsville, IN | Joseph O'Rourke (Sp.); James Flynn (Dir.) |
| Wayne State, Detroit, MI | George Ziegelmueller |
| Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, MI | Howard Dooley |
| Wittenberg, Springfield, OH | Ernest Dayka |
| Wooster, Wooster, OH | Gerald H. Sanders |
| Xavier, Cincinnati, OH | William A. Jones |

Region VI

Governor: Vernon McGuire, Texas Tech University

| Chapter and Address | Chapter Sponsor and Forensics Director |
|--|--|
| Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, LA | Harold Mixon |
| Oklahoma, Norman, OK | Paul Barefield |
| Southern Methodist, Dallas, TX | Clifford Thompson |
| Texas, Austin, TX | |
| Texas Tech, Lubbock, TX | Vernon R. McGuire |
| Tulane, New Orleans, LA | Pamela Jackson |

REGION VII

Governor: Mel Moorhouse, Wichita State University

| | |
|---|--|
| Creighton, Omaha, NB | Fr. Marion Sitzmann |
| Grinnell, Grinnell, IA | William Vanderpool |
| Iowa State, Ames, IA | James Weaver |
| Iowa, Iowa City, IA | Robert Kemp |
| Kansas, Lawrence, KS | Donn W. Parson |
| Kansas State, Manhattan, KS | Vernon Barnes |
| Missouri, Columbia, MO | James Gibson (Sp.); Karen Chapman (Dir.) |
| Nebraska, Lincoln, NB | Jackson Harrell |
| Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA | Forrest Conklin |
| Southwest Missouri, Springfield, MO | Carl D. Flaningam |
| Wichita State, Wichita, KS | Mel Moorhouse (Sp.); Don Swender (Dir.) |

REGION VIII

Governor: Larry Schnoor, Mankato State College

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Mankato, Mankato, MN | Larry Schnoor |
| Marquette, Milwaukee, WI | Michael Wittig |
| Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN | Steve Mudd |
| North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND | |
| South Dakota, Vermillion, SD | W. H. Bennett |
| Wisconsin, Madison, WI | Winston Brembeck (Sp.) |
| Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI | Ruth McGaffey |

REGION IX

Governor: Wayne Callaway, University of Wyoming

| | |
|--|---|
| Brigham Young, Provo, UT | Jed Richardson |
| Colorado, Boulder, CO | Robley Rhine |
| Colorado College, Colorado Springs, CO | James A. Johnson |
| Denver, Denver, CO | Paul Hunsinger (Sp.) |
| New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM | Sandra L. Corless |
| New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, NM | Walter F. Brunet |
| Utah, Salt Lake City, UT | Jack Rhodes |
| Utah State, Logan, UT | Rex E. Robinson (Sp.); Bonnie Spillman (Dir.) |
| Weber State, Ogden, UT | John Hebestreet |
| Wyoming, Laramie, WY | B. Wayne Callaway |

REGION X

Governor: John DeBross, University of Southern California

| Chapter and Address | Chapter Sponsor and Forensics Director |
|--|--|
| California State, Long Beach, CA | Jack Howe |
| California State, San Francisco, CA | Harry McGuckin (Sp.); John Gay (Dir.) |
| Hawaii, Honolulu, HA | Donald Klopff (Sp.); Dean Ellis (Dir.) |
| Nevada, Reno, NV | Gordon Zimmerman |
| Occidental, Los Angeles, CA | Gage Chapel |
| Oregon, Eugene, OR | Gary Cross |
| Oregon State, Corvallis, OR | Thurston Doler (Sp.) |
| Pacific, Forest Grove, OR | Albert Hingston (Sp.); Lynn Enghdall (Dir.) |
| University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA | James Dempsey |
| University of California, Santa Barbara, CA | James Marteney |
| Southern California, Los Angeles, CA | John DeBross and James McBath (Sp.); John DeBross (Dir.) |
| Stanford, Palo Alto, CA | Gary Roberts |
| Washington State, Pullman, WA | Janice Miller |
| Whittier, Whittier, CA | Gerald Paul |
| Willamette, Salem, OR | Howard Runkel (Sp.); Thomas G. Matthes (Dir.) |

SPEAKER and GAVEL

Allen Press, Inc.
P. O. Box 368
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Return Postage Guaranteed

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

Main Library
Mankato State College
Mankato, Minn. 56001