

11-1959

Complete Issue 42(1)

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

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

Recommended Citation

Delta Sigma Rho. (1959). Complete Issue 42(1). *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho*, 42(1), 1-16.

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 *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho* by an authorized editor of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

ROBERT L. SCOTT
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH AND THEATER
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

the gavel

volume 42

number 1

**of
delta
sigma
rho**



november

1959

THE GAVEL

Official publication of Delta Sigma Rho, National Honorary Forensic Society

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS

By THE ALLEN PRESS

**Editorial Address: Delta Sigma Rho, Bureau of Continuation Education,
Colorado University, Boulder, Colorado**

THE GAVEL has been entered as second-class matter at Lawrence, Kansas, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Issued in November, January, March and May. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money orders. 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."

The membership fee is \$10.00. The official key of 10K (size shown in cut on this page) is \$6.00, or the official keypin of 10K is \$7.00. Cut diamond in key is \$7 additional. **Prices include Federal Tax.**

The names of new members, those elected be-

tween September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of THE GAVEL. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive THE 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 **The Gavel** may subscribe at the following rates: \$1.50 per year for the standard subscription; \$5.00 per year for those who wish to contribute to the work of **The Gavel** and who will be listed as sponsors in each issue; and \$25 for a lifetime subscription.



NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: Herold Ross, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

Secretary: Paul Carmack, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Treasurer: Kenneth G. Hance, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Trustee: E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Honorary Trustee: Gilbert L. Hall, 1208 N. Wayne, Arlington, Virginia.

Vice Presidents: Eugene Chenoweth, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Bob Griffin, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada; Leroy Laase, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska; Bob Newman, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Paul Boase, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; P. Merville Larson, Texas Tech College, Lubbock, Texas; Brooks Quimby, Bates College, Lewistown, Maine.

EDITORIAL STAFF OF THE GAVEL

Editor: Charles Goetzinger, Bureau of Continuation Education, Colorado University, Boulder, Colorado.

Associate Editors: Halbert E. Guley, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois; Clayton Schug, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania; Paul Carmack, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Austin Freeley, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio; Robert A. Lang, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

THE GAVEL

DELTA SIGMA RHO

of

VOLUME 42

NOVEMBER, 1959

NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Make the Congress a Must by <i>Herold Ross</i>	2
The Value of Forensics Training for Engineers by <i>Bernard Van Emden</i>	3
The First Negative Rebuttal Speech by <i>Charles E. Parkhurst</i>	5
The First Affirmative Rebuttal Speech by <i>Osborn T. Smallwood</i>	7
Delta Sigma Rho New Initiates—1959	9
Speaking to the Soviet Public by <i>Nelson F. Norman</i>	13
The Implications of the Use of a Different Proposition by <i>Austin J. Freeley</i>	15
Committees for the 1960 Student Congress—Indiana University	16

Important Notice

Effective Immediately

THE EDITORIAL OFFICES OF
THE GAVEL WILL HAVE THE
FOLLOWING NEW ADDRESS:

Charles Goetzinger, Gavel Editor
Bureau of Continuation Education
352 Chemistry Building
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

President's Page . . .

Make the Congress a Must

BY HEROLD ROSS

This is a Congress year for Delta Sigma Rho and, therefore, an important year with a climactic event. The National Congress was developed by our society and has long been one of its outstanding events. In later years, it is true, the congress idea has been adopted by other societies and tournaments, but ours is still a leader in the field.

To be truly national next spring, as it has always been in the past, chapter representatives must come from all sections of the nation—north, south, east, and west. Chapter representatives should bring varied and different opinions and positions on the topics for discussion. They should reflect what young Americans are thinking and saying from coast to coast. The national congress then becomes a true meeting of American minds.

So, plan *now* to have representatives. Next January, if you were to be notified of the Congress, you might very well be committed as to budget. Now, when many proposals are tentative, make the Congress in March a *Must*.

The officers and committees are already hard at work on the plans. We promise one of the most valuable and exciting events in your forensic experience. Make sure that you are among those present.

In addition to the congress itself, the

General Council, the highest executive body of Delta Sigma Rho, will be convened for the determination of policy. Your chapter has an equal voice with all of the others in making decisions, but you can exercise this right of society citizenship only by electing and sending a voting delegate. The agenda will be drawn up by the Executive Committee in Washington at Christmas time. You will then have ample time to discuss the various matters with chapter members before the Congress. Then your delegate will be in a position to express the chapter views. Student representatives will also be elected to meet with the Executive Committee. If your chapter has an unusually outstanding member, he or she should be nominated.

Since the Congress is scheduled at two year intervals, this will be the only opportunity many students will have. Consequently, attendance cannot be postponed. Therefore, make your decision to attend, put the trip in your forensic budget and look forward to a most rewarding forensic experience.

Make the Delta Sigma Rho Congress schedule for the Indiana University Campus in Bloomington, Indiana, March 24-25-26, 1960, a *Must*.

Delta Sigma Rho

STUDENT CONGRESS

March 24, 25 and 26, 1960

Indiana University

Bloomington, Indiana

The Value of Forensic Training for Engineers

BY BERNARD VAN EMDEN
Electronics Development Engineer

I. Introduction

Engineering students may have considerable difficulty in obtaining their instructors' permission to participate in intercollegiate forensic activities. The reasons for the difficulty are as follows. First, many professors feel that an engineering student does not have sufficient time for extracurricular activities. They feel that there is only sufficient time to allow the student to study. Second, they feel that either there are no benefits to forensic activities or that any benefits will be of little or no use to the engineer. It is, therefore, the goal of this paper to show the value of forensic training to the engineer.

It is hoped that this article will be one of a series of articles of the same nature. The sum of the articles would be a wealth of facts with which to "sell" forensic training and activities. It is also hoped that this paper will provide the inspiration for members of other occupational groups so that they, too, will write similar articles regarding their groups.

This paper will systematically list the various possible daily activities of an engineering graduate and will show how forensic training may be applied to these activities. By demonstrating the many uses of forensic training, the value of this training will, of necessity, be demonstrated.

II. Engineering Activities

- A. *Design.* Primary in the mind of the engineer is the providing of accurate design data. He is called upon to provide drawings, reports and working models of the units for which he is responsible. Many times he will have a number of design alternatives; he may be called upon to justify his choice.
- B. *Proposal.* An engineer may be given a problem to investigate. He then will be called on to provide a technical description of the alternative solutions, including the relative merits of each.

C. *Experimental.* An engineer may be called on to design and perform experiments. Upon completion, he is expected to communicate the results and conclusions to others.

D. *Customer-Vendor Relations.*

1. *Sales.* An engineer may act as a salesman when the product sold is of a technical nature.
2. *Purchasing.* An engineer may be called on to provide specifications for parts or systems which are to be purchased.

E. *Liaison.* An engineer may act as liaison between engineers or between non-technical people and engineers.

F. *Technical Organizations.* An engineer may be called on to lead or participate in the activities of technical organizations.

G. *Teaching.* An engineer may be called on to teach fellow engineers, technicians or non-technical personnel.

H. *Management.* Some engineers are selected to lead other engineers or to direct the activities of engineering and/or non-engineering organizations.

I. *Associations in General.* Many engineers work closely with other people (collaborate on the above) and are required to communicate with them on technical and non-technical matters.

J. *Civic Activities.* Some engineers take an active part in civic activities in technical or non-technical capacities.

III. The Applicability of Forensic Training

The following paragraphs demonstrate the value of forensic training to the engineer. Each section of II shall be discussed to show how forensic training will assist the engineer in the subject activity.

At no time will any comparison be made. No effort will be made to prove forensic training more valuable than any other training.

- A. *Design.* Subsequent to the actual design of a piece of equipment is the "selling of the design." Many devices have been designed but never constructed. This is due in part to the inability of the designer to convince others of the importance of the design. If the designer were skilled in forensics, he could, through written and oral reports and discussions, convince others of the value of his design. In many cases the final design presented is a series of compromises. A designer, skilled in speaking, could convince others of the reasons why his particular set of compromises are the best.
- B. *Proposal.* In writing a proposal an engineer requires a great deal of forensic skill. He must present a list of possible solutions including a complete argument for and against each. On the basis of his own arguments, he must then decide upon the best solution(s) and show in more detail how this solution could be mechanized.
- C. *Experimental.* The reports presented at the completion of an experiment may either be verbal or written. In any case the value of the entire experiment is limited by the quality of the report presented. If the communication is poor, the entire experiment may never be utilized.
- D. *Customer-Vendor Relations.* The value of oral communication in dealing with customers either in a sales or purchasing capacity is obvious. In the sales function, the fluency of the engineer may determine whether or not a sale is made. In a purchasing situation, the amount of time necessary to communicate will be greatly shortened should the engineer be skilled forensically.
- E. *Liaison.* When a person must act as a go-between, a tremendous amount of communication skill is required. To illustrate this, the old party game might be suggested. In this game, one person is told the story, and it is whispered around the room and finally the last person in the room tells the story to the rest of them. Usually this story is completely different from the original story. In a technical situation the same could occur if the person acting as the liaison engineer did not communicate well. The information received by other people through the liaison then would be completely different from what was actually intended.
- F. *Technical Organizations.* It has been determined many times that the presentation of technical papers before organizations is a method by which an engineer may advance himself. However, a paper can be excellently written, but if it is poorly presented at the technical organization meeting, it will be forgotten very quickly and its impact will be lost.
- G. *Teaching.* Many engineers occupy positions as teachers. The facility to speak well is a tremendous asset to a teacher and, in fact, if a teacher does not have this facility, he usually cannot accomplish his job at all.
- H. *Management.* Many engineers do not remain in design capacities for long, in fact, some of them go into management-type positions. In these positions they are called upon to direct the activities of other organizations, and in this direction must communicate well with other people. In addition, as managers and supervisors, they are required to report to superiors. The quality of their management is judged mainly on the nature of their reports. Even if the amount of work done is tremendous and the quality of the work is excellent, if the report presenting this is poor, it will be judged as such. In addition, persons in lower managerial positions are required to motivate others. The ability to speak well is an asset in this function.
- I. *Associations in General.* Besides their activities as engineers, contrary to a common belief, engineers are also in the realm of human beings, and as such must communicate with other human beings in their normal daily life. As a minor point, forensic ability is an advantage here, of course.

(Continued on Page 14)

The First Negative Rebuttal Speech

BY CHARLES E. PARKHURST

Brooklyn College

(This is the first of a series of four articles on rebuttal technique. Two will appear this issue, two in a later issue.—The Editor)

Within the framework of formal school debate, I believe that we can isolate certain unique features of each of the eight speeches which currently constitute the traditional form. Among the features unique to any given speech will be one or a combination indicative of what I call the critical problem of that particular speech. What I mean by this is that in each speech there is a problem which *must* be solved by the speaker. While successful solution in a given case will not guarantee victory, failure to solve the problem will place the debater's side at a serious disadvantage and may bring defeat. It is this critical problem of the first negative rebuttal speech which I wish to consider here; however, it may be helpful to do so indirectly.

Michigan State University is at present conducting a study of debate judging. Many of you may recall the forms used in this study. They have been distributed at several tournaments this year—those of us who attended the Dartmouth Invitational, for example, were asked to cooperate in the study. One of the forms is given to the judge with his copy of the debate ballot, and he is asked to give a running account of his attitudes as the debate is in progress. A specific item on that form may help us to focus on our problem. The judge is to indicate which team, if either, is leading at the end of each speech. I am firmly convinced that if the negative team is not leading at the end of the first negative rebuttal speech, chances for a negative victory are virtually zero. The reasons for this are too apparent to review. What this means for the first negative rebuttalist, assuming a debate between approximately equal teams, is that he must pull as far ahead of his affirmative opponents in this speech as he possibly can. Thus, his critical problem is to find appro-

priate material to include in his speech to accomplish this end. Solution of that problem is often inhibited by another unique feature of this speech—that it immediately follows another negative speech. The inhibiting factor is the temptation to let down because the entire negative case has now been presented; the affirmative speakers have not had an opportunity to reply to the second half of the negative case or to whatever the second negative constructive speaker may have included. The temptation often leads the first negative rebuttalist to a general summarizing and repetition of material with little or no effect of bringing progress to the debate.

That then is a general statement of the problem—a general aid in its solution is establishment of a “division of labor” between the two negative speakers. Obviously this division should be decided upon well in advance of any given debate, and preparation for and practice of the work of each speech should proceed in accord with this division. (Not only will this help the first negative rebuttalist in achieving a solution to his critical problem, but it will contribute to more effective teamwork, which in turn will make for more efficient use of the thirty minutes available to the team in the debate.)

General statements are of little real help, however, so now I should like to consider what the division of labor might be in the two general negative approaches: the orthodox negative, including the straight refutation case through a repairs case, and the counter-proposition negative. Since we cannot consider any speech without reference to the rest of the debate, we shall have to refer to the entire negative structure, as it is likely to develop following the presentation of the affirmative *prima facie* case. I shall not consider the unusual situations in which

the affirmative fails to present such a case, nor shall I consider any debates except those on propositions of policy.

Whether the affirmative follows the usual practice of dividing the case between the two constructive speeches or attempts to cover the entire case in the first speech, I suggest that the first negative constructive speaker confine his refutation to the need which the affirmative is seeking to establish, taking between four and six minutes for that if he also has constructive arguments to present. On the 1958-59 national proposition, Resolved: That the further development of nuclear weapons should be prohibited by international agreement, the first negative constructive speaker, following refutation of the need as suggested, could spend the remainder of his ten minutes on "Need for continued development of nuclear weapons" and on repairs, "test underground exclusively" (if the affirmative has presented a health hazard). The second negative constructive speaker must avoid going into detail on "need" or on his colleague's constructive arguments; after deferring these matters to his colleague's rebuttal, he should spend most of his time (say eight minutes) on an "even-if" attack on the plan—its inadequacies, impracticalities, dangers—and in bringing up disadvantages or evils of the entire affirmative proposal. With such a division of labor established in the constructive speeches, the first negative rebuttalist has his work clearly defined in such a way that his speech will bring real progress to the debate. In short, he will be responsible for furthering those arguments which he himself originated. He returns to a final major attack on the need, spending as much as three minutes on this. He presents any necessary counter-refutation on his repairs or constructive arguments, spending one and a half to two minutes. He then quickly summarizes the challenges of his colleague; it is obvious that he must be prepared to do this in about half a minute. The first two of these steps can be practiced separately in outgrowths of direct-clash type practice sessions. The third step can be worked out smoothly in close association with one's colleague; indeed this last half minute can be prepared so as to require little or no variation from debate to debate,

since it need be only a general summary of the particulars of the second negative constructive speech—"As we have seen, the gentlemen of the opposition have presented a proposal which is inadequate, impractical, and dangerous. . . ." In general, of course, the rebuttalist must avoid spending more time on a given argument than his opponent did, and more commonly, he must limit himself further to conform with the suggested times and keep his entire presentation within the five-minute allowance.

It is neither necessary nor practical to indicate in detail what the division of labor would be with the negative counterplan. It is not practical because of the wide variety of forms which the counterplan case may take. It is not necessary because the important consideration, as with the orthodox case, is that the first negative rebuttalist be primarily responsible for carrying those arguments which he advanced in his constructive speech. But let me give an example briefly: the first negative constructive speech will include admitting all or a significant part of the need, then presenting the negative plan, and possibly demonstrating how the plan meets the admitted need. The second negative constructive speaker must avoid spending too much time on counter-refutation; rather, he will complete the negative constructive case, if his colleague has not done so, and proceed to attack the affirmative plan. In doing the latter, he must demonstrate the superiority of the negative plan, of course. But, assuming the expected affirmative attack on the negative plan, this can be an "even-if" comparison. Once more, our first negative rebuttalist has some specific work to do—he presents the counter-refutation on his plan and develops details of the plan with additional evidence, concluding, as before, with but a brief summary of his colleague's attacks.

These two examples of divisions of labor are not only conceived to aid the first negative rebuttalist in solving his critical problem, but also they are organized to minimize the danger of failure to present all of the necessary arguments in the two constructive

(Continued on Page 14)

The First Affirmative Rebuttal Speech

BY OSBORN T. SMALLWOOD

Howard University

The first affirmative rebuttal speech possesses a fascination which is unique among the speeches in a debate. In any debate worthy of the name the affirmative should be trying to catch up with the negative, which should be well ahead at the time this speech is begun. Hence, the speech affords the debater a challenge of the highest order and provides for the interested and alert listener all the sensations which he experiences when he observes a quarterback trying to overcome the opposing team's lead in the last quarter or a famous batter trying to get across the winning run in the late innings of a game. This speech possesses this particular quality because it has to carry the weight of replying to fifteen minutes of negative debating. It is the only speech in the debate which has this unique burden.

To carry this burden the speech must be planned so that it will certainly do three things: (1) it must re-establish in the listener's mind the case of the affirmative which under the battering of efficient negative debaters will bear little resemblance to what it was when originally presented; (2) it must answer damaging attacks made by the negative; and (3) it must include an attack on the negative so that the second negative rebuttalist will have to spend some time plugging up holes in his own position before he can again level his guns on the affirmative.

In planning this speech the debater must, of course, recognize that the negative speakers may use one of three different methods of upholding the negative position, namely:

1. The straight negative, which consists of a defense of the status quo.
2. The case of repairs, which recognizes certain evils in the status quo but insists that these are not inherent and can be taken care of with a modification of the present policy.
3. The counterplan, which either (a)

destroys the affirmative needs and establishes other needs which are met by the negative proposal, or (b) accepts the affirmative needs and attempts to show that the negative alternative proposal better meets these needs by producing more benefits or introducing fewer difficulties than the affirmative proposal.

Assuming that the negative elects to defend the present policy without recognizing the need for any significant changes, the first affirmative rebuttal speech should be organized around the three basic issues which all affirmative teams must establish if they hope to win a debate.

1. The need for a change.
2. The outline of a workable proposal.
3. The benefits which will accrue if the affirmative proposal were adopted.

Where the emphasis should go in a given debate would depend on the nature of the negative attack. Since the negative may win the debate by successfully destroying only one of the basic contentions of the affirmative, the negative may elect to hammer away with an avalanche of evidence at the contention which is most difficult for the affirmative to defend in an effort to win by completely demolishing this contention. In this event, the contents of the first affirmative rebuttal must be adjusted accordingly. The emphasis would be on this contention which the negative has singled out for attack. In addition the attention of the listener should be directed to the fact that the other two basic contentions had been conceded.

When the negative makes an all out attack on the three basic contentions of the affirmative, then this speech must be so planned as to re-affirm the position of the affirmative on each of the basic issues. In doing this, further evidence in support of

the affirmative contentions should be introduced. Seemingly damaging arguments presented in the second negative constructive speech and re-emphasized in the first negative rebuttal must be dealt with. A further analysis of these negative arguments must be included in this speech for the purpose of showing the audience that they really do not significantly weaken the affirmative position. Any pertinent questions seriously asked by the negative should be answered in this speech.

The entire speech should not be limited to rebuttal, or defense. A minute or two should be reserved for refutation, or attack. Weaknesses in the negative position should be spotlighted. Fallacies in the negative's reasoning should be exposed. Counter questions for the negative to answer should be asked.

The final half-minute should be reserved for a brief summary and conclusion to the speech. The speech should not simply evolve; it should be planned and carefully—even though a bit hastily—organized.

At the end of this first affirmative rebuttal speech the affirmative needs, plans, and benefits should again stand out in clear relief against the background of negative attacks and the weaknesses of the negative position should be revealed for all to behold.

This is the basic structure of the first affirmative rebuttal. It is only slightly modified if the negative elects to use a case of repairs. In this case the negative will admit that there are problems existing as a result of the present policy but will deny that these problems are serious enough to warrant the change proposed by the affirmative. The affirmative will undoubtedly be accused of exaggerating the needs and of failing to recognize that the problems that exist are not inherent in the status quo; therefore the needs can be met by a slight modification of the present policy without introducing such a radical change as that suggested by the affirmative. For example, in debating the question of outlawing further development of nuclear weapons, many negative teams have suggested underground testing or out of space testing as a solution to the problem posed by the affirmative contention that

continued testing constitutes a health hazard to the human race.

In adjusting the first affirmative rebuttal to this type of case the word inherent becomes the key to the issue. After re-establishing the seriousness of the need, this speech must then contain a discussion of the inherency of the evils pointed out by the affirmative. If the evils can be cured without radically changing the status quo, then the evils are not inherent. However, if they cannot be remedied without changing the status quo, then they are inherent. It is the burden of this speech, in this situation, to persuade the audience that the evils are inherent in the present situation and therefore a change is warranted.

A third situation presents itself when the negative chooses to present a counterplan. The first affirmative rebuttal, in this instance, should open with an indication that the negative has taken on itself a burden of proof which is equal to that of the affirmative. Following this, the speech should be concerned with a justification of the affirmative needs and a comparative analysis of the affirmative and negative proposals for the purpose of showing that the affirmative plan meets the needs better than the negative proposal.

How does one coach debaters to prepare the type of speech discussed in the preceding paragraphs? To answer this question we must recognize that basically coaching is a pedagogical operation and consequently all of the principles of good pedagogy (such as clear exposition, discussion, and practice) apply here. Certainly, the structure and purpose of the first affirmative rebuttal speech must be discussed with a student before he can hope to prepare it. He should then be given suggestions concerning the preparation of evidence and rebuttal cards. He should be made aware that he cannot hope to prepare an effective first affirmative rebuttal speech unless he has studied the negative side of the argument as well as the affirmative. He must understand the importance of being able to anticipate negative arguments and of having cards already prepared which point out the

(Continued on Page 12)

List of Members Initiated Since September 1, 1958

ALBION COLLEGE

Robert N. Culver
 Roger D. Manning
 Frederic E. Pass, Jr.
 Stanley L. Werner

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Robert E. Duncan
 Robert L. Eckleberry
 Susan J. Strand
 Wilda R. Webber

AMHERST COLLEGE

William I. Goldberg
 Stanley W. Morris
 Kenneth T. Palmer
 Lawrence D. Posner

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Patsy A. Burdett
 Glorianne Engel

BATES COLLEGE

Mary Ellen Crook
 John B. Lawton, Jr.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Roger H. Allen

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Kenneth B. Becker
 William E. Hellerstein
 Lucille H. Newman
 David C. Schwartz
 David I. Faust

BROWN UNIVERSITY

John L. Lazzatti
 Dwight N. Mason
 Robert S. Bregy
 Theodore E. Somerville
 Richard R. Wandmacher
 Stephan Ryner
 James S. Gurney
 Louise G. Patton
 E. Lang D'Atri
 Robert E. Brech, Jr.
 Wallace H. Terry, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

David L. Wood

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

W. Findley Guffey, III
 Caroline F. Keller
 Arnold J. Levine
 Lawrence W. Rosenfield

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

Leroy F. Foreman

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY

Janet A. Allen
 Don R. Daseke
 Julie L. Heston
 Pamela Parkhill
 Mary J. Stubbs
 William E. Wickens

ELMIRA COLLEGE

Patricia A. Kelly

GRINNELL COLLEGE

John B. Dinklage
 Lucien M. Geer
 Robert G. Nachman
 John Michael Watkins

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Ronald Git Sun Au
 Ulysses J. Dotson

UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

Wayne L. Kidwell
 Charlotte A. Martell
 Leo D. Tafolla
 Gary F. Woolvorton

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Dianne V. Baumann
 Daniel Bures
 Grant L. Eddy
 James Elston Molenaar
 J. Vincent Peterson

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Morris E. Binkley, Jr.
 Mary M. Walker
 Richard M. Atwell

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Kenneth M. Lochner, Jr.

IOWA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Jack L. Dodd
 James D. Gohman

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

David L. Brodsky
 Peggy A. Brooks
 Judith A. Clark
 Gerald R. Miller

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY

G. Daniel Carney
 Fredric E. Kramer
 Joseph B. Miller
 Dr. Austin J. Freeley
 Sherman L. Berne
 Robert B. Mellert
 John B. Robertson
 Paul A. Raymond
 Donald A. Havlock

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Edward G. Collister
 Larry G. Ehrlich
 Stephen H. Hill
 R. Alan Kimbell
 Robert A. Nebrig, Jr.
 Robert M. Walker

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

David A. Nuttle
 Daniel F. Hahn

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

Brian P. Hendley
 Mary Lou Kendrigan
 Judith A. Mikulsky
 Angela T. Mischke
 Peter M. Sanfelippo
 Kathleen A. Whalin

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Alice Lohrmen
 Carol A. McLay
 Robert C. Gunn
 Larry T. Carbonelli
 Louis E. Winter

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

George W. Curtis, Jr.
 Frank L. Greenagel
 William W. Lammors
 Donald B. Marti
 Donald W. Parson
 Joan M. Sampson
 Nancy Schmidt

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Emily Goetz
 Richard E. Hodges
 Ronald J. James
 Jack Lyman Pooker

MOREHOUSE COLLEGE

Theodore M. Alexander
 Brailsford R. Brazeal
 A. Russell Brooks
 Anthony C. Campbell
 Homer L. McCall
 Roland Smith
 Edward B. Williams
 Frederick B. Williams
 Robert F. Williams
 Samuel W. Williams
 Preston M. Yancey, Jr.

MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE

Mary F. Freshwater
 Janet L. Magaro
 Leah M. Meyers
 Nancy A. Sorokis
 Audrey H. Winsky

MUNDELEIN COLLEGE

Sheila Callan
 Janet I. De Grazia
 Jacqueline A. Dempsey
 Ann Zarlinga

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Donald J. Epp
 Eileen C. Warren

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Mary Jo Anne Blower
 Robert El Cooper
 Dennis R. Hunt
 Richard D. Kirshberg
 John C. Roberts
 Don R. Steinle

OSBERLIN COLLEGE

Betty L. Boyd
 James J. Hamilton
 Roger T. Johnson
 Eva M. Parker-Crosby
 Harry B. Parrott, Jr.
 Janet M. Reed
 Charles A. Ryerson
 Ned A. Shearer

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

William S. Bach
 Richard E. Hattwick
 Robert D. McCrie
 George S. Pond

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

James L. Caplinger
 Robert Henderhan
 William Loughran
 Allen R. Rule

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Beverly A. Burgoyne
 Mary N. Huygens
 Gerald T. Minifie

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Edward Cohen
 Howard Gordon
 Barbara Babcock

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Sandra Grotzky
 Vicki J. O'Donnell

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Ann Abbianti
 Jack M. Chisholm
 Rose Trattner
 Harry W. Turner

POMONA COLLEGE

Barbara Votaw
 Henry H. Batchelder
 William B. Hixson III
 Jean L. Kling

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Earl W. Brydges
 Edward A. Cherry
 Lawrence E. Fielder
 Hugh C. Gregg II
 Charles C. Harrington
 Caroline A. Passage

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Frank Gabriel Basile
 Barry F. Greenberg
 Barbara Kriss
 Willa S. Noveck
 Jerald D. Usatch
 Alice S. Weinstein
 Henry E. Friedlander

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Bert B. Adkins
 Dwight F. Henderson
 Robert C. Hightower
 Dorothy P. Heard

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Beril M. Abraham
 W. Nathaniel Howell, Jr.
 Susan S. Keller
 Richard J. Weiskittel, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Doris A. Holtz

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Paul R. Abramson
 Frederick W. Toutenberg

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON

Larry H. Wanetick
 George E. Cherba
 Joel L. Falik
 Murray J. Levith
 Martin A. Volkar

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Arthur J. Yahrmatter
 Alan R. Aronson
 Carolyn J. Wesley

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Peter U. Hook
 Mary L. Keffer
 Hampton J. Rector

UNIVERSITY OF WICHITA

Quincalee Brown
 Mary Lou Shelly

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Borell Kirschen
 Peter W. Sachs

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

John E. Harriman
 Darlene L. Scherer

COLLEGE OF WOOSTER

Frances J. Johnston
 Roger McManus
 Carol L. Stine

YALE UNIVERSITY

Donald G. Tinder
 Brian G. Weinstein
 George C. Hatch, Jr.
 Peter H. Seed
 Roger B. Merrick

MEMBERSHIP-AT-LARGE

Carl G. Balson—BE
 W. Francis English—MO
 Robert P. Friedman—MO
 Stewart L. Garrison—AM
 Charles S. Goetzinger, Jr.—KA
 Thomas A. Hopkins—PS
 Robert F. Karsch—MO
 Melvin F. Moorhouse—WICH
 Robley D. Rhine—CLR
 David B. Strother—WA
 Maurice D. Van Gerpen—CLR

PLEASE NOTE — when writing D.S.R. Secretary, Paul A. Carmack, use this full address:

DELTA SIGMA RHO

205 Derby Hall

Department of Speech

Ohio State University

Columbus 10, Ohio

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE . . .

(Continued from Page 8)

affirmative position of these negative arguments. Thus he will learn that the speech, in its essence, is prepared during the intensive study of the question which is required of all debaters who hope to excel.

Furthermore, the student should be given suggestions as to how he is to plan his speech while the debate is in progress. At the beginning of the debate he should have his, or his team's, card file before him. He and his partner should have decided what evidence is to be used in the constructive speeches and what will be used in the rebuttal.

He should then have the affirmative case outlined before him on the left-hand side of a sheet of paper. Arguments of the negative should go on the right-hand side of the sheet. The arguments should be followed through the four constructive speeches. At the end of the second negative speech the arguments of the negative will be known and a glance at the sheet will indicate which arguments the negative is emphasizing and which ones are merely introduced to confuse or discomfort the affirmative.

The five-minute period between the constructive and rebuttal speeches is to be used for the purpose of outlining the first affirmative rebuttal. The speaker should determine the organization and content of the speech in consultation with his partner. He must keep in mind the replies which his colleague, in the second affirmative presentation, made to the attacks of the first negative speaker. He must evaluate the importance of the arguments advanced by the second negative speaker in his constructive speech and be prepared to make any necessary modifications suggested by the further development of the negative case in the first negative rebuttal speech. If this negative rebuttal speech develops as anticipated, the first affirmative rebuttal should be presented as planned during the intermission.

After the debater has been given the above suggestions, he should be offered as many opportunities as time permits to engage in practice debates in the presence of

the coach, who in his critique following the practice debate will point out the respects

Finally, debaters should be cautioned about the following pitfalls in planning the first affirmative rebuttal: (1) spending too much time on mere summarizing and repeating of evidence previously introduced in which the debater was or was not successful in his first affirmative rebuttal.

into the debate; (2) arguing negative issues to such an extent that defense of the affirmative contentions is weakened; (3) limiting the rebuttal to issues discussed by the first affirmative speaker and thus leaving too much of a burden for the second affirmative speech; (4) attempting to answer too much and thereby weakening the defense of those issues which are vital to the support of the case; and (5) being so much concerned with defending the affirmative position that an attack on the negative is neglected.

No speech in debate challenges the ingenuity of a speaker more than the first affirmative rebuttal. To exercise the analytical ability necessary to evaluate the arguments adduced in the previous fifteen minutes of negative presentation, to decide which ones must be answered, and successfully to rebuild the affirmative case by countering the potent negative arguments with convincing evidence and cogent logic require a keen, alert intellect and consummate debating skill.

Attention, Authors!

**Any journal is only as good
as its contributors make it.**

Therefore:

1. If you have a manuscript you need published—send it.
2. If you have an idea—write it, then send it.

Send it to

Charles Goetzinger, Editor, **Gavel**
Bureau of Continuation Education
352 Chemistry Building
Colorado University
Boulder, Colorado

Speaking to the Soviet Public

BY NELSON F. NORMAN

Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, California

This summer demonstrated a new dimension in speech practices and proved anew how rich—and unexpected—are the dividends which accrue from such experiences as are constantly promoted by Delta Sigma Rho.

Speech had paved the way for this member before. A first job had required promotional work involving much vocal convincing. A second professional step led to radio announcing and newscasting. This in turn paid for doctoral studies in Soviet history, which led to speech-utilizing teaching at the high school, junior college, college, and university levels. Along the way, instruction both by radio and television borrowed heavily from techniques acquired in collegiate speech courses and competition.

But only this summer, during two tours in the Soviet Union, did a new and unique value reveal itself. Censorship now permits abundant man-to-'man-in-the-street' discussions behind the Iron Curtain. All that is needed is a minimum working knowledge of the Russian language, plus an inexhaustible energy. What we later came to call "testifying" or "witnessing" (after religious precedents) happened in this way: one night along the banks of the Volga in Stalingrad a group of American tourists had a songfest. The night was balmy and brilliantly moonlit, and a few local citizens began to edge hesitantly closer to inspect these curious foreigners at closer range. Soon, enough had gathered to trade a few Russian songs for American ones.

After awhile the singing stopped, and a few tentative stabs were made at cross-cultural conversation. Soon a manageable amalgam of Russian, English, French, and German evolved, so that communication could proceed. At this point, as American guides at the Moscow exposition can attest, all one's ingenuity and capacities were plumbed for one of the most exciting speech challenges to be met in our age. Imagine the range of questions: "What is your job?

How much are you paid? Why does the United States not let us visit there as you are visiting here? Why do your newspapers lie about the Soviet Union? How much electricity does your largest dam produce? Do you have an automobile? How can you live in a house which you don't own? Why does the United States threaten us by building military bases all around us? Don't the common people in America want peace? Why can't you solve the integration problem? Why does capitalism permit unemployment? Don't you feel insecure without socialized medicine? Who are your best poets? Architects? What do your schools teach about the Soviet Union?

Debaters can sense the task of facing all such cross-examinations. A certain number of loaded and stock questions must be expected and prepared for. Then one can take advantage of sincere inquiries, and those which will permit introduction of our own viewpoints based on our vastly different value structure. What surprised me most, in spite of having been exposed to learned literature on the Soviet Union for years, was this: how different are the thought patterns, reactions, and judgments of the average Soviet citizen from what we had been led to expect. How grateful I was for the hundreds of times on the platform I had had to develop mental flexibility in order to adapt extemporaneously to unexpected situations. This was just as valuable as the resource of Soviet information upon which I drew, and which won a reception from the listeners who were surprised either (a) that an American would be so interested in their history, or (b) that his government would permit him to pursue such studies! Questions and answers were much more frank, and American opinions given more credence due to this circumstance of demonstrated interest in the realities of the Soviet situation. Faulty knowledge of Russian helped establish confidence also: American citizens who speak Russian too well are suspected of being émigrés or children of those

who fled the Soviet Union, and hence are regarded as potentially hostile. One or two slight attempts to heckle were made at the start, but the crowd, which had grown to about two hundred, silenced the hecklers.

This first session lasted for four and one-half hours, well into the following morning. Conversation broke off not from official interference which would have intervened until recently, but only from deference of the crowd for our manifest exhaustion. Two singers with a guitar lustily broke out in Spanish song, and the whole crowd accompanied us up the broad steps of the embankment on our way back to our hotel.

Such a workout was certainly not typical of college experiences, but the mental shaping which came from past presentations and adaptations of ideas made this experience possible, as well as similar ones later in Sochi, Kiev, and Leningrad. The greatest lessons learned were these: humor smooths exchanges more than rancor or recrimination; a trade of information is better than a

one-way soap-box dispensing; intangible ideas (such as "Intellectual Freedom," "Critical Thinking," and "Individual Rights"), even though they may be alien to the listener, will be accorded an inquiring attention if a basis of mutual respect is established; differing philosophical viewpoints are best introduced intermittently as "filler" amid several layers of clear, concrete, asked-for fact.

No one would dream that a few such sessions will end the cold war. But our contest with the Soviet Union involves ideas as much as metal weapons. If such confrontations can be multiplied, and we are prepared to make the most of developing opportunities, those threats to world peace which arise from ignorance and closed-mindedness can be minimized. We should never forget that such meetings are true arenas, and that solid training in presentation of worth-while ideas provides one of the best assurances that the case for our way of life will be successfully presented.

FIRST NEGATIVE . . .

(Continued from Page 6)

speeches. If the second negative constructive speaker does not abide by some sort of division of labor, he will cover the entire debate rather superficially or else he will not complete the negative case. In the first instance, the first rebuttalist will find it more difficult to solve his critical problem, for he must make more significant in five minutes what his colleague did in a sketchy manner in ten. In the second instance, the rebuttalist has the unsatisfactory choice between failing to complete the negative case or introducing new arguments.

Probably most persons would agree with what I have stated as the first negative rebuttalist's critical problem, that of finding materials for his five-minute speech which will enable the negative team to pull as far ahead in the debate as possible. The specific divisions of labor I have presented as frameworks within which solutions to that problem are most easily found may not find

(Continued on Page 16)

FORENSICS FOR ENGINEERS

(Continued from Page 4)

J. *Civic Activities.* Because of their professional status, many engineers are invited or elected to civic posts. In this capacity, of course, they are required to speak publicly and to defend engineering type decisions in public. Each of these tasks requires a high degree of forensic ability.

IV. Conclusion

This paper has tried to show, in an organized manner, the advantages of forensic training for an engineer. The various engineering activities have been pointed out, and the value of forensic training in each of these activities has been pointed out. Consequently, if the engineering activities individually require forensic ability, obviously the entire task of engineering requires even a greater degree of forensic skill. It is hoped, therefore, that this article has provided the basic materials by which forensic training may be sold to engineering personnel.

The Implications of the Use of a Different Proposition

BY AUSTIN J. FREELEY

One of the experimental features of the First Biennial Delta Sigma Rho National Forensic Tournament was the use of a debate proposition other than the national intercollegiate debate proposition. After the tournament announcements were published several chapters wrote to say that they would have participated in the tournament had the national debate proposition been used. As the time for the tournament drew near several other chapters canceled their registrations saying that they found it impractical to prepare teams on a different proposition.

In an effort to determine the preference of the members on this matter a questionnaire was sent to all chapters. Forty responses were obtained. Not all respondents replied to all questions. The results of this survey are reported for your information.

I. Proposition

Twenty-two respondents indicated that they favored the use of the national intercollegiate debate proposition at future Delta Sigma Rho tournaments. Fifteen respondents indicated that they favored the use of a different proposition at Delta Sigma Rho tournaments. Three respondents indicated no preference as to proposition for this specific tournament.

II. Participation

Thirteen colleges indicated they would attend future Delta Sigma Rho tournaments

only if the national debate proposition were used. Three respondents indicated they would attend future Delta Sigma Rho tournaments only if a different proposition were used. Eighteen colleges indicated they probably would attend future Delta Sigma Rho tournaments whether or not the proposition they prefer is used.

III. Reasons for Not Attending

A space was provided on the questionnaire for additional comments. Sixteen respondents made use of this space to indicate their reason for not attending the 1959 tournament.

One cited a conflict in dates, three cited travel costs, nine cited the use of a different proposition, three listed a combination of factors. Typical of this latter group was the comment of a chapter sponsor who has attended most of the Delta Sigma Rho national meetings. He said, "So late in the season and so many other activities for experienced debaters, we could not attend. The fact of a new topic made my debaters less willing to attempt the trip. Consequently, I should say that the different topic was an important reason why we did not attend."

Dr. Austin J. Freeley is Director of Forensics at John Carroll University and served as Tournament Director for the First Biennial Delta Sigma Rho National Forensic Tournament. A preliminary report of this survey was presented at the Faculty Sponsors Round Table at the Tournament. This article contains additional replies received since that time.

THE GAVEL NEEDS MATERIAL!

Deadline for March Issue is February 7, 1960

FIRST NEGATIVE . . .

(Continued from Page 14)

such ready acceptance. There is nothing sacred about them, however; I have suggested these because in my experience as debater, coach, and judge, I have found that

negative teams following these patterns are usually more successful. But more important than my specific suggestions will be the constructive thinking of debaters and coaches who, agreeing that the critical problem exists, will seek ever more effective ways of solving it.

Committees for the Student Congress, 1960 Indiana University

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| I. Committee on Rules and Procedures
Eugene Chenoweth, <i>Chairman</i>
Austin Freeley
Edd Miller
Charles Goetzinger | Leroy Laase
Victor Harnack |
| II. Committee on Local Arrangements
Jeffrey Auer, <i>Chairman</i>
Robert Jeffrey
Robert Gunderson | Don Olson
Russell Windes |
| III. Committee on Choice of Topic and Investigation of Subject Matter
Paul Boase, <i>Chairman</i>
Lillian Wagner
Roger Nebergall | Orville Hitchcock
Joseph Lane |
| IV. Committee on Sponsor Activities
E. C. Buehler, <i>Chairman</i>
Paul Carmack
Wayne Brockriede | Mildred Berry
Robert Friedman |
| V. Committee on Initiation
Robert Weiss, <i>Chairman</i>
J. V. Garland
James McBath | A. R. Brooks
Earl Wells |
| VI. Committee on Evaluation
Merville Larson, <i>Chairman</i>
Robert Newman
Ed Robinson | Laura Caswell
David Ralph |
| VII. Committee on Alumni Relations
Robert Griffin, <i>Chairman</i>
Brooks Quimby
Sub-Committee on Citations
Winston Brembeck
Thorrell Fest | Clayton Schug
Kenneth Hance |

Delta Sigma Rho . . . Chapter Directory

Code	Chapter Name	Date Founded	Faculty Sponsor	Address
A	Albion	1911	J. V. Garland	Albion, Mich.
AL	Allegheny	1913	Nels Juleus	Meadville, Penn.
AM	Amherst	1913	S. L. Garrison	Amherst, Mass.
AMER	American	1932	J. H. Yocum	Washington, D.C.
AR	Arizona	1922	G. F. Sparks	Tucson, Ariz.
B	Bates	1915	Brooks Quimby	Lewiston, Maine
BE	Beloit	1909	Carl G. Balson	Beloit, Wisc.
BK	Brooklyn	1940	Charles Parkhurst	Brooklyn, N.Y.
BR	Brown	1909	Anthony C. Gosse	Providence, R.I.
BU	Boston	1935	Wayne D. Johnson	Boston, Mass.
CA	Carleton	1911	Ada M. Harrison	Northfield, Minn.
CH	Chicago	1906	Marvin Phillips	Chicago, Ill.
CLR	Colorado	1910	Thorrel B. Fest	Boulder, Colo.
COL	Colgate	1910	Stan Kinney	Hamilton, N.Y.
CON	Connecticut	1952	Charles McNames	Storrs, Conn.
COR	Cornell	1911	H. A. Wichelns	Ithaca, N.Y.
CR	Creighton	1934	Rev. Robert F. Purcell, S. J.	Omaha, Nebraska
D	Dartmouth	1910	Herbert L. James	Hanover, N.H.
DP	DePauw	1915	Robert O. Weiss	Greencastle, Ind.
EL	Elmira	1931	Geraldine Quinlan	Elmira, N.Y.
GR	Grinnell	1951	Wm. Vanderpool	Grinnell, Iowa
GW	George Washington	1908	George F. Henigan, Jr.	Washington, D.C.
H	Hamilton	1922	Willard B. Marsh	Clinton, N.Y.
HR	Harvard	1909		Cambridge, Mass.
HW	Hawaii	1947	Orland S. Lefforge	Honolulu, Hawaii
I	Idaho	1926	A. E. Whitehead	Moscow, Idaho
ILL	Illinois	1906	Wayne Brockriede	Urbana, Ill.
IN	Indiana	1951	E. C. Chenoweth	Bloomington, Ind.
ISC	Iowa State	1909	Ralph L. Towne	Ames, Iowa
IT	Iowa State Teachers	1913	Lillian Wagner	Cedar Falls, Iowa
IU	Iowa	1906	Orville Hitchcock	Iowa City, Iowa
JCU	John Carroll	1958	Austin J. Freeley	Cleveland, Ohio
K	Kansas	1910	E. C. Buehler	Lawrence, Kansas
KA	Kansas State College	1951		Manhattan, Kansas
KX	Knox	1911		Galesburg, Ill.
MQ	Marquette	1930	Joseph B. Laine	Milwaukee, Wisc.
M	Michigan	1906	N. Edd Miller	Ann Arbor, Mich.
MSU	Michigan State	1958	Huber Ellingsworth	East Lansing, Mich.
MN	Minnesota	1906	Robert Scott	Minneapolis, Minn.
MO	Missouri	1909	Robert Freidman	Columbia, Mo.
MM	Mount Mercy	1954	Thomas A. Hopkins	Pittsburgh, Penn.
MU	Mundelein	1949	Sister Mary Antonia, B.V.M.	Chicago, Ill.
N	Nebraska	1906	Don Olson	Lincoln, Nebraska
NEV	Nevada	1948	Robert S. Griffin	Reno, Nevada
ND	North Dakota	1911	John S. Penn	Grand Forks, N.D.
NO	Northwestern	1906	Russel Windes	Evanston, Ill.
O	Ohio State	1910	Paul A. Carmack	Columbus, Ohio
OB	Oberlin	1936	Paul Boase	Oberlin, Ohio
OK	Oklahoma	1913	Roger E. Nebergall	Norman, Okla.
OR	Oregon	1926	Herman Cohen	Eugene, Oregon
ORS	Oregon State	1922	Earl W. Wells	Corvallis, Oregon
OW	Ohio Wesleyan	1907	Ed Robinson	Delaware, Ohio
P	Pennsylvania	1909	G. W. Thumm	Philadelphia, Pa.
PO	Pomona	1928	Howard Martin	Claremont, Calif.
PR	Princeton	1911	Clarence S. Angell	Princeton, N.J.
PS	Pennsylvania State	1917	Clayton H. Schug	University Park, Pa.
PT	Pittsburgh	1920	Bab Newman	Pittsburgh, Pa.
R	Rockford	1933	Mildred F. Berry	Rockford, Ill.
SC	Southern California	1915	James H. McBath	Los Angeles, Calif.
ST	Stanford	1911	Leland Chapin	Stanford, Calif.
SW	Swarthmore	1911	E. L. Hunt	Swarthmore, Penn.
SY	Syracuse	1910	J. Edward McEvoy	Syracuse, N.Y.
TE	Temple	1950	Amelia Hoover	Philadelphia, Pa.
T	Texas	1909	Martin Todaro	Austin, Texas
TT	Texas Tech	1953	Merville Larson	Lubbock, Texas
VA	Virginia	1908	Robert Jeffrey	Charlottesville, Mo.
W	Washington	1922	Ronald F. Reid	St. Louis, Mo.
WA	University of Washington	1954	Laura Caswell	Seattle, Wash.
WAY	Wayne	1937	Rupert L. Cartright	Detroit, Mich.
WEL	Wells	1941	Evelyn Clinton	Aurora, N.Y.
WES	Wesleyan	1910	Donald Torrence	Middletown, Conn.
WICH	Wichita	1941	Mel Moorhouse	Wichita, Kansas
WIS	Wisconsin	1906	Winston L. Brembeck	Madison, Wisc.
WJ	Washington and Jefferson	1917	Frederick Helleger	Washington, Penn.
WM	Williams	1910	George R. Connelly	Williamstown, Mass.
WO	Wooster	1922	Madine Schwitzer	Wooster, Ohio
WR	Western Reserve	1911	Lawrence Wm. Kuhl	Cleveland, Ohio
WVA	West Virginia	1923	F. A. Neyhart	Morgantown, West Va.
WYO	Wyoming	1917	John Goudy	Laramie, Wyoming
Y	Yale	1909	Rollin G. Osterweis	New Haven, Conn.
L	At Large	1909		

DELTA SIGMA RHO
205 Derby Hall
Department of Speech
Ohio State University
Columbus 10, Ohio

Entered as
Second-class matter
at
Lawrence, Kansas

Return Postage Guaranteed

