

Complete Issue 7(4)

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

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

Recommended Citation

(1970). Complete issue 7(4). *Speaker & Gavel*, 7(4), 106-148.

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

et al.: Complete Issue 7(4)

speaker and gavel



volume 7, number 4

may, 1970

SPEAKER and GAVEL

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

PUBLISHED AT LAWRENCE, KANSAS
By ALLEN PRESS, INC.

Second-class postage paid at Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. 66044

Issued in November, January, March and May. The Journal carries no paid advertising.

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

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

The membership fee is \$10.00. The official key of 10K (size shown in cut on this page) is \$6.25, or the official keypin of 10K is \$7.50. Cut diamond in key is \$7 additional. **Prices include**



Federal Tax. Individual key orders add 50c. The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the November issue of SPEAKER and GAVEL. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive SPEAKER and GAVEL for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive SPEAKER and GAVEL may subscribe at the standard rate of \$5.00 per year.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

President: JAMES H. McBATH, University of Southern California
Vice President: AUSTIN J. FREELEY, John Carroll University
Secretary: THEODORE J. WALWIK, Indiana State University
Treasurer: KENNETH G. HANCE, Michigan State University
Trustee: WAYNE C. EUBANK, University of New Mexico
Historian: HEROLD T. ROSS, DePauw University

REGIONAL GOVERNORS, MEMBERS AT LARGE, AND REPRESENTATIVES

Regional Governors: JOHN A. LYNCH, St. Anselm's College; RAYMOND BEARD, State University of New York at Cortland; GEORGE F. HENIGAN, George Washington University; JOSEPH C. WEATHERBY, Duke University; THOMAS LUDLUM, Capital University; VERNON R. McGUIRE, Texas Tech University; MELVIN MOORHOUSE, Wichita State University; BERNARD L. BROCK, University of Minnesota; GEORGE ADAMSON, University of Utah; ROBERT GRIFFIN, University of Nevada.

Members at Large: ANNABEL HAGOOD, University of Alabama; PETER KANE, State University of New York at Brockport; LEROY LAASE, University of Nebraska.

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

Representative on SAA Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion: AUSTIN J. FREELEY, John Carroll University.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: ROBERT O. WEISS, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 46135.

Associate Editors: BERNARD BROCK, University of Minnesota; DON CAGE, Texas Tech University; MALTHON M. ANAPOL, University of Delaware.

Speaker and Gavel

Volume 7

May, 1970

Number 4

Report of the National Conference of DSR-TKA— <i>George Adamson</i>	106
Distinguished Alumni Award: Marie Hochmuth Nichols	107
President's Remarks— <i>James H. McBath</i>	107
Distinguished Alumni Award: Frank P. Fogarty	110
Distinguished Alumni Award: Harry Leroy Scharon	110
Distinguished Alumni Award: P. Merville Larson	111
Speaker of the Year Award: John V. Lindsay	112
RESULTS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE	
Two-Man Debate Results	118
Four-Man Debate Results	121
Persuasive Speaking Results	125
Extemporaneous Speaking Results	126
Results of Student Congress	127
Minutes of the National Council	128
The Appropriateness of a Toulmin Analysis of Legal Argumentation— <i>Jerie M. Pratt</i>	133
William Wells Chaffin 1930–1970; Kevin Raymond Baker 1949–1970	138
To Believe or Not to Believe— <i>E. Christian Buehler</i>	139
Pace College Chapter Installation	142
STUDENT FORUM: What Are the Characteristics of the Ideal Debate Judge?— <i>Tim Wright; Kathy Shirley; Richard D. Raum; Tom Walsh</i> and <i>David Bawcom</i>	143
Chapters and Sponsors	146

PLAN AHEAD!

Annual DSR-TKA National Conferences

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
April 7–10, 1971

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.
March 29–April 1, 1972

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF DSR-TKA

March 25–28, 1970

The University of Alabama outdid itself in promised hospitality, food, and a smoothly-run Conference. Those who did not attend missed a memorable experience.

Credit for the success of the Conference goes to many: Most importantly to Dr. Annabel Hagood, Conference Host; Dr. David Mathews, President of the University of Alabama, who gave the welcoming speech; Dr. Kenneth Andersen (University of Michigan), Congress Director; Prof. Joe Cook, Assistant Director (University of Tennessee); Dr. Brad Bishop, Director of Persuasive Speaking (Sanford University), and his assistant, Mary John Smith, Assistant Director of Forensics, University of Alabama; Professor Norma C. Cook (University of Tennessee), Director of Extemporaneous Speaking, and Mike Ferniany of the University of Alabama, assisting; Dr. Nicholas M. Cripe (Butler University), Director of Four-Man Debate, and Assistant Director, Prof. John H. Sloan (University of Alabama); Dr. Glenn Pelham (Emory University), Director of Two-Man Debate, and his Assistant Director, Woodrow Leake (University of Alabama). John Saxon, Student Coordinator, Charles Adams, Director of Conference Events, John Burton, Dean of Continuing Education, contributed immeasurably to the Conference.

Members of our Society should know that the University of Alabama students and administration contributed over \$2,000.00 to help finance the Conference. Although the final figures are not yet available, the National Council will contribute five to eight hundred dollars. These amounts are in addition to the money collected from fees and meal tickets. The figures should serve to reassure those students and sponsors concerned with high costs.

Innovations proved highly successful this year. The "State of the Society Report" by President Jim McBath at the opening assembly served to set the stage for the Conference. The "Seminar on Southern Politics" was a scene stealer, thanks to Mary John Smith; Dr. James Salem, Director of American Studies at the University of Alabama; Mr. Tom Turnispeed, National Campaign Coordinator for former Governor George C. Wallace of Alabama, and Mr. Russell J. Drake, Legal Director, Selma Interreligious Project.

The Sponsors' Meeting, unlike those in previous Conferences, drew attendance from almost 100% of the coaches and sponsors. The banquet was shorter this year—'nuff said. The primary goal for next year is to provide more *student participation* in all aspects of our Conference from planning stages to the conclusion.

Plan now to attend succeeding Conferences. Indiana State University (Terre Haute), Ted Walwik, Director, will host next year's Conference. *Mark the dates:* April 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1971. *Note, also,* that the University of New Mexico, "Tex" Eubank, Director, will host the Conference in 1972—March 29, 30, 31, and April 1.

Again, our thanks to members of the Conference Committee, to Dr. Gregg Phifer, Chairman of the Speaker of the Year Awards Committee; Dr. Robert Huber, Chairman of the Alumni Awards Committee, and to all others who

(Continued on page 112)

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARD

MARIE HOCHMUTH NICHOLS



Marie Hochmuth Nichols, a preeminent scholar and teacher in the field of speech and former president of the Speech Association of America receives the Distinguished Alumni Award of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. The award is presented by James H. McBath, president of DSR-TKA, as Robert Huber, chairman of the awards committee, looks on.

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

JAMES H. MCBATH

March 25, 1970

delivered at the National Conference, DSR-TKA,
University of Alabama

It is customary for the president at this meeting to review the state of the society. One way to suggest "state" is to describe growth and accomplishment—and here our record is impressive. Let me illustrate: DSR-TKA now includes more than 200 chapters, the newest ones being Valdosta State, South Alabama, the United States Naval Academy, and St. John's University. The Chapter Standards Committee now is reviewing applications from seven more schools. DSR-TKA's ranks of active and alumni members exceed 21,000, and its publication, the *Speaker and Gavel*, under the editorship of Robert Weiss, is a journal of quality.

The Speaker-of-the-Year Committee, chaired by Gregg Phifer, has this year chosen another outstanding public citizen for recognition, Mayor John

V. Lindsay of New York. The Distinguished Alumni Awards Committee, headed by Robert Huber, will honor four alumni at the banquet Friday night, including our guest speaker, Dr. Marie Hochmuth Nichols, immediate past-president of the Speech Association of America. The Student Speaker-of-the-Year will be selected by his peers at this conference. Our Research Committee chairman, Dr. Lillian Wagner, is supervising an index of forensic publications to make readily available the scholarship of argumentation and debate. By the conventional measures by which one estimates "state," DSR-TKA is in blooming good health. That more than 400 delegates from 75 colleges and universities have come to Tuscaloosa for this conference is another visible evidence of vigor.

But there is another sense in which one speaks of the "state" of an organization—the sense of ethos and ideas, the way in which a society perceives itself and its educational and social meaning. DSR-TKA performs well its *recognizing* function; it performs well its *informing* function. It performs less well its *innovative* function. Let me illustrate my point through comment on innovation in three areas: the academic field of speech communication, the field of forensics, and forensic societies themselves.

First consider the field of speech. The example is appropriate since more than 90% of forensic directors hold appointment in such departments and courses bearing academic credit in forensics, argumentation, and debate are housed in such departments. Twenty years ago, a speech professor from the University of Washington opened his article in the *AAUP Bulletin* with the words:

"And what do you teach at the University?" asks the kindly old lady on the bus. I pause warily, for I have been through this before and I know what is coming. But there is no escape—my stop is a mile on ahead—so searching her face hopefully for some faint sign of understanding I reply, trying to sound casual, "I teach speech." There is a long pause. The next move is up to her and we both know it. In her eyes is a kind of mildly embarrassed confusion. Dropping her gaze, she emits on a rising inflection an ambiguous "Oh!" and then adds reassuringly, "That's nice." As there is obviously little more to be said on this subject, we turn to vacuous commentary on the weather."

But the field that Professor Baskerville wrote about in 1953 is vastly different today. The impact of the behavioral sciences, the development of communication research, the impress of social relatedness—all have changed the field. Now studies such as organizational communication, comparative rhetoric, cross-cultural communication, freedom of speech, and language development have joined the traditional curriculum of rhetoric and public address, oral interpretation, and speech education. Thus the new speech communication discipline today grants more degrees annually than sociology, philosophy, political science, biology, geology, botany, biochemistry, anthropology, classics, religion, international relations, and any of the foreign languages. The average annual growth rate in graduate degrees in the past ten years—6.74%—is exceeded only by English, sociology, business administration, and physics. My point is not to puff the field of speech communication, but instead to emphasize that change, productive change, has occurred.

Consider now the field of forensics. Historically, innovation and change

have come through the forensic honoraries. The three honoraries—Pi Kappa Delta, Delta Sigma Rho, and Tau Kappa Alpha—were responsible for:

- the first organizations devoted to forensics
- the first debate trips
- the first forensic journals
- the first single national debate question
- the first debate tournament
- the first student congress.

Now the reason—the inherent reason—why the honoraries were able to innovate probably has been that they are open societies. That is, student and faculty involvement have always been not just possible, but encouraged. Most of our organizations are professional in nature, monolithic in structure, and self-perpetuating in purpose. Change is hard to come by. Who was it who said: “No priesthood ever initiates its own reforms”?

But through agencies like DSR-TKA, constructive change can be facilitated. Now it is possible that all of us here tonight are perfectly satisfied with the state of forensic affairs. Perhaps the tournament devised by J. Thompson Baker in 1923 is entirely satisfactory. Maybe the single national topic engineered in 1942 is an optimum arrangement. It is conceivable, though barely, that the forensic world created by your fathers and grandfathers approaches the ideal. If you think that the massive investment in forensics—more than \$1,500,000 in travel budgets alone—is administered most wisely, then you should remain silent. Maybe the contribution to posterity from our generation can be the comparative advantage case, the yard-long flow sheet, and delivery that would impress “Gatling Gun” Fogelman, the marvel of the old circuit chautauqua.

But if you are of the opinion that improvements can be made, then Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is the best available instrument to translate informed opinion into action. DSR-TKA, with a tradition of innovation, is an open society inviting active participation in chapter, regional, and national affairs. The cardinal strength of DSR-TKA has been its ability to interweave continuity with change.

The conventional word to be said in closing would be to wish you success as students and alumni. But success as the world measures it is too easy. I would like to wish you something that is harder to come by. I wish you meaning in your forensic experience. And meaning is not something you stumble across, like the answer to a riddle or the prize in a treasure hunt. Meaning is something you build into your career, starting fairly early and working at it fairly hard. You build it out of your own past, out of your standards and loyalties, out of experiences with other students and teachers, out of your talent and understanding, out of the things you believe in and the people you respect, out of the values for which you are willing to make sacrifices, out of the uses to which you put your forensic ability. The ingredients are there. You are the only one who can put them together into a unique pattern that has purpose and meaning for you. If it does, then the yardstick by which the world usually measures success will not apply. But it will be your “state” and collectively what you do becomes the “state” of our society.

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARDS

FRANK P. FOGARTY

Frank P. Fogarty, charter member of the Delta Sigma Rho chapter at Creighton University, is a man of deeds in two worlds—the world of communications and the world of civic affairs.

His world of civic affairs began in 1929 as general manager of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. Through the years he has served as National Vice-Chairman of the 1970 fund-raising campaign of the Red Cross, on the Board of Trustees of Duchesne Academy, Board of Trustees for the Children's Memorial Hospital, Alumni Council of Creighton University, Board of Regents of the Municipal University of Omaha, as President of United Community Service of Omaha, President of the Omaha Rotary Club, and President of the Chamber of Commerce.

His world of communications was broadcasting, from which he retired this January. The succession of responsible positions tells the story. First he was Vice-President of the Paxton and Gallagher Company, then General Manager of radio station WOW, next Vice-President and General Manager of Meredith WOW, thence to Executive Vice-President, and on to President. His final position made him General Manager of WHEN AM-TV of Syracuse, N. Y., WNEW TV of Flint, Saginaw, and Bay City, Michigan, KPHO AM-TV of Phoenix, Arizona, KCMO and KFMU of Kansas City, Missouri, and WOW AM-FM-TV of Omaha, Nebraska.

Because Frank P. Fogarty has been so effective in the world of civic affairs and the world of communications, we honor him as a Distinguished Alumnus of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

(Receiving the award on behalf of Mr. Fogarty was Rev. Harold McAluffe, S.J., sponsor of the Creighton University chapter.)

HARRY LEROY SCHARON

Dr. Harry Leroy Scharon, graduate of Bridgewater College, Professor of Geophysics at Washington University of St. Louis, formerly a Geophysical Field Assistant in the United States Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey, has been a frequent consultant for various mining and engineering firms, a holder of high offices in six professional organizations, a presenter of more than 40 technical papers at scientific meetings, and a recipient of three National Science Foundation grants—first for a two-year paleomagnetic investigation of the St. Francis Mountains in Missouri, next a three-year research program in paleomagnetism of mountains in Taiwan, South Korea and the Philippines, and finally, but perhaps most important of all, as the only American representative with the Soviet expedition to Antarctica.

Because Harry Leroy Scharon has intellectually contributed to the advancement of scientific knowledge in the world of geophysics, because he has effectively contributed to his fellow men as a teacher, a consultant, and a professional leader, and because he has responsibly contributed to international good will through his expeditions to the South Pole and the Far East, we honor him as a Distinguished Alumnus of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

(This award was accepted for Dr. Scharon by Prof. Roger E. Sappington, sponsor of the Bridgewater College chapter.)

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI AWARD P. MERVILLE LARSON



Dr. P. Merville Larson, professor and head of the speech department at Texas Technological College, graduate of Kansas State University, doctor of philosophy from Northwestern University, we honor you first as a teacher: a teacher in Colorado public schools, the Manhattan, Kansas, high school and the Hutchinson, Kansas, Junior College; instructor of speech at North Park College and Moorhead Teachers College, and coordinator of forensics at the University of Denver.

We honor you as an administrator, serving as acting head of the speech departments of Eastern Illinois University and Southwest Texas State Teachers College, then on to serve as head of the speech departments at Texas College of Arts and Industries, Southern Illinois University, and finally at Texas Technological College.

We honor you for your contributions to the literature of our field—your authorship of *Social Science and the Dalton Plan*, and your co-authorship of *The Teacher Speaks*, *Helping the Bible Speak*, *Mastering Speech Skills*, *Communicating Effectively Through Speech*, and *Speech for the Creative Teacher*.

We honor you for your contributions to public service in our field: for founding the West Texas Speech Association, the Tech Forensic Union, and the Tech chapter of Delta Sigma Rho; for serving as president of the Texas Speech Association, president of the Lubbock Theater Center, and president of Phi Rho Pi; for exercising leadership as a member of the executive council of the Speech Association of America, as executive secretary of the Texas Speech Association, and finally as National Vice President of Delta Sigma Rho.

For your excellence as a teacher, your service as an administrator, your contributions to our literature, and your continued leadership in our world of forensics and speech, we present you with this Distinguished Alumni Award.

DELTA SIGMA RHO-TAU KAPPA ALPHA

SPEAKER OF THE YEAR

JOHN V. LINDSAY

Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City is the recipient of the annual Speaker of the Year Award presented by Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha.

The announcement was made at the National Conference Banquet, March 27, by Dr. Gregg Phifer, the 1969 chairman of the Speaker of the Year Award committee.

Lindsay is a native of New York City. He holds the LL.B. from Yale, served in the U.S. Navy with distinction during World War II, was admitted to the New York Bar in 1949, practiced law in New York and served as Republican congressman from New York's 17th District in the 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses.

Nationally known for his dedication to good government for America's largest and most complex city, Lindsay was also singled out by Dr. Phifer as the type of man who "pleads the city's case to an unsympathetic state legislature, walks the streets of the city to cool down the long, hot summer, brings a calm voice of reason to the national Republican convention—a person of highly effective, intelligent, and responsible speech."

"Those who study the crisis of our cities," said Dr. Phifer, "often cry in despair that our largest cities are ungovernable, that the garbage men, the police, and the teachers cannot all be kept happy at one time.

"These counsels of despair may be correct. The great American cities may be ungovernable. But if they are to be proved wrong, it will take men like Mayor Lindsay to do it."

Though not present, Lindsay accepted the honor and in a telegram said: "The quality of our dialogue—whether we talk sense among ourselves and to others—will determine the future and the fate of America. What we—I as an amateur in speech and you as professionals have in common, I hope, is a respect for language and a concern for the way it is used."

A fuller report concerning this award will appear in the next issue of *Speaker and Gavel*.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE (*Continued from page 106*)

contributed in any way to the success of the Conference. Special thanks for the cooperation of the 300 students who participated.

Suggestions for improving future Conferences will be welcomed.

Sincerely,

Your National Conference Committee

John Gregg, Acting for George Ziegelmueller

Kenneth E. Andersen

George F. Henigan

George A. Adamson, Chairman



STUDENT SPEAKER OF THE YEAR

Chuck Humphreys, President, National Student Council; Kent Moors, St. Anselm's College, Student Speaker of the Year



TWO-MAN DEBATE—1st PLACE—COLLEGE OF WOOSTER

Ron Ruskin, Melinda Pierce, Jerry Sanders, Coach



FOUR-MAN DEBATE—1st PLACE—SAMFORD UNIVERSITY

Nicholas M. Cripe, Chairman, Four-Man Debate; Brad Bishop, Coach; Ben Rice, Assistant Coach; Becky Johnson; Barbara Davis; Mary Lynn Bates and David Peterson (not pictured)



SUPERIORS IN STUDENT CONGRESS

Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairman, Student Congress; Allan Wallace, Mercer University; Don Martin, Memphis State University; James Swartz, George Washington University; Linda Duff, University of Kentucky (not pictured)



SUPERIORS IN PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

Brad Bishop, Chairman, Persuasive Speaking; Tim Halverson, Muskingum College; Wally Jones, Wayne State University; Mike Norton, University of Tennessee; Janet Pruitt, University of Alabama



SUPERIORS IN EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

Norma C. Cook, Chairman, Extemporaneous Speaking; Leo D. Brown, University of Utah; Frank England, University of Tennessee; Betsy McKenney, Texas Tech University; Tom Walsh, Texas Tech University



TWO-MAN DEBATE—2nd PLACE—TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Tom Walsh, David Bawcom



FOUR-MAN DEBATE—2nd PLACE—UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
Nicholas M. Cripe, Chairman, Four-Man Debate, John Bertolotti, Ken Smith,
Janet Pruitt, Steve Windom



TWO-MAN DEBATE—3rd PLACE—UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
Larry Kaplan, Perry Mocciano



FOUR-MAN DEBATE—3rd PLACE—BUTLER UNIVERSITY
John Swanson, Todd Nielsen, Peter Tamulonis, Tom Sughrue

TWO-MAN DEBATE RESULTS

Final Round

Wooster defeated Texas Tech 5-2

Semifinal Round

Texas Tech defeated Southern California 5-0 Wooster defeated North Carolina 3-2

Quarterfinal Round

Texas Tech defeated Kansas 2-1 Wooster defeated Syracuse 2-1
 Southern California defeated Florida 3-0 North Carolina defeated Wichita 2-1

Octafinal Round

Texas Tech defeated Wake Forest 3-0 Wooster defeated Michigan 2-1
 Kansas defeated Spring Hill 2-1 Syracuse defeated Nebraska 3-0
 Florida defeated St. Anselm's 2-1 Wichita defeated Georgia 2-1
 Southern California defeated Tulane 3-0 North Carolina defeated Duke 3-0

PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

Team	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
American	L	L	W	L	L	W	2-4
Alan Webb	21	24	18	20	22	25	130
Mitchell Stewart	19	24	18	23	23	24	131
Auburn	W	W	L	L	W	L	3-3
Lewis Page	21	17	30	17	23	19	127
Mary Fisher	22	20	29	18	24	20	133
Cincinnati	L	L	L	L	L	W	1-5
Greg Braden	22	18	16	18	21	21	116
Geoff Braden	23	21	15	16	23	24	122
Davidson	W	L	L	L	L	L	1-5
Charlie Davis	18	16	19	18	18	13	102
Gray Mason	20	18	19	24	21	17	119
Denison	L	L	W	W	W	L	3-3
Frederick Coombs	22	20	23	23	21	22	131
Steven Goldsmith	25	20	19	25	21	21	131
Duke	L	W	W	W	W	L	4-2
Doug Poe	18	20	17	22	20	18	115
Fred Register	15	20	17	25	22	18	117
Emory	W	L	W	L	L	L	2-4
Walter Gordon	19	23	24	24	21	29	140
Al Bruce	21	23	24	22	22	27	139
Florida	L	W	W	W	W	L	4-2
Steve Rosin	22	23	24	25	28	24	146
Gregg Mathews	23	24	26	28	29	25	155
Florida State	L	W	L	L	W	W	3-3
Richard Carrigan	17	25	22	21	30	27	142
Steve Craig	15	22	22	22	29	26	136
Georgia	W	W	W	L	L	W	4-2
Bob Cohen	24	27	23	28	23	24	149
Roy Garber	25	28	20	21	23	26	143
Hampton Institute	L	L	L	W	L	L	1-5
Shelvin L. Hall	19	20	16	18	14	23	110
Carole Browne	18	20	15	19	16	23	111

PRELIMINARY ROUNDS (Continued)

Team	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Indiana State	L	L	L	W	W	W	3-3
Mike Wills	18	19	23	23	21	22	126
Dave Campbell	20	21	22	24	23	23	133
John Carroll	L	W	L	L	W	L	2-4
Tom Sheehan	22	25	20	20	13	18	118
Dale Kwarcianny	23	25	22	22	14	18	124
Kansas	L	L	W	W	W	W	4-2
Diana Bartelli	21	19	27	22	27	26	142
Phyllis Culham	25	18	29	22	26	26	146
Michigan	W	W	W	L	W	W	5-1
Mike Hartman	27	23	23	18	30	25	146
Bill Black	23	26	20	22	28	24	143
Michigan State	L	W	L	L	L	W	2-4
S. Secor	18	22	18	16	21	24	119
M. Schofield	18	21	18	15	22	24	118
Nebraska	W	W	L	L	W	W	4-2
Stephanie Scholtes	24	20	18	22	30	28	142
David Domina	23	20	18	20	30	23	134
Nevada	L	W	L	L	L	W	2-4
Craig Ihara	F	21	18	20	22	17	98
Mark Handelsman	F	22	20	19	22	16	99
North Carolina	W	W	W	W	W	W	6-0
Joe McGuire	26	25	28	23	26	25	153
Tom Foster	24	26	23	22	26	24	145
Notre Dame	L	L	L	L	W	W	2-4
Tom Gies	19	21	15	26	24	19	124
Norman Lerum	18	24	19	28	23	22	134
Ohio State	L	L	L	W	L	L	1-5
Joe Igel	19	25	19	21	18	27	129
Bill Egbert	22	26	22	23	16	28	137
Pittsburgh	W	L	W	L	L	L	2-4
George Hopson	30	20	19	22	27	23	141
Patricia Burns	29	19	21	27	25	24	145
St. Anselm's	W	L	W	W	L	W	4-2
George Olsen	22	24	24	25	21	24	140
Kent Moors	27	24	21	27	21	25	145
St. John's	W	W	W	L	L	L	3-3
Patricia Cleland	22	24	25	19	23	23	136
Jim Bradley	23	26	24	19	24	27	143
Santa Barbara	L	L	L	L	W	L	1-5
Judi Bloom	18	19	22	12	23	20	141
Bob MacLagan	21	21	24	25	26	21	138
South Alabama	L	L	W	W	L	W	3-3
Don Akridge	19	19	24	30	20	29	141
Paul Greene	22	23	25	27	18	28	143
South Carolina	W	W	L	L	W	L	3-3
Bob Stepp	20	17	16	19	23	27	122
Sam McDowell	20	23	25	23	25	26	142
Southern Cal	W	W	W	W	W	L	5-1
Perry Mocciano	25	20	22	29	26	24	146
Larry Kaplan	25	21	23	27	24	24	144

PRELIMINARY ROUNDS (Continued)

Team	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	Total
Spring Hill	W	W	W	W	L	L	4-2
Joseph Danner	22	15	26	22	30	23	138
Larry Ackels	26	25	24	26	30	26	157
Stanford	W	L	L	W	L	L	2-4
Dean Swartz	21	26	23	19	24	24	137
Ken Philpot	23	25	21	20	23	24	136
Syracuse	W	W	W	W	L	W	5-1
James McHugh	22	27	24	23	21	18	135
Robert Putnam	24	23	26	26	21	20	140
Tennessee	W	L	W	W	L	L	3-3
Frank England	22	24	21	23	25	20	135
Mike Norton	23	25	22	24	26	21	141
Texas Tech	W	W	W	W	W	W	6-0
Tom Walsh	24	25	30	24	24	24	151
David Bawcom	24	27	30	19	21	22	143
Tulane	W	L	W	W	L	W	4-2
Michael Hickok	25	20	20	24	19	19	127
Michael Pinnolis	24	20	20	25	21	21	131
Vermont	L	W	W	L	L	L	2-4
Richard Raum	22	27	24	18	23	20	134
Edward Burrington	23	28	18	22	25	21	137
Wake Forest	W	W	L	W	W	L	4-2
Rusty Stout	17	24	18	18	20	18	115
Laura Abernathy	24	25	25	18	28	20	140
Wayne State	W	L	L	L	W	L	2-4
John Klemme	26	24	26	24	21	25	146
Wally Jones	25	25	24	23	23	24	144
Weber State	L	L	L	W	L	L	1-5
Tim Ahern	17	23	21	22	24	27	134
Karin O'Connell	19	24	22	22	22	25	134
Western Michigan	L	L	L	W	W	W	3-3
Kai Sorenson	20	20	19	25	26	28	138
Len Sowers	20	18	19	20	24	29	130
Westminster	L	L	L	W	L	W	2-4
P. Lowry	18	14	22	24	12	23	113
A. Rowbotham	16	14	25	23	11	24	113
Wichita State	W	W	L	L	W	W	4-2
Ranney Ramsey	20	23	23	24	24	29	143
Gary Boyce	22	24	24	25	24	27	146
Wooster	L	W	W	L	W	W	4-2
Ron Ruskan	21	24	24	18	23	22	132
Melinda Pierce	22	25	23	19	24	29	142

CERTIFICATES OF ACHIEVEMENT

Larry Ackels, Spring Hill
 Greg Mathews, Florida
 Joe McGuire, North Carolina
 Tim Walsh, Texas Tech
 Bob Cohen, Georgia
 Gary Boyce, Wichita State
 Mike Hartmann, Michigan
 Perry Mocciano, Southern California

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE

School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Pts.	Total
Ind. St. Aff.	W	W	L	L	W	W	L	L		11-5
Marshall	18	23	21	16	24	26	12	18	158	726
Owens	20	23	20	19	24	24	14	15	159	
Ind. St. Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	L		
Roloff	24	28	27	23	23	22	28	24	196	
Greenwood	23	27	23	21	20	21	26	22	183	
Mercer Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	W	L		2-14
Surrencef	17	16	17	15	19	14	20	19	137	605
Cragg	19	20	21	18	24	21	24	21	168	
Mercer Neg.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	W		
Dodson	18	17	19	18	20	22	16	22	152	
Russell	18	18	18	17	21	19	15	22	148	
Fla. St. Aff.	L	W	L	W	L	L	L	L		4-12
Castro	21	23	16	24	15	25	23	29	176	637
Garten	18	22	22	24	13	19	21	28	167	
Fla. St. Neg.	L	L	W	L	L	L	L	L		
Smith	18	17	20	17	18	20	15	23	148	
Wilson	18	19	20	18	18	18	20	15	146	
Wooster Aff.	W	W	W	L	L	W	L	L		5-11
Hamilton	24	28	25	14	16	20	21	23	171	674
VanVleck	23	24	23	13	19	22	22	26	172	
Wooster Neg.	W	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Kaempfer	19	22	24	17	21	20	18	28	169	
Willey	18	22	23	18	19	18	19	25	162	
Tennessee Aff.	W	L	W	W	W	L	L	L		9-7
Kinard	25	25	17	23	19	21	18	15	163	691
Wade	20	23	16	24	22	24	23	19	171	
Tennessee Neg.	W	L	W	W	W	W	L	L		
MacDonald	20	21	20	22	19	28	20	23	173	
Waters	20	21	22	26	22	29	20	24	184	
Michigan Aff.	W	W	L	W	L	W	L	W		12-4
Shuman	26	16	23	18	27	24	15	22	171	734
Maximick	25	17	27	24	28	25	17	21	184	
Michigan Neg.	L	W	W	W	W	W	W	W		
Sellers	25	20	25	21	27	24	26	26	194	Fourth
Jansen	17	18	25	22	29	23	25	26	185	
St. John's Aff.	L	W	L	W	W	L	L	L		7-9
Mollica	14	26	18	28	28	16	19	27	176	711
Borovina	14	27	17	29	30	17	21	27	182	
St. John's Neg.	L	L	W	W	W	W	L	L		
McKeon	20	18	19	25	22	28	22	15	169	
Rowley	24	19	22	26	22	30	23	18	184	
Tulane Aff.	W	L	W	L	L	L	W	L		5-11
Thalheim	18	19	24	26	14	13	19	18	151	656
Buras	19	21	24	24	15	18	23	18	162	
Tulane Neg.	L	L	W	L	L	L	L	W		
Richoux	25	20	24	19	21	23	22	22	176	
Schuster	24	23	23	17	21	23	14	22	167	
Samford Aff.	W	L	L	W	L	W	W	W		13-3
Peterson	24	26	26	21	18	24	23	21	183	756
Davis	25	28	30	23	16	26	24	25	197	

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Pts.	Total
Samford Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W		
Bates	27	26	22	20	20	21	21	23	180	First
Johnson	25	26	28	21	24	22	23	27	196	
Ball St. Aff.	W	L	W	L	L	W	W	W		8-8
Hinshaw	25	26	22	18	26	21	20	25	183	707
Lakes	27	28	23	19	27	21	26	27	198	
Ball St. Neg.	L	L	L	W	W	W	L	L		
Russell	18	14	24	24	25	21	21	24	171	
Friedly	15	14	23	18	24	19	21	21	155	
Valdosta St. Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		0-16
Davis	25	16	17	20	15	21	22	18	154	570
Wade	23	19	16	20	16	19	20	22	155	
Valdosta St. Neg.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Sutton	15	10	14	23	18	14	14	16	124	
Owens	18	11	17	23	18	17	16	17	137	
Miami Aff.	L	W	L	W	W	W	W	L		11-5
Price	0	25	19	24	22	24	25	24	163	731
Goldstein	0	28	22	27	26	27	25	24	179	
Miami Neg.	L	W	W	W	W	W	L	W	389	
Richer	24	27	28	21	26	25	16	27	194	
Remland	24	30	25	22	27	25	15	27	195	
Capital Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	W	L	W		8-8
Leopard	16	25	15	20	23	22	18	18	157	702
Daerzbacher	17	26	19	24	22	24	24	24	180	
Capital Neg.	W	W	W	L	W	L	W	W		
Frasch	26	28	23	20	20	26	7	23	173	
Herbert	29	28	21	21	22	23	24	24	192	
Memphis St. Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		4-12
Jones	19	14	20	21	15	18	18	22	147	664
Manuel	21	15	23	22	22	18	18	23	162	
Memphis St. Neg.	W	W	L	L	W	W	L	L		
Pernell	25	27	17	20	22	27	21	18	177	
Rasdale	19	29	18	22	22	26	22	20	178	
Mich. St. Aff.	W	L	L	L	W	W	L	L		8-8
Strehler	23	25	19	20	18	19	23	16	163	704
Poole	22	24	21	25	25	25	24	19	185	
Mich. St. Neg.	W	W	W	L	L	W	W	L		
Sarvis	24	22	30	25	21	21	18	19	180	
McPhee	22	21	30	25	14	25	17	22	176	
NYU—Wash. Sq. Aff.	L	W	W	L	L	L	L	L		5-11
Jacobs	18	23	15	21	19	18	16	20	150	603
McMahon	25	24	20	18	18	11	17	21	154	
NYU—Wash. Sq. Neg.	W	L	L	W	W	L	L	L		
Allen	20	8	12	27	29	14	22	16	148	
Luibelman	20	9	16	25	28	14	21	18	151	
L.S.U. Aff.	L	W	W	W	W	L	W	W		11-5
Jackson	21	20	24	24	22	18	25	26	180	751
McConnell	22	24	22	29	22	20	27	29	195	
L.S.U. Neg.	L	W	W	L	L	W	W	W		
Kirby	18	25	22	15	27	26	27	26	186	
Higgs	17	27	21	19	27	25	26	28	190	

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Pts.	Total
Alabama Aff.	L	W	W	L	W	W	W	W	W	13-3
Smith	20	27	25	24	17	27	27	23	190	742
Pruitt	25	29	24	18	20	28	28	24	196	
Alabama Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	L	W	W		
Bertolotti	21	22	18	24	23	16	22	27	173	Second
Windom	29	23	24	20	24	18	23	22	183	
Butler Aff.	W	L	W	L	W	W	L	L		12-4
Tamulonis	28	25	24	15	27	27	21	22	189	793
Sughrue	28	24	25	15	28	29	21	23	183	
Butler Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W		
Swanson	24	27	22	30	25	19	28	29	204	Third
Nielsen	24	28	25	30	22	20	29	29	207	
Emory Aff.	W	L	L	L	W	L	W	W		10-6
Garrett	27	18	16	25	29	22	27	25	189	760
Jones	26	19	19	26	30	22	29	25	196	
Emory Neg.	W	L	W	L	W	W	W	W		
Lofto	22	23	23	19	26	23	21	28	185	
Konigsberg	28	23	25	19	28	24	15	28	190	
U. of Fla. Aff.	W	W	W	W	L	L	W	W		11-5
Schwartz	26	16	26	25	18	24	25	24	184	735
Rosenthal	29	19	28	26	22	23	26	26	199	
U. of Fla. Neg.	L	L	W	W	W	L	W	W		
Schulman	26	18	20	21	23	24	22	18	170	170
Beers	21	24	23	24	24	26	22	18	182	182
Muskingum Aff.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		1-15
Kennedy	16	22	23	18	22	19	16	20	156	566
Waugh	15	21	20	19	24	17	15	18	149	
Muskingum Neg.	L	L	L	W	L	L	L	L		
McMuldrew	14	18	14	20	18	12	19	10	126	126
Hoover	14	17	20	23	19	12	21	9	135	
Maryland Aff.	W	L	L	L	W	L	L	L		7-9
McCarthy	25	23	19	23	22	19	18	17	166	737
Barron	28	25	20	24	23	18	21	22	181	
Maryland Neg.	L	W	L	W	W	W	L	W		
Kleinhauf	25	25	27	21	24	24	22	28	196	196
McGuire	28	26	19	26	23	22	22	28	194	194
Vermont Aff.	L	L	W	W	L	W	W	W		10-6
Salmon	20	20	18	18	20	18	21	27	162	663
Fletcher	25	21	19	20	24	21	22	27	179	
Vermont Neg.	W	W	L	W	L	L	L	W		
Hoffman	17	18	22	26	19	23	20	18	163	163
Harvey	16	19	24	18	18	24	21	19	159	159
Murray St. Aff.	W	W	W	W	W	L	W	W		8-8
Harvey	18	21	24	20	22	20	23	23	171	636
Duncan	20	22	26	19	21	20	22	25	175	
Murray St. Neg.	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Coppinger	24	17	18	16	20	18	20	18	151	151
Walter	19	15	19	14	14	18	26	14	139	139
U. of Ill. Aff.	W	L	L	L	L	W	W	L		9-7
Reid	24	18	18	20	23	21	20	20	164	725
Mitchell	27	19	21	20	23	23	20	20	173	

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Pts.	Total
U. of Ill. Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	189	
Allen	25	28	23	24	24	20	21	24	189	
Jackson	22	27	22	27	26	24	28	23	199	
Texas Tech. Aff.	W	W	W	W	L	W	W	W	188	11-5
McKinney	26	23	25	22	20	20	26	26	188	702
Gage	25	26	24	19	21	21	24	27	187	
Texas Tech. Neg.	L	W	L	W	L	L	W	W	169	
Cobb	18	25	23	16	23	20	24	20	169	
Trapp	16	24	22	18	17	17	24	20	158	
Purdue Aff.	L	L	L	L	W	W	L	L	180	8-8
Lake	23	22	25	21	25	20	23	21	180	738
Nick	20	24	25	20	22	19	21	21	172	
Purdue Neg.	L	W	W	W	L	W	W	W	192	
Fahnestock	25	20	28	27	16	24	26	26	192	
Saunders	25	22	27	28	18	23	27	24	194	
U. of Ga. Aff.	L	L	L	L	W	L	W	L	175	5-11
Porterfield	21	18	21	19	27	25	24	20	175	701
Gulliams	21	21	26	22	26	26	24	19	185	
U. of Ga. Neg.	L	L	W	L	L	W	W	L	167	
Cash	21	18	21	22	25	19	26	15	167	
Goss	20	17	20	21	24	21	28	23	174	
Wichita St. Aff.	L	L	L	W	W	L	W	W	187	9-7
Scotfield	23	17	26	26	24	22	26	23	187	728
Graber	23	17	26	27	25	23	25	23	189	
Wichita St. Neg.	W	W	L	W	L	L	W	W	168	
Allen	23	17	17	19	28	22	18	24	168	
Adams	22	20	19	23	27	26	21	26	184	
Rhode Is. Aff.	W	L	L	W	L	L	L	W	159	7-9
Scott	19	17	20	20	18	25	18	22	159	664
Erickson	21	22	18	19	16	27	22	22	167	
Rhode Is. Neg.	W	L	L	W	L	L	W	W	154	
Bernstein	18	17	20	24	17	18	24	16	154	
O'Malley	26	24	18	24	24	26	21	21	184	
George Washington Aff.	L	L	W	W	L	W	L	L	179	10-6
McGeer	20	27	23	19	23	22	22	23	179	738
Ledford	23	27	24	20	24	24	22	26	190	
George Washington Neg.	W	W	W	L	W	W	L	W	182	
Newcity	24	24	22	17	24	22	23	26	182	
Johnson	26	26	23	18	26	23	21	24	187	
Bridgeport Aff.	W	L	L	L	L	L	W	L	153	5-11
Lakis	20	20	17	22	18	20	18	19	153	651
Detsky	21	20	18	22	22	21	20	22	166	
Bridgeport Neg.	L	W	L	L	L	W	L	L	154	
Farber	13	19	18	16	14	23	24	27	154	
Stokes	20	20	26	20	23	25	18	26	178	
Utah Aff.	L	W	W	L	W	L	W	W	183	11-5
Gunnell	25	19	24	23	22	20	24	26	183	755
Wood	21	20	24	20	21	20	23	26	175	
Utah Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	W	L	L	202	
Brown	25	23	29	27	25	25	25	23	202	
Poppas	22	22	29	26	25	24	25	22	195	

RESULTS OF FOUR-MAN DEBATE (Continued)

School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Pts.	Total
Bridgewater Aff.	L	W	L	L	L	W	L	W		7-9
French	23	21	18	21	18	15	7	22	145	626
Witlock	20	18	19	21	19	16	20	23	156	
Bridgewater Neg.	L	W	W	L	L	W	L	W		
Andes	12	19	23	21	19	18	21	21	154	
Houff	18	21	24	18	23	20	22	25	171	
U. of Minn. Aff.	W	W	L	W	L	L	W	W		11-5
Cambronne	28	23	24	21	20	23	28	23	190	764
Corless	27	23	25	22	21	24	28	27	197	
U. of Minn. Neg.	W	W	W	W	W	L	W	L		
Carter	26	28	26	25	27	18	22	24	196	
Gilliland	22	27	27	21	24	19	20	21	181	

CERTIFICATES OF ACHIEVEMENT

Superior—Affirmative

Paul Rosenthal, University of Florida

Larry Lakes, Ball State University

Barbara Davis, Samford University

Sandy Corless, University of Minnesota

Superior—Negative

Todd Nielsen, Butler University

John Swanson, Butler University

Leo D. Brown, University of Utah

Barb Jackson, University of Illinois

RESULTS OF PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

Speaker	School	I		II		III		IV		V		VI	
		R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G
Allen	Wichita State	4	83	5	84	2	87	2	95	4	81	5	80
Bloom	Santa Barbara	4	84	5	82	5	80	5	75	4	84	4	83
Cage	Texas Tech	3	87	1	88	1	89	4	80	3	84	1	90
Cragg	Mercer	3	86	2	87	3	84	3	92	2	85	3	87
Craig	Florida State	3	86	3	83	2	89	3	84	2	90	4	82
Davis	Samford	3	89	1	90	1	92	1	90	2	88	2	89
Essex	Cincinnati	3	85	3	89	3	85	4	75	5	83	5	81
Friedley	Ball State	4	83	5	76	5	83	2	85	1	90	1	92
Gunnell	Utah	2	88	4	82	4	85	5	79	5	80	5	85
Garten	Florida State	3	88	2	84	5	83	4	83	2	92	2	90
Halverson	Muskingum	3	87	2	88	1	95	1	96	1	92	2	96
Jansen	Michigan	5	81	5	85	5	80	4	83	5	77	5	80
Jones	Wayne State	1	88	1	98	1	89	1	90	1	90	1	91
Kinard	Tennessee	5	81	4	86	5	83	5	82	4	82	5	78
Lombardo	Butler	4	78	3	85	1	99	1	93	5	81	4	86
Maximiuk	Michigan	5	75	5	80	5	84	—	—	—	—	—	—
McRae	Valdosta State	5	78	5	76	4	85	5	79	5	80	4	83
Maxcy	Emory	2	86	2	96	4	84	2	87	3	84	3	87
Nicholson	Indiana State	5	82	3	85	4	82	2	88	4	83	3	83
Norton	Tennessee	2	90	3	97	2	94	1	93	1	91	1	93
Pappas	Utah	1	84	1	92	5	—	2	87	4	78	2	86

RESULTS OF PERSUASIVE SPEAKING (Continued)

Speaker	School	I		II		III		IV		V		VI	
		R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G
Paul	Creighton	5	79	5	75	4	85	5	78	5	80	5	79
Peterson	Samford	3	85	2	90	4	78	3	80	3	84	2	91
Philbin	Creighton	4	84	3	85	4	79	5	75	5	80	5	84
Pruitt	Alabama	2	95	1	90	2	86	3	86	1	93	1	94
Ramsey	Wichita State	5	84	4	79	3	84	3	80	3	86	3	86
Raum	Vermont	1	95	3	82	2	89	4	84	3	90	2	88
Russell	Ball State	4	84	2	85	1	90	5	79	2	80	4	83
Stout	Wake Forest	1	89	4	84	1	98	2	88	2	87	1	92
Stubblefield	Louisiana State	2	91	4	83	2	85	3	84	1	90	3	84
Swartz	Stanford	1	91	1	96	2	98	1	91	3	80	1	87
Wallace	Mercer	5	82	5	80	5	82	4	78	4	82	4	91

Certificates of Achievement—Superior

Tim Halverson, Muskingum College
 Wally Jones, Wayne State University
 Mike Norton, University of Tennessee
 Janet Pruitt, University of Alabama

Certificates of Achievement—Excellent

Barbara Davis, Samford University
 Richard Raum, Vermont University
 Rusty Stout, Wake Forest University
 Don Swartz, Stanford University

RESULTS OF EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

School	Speaker	I		II		III		IV		V		VI	
		R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G
Alabama	Raines	1	90	4	86	5	79	1	95	1	87	3	96
	Windom	5	80	4	90	4	80	5	75	5	75	5	75
Bridgeport	Farber	4	84	5	81	5	85	5	84	5	80	5	86
	Stokes	3	87	2	93	3	85	2	88	5	83	4	82
U.C. Santa Barbara	MacLagan	5	83	5	81	2	90	5	79	5	79	5	75
	Carlow	4	84	4	83	5	83	5	85	3	83	5	85
Cincinnati	Morrow	2	94	5	80	5	85	4	76	2	83	2	84
Creighton	Bataillon	4	81	3	92	5	79	4	88	5	84	4	82
	Witt	5	82	3	85	5	83	5	80	5	75	5	84
Emory	Kidwell	3	88	2	87	3	92	3	85	4	83	5	85
Florida State	Carrigan	2	89	5	82	5	83	3	82	1	85	3	83
	Wilson	3	83	5	82	4	80	4	84	5	80	5	75
George Washington	Johnson	5	84	5	82	2	94	1	100	1	88	1	98
	Newcity	5	83	3	87	3	82	3	87	2	90	3	87
Maryland	Barron	3	80	5	84	1	92	1	93	1	88	1	93
	McCarthy	5	77	3	84	2	93	2	90	3	85	1	96
Michigan	Sellers	2	84	3	87	4	89	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Shuman	3	90	5	89	2	86	3	80	5	76	4	82
Minnesota	Carter	3	89	4	83	5	85	5	82	3	85	3	87
Nebraska	Baldwin	1	96	3	86	5	84	5	82	4	82	3	80
	Wightman	1	96	1	86	3	92	1	86	4	78	5	76

RESULTS OF EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING (Continued)

School	Speaker	I		II		III		IV		V		VI	
		R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G	R	G
N.Y.U. (Wash. Sq.)	Laibelman	5	81	5	83	5	80	5	80	4	84	5	83
	McMahon	5	75	5	81	5	84	5	86	5	84	5	81
Samford	Bates	5	78	2	88	2	91	2	89	2	89	2	90
	Johnson	4	80	5	82	4	90	5	83	5	80	5	76
South Alabama	Akridge	5	78	4	85	4	90	5	80	4	85	5	80
	Greene	4	79	5	85	3	90	3	84	5	80	4	85
Spring Hill	Danner	5	80	5	89	5	78	4	87	5	75	4	86
	Ackels	3	85	2	88	3	85	3	86	3	84	4	78
Stanford	Philpot	1	85	1	89	5	86	2	90	5	81	2	97
	England	2	90	2	85	1	95	3	89	2	84	1	98
Tennessee	MacDonald	5	81	5	79	4	85	5	82	3	86	2	89
	McKinney	1	92	1	90	1	91	1	90	1	93	1	90
Texas Tech	Walsh	5	77	1	94	1	95	1	95	1	90	2	89
	Brown	1	93	1	94	1	90	2	88	2	86	2	82
Utah	Wood	2	86	2	88	2	89	5	75	3	80	1	85
	Eckrich	5	76	5	82	5	85	4	83	2	87	3	86
Westminster	Adams	5	75	4	86	5	83	5	83	5	80	4	85
	Boyce	4	83	1	93	1	92	5	83	5	80	5	84

Certificates of Achievement—Superior

Leo Brown, University of Utah
 Frank England, University of Tennessee
 Betsy McKinney, Texas Tech University
 Tom Walsh, Texas Tech University

Certificates of Achievement—Excellent

Michael Barron, University of Maryland
 Ken Johnson, George Washington University
 Ellen McCarthy, University of Maryland
 Tim Raines, University of Alabama

RESULTS OF STUDENT CONGRESS

Certificates of Achievement—Superior

James Swartz, George Washington University
 Donald Martin, Memphis State University
 Linda Duff, University of Kentucky
 Allen Wallace, Mercer University

Certificates of Achievement—Excellent

Melissa Maxcy, Emory University
 Kraig Noble, Ohio Wesleyan University
 Joseph Bataillon, Creighton University
 Tom Morrow, University of Cincinnati

MINUTES OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

March 26, 1970

Members present for all or part of the meeting: McBath, Walwik, Wetherby, Adamson, Lynch, Humphries, Hagood, Griffin, Moorhouse, Freeley, Hance, H. Ewbank, Ludlum, Henigan.

President James McBath called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

Minutes of the meetings of the National Council held in December 1969 approved as distributed.

Report of the Secretary, Theodore J. Walwik:

1. Approximately 150 persons have been elected to membership since July 1, 1969.
2. Motion, Walwik; Second, Ewbank: Elections as members-at-large be approved for Henry W. Littlefield, President of the University of Bridgeport, and Thomas Langevin, President of Capital University. *Passed.*
3. Correspondence with Thomas Pappas of Anderson College has resulted in no reply.
Motion, Adamson; Second, Moorhouse: Secretary is directed to write Anderson College notifying that the grant of a charter is rescinded. *Passed.*
4. Correspondence with chapters at University of North Carolina and Vanderbilt has resulted in the probable return of those charters to good health. No reply has been made to attempts to correspond with Bates College. As directed, the Secretary wrote letters of encouragement to Duke and Hanover. With pleasure, it was noted that Duke has been able to elect two students to membership, thereby restoring the chapter to good health.

Report of the Treasurer, Kenneth Hance:

1. Our immediate cash status is very weak.
2. The proposed budget for 1970-71 was presented (appended).

George Henigan noted that the N.F.L. Trophy is still being engraved TKA. The President was instructed to write a letter to the National Forensic League and the Secretary was instructed to write a letter to Balfour advising that the engraving should read DSR-TKA.

President McBath reported from Trustee Ewbank and Trustee-Emeritus Buehler. Both recommend an increase in initiation fees. A general discussion of financial health of the Society followed.

1. Hance reported that investment income has not decreased despite stock market uncertainties.
2. Ewbank presented a summary of membership costs in other ACHS societies.

McBath summarized the sense of the Council that fees should be increased only as a last resort. The question was then raised, "How can income be increased?"

1. Discussion of the merits of using more investment income as cash rather than as reinvestment capital.
2. Hance and Walwik were appointed as a subcommittee to propose a means of implementing the Alumni Life Patron plan.
3. The National Conference Committee was asked to consider a registration fee for faculty members attending the National Conference.

Hance reported that the Internal Revenue Service requires that the chapters file Form 990-A. It was suggested that Attorney George Lamb be consulted in this matter.

Chapter Standards report, Henry Ewbank:

1. Motion, Ewbank; Second, Henigan: A chapter be granted to the University of San Francisco, James Dempsey, sponsor. *Passed*.
2. Discussion of the standing of the chapter at San Francisco State. President McBath will advise San Francisco State that, unless initiates are forthcoming by July 1, 1970, the charter will be suspended.
3. As a result of contact by President McBath, it is expected that Occidental College will initiate soon.
4. Ewbank, Walwik, McBath, and Freeley appointed as a committee to draw up a scheme of notification of charter grants.

Adjourned at 4:35 to reconvene at 2:00, March 27, 1970.

March 27, 1970

Present for all or part of the meeting: McBath, Walwik, Wetherby, Ewbank, Ludlum, Griffin, Moorhouse, Laase, Hance, Freeley, Humphries, Lynch, Henigan, and Hagood.

President James McBath called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m.

President McBath recommended that V. R. McGuire of Texas Tech be named Regional Governor. Motion, Moorhouse; Second, Henigan: Approve the recommendation. *Passed*.

President McBath appointed N. M. Cripe of Butler University as Chairman of a Constitution Updating Committee. Motion, Laase; Second, Hance: Approve the recommendation. *Passed*.

Motion, Walwik; Second, Henigan: Approve election as members-at-large of James Hall and Thomas Houchin of St. John's, Warren Decker of Wichita State, and Sue DeWine of Miami (Ohio). *Passed*.

Discussion of the financial affairs of the society:

1. Hance recommended no increase in fees, adoption of the proposed 1970-1971 budget, and use of additional cash from capital gains if necessary.
2. Motion, Hance; Second, Griffin: Proposed 1970-71 budget be adopted. *Passed*.
3. Motion, Hance; Second, Henigan: The President is authorized to develop and implement a program to bring the Alumni Life Patron plan to the attention of the alumni. *Passed*.

Report of the ad-hoc committee on clarifying procedures for processing chapter charter petitions. (Recommended procedure appended).

Motion, Ewbank; Second, Laase: The revised charter procedures be approved. *Passed.*

Charles Humphries, Student Council President, reported for the National Student Council.

1. Request that the National Student Council President be included on the National Council mailing lists.
2. The Student Council discussed the need for a new event for the National Conference that more nearly reflects the whole range for forensic skills than does the traditional debate format.

Motion, Walwik; Second, Ewbank: The President be authorized to appoint a committee of at least five persons, including both faculty and students, to develop a new non-traditional persuasive forensic activity for the National Conference. *Passed.*

Reports from Regional Governors:

1. Jack Lynch, Region I: Not much interest in a regional event. Governor Lynch will install the chapter at Emerson College on April 29.
2. Tom Ludlum, Region V: We should consider changing two-man debate to eight rounds with power-matching.
3. George Henigan, Region III: The United States Naval Academy chapter will be installed soon.

Sixteen chapters participated in the regional tournament at Bridge-water. George Henigan was reelected Governor.

Chapters are undertaking a series of televised debates over WETA in Washington.

The Region regrets the death of William Chaffin, sponsor of the Chapter at Washington and Lee.

The chapter at Delaware was installed in October.

4. Joe Wetherby, Region IV: Attempts to correspond with the chapter at Morehouse have been unsuccessful.
The Region has established a Hall of Fame.

Reports of the National Conference Committee, George Adamson, Chairman:

Motion, Adamson; Second, Ewbank: Tournament fees for the 1971 National Conference be fixed at a maximum of \$5.00 per conference participant. Meal tickets at a maximum of \$12.00 per faculty member and \$15.00 per student may be required. *Passed.*

Adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theodore J. Walwik

National Secretary

PROPOSED BUDGET 1970-71

(Approved by National Council, March 27, 1970)

INCOME

Initiations	\$3800.00
Investment Income (Cash)	4000.00
Charters	200.00
Special Gifts	—
Miscellaneous	500.00
Members-at-Large	100.00
Keys	—
	\$8600.00

DISBURSEMENTS

Speaker and Gavel:

Issues	\$3900.00
Editor's Office	300.00
Printing and Postage	200.00
President's Office	200.00
Secretary's Office	1000.00
Treasurer's Office	200.00
Historian's Office	150.00
Maintenance of Records by Allen Press	700.00
Dues and Expenses re. Association of College Honor Societies	150.00
Expenses re. SAA Committee on Debate-Discussion	150.00
Membership Certificates	400.00

Awards:

Speaker-of-the-Year	50.00
Distinguished Alumni	25.00
Trophy for NFL	125.00
Student Council	150.00
National Conference	800.00
Miscellaneous	100.00
Keys	—
	\$8600.00

"Balanced Budget"

Notes:

- (1) *Income* increased by \$50.00 (Members-at-Large)
- (2) Disbursements decreased by \$275.00:
 - (a) *Speaker and Gavel*: \$100.00 decrease
 - (b) Historian's Office: \$50.00 decrease
 - (c) SAA Life Membership: \$200.00 decrease
 - (d) Student Council: \$50.00 decrease
 - (e) Miscellaneous: \$25.00 decrease

REVISED CHARTER PROCEDURES

(Approved by National Council, March 27, 1970)

1. The initial inquiry from an institution desiring a charter in DSR-TKA should be received by or directed to the Chairman of the Standards Committee.
2. The Chairman of the Standards Committee will reply to all inquiries:
 - a. If the forensics program in the interested institution is not well known to him, the Chairman will state the criteria for granting charters and invite further correspondence;
 - b. If the forensics program of the interested institution is well known to the Chairman, then he will forward petitions for a charter. The applying institution will complete four copies of the petition for charter. The petitions will then be sent to the appropriate Regional Governor and to the three members of the Standards Committee. With the petition sent to the Chairman of the Standards Committee, the petitioning institution must send a check for \$100.00, the amount of the charter fee.
3. The chairman of the Standards Committee will receive the completed petitions from the Regional Governor and the members of the Standards Committee with their reactions and recommendations.
4. The Chairman will forward the Charter Fee to the National Treasurer.
5. The Chairman of the Standards Committee will report the recommendation of the Standards Committee to the National Council. If appropriate and necessary, the Chairman of the Standards Committee may solicit a mail ballot from the National Council.
6. If the National Council votes to grant a charter, then the Chairman of the Standards Committee advises the petitioning institution of the action. He will forward a Charter Application Form and applications for membership to the prospective chapter sponsor. The Charter Application Form will show the proposed date of chapter installation (as arranged with the Regional Governor), names of charter members to be engrossed on the Charter, and the name of the chapter sponsor.
7. The prospective sponsor will forward the Charter Application Form and applications for membership (with appropriate fees) to the National Secretary.
8. The National Secretary will order the charter from the Balfour Company and will send a letter to the Regional Governor authorizing him (or his designate) to install the chapter.
9. In the event that the National Council declines to grant a charter to a petitioning institution, the Chairman of the Standards Committee will advise the prospective sponsor of that action, with carbon to the National Treasurer. The National Treasurer will then refund the charter fee.

THE APPROPRIATENESS OF A TOULMIN ANALYSIS OF LEGAL ARGUMENTATION

JERIE M. PRATT

When Chief Justice Earl Warren retired from the Supreme Court, it was thought by some that the controversy surrounding the "activist" Warren Court would come to an end. Then President Johnson appointed Abe Fortas to the position of Chief Justice, and the controversy was rekindled. And when Richard Nixon appointed Judge Clement Haynsworth to the Court, public outcry continued until the Senate rejected his nomination. These examples illustrate the continuing public interest and concern over the role of the Supreme Court as a decision-making body in society. It does seem that the controversy surrounding the Supreme Court is unlikely to decline as long as the Court retains its present activist role of interpreting the Constitution in decisions which have far-reaching effects on individuals and society.

Much has been written and will continue to be written on the Supreme Court and its role in society. This controversial group has been extensively studied in a number of fields; but until recently its rhetoric was little analyzed by the field of speech. As Warren Wright, one of the earliest rhetoricians to analyze rhetoric in the judicial setting, has said: "Just as the President or a congressman enters the public forum to speak for his position on a public issue, so does the judge through his judicial opinion, place his ideas before the nation."¹ Rhetoric in the form of judicial opinions, however, has received little attention from rhetoricians. As Wright has also observed:

Students of American public address, believing that rhetoric has been influential in shaping the American nation, have sought to examine and describe the role of formal persuasion in American history. That examination has thus far overlooked the rhetoric of some of the most influential contributors to the public forum, the members of the Federal judiciary. The rhetoric of the Federal bench embraces more than 150 years of official opinions handed down by some of America's greatest statesmen, and those opinions state some of the most important arguments on some of the most persistent issues in American history.²

Wright continues, "The major reasons for this oversight probably are twofold: First, the judicial opinion has not been seen as rhetoric; second, no rationale exists for describing this kind of American persuasion."³ Wright and others through their work have suggested that judicial opinions are a form of rhetoric. The second reason given by Wright was the lack of methodology suitable for the study of judicial rhetoric. Wright suggests that the method of Aristotle be applied to this rhetoric; it would seem, however, that other methods of analysis might be applied in order to arrive at new insights into the field of judicial rhetoric.

It will be the purpose of this paper to suggest the appropriateness of the

Mrs. Pratt is a graduate student in the Department of Speech, Communication, and Theatre Arts at the University of Minnesota.

¹ Warren Wright, "Judicial Rhetoric: A Field for Research," *Speech Monographs*, XXXI (March, 1964), p. 64.

² Wright, p. 64.

³ Wright, p. 66.

method developed by Stephen Toulmin in *The Uses of Argument* for analyzing legal argumentation. There are two controversies surrounding this method which are beyond the scope of this study. Toulmin's book was received with mixed reaction from the reviewers in speech and philosophy.⁴ There seems to be disagreement over whether Toulmin's system is an improvement over traditional logic. This author does not intend to make a judgment about the advantages or disadvantages of the Toulmin system over traditional logic since the purpose of this paper will be to suggest the applicability of the system to legal rhetoric rather than to criticize it. Secondly, there have been several attempts made, particularly in speech, to improve upon the Toulmin model.⁵ It will not be the intent of this author, however, to improve upon the system, inasmuch as this paper is concerned with the appropriateness of the system itself. It can be suggested, however, that Toulmin has had an influence in the field of speech because there have been such attempts to elaborate upon his system. Therefore, this paper will, first, lay out the weaknesses of traditional logic which Toulmin sought to correct with his system. Second, it will suggest the inadequacies of the traditional method for analyzing legal rhetoric. And third, it will describe the appropriateness of the system presented by Toulmin for analyzing legal rhetoric.

Toulmin suggests two weaknesses of the traditional logical system:

The traditional pattern of analysis, I suggested, has two serious defects. It is always liable to lead us . . . to pay too little attention to the differences between the different modes of criticism to which arguments are subject—to the differences, for instance, between warrants (W) and rebuttals (R). . . . The other defect of the traditional pattern is the effect it has of obscuring the differences between different fields of argument, and the sorts of warrants and backing appropriate to these different fields.⁶

The first defect that Toulmin suggests is accounted for in his different spacial arrangement for analyzing arguments. The second defect, however, is more central to fundamental distinctions between the systems. The failure to consider field-dependent standards when evaluating arguments comes from an adoption of the analytic paradigm.

Toulmin differentiates the analytic argument from the substantive argument by suggesting three tests.

First, there is the *tautology* test: in an analytic syllogism with an "all" in the major premises, the data and backing positively entail the conclusion, so that we can write "D, B, or *in other words* C," confident that in stating the conclusion we shall simply be repeating something already stated in the backing. . . . Secondly, there is the *verification* test: must

⁴ See for example Winston L. Brembeck, "New Books in Review," review of *The Uses of Argument*, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLIV (October, 1958), pp. 325-326; S. Körner, "New Books," review of *The Uses of Argument*, *Mind*, LXVIII (July, 1959), pp. 425-427; and Joseph L. Cowan, "The Uses of Argument—An Apology for Logic," *Mind*, LXXIII (January, 1964), pp. 27-45.

⁵ See for example Wayne Brockriede and Douglas Ehninger, "Toulmin on Argument: An Interpretation and Application," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLVI (February, 1960), pp. 44-53. These ideas were further extended in the book by the same authors, *Decision by Debate* (New York: Dodd-Mead and Co., 1963); Arthur Hastings, "Reasoning Processes," and in Glen E. Mills, *Reason in Controversy* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964), pp. 125-147.

⁶ Stephen E. Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 143.

verifying the backing implicitly relied on in an argument *ipso facto* involve checking the truth of the conclusion? . . . Finally, there is the test of *self-evidence*: once a man has had data, backing, and conclusion explained to him, can he still raise genuine questions about the validity of the argument?⁷

By using such analytic arguments as the paradigm for all arguments, most arguments fall short of such validity criteria. According to Toulmin:

Many of the current problems in the logical tradition spring from adopting the analytic paradigm-argument as a standard by comparison with which all other arguments can be criticised. But analyticity is one thing, formal validity is another; and neither of these is a universal criterion of necessity, still less of the soundness of our arguments. . . . Logicians have taken analytic arguments as a paradigm; they have built their system of formal logic entirely on this foundation; and they have felt free to apply to arguments in other fields the categories so constructed.⁸

Toulmin offers in his system a consideration of the field-dependence of validity of arguments. He says:

What standards can we take as relevant when judging arguments in any particular field? . . . Instead of building up a set of logical categories designed to fit the special problems in each field—categories for which the criteria of application are in theory, as they are in practice, *field-dependent*—they have seen in the analytic type of argument an ideal to which alone they will allow theoretical validity. . . .⁹

Toulmin does make a distinction between the force of the argument which he says is field-invariant and the criteria for its use which he claims are field-dependent. He writes, "The *force* of the conclusion 'It cannot be the case that . . . ' or ' . . . is impossible ' is the same regardless of fields: the *criteria* or sorts of ground required to justify such a conclusion vary from field to field."¹⁰ This leads Toulmin to conclude that "all the *canons* for the criticism and assessment of argument . . . are in practice field-dependent" whereas "all our terms of assessment are field-invariant in their *force*."¹¹

It becomes clear that the field-dependent aspect of the argument is found in the backing and the warrant. "The kind of backing we must point to if we are to establish its authority will change greatly as we move from one field of argument to another."¹² Also, with regard to warrants, "the differences between warrants in different fields are also reflected in idiom."¹³ Therefore, "an argument in any field whatever *may* be expressed in a formally valid manner, provided that the warrant is formulated explicitly as a warrant and authorises precisely the sort of inference in question. . . ."¹⁴ The consideration of the field-dependent criteria for establishing the validity of arguments is essential to the Toulmin system. Toulmin summarizes this connection when he writes:

Validity is an intra-field, not an inter-field notion. Arguments within any field can be judged by standards appropriate within that field, and

⁷ Toulmin, p. 131.

⁸ Toulmin, p. 145.

⁹ Toulmin, p. 218.

¹⁰ Toulmin, p. 36.

¹¹ Toulmin, p. 38.

¹² Toulmin, p. 104.

¹³ Toulmin, p. 117.

¹⁴ Toulmin, p. 135.

some will fall short; but it must be expected that the standards will be field-dependent, and that the merits to be demanded of an argument in one field will be found to be absent (in the nature of things) from entirely meritorious arguments in another.¹⁵

Having suggested the weaknesses of traditional logic which Toulmin sought to correct, we may turn to the weaknesses of traditional logic as applied to legal rhetoric. Several legal authorities have called for a new method to analyze legal reasoning. Anthony G. Guest has referred to the necessity of considering the peculiar dynamic and fluid aspects of legal decision-making. Guest describes legal rules as "fluid and uncertain" and suggests the inadequacy of traditional logic based on Euclidean geometry to analyze such a system. "A realization of this fact provokes the further observation that propositions of law are not based, like those of Euclidean geometry, upon fixed idioms or postulates, but upon concepts of a linguistic and jurisprudential nature which may be indefinite and change in the course of time."¹⁶ Guest also suggests that the central question in legal reasoning is "how to determine whether a rule applies to the case, or conversely, the propriety of subsuming the case under the rule."¹⁷ From this point of view authorities such as Edward H. Levi have analyzed legal reasoning. In his classic work, Levi states: "The basic pattern of legal reasoning is by example. It is reasoning from case to case. It is a three-step process described by the doctrine of precedent in which a proposition descriptive of the first case is made into a rule of law and then applied to a next similar situation."¹⁸ He states that "the finding of similarity or difference is the key step in the legal process."¹⁹ As Guest summarizes the problem, "It may therefore be admitted that much of the traditional logic has little light to shed on some of the most pressing problems of legal thought."²⁰

Having considered the weaknesses that Toulmin sought to correct through his system of analysis, and the inapplicability of traditional logic to legal rhetoric, it is possible to see the two contrasting models which Toulmin suggests and then to explain the relevance of the Toulmin model for the analysis of legal argumentation. Toulmin suggests that the traditional system is based on a geometric model while his system is based on a legal model.

The analogy between rational assessment and judicial practice presents us with a rival model for thinking about the idea of logical form. It now appears that arguments must not just have a particular shape, but must be set out and presented in a sequence of steps conforming to certain basic rules of procedure.²¹

. . . We have before us two rival models, one mathematical, the other jurisprudential. Is the logical form of a valid argument something quasi-geometrical, comparable to the shape of a triangle or the parallelism of two straight lines? Or alternatively, is it something procedural: is a formally valid argument one *in proper form*, as lawyers would say,

¹⁵ Toulmin, p. 255.

¹⁶ Anthony Gordon Guest, "Logic in the Law," *Oxford Essays in Jurisprudence*, ed. Anthony Gordon Guest (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 177.

¹⁷ Guest, p. 193.

¹⁸ Edward H. Levi, *An Introduction to Legal Reasoning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 1.

¹⁹ Levi, p. 2.

²⁰ Guest, p. 193.

²¹ Toulmin, p. 43.

rather than one laid out in a tidy and simple *geometrical* form? Or does the notion of logical form somehow combine both these aspects, so that to lay an argument out in proper form necessarily requires the adoption of a particular geometrical layout?²²

The model of the Toulmin system, therefore, is peculiarly appropriate for the study of judicial rhetoric. As Toulmin suggests, "What we called to begin with 'the jurisprudential analogy' may be seen in retrospect to amount to something more than a mere analogy."²³ The weaknesses of traditional logic have made it inappropriate for the analysis of legal arguments. As one author expressed it:

The chief objection to logic in the law is usually expressed in the form that logical thought processes are rigid and inflexible whereas legal reasoning is empirical and discretionary. . . . In particular, this general distrust is supported by three specific arguments: that decisions cannot be arrived at simply by deduction from existing legal principles, that legal rules are too fluid and uncertain to support any logical inferences which could be drawn from them, and that the whole conception of law as a single, unitary, logically consistent system is at least an impractical ideal, if not an illusionary fetish.²⁴

There is one further reason for the appropriateness of the Toulmin system for legal argumentation. That reason is the justificatory nature of both the Toulmin system and judicial rhetoric. Toulmin has written:

For logic is concerned not with the *manner* of our inferring, or with questions of *technique*: its primary business is a retrospective, justificatory one—with the arguments we can put forward afterwards to make good our claim that the conclusions arrived at are acceptable, because justifiable, conclusions.²⁵

This justificatory approach is also the essence of the legal argument, as Guest pointed out: "When a judge decides a case, his reflex may be instinctive. A good judge, so it has been said, arrives at his conclusion first and gives his reasons after . . . for the object of the legal process is decision, and there has to be a reasoned justification of the decision made."²⁶ And Clarence Darrow emphasized the point when he said, "The most important thing to do is to make the judge *want* to decide things your way. . . . They are human beings, moved by the same things that move other human beings. The points of law merely give the judge a *reason* for doing what you have already made him want to do."²⁷

Because the Toulmin system compensates for the weaknesses of traditional logic and accommodates the distinctive characteristics of legal argumentation, this system can provide a fruitful tool for the analysis of this controversial form of persuasive communication. The arguments of the Supreme Court perform a crucial function in public decision-making; and they deserve to be studied in a manner which offers us the most valuable insights.

²² Toulmin, p. 95.

²³ Toulmin, p. 255.

²⁴ Guest, p. 176.

²⁵ Toulmin, p. 6.

²⁶ Guest, p. 187. For further support of this position, see Jerome Frank, *Law and the Modern Mind* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963), pp. 108-109.

²⁷ Irving Stone, *Clarence Darrow for the Defense* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1941), p. 72.

WILLIAM WELLS CHAFFIN 1930–1970

KEVIN RAYMOND BAKER 1949–1970

Professor William W. Chaffin, sponsor of the Washington and Lee chapter of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha, and Kevin R. Baker, a member of the chapter, were fatally injured February 22 in an automobile accident as they returned from the Dartmouth Invitational Debate Tournament.

“William Chaffin was an institution of Washington and Lee,” stated an editorial in the Washington and Lee student newspaper, “and an inspiration to a generation of debaters. His charisma and dedication created an unmatched sense of pride within the University and brought respect to Washington and Lee from colleges across the nation. Our mentor-friend, honed to brilliance in the art of arts, has left a disproportionate void.”

Washington and Lee President Robert E. R. Huntley, in a letter to DSR-TKA Regional Governor George F. Henigan, expressed these sentiments: “Both of these men were outstanding, one as an enthusiastic debate coach and the other as an excellent student and debater. They were the kind of teacher and student Washington and Lee is proudest to have. They will long be remembered at this University.”

Professor Chaffin was an associate professor of speech and English and director of forensics at Washington and Lee, where he had been on the faculty since 1960. A graduate of the University of Richmond, he earned an M.A. in speech at the University of Virginia. At Washington and Lee he had developed a remarkably rich forensics program on both the intramural and intercollegiate levels.

Kevin Baker, a junior, was co-captain of the debate team, was an honor roll student, and had been in several positions of leadership on the campus. He was elected to DSR-TKA in 1969.

The one-car accident, which occurred near Woodstock, Virginia, at 5:00 on a Sunday morning, also seriously injured Tim Wright, author of an essay elsewhere in this issue.

TO BELIEVE OR NOT TO BELIEVE

E. CHRISTIAN BUEHLER

The three major forensic societies among colleges of America were founded in a brief space of five years and preceded by half a decade the birth of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking. Oratory flourished among the colleges a quarter of a century earlier, and debate was in full swing a decade before the honor societies were established.

The image of the forensic societies among the academic hierarchy at the college level was exceedingly favorable. Members of D.S.R. and T.K.A. could sit at the tables of Phi Beta Kappa and hold their heads high. There were those who felt that honor and distinction for excellence on the forensic platform was more to be desired than election to Phi Beta Kappa. They reasoned that most of the top debaters and orators could by industry and perseverance make Phi Beta Kappa, but precious few of the "Phi Betas" could demonstrate superior ability on the forensic platform. Furthermore, the forensic honoree usually stood out as a leader in the various student activities and gave high promise of being prominent and successful in the cold world of tomorrow.

Obviously, the movement of intercollegiate educational forensics grew and flourished in a favorable climate and played a significant role in bringing speech as an academic discipline into the college classroom. It threw a key block and ran powerful interference for the entrance of the profession of speech teachers into the doors of our colleges. And for two decades, in terms of quantity there appeared more articles in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* which related to forensics than to any other subject. It is also interesting to note that half of those who have held the office of president of SAA since the time of its inception were former debate coaches or directors of forensics. Thus, intercollegiate forensics forms part of the roots, trunk and branches of our professional tree.

The time was right for the coming and the flowering of intercollegiate forensics. One towering fact stands out as we view this phenomenon, namely, that it was born in an aura of faith. College administrators, faculty and students generally believed in the worthiness of competitive forensics. Our thing was born on the rock of faith. As humans, our lives become more meaningful and our deeds more self-rewarding if we can operate from a basis of faith.

We now ask the agonizing question: "Have we lost the faith that gave us birth, life and vitality?" Are we suffering from a faith gap?

I choose not to sit in the scorner's seat or render judgment on this generation. I cannot claim the youth of today is less honest, less sincere, less idealistic, less humanitarian, than the youth that cheered those who shaped and formed our forensic destiny long ago. I doubt if men with the same vision and ideals our founders had would be able to bring into being our kind of forensic honor society today. There is no point in trying to fix the blame on any individuals for the loss of faith in our mission. We need

Dr. Buehler is Professor Emeritus of Speech Communication at the University of Kansas. For 11 years he was National President of Delta Sigma Rho and in 1964 he received the Distinguished Alumni Award of DSR-TKA. He was trustee of this society for the past six years.

insights about the conditions which contribute to the realignment of our attitudes toward what we are doing.

Why am I concerned about the state of our organization and the direction we are going? I am unhappy as I look at the record of chapter activities. More than 10% of the chapters are listed as delinquent. Seventy-five chapters did not initiate a single member last year; 17 initiated only one. Considering the size of the debate squads, the number of competitive contests, the increase in student enrollments, and the number of chapters listed, we are operating at less than 20% of our potential compared to two or three decades ago. Is this the manifestation of faith?

I have been shocked as I listen to the complaints stemming from some sponsors and students about the once in a lifetime \$10.00 initiation fee. It is disheartening to note the resistance to the notion that even a modest adjustment be made commensurate with the facts of inflation. Is this a testimony of faith?

I am disturbed as I visit the packed trophy cases and see the array of shiny hardware and listen to the comments of debaters and sponsors. I get the impression that it is more meaningful to win a certain tournament than to be elected to DSR-TKA. This is the earmark of self-aggrandizement and reflects a kind of vanity that has little relevance to the quality of learning or the goals of self-development. These are the traits of a huntsman out for blood and booty, a characteristic of the American debaters which the British debaters deplore. Is this in tune with the educational goals of our founders?

I regret to see the heavy turn-over among faculty sponsors and forensic directors. There seems to be a down-grading of this role in the eyes of department chairmen. The supervision of intercollegiate forensics is often viewed as a kind of unavoidable chore which can be conveniently turned over to some graduate assistant as he hammers out his advanced degree.

As I read the various signs of decline in the faith as it relates to our central mission, I fear that unless we make some realistic adjustments, especially at the level of the grass roots, our survival as a national forensic honor society is in jeopardy.

In fairness to the total picture, I also wish to point out signs of encouragement. The quality of *Speaker and Gavel* has been greatly improved over that of the past. This, our one and only publication, represents the lifeline of communication and the source for energizing ideas pertaining to our educational objectives.

I have also been heartened by the spirit of devotion and dedication that prevails at the top level among the officers and the participants at council meetings. Would that chapter sponsors and students could get the message generated by the faith manifested among our leaders.

Above all, I have been encouraged by the attitude and quality of performance demonstrated among a large number of chapter sponsors and those in charge of forensics. These sponsors conduct well-balanced programs where trophies and victories do not interfere with sound educational goals.

My central concern is faith as it relates to our role as the national forensic honor society. Faith is a rare and precious commodity bearing fruits of loyalty, devotion, dedication, and a spirit of commitment. But it is something that is not inherited like a birthmark or a blood type. It is something that must be reconstructed and renewed from time to time. It can never be taken for granted.

Faith and action are often indivisible. We can do something about faith by talking about it by word of mouth and pen. It was not taken for granted in the Declaration of Independence, in the Preamble to the Constitution, in the rituals of the religions, in the code of ethics devised for the legal and medical professions. It is not taken for granted in Boy Scout work, in the salute to the flag, or at the marriage altar. The profession of speech teachers and our honor society were launched and sent into orbit by people who talked about something in which they believed. Our challenge concerns a renewal of faith in something we already have.

I propose a free and open call for a declaration of faith in our mission. I direct this call to the students. Why not have an essay contest of 500 words or so on the subject: "Why I believe in DSR-TKA"? I think students would welcome the challenge to take stock of what good things can come from their forensic ventures. These essays reflecting a declaration of faith should be judged not by us elders but by a student panel of peers. I suggest the three top essay winners be published in *Speaker and Gavel*. Special certificates, trophies, or cash awards could be provided for the winners. I'll gladly put a piece of my faith on the line and offer \$100 toward the purpose, provided of course that 20 or more enter the contest. If there are no takers, then we would have proof that there is insufficient faith.

The year following the student contest, the same pattern could be applied to chapter sponsors. But the age should be limited to 30 or 35. Let us tune in on what youth has to say.

I suspect much of the faith gap which plagues us is linked with an information gap. Those with little faith should be forgiven for they know not what they are doing. Students should know that it takes money to operate the society and that most societies like ours are entirely supported by fees. Students should know that for the past six years their initiation fees did not pay half the costs of operating the society. The major costs were paid for by students and faculty of yesterday who paid on the basis of dollar value about three times the amount of today's students.

Students should know that on the basis of our present program of operation it would take a \$26.00 initiation fee just to break even. Students should know that all of our unencumbered capital is completely exhausted and our remaining capital structure built over a period of 25 years from student fees provides an investment income of a little more than 25% of our annual budget. Students should realize that scores of officers and faculty have given free, hundreds of hours of their professional time for the good of the order. Moreover, hundreds and even thousands of dollars from college funds and private pockets have been used to defray cost of administration and government of the society.

Much of the faith building can be accomplished by individual students using the inventory method of identifying benefits and rewards which accrue from their forensic ventures.

High on the list is the actual concentrated practice and experience in persuasive speaking under expert direction. The debater may learn more about a certain public issue in one season than he would in a 3-hour credit college course. He gets training in critical analysis, processes of logic, and the strategy of handling various lines of argument.

The chances are the debater will get some of the finest and most valued critical instruction of his entire college career. This private instruction can never be measured in terms of dollars.

Fringe benefits are numerous. The debater comes into close association with students who are the cream of the crop. The most exciting spontaneous and educationally productive seminars are often generated in an automobile traveling to and from tournaments.

Debaters should not overlook the satisfaction derived from travel and visits to other cities and universities. These free rides with meals and lodging are gifts which many debaters of long ago could not take for granted. I recall that my debaters who wanted so much to have more debate experience volunteered to pay for their own meals. This they did by their own request for 14 years.

Students should also realize the possible future value of honor associated with DSR-TKA when seeking a job or position. This mark of distinction and honor on an application blank will often mean the difference between acceptance and rejection involving monetary rewards 100 times the cost of the initiation fee.

It is well that we take time to count some of our blessings which we enjoy in the context of intercollegiate forensics and name them one by one. This could help to wipe out some of the curse wrought by taking things for granted. May it help to bring a rebirth in faith in what we are doing.

PACE COLLEGE CHAPTER INSTALLATION

Pace College, New York, N. Y., received its charter as a member institution of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha in ceremonies conducted on April 30, 1969.

Dr. Raymond Beard, of the State University of New York at Cortland, Governor of Region II, conducted the installation ceremony and complimented the strong "debate atmosphere" built at Pace College as evidenced by the many trophies and awards the team has won at tournaments throughout the East.

Dr. Frank E. Colbourn, Director of Debate and Associate Professor of Speech at Pace College, accepted the charter and presented the charter members for initiation: Michael DeStefano, Paul Baumgartner, Jerry Goldberg, Judith Goldberg, David Levine, Marshall Morris and Ward Riley. Also attending the installation was Pace College's Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Joseph Sinzer. Dr. Sinzer replied to Dr. Beard's remarks and expressed the hope that Pace will continue her many-faceted debate program.

In November, 1969, Pace hosted the Eastern Forensic Association's Mid-Year Debate Championship Tournament, which it substituted for its own Ninth Annual C. Richard Pace Memorial Debate Tournament. More than 40 teams from the Northeast participated in the two-day debate and public speaking competition.

A banquet followed the installation with a champagne toast to the success of the current undergraduate debaters at the college. Leadership of the new chapter is in the hands of Marshall Morris and David Levine, co-presidents.

STUDENT FORUM: WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE IDEAL DEBATE JUDGE?

TIM WRIGHT

Washington & Lee University

Despite varying degrees of emphasis on several aspects of debating (i.e., evidence, organization, "clash," etc.), it appears obvious that one factor is the most crucial. The other features of debate notwithstanding, that one factor (in *any* debate) is the submission and defense of *issues*. The relevance, significance and validity of the issues in any debate is the single essential item of the contest.

If the above position is accepted as valid, the role of the judge becomes evident, and the "ideal judge" is readily defined. Because the task of determining which of the issues are most relevant, significant and valid falls to the judge, the *ideal* judge is, naturally, the one whose perception, acceptance and criticism of the issues are based on the most rational grounds. This is obvious, and many who are active in debating or judging would assert that the practice of rationality (where issues are concerned) is followed today. However, it appears that methods of judging (due, unfortunately, to methods of debating) have tended to preclude the most rational evaluation of the arguments.

Such preclusion is the result of debate techniques which have become inherent. The emphasis is now on establishing "points," defending "points," and avoiding failure to respond to "points." It should be clear that "points" and "issues" are NOT synonymous. The latter is the whole of which the former are parts. It has become the accepted *modus operandi* both to debate and to determine the outcome of debates on the basis of the relative number of points "dropped" by each team. Such a practice de-emphasizes the importance of broader (though not less specific) argumentation and relegates the judge to the position of mere auditor who copies down points and checks them off on his flow.

The conclusion is evident. The "ideal judge" is the critic who is less concerned with verbal answers to slender statements than with relevant, significant, valid issues. Debaters themselves, by comparing flow sheets, could determine who dropped fewer points. The judge is necessary for the evaluation of issues; the ideal judge is the one who evaluates *issues*.

KATHY SHIRLEY

College of William and Mary

The Ideal Debate Judge, somewhat like Plato's Ideas, probably exists in an upper realm of Being somewhere never to be truly known by anyone—

Ed. note: The Student Forum Feature has been developed in cooperation with Don Cage, Second Vice-President of the Student Council of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha in 1969-70 and an Associate Editor of *Speaker and Gavel*. We wish to thank the four students who wrote the essays printed here for their thoughtful contributions. Any responses to these ideas or suggestions for future forums of this kind will be gladly received.

much less a lowly debater! Yet there are many 'images' of the Ideal traveling on the debate circuit today. What, then, should their characteristics be?

Now, certainly, all judges can listen; they can write and consequently take a flo sheet of a debate; and, all most surely have knowledge of debate techniques and of which elements go into the making of a good debate. But the virtue of an ideal debate judge is not that he can do each of these things, but that he can do them in a critical manner.

That is, he doesn't sit passively in his chair in the back of the room and merely observe the debate round. He actively listens, all the while thinking right along with the speaker—but at the same time, he never "*debates*" with the speaker; this he leaves to the other team! An ideal judge, then, is alert.

Along the same lines, while listening critically, he will keep in mind those techniques essential for a good debate, and demand they be incorporated in the debate. The ideal judge, then, knows his subject.

While listening, the ideal judge is also taking notes. Granted, arguments are sometimes rather difficult to follow, and may not be arranged in the most logical or simple manner possible. And, it is the *debater's* responsibility to make his arguments clear. Yet the judge has a similar responsibility to keep track of the arguments, to follow the progress of the debate. An ideal judge will do this well.

Finally when it comes to filling out the ballot, the ideal judge will make his decision on the merits of the debate itself. Certainly his own prejudices will enter in to some extent, but the ideal judge will not be guided solely by them, or by what he "would really have liked to have heard." Instead, he will judge the debate on what he *did* hear. If he has listened critically, taken an adequate flo sheet, and has knowledge of what makes a good debater and a good debate, then his decision will be a fair one.

Let me conclude with the thought that a judge will have more of an opportunity to be "ideal" if the debaters themselves strive to be more "ideal."

RICHARD D. RAUM

University of Vermont

The ideal debate judge is, of course, the one who consistently gives my team victories. Beyond that, however, a superior judge is one who evaluates the debate in terms of both argumentative and persuasive concerns. Specifically, through the constructive speeches he briefs and pays particularly close attention to the development, strength, and clash of arguments; then sits back during rebuttals and, while still giving considerable importance to arguments, becomes more interested in being persuaded to believe the relative values of the positions. The decision ought to be a weighing of the effectiveness of each. If he neglects the former, the debate can easily become an hour of emotional appeals, lies, distortions, and irrelevancies. If he neglects the latter, the debate no longer is an experience in dealing with human beings, but with some machine-like, cold, heartless, methodical, argument-counter. Unfortunately, there is too much of this sort of thing going on. Were all judges to evaluate a debate in this manner, debating would not only be more enjoyable and less frustrating than it is now, but it would also be a more worthwhile experience, with greater application in later life.

TOM WALSH AND DAVID BAWCOM
Texas Tech University

Every debater in the country fears the day he walks into a debate round and finds a disaster imminent. We all have a picture of the world's worst judge—little old lady attired in a traditionally long dress, a yellow flowered hat, knitting a sweater, waiting for the debate round she is about to judge to be over.

The example may be slightly extreme but too many times this situation is approached in our "college" debate tournaments.

The most important characteristic of the perfect debate judge would have to be attentiveness. He should care about the debate and follow the issues closely, but not so closely as to frown violently on bad points or agree heartily on good ones. The debate is to be left to the debaters.

Probably the second most important qualification is a knowledge of debate, preferably a formerly successful debater and currently successful coach. He should be able to recognize the important points of the debate, to determine if the obligations of the participants have been met, and evaluate the speaker's ability to give a "good" speech.

Another vital requirement is knowledge of the debate topic. A good judge will accept the fact that not every topical case requires the elimination of intervention or the military-industrial complex. (Unless the team is able to obscure it in an ambiguous first affirmative.) The ultimate judge will also understand the fundamental terms used in a debate. An example would be knowledge of the difference between a grant-in-aid and a Walter Heller.

When debaters are performing before an attentive and knowledgeable judge one other non-essential may be added—a sense of humor. Fortunately, this element does not seem to be completely lacking on the debate circuit.

Finally, with all the desirable characteristics of a perfect debate judge present, one of the two debate teams in many rounds will always be convinced that the decision was a squirrel.

REQUEST FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH MANUSCRIPTS

Scholarly manuscripts on the subject of freedom of speech are requested by the Committee on Freedom of Speech, Speech Association of America, for possible publication in the *1970 Yearbook on Freedom of Speech*. Also, any teacher who has designed a course in free speech is asked to submit his syllabus to be considered for publication. Send contributions no later than October 1, 1970, to: Thomas L. Tedford, Editor, *1970 Yearbook on Freedom of Speech*, Dept. of Drama and Speech, UNC-G, Greensboro, N. C. 27412.

Chapters and Sponsors

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

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Hamilton, Clinton, N. Y.	J. Franklin Hunt
Hampden-Sydney, Hampden-Sydney, Va.	D. M. Allan
Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	Marian Smith
Hanover, Hanover, Ind.	Stanley B. Wheeler
Hartford, Hartford, Conn.	Joyce Milliken
Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii	Dean Ellis
Hiram, Hiram, Ohio	Keith Leonard
Howard, Washington, D. C.	Leroy Giles
Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	Tom Jennes
Illinois, Urbana, Ill.	Joseph W. Wenzel
Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.	E. C. Chenoweth
Indiana State, Terre Haute, Ind.	Donald J. Shields
Iowa State, Ames, Iowa	James Weaver
Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	Robert Kemp
John Carroll, Cleveland, Ohio	Austin J. Freeley
Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas	Donn W. Parson
Kansas State, Manhattan, Kansas	Jack Kingsley
Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	Gifford Blyton
Kings, Wilkes Barre, Pa.	Robert E. Connelly
Knox, Galesburg, Ill.	Tom Crabtree
Lehigh, Bethlehem, Pa.	H. Barrett Davis
Lincoln Memorial, Harrogate, Tenn.	Earl H. Smith
Louisiana State, Baton Rouge, La.	Harold Mixon
Loyola, Baltimore, Md.	Stephan W. McNiernay
Loyola, Chicago, Ill.	Elaine Bruggemeier
Manchester, North Manchester, Ind.	Ronald L. Aungst
Mankato State, Mankato, Minn.	Elizabeth Morehouse
Marquette, Milwaukee, Wisc.	John Lewinski
Maryland, College Park, Md.	Bonnie Buenger
Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.	Ronald Matlon
Memphis State, Memphis, Tenn.	Charles L. Montgomery
Mercer, Macon, Georgia	Mrs. Gerre G. Price
Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	J. Robert Olian
Miami, Oxford, Ohio	Deborah M. Peters
Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.	C. William Colburn
Michigan State, East Lansing, Mich.	Donald P. Cushman
Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.	Bernard L. Brock
Missouri, Columbia, Mo.	James Gibson
Montana, Missoula, Mont.	Robert Boren
Morehouse, Atlanta, Ga.	Robert Brisbane
Morgan State, Baltimore, Md.	Harold B. Chinn
Murray State, Murray, Ky.	James Albert Tracy
Muskingum, New Concord, Ohio	Judson Ellerton
Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.	Donald O. Olson
Nevada, Reno, Nev.	Robert S. Griffin
New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.	William O. Gilsdorf
New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.	W. C. Eubank
New Mexico Highlands, Las Vegas, N. M.	Walter F. Brunet
New York (Univ. Hts.), New York, N. Y.	Norman Puffett
New York (Wash. Sq.), New York, N. Y.	David Leahy
North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.	Bert E. Bradley
North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.	Richard R. Marks
Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa	Lillian R. Wagner

Chapter Name, Address	Faculty Sponsor
Northwestern, Evanston, Ill.	Thomas B. McClain
Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.	Leonard Sommer
Oberlin, Oberlin, Ohio	Daniel J. Goulding
Occidental, Los Angeles, Calif.	Gary K. Paben
Ohio, Athens, Ohio	Ted J. Foster
Ohio State, Columbus, Ohio	
Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware, Ohio	Ed Robinson
Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.	Paul Barefield
Oregon, Eugene, Ore.	
Oregon State, Corvallis, Ore.	Thurston E. Doler
Pace, New York, N. Y.	Frank Colbourn
Pacific, Forest Grove, Ore.	Albert C. Hingington
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.	Miceal P. Carr
Pennsylvania State, University Park, Pa.	Clayton H. Schug
Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Thomas Kane
Purdue, Lafayette, Ind.	Henry L. Ewbank
Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.	Howard I. Streifford
Randolph-Macon, Ashland, Va.	Edgar E. MacDonald
Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.	Richard W. Roth
Richmond, Richmond, Va.	Max Graeper
Roanoke, Salem, Va.	William R. Coulter
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y.	Joseph Fitzpatrick
Rollins, Winter Park, Fla.	Dean F. Graunke
Rutgers, New Brunswick, N. J.	E. James Goodwin
St. Anselm's, Manchester, N. H.	John A. Lynch
St. Cloud State, St. Cloud, Minn.	William R. McCleary
St. Lawrence, Canton, N. Y.	Joan O. Donovan
Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.	Brad Bishop
San Francisco State, San Francisco, Calif.	Henry E. McGuckin, Jr.
University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.	Kathy Corey
South Alabama, Mobile, Ala.	Howard Pelham
South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.	Merrill G. Christophersen
South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.	Robert Emry
Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.	James McBath
Southern Methodist, Dallas, Texas	Richard Sinzinger
Southwest Missouri State, Springfield, Mo.	Don Stanton
Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.	Bettie Hudgens
Stanford, Palo Alto, Calif.	Kenneth E. Mosier
State Univ. of N. Y. at Albany, Albany, N. Y.	Jeanine Rice
State Univ. of N. Y., Harpur College, Binghamton	Eugene Vasilew
Susquehanna, Selinsgrove, Penna.	Larry Augustine
Syracuse, Syracuse, N. Y.	Paul R. McKee
Tampa, Tampa, Fla.	Hugh Fellows
Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.	Ralph Towne
Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.	Norma C. Cook
Texas, Austin, Texas	John F. Schunk
Texas Tech, Lubbock, Texas	P. Merville Larson
Tulane, New Orleans, La.	Ralph Calderaro
Ursinus, Collegeville, Pa.	Joseph E. Vannucchi
Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	George A. Adamson
Utah State, Logan, Utah	Rex E. Robinson
Valdosta State, Valdosta, Ga.	Helen Thornton
Vanderbilt, Nashville, Tenn.	Kassian Kovalcheck
Vermont, Burlington, Vt.	Robert Huber

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

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

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

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

Other individuals and libraries are welcome to subscribe to *Speaker and Gavel*. Subscription orders should be sent to Allen Press, P. O. Box 368, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.



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.