

“A Proposal . . .” Evaluated

THEODORE NELSON

The author of “A Proposal for Future National Conventions,” in his closing paragraph, invited rejoinders and evaluations of his proposal. In a genuine spirit of good will, I am constrained to accept this invitation, since there seems to me to be much in the proposal that ought to be challenged.

I find it difficult to imagine anything better than this scheme to divert a national Pi Kappa Delta Convention from its historic purpose. To start with, the basic assumption motivating the plan is that “the ‘long’ convention will continue on the justification that the convention features (particularly business) are what makes this experience different from the usual tournament.” This identification of “convention features” with “particularly business” really is puzzling. After more than passing acquaintance with these national conventions, I cannot recall that those who have planned and administered them ever believed that conducting business was a feature that justified a convention of more than normal tournament length. The business meetings have provided delegates an incidental, valuable experience in democratic processes, but, to my knowledge, have not been a primary reason for prolonging the convention. My understanding has been that the convention’s main purpose has been to provide Pi Kappa Delta students an opportunity to receive training and experience in various forms of speaking activities. The constitutionally stated purpose of Pi Kappa Delta is “to stimulate progress in, and to promote the interests of intercollegiate oratory and debate and public speaking. . . .” How can one reconcile this with the assumption that the “long” convention is justified by convention features, particularly business? Arguments for four and a half day conventions have been based on the difficulty of scheduling the traditional pattern of contests and such convention features as speakers, tours, dances, talent shows and business meetings within shorter time limits.

Theodore Nelson is director of forensics at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, and a former national president of Pi Kappa Delta.

Obviously, if the assumption as to the purpose of national conventions as expressed in “A Proposal. . .” is not valid, then the plan itself must be evaluated on the basis that it might add to the incidental values of the national convention. Even on this ground, however, the proposal, it seems to me, falls short. The alleged goal of the plan is to make business sessions “so effective that a majority of those attending will feel they had a part in the decisions that were reached.” My guess is that the proposal would result in so much parliamentary activity and confusion that delegates would feel that the part they had in making decisions was not worth the distractions from the main purpose of the convention, namely, participation in the forensic contests. The basis of this prediction is that the plan is perfectly styled to create tensions and disagreements between faculty sponsors and the National Council and the convention student delegates. This likelihood stems from the differences in perspective that prevails among those whose affiliation with the fraternity extends over a period of years in contrast to students whose affiliation has been, at the most, two or three years and whose attendance at national conventions normally is not repeated. Let it be noted that this is not an indictment of students: it is a psychological tendency produced by long-range responsibility for the organization. If the roles of faculty sponsors and students were interchanged, I suspect the same tendency would exist.

Let us see how this plan might work in practice. On Monday of the convention (from 11:00 to 12:00 according to the projected time schedule) the Legislative House would meet. As original business a student delegate would propose that membership in Pi Kappa Delta be limited to students who have participated in intercollegiate debating. After heated debate, the proposal might pass. The next afternoon, again according to schedule, after a veto by the National Council on the grounds of unconstitutionality, the Legislative House and the Legislative

Senate must act to sustain or override the veto. The tension builds as student delegates caucus in the halls and in their rooms. Some discerning delegate discovers that the constitution can be amended by the same two-thirds vote as required to override the veto. So while the student delegates in the House proceed to do just that, other students (except oratory delegates, of course) invade the meeting of the Senate to discuss the matter before the ten Province Governors, who, one might suspect, would find it difficult to antagonize voters by ignoring the pressure of a possible two-thirds majority. Though it is difficult to determine two-thirds of ten, let's assume that six of the ten governors concur with the Legislative House and the National Council is overruled and the constitution is amended.

I would suspect that by this time the interest of the Convention would be largely parliamentary, and that delegates and faculty sponsors might wonder if there were justification for taking students half way across the nation to promote student-faculty tension. Even more important, they also might wonder if Pi Kappa Delta could long survive reckless modification by enthusiastic delegates.

Another weakness of the proposal, it seems to this writer, is the assignment of the power to nominate national officers to a body which contains the most likely candidates for those positions. Presumably, the proposal means by "national officers" under item two, the members of the National Council, since there are no nominations, under present constitutional provisions, of the president and the vice-president. These are chosen automatically from the members of the National Council. If the plan is to nominate others than National Council members, the proposal is even more undesirable, since it would open the way to electing national officers without previous experience in the administration of the fraternity's affairs. One must infer, therefore, that the intention is for the Legislative Senate to nominate the candidates for the National Council. This group would be hard-pressed to avoid nominating someone from their own group, which is hardly the practice of a democratic nominating committee.

To sum up, then, the proposal stems

from a questionable assumption as to the purpose of national conventions, and any attempt to put it into effect would detract from what has been the main purpose of these national assemblies. Furthermore, it might very well stimulate conflict and tension between student delegates and faculty sponsors. As the proposal distributes power, the nature of Pi Kappa Delta might change in ways not according to the long-range interests of the organization. Finally, there is considerable doubt as to the wisdom of turning the nomination of the national officers over to a group having such political interest in the administration of the organization.

A Keynoter's Dilemma

(Continued from page 11)

note addresses, one to the convention delegates which would not be broadcast, and a different one via TV and radio which the convention delegates would not hear "live"; or (2) have two men serve as keynote speakers with one of them speaking untelevised to the convention delegates, and the other directing his speech to the listening and viewing audience via radio and TV. This latter suggestion might even be accomplished with both men speaking simultaneously.

Frank G. Clement's attempts to elicit responses from two different types of audiences by adapting his selection and treatment of materials *only* to one of these two audiences, the Democrats, produced ambivalent results in 1956—effective to the Democrats, but ineffective to the Republicans and independents. However, although circumstances and applied speech principles were not employed in his favor, this writer believes that his basic concept is sound. This concept—that his duty was to arouse the support of *all* Americans—implies the possibility of more significant results than the mere invigorating of the party faithfuls. It seems safe to speculate that if further research by mass communications scholars bears out the findings discussed in this paper, then ex-Governor Frank G. Clement's well-intentioned but misguided keynote of 1956 will be overshadowed by his vision and astuteness in his unprecedented paving-the-way for more effective and far-reaching keynote addresses via the picturized airwaves.

An Ancient Force in Action Today—Ethos

PETER L. EPPINGA

In the fourth century before Christ, Aristotle said that a speaker's *ethos* "is his most potent means of persuasion." *Ethos* Aristotle defined as a speaker's intelligence, character and good will. Further, in discussing each of these characteristics, he stated that one who reasons prudently and wisely, who has a virtuous character, and who convinces others that he wishes them good things for their sake and not for his own earns the belief of his audience. The fact that this idea was first expressed more than 2,200 years ago does not diminish its importance as a vital factor in influencing people in today's world. In fact, contemporary speech scholars agree that it is "one of the vital factors in determining response to persuasive stimuli."

Perhaps one of the most spectacular demonstrations of the effectiveness of *ethos* was exhibited by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon during his Latin American trip in May, 1958. Before we can fully understand the effect of his *ethos*, we must look at Mr. Nixon's entire trip in retrospect. At the first four places visited (Montevideo, Uruguay; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Asuncion, Paraguay; and La Paz, Bolivia) there was no trouble, no hostility. The entire complexion of the trip changed, however, in Lima, Peru, when mobs spit on, shoved and stoned Mr. Nixon. Although there was no violence in Quito, Ecuador, and Bogota, Colombia, the worst experience of the trip was still awaiting the Nixon party when they arrived in Caracas, Venezuela. When their cars were blocked by a traffic jam, mobs armed with stones and clubs attempted to break into the cars and drag Mr. and Mrs. Nixon and the members of their party out. Another incident in Caracas was the discovery of four hundred Molotov cocktails near a plaza where Mr.

Nixon was to have laid a wreath (because of mob violence, he decided not to attempt the wreath-laying ceremony). The cocktails were found after the event was to have taken place! So you see that Mr. Nixon encountered some very real threats to his safety and the safety of all who were with him. What lay behind these threats? What were the reasons for the dislike of Mr. Nixon by the Latin Americans?

The reasons for these insults to Mr. Nixon and the country he represented are complex, but can be broken down, for practical purposes, into three major sources of irritation. The first of these is the United States' apparent attitude toward dictators. We are criticized because we recognize dictator regimes too quickly, and in particular the Venezuelans were especially disgusted because their ousted dictator, Perez Jimenez, was living at ease in the United States. In spite of the fact that Mr. Nixon emphasized the U. S.'s desire to extradite Jimenez if Venezuela requested it, the Latin Americans still construed his presence in the U. S. and our recognition of dictator regimes as attempts by the U. S. to withhold the benefits of democracy from them and keep them in anarchy.

Secondly, the economic problems of the Latin American countries were a major source of irritation preceding and during Mr. Nixon's trip. Most of the countries he visited were going through hard times and tended to blame the U. S. for them. In Venezuela, a country rich in petroleum products, the people were angered because restrictions had to be imposed by the U. S. on imports of Venezuelan petroleum. In Peru, where the first outbreak of hostility occurred, the people were fearful lest the U. S. impose tariffs on lead and zinc, which are the country's chief exports. Now, in this issue of economic dependence, unless we in the U. S. are very careful to consider all sides of a question, we are likely to alienate someone by hitting them where it

Peter L. Eppinga is a pre-law student at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. He was a Pi Kappa Deltan at Hope College before transferring.

hurts—in the pocketbook. The difficulty is that since the close of World War II when the U. S. was forced to emerge not only as a world participator, but also as a world leader, we have been so consumed with the immense problems in the “front yard” that we have relegated the problems in the “back yard” to a position of lesser consideration.

These two irritations were certainly enough to agitate the people of Latin America against Nixon and the U. S. To exploit this agitation and build it up into an explosive force was the aim of the Communists in Latin America. Their infiltration of student groups provided them with the means to do so. Student groups in Latin America are numerically strong, politically active, and experienced in street demonstrations; they can cause a maximum disturbance with a maximum of impunity. An example of the effect of this can be seen in the mob demonstrations in Venezuela. In the shouting mobs lining the street and trying to break into his car in Caracas, Mr. Nixon saw many who were of the “student age” group.

In addition to the students, the Communists stirred up discontent among all the people by stressing the blame of the U. S. for their economic problems. But the Communists were not satisfied with merely arousing the Latin Americans against the U. S. as a whole. To create a personal dislike of Mr. Nixon, the Communists depicted him as a typical Yankee warmonger and exploiter. This was particularly effective, since the Latin Americans have a latent dislike for their “overrich Yankee neighbor,” anyway. The stories that the Communists spread among the people, coupled with the basic dislike and distrust of the U. S. inherent in the people of Latin America, instilled in many a hate for Nixon before he even arrived. On May Day, placards and slogans in the May Day Parade in Caracas proclaimed him a “world villain.” To these people, this was no joke! They believed the validity of their statements and showed it by the “unreasoning hate in the faces of the mob” that Mr. Nixon saw in Caracas.

Now, how did Mr. Nixon demonstrate *ethos*? His *ethos* was exhibited first of all by what he said. When the Communists saw that his speeches were pleasing the Latin Americans, they turned from booing

and catcalls to open violence. How he met this challenge is a second very interesting part of his *ethos*. For in order to prove the possession of intelligence, character and good will, a speaker must be prepared to demonstrate these qualities by his actions as well as by his words. Let us see how Mr. Nixon did both.

Primarily, his message was one that the Latin Americans were happy to hear. His theme was freedom and progress for both Americas, and he said that the only war the U. S. wants to fight is a war against poverty, disease and misery. Furthermore, he endorsed the recent revolutions in Venezuela, Colombia and Argentina against dictator regimes. Now, by saying these things, Mr. Nixon was effectively demonstrating to the people his *ethos*—his intelligence, character and good will. One of the most important ways in which a speaker can impress an audience with his intelligence is to reveal a familiarity with the auditors' present interests. If the audience is to believe that the speaker possesses character and good will, he must identify himself properly with their problems. What were the Latin American people interested in? They were interested in the basic problems of life—poverty, disease, misery and freedom—and to them anyone who wanted to help rid them of these problems possessed virtuous character and good will toward them.

In addition to Mr. Nixon's ideas, his presentation of them made a great impression on the people he encountered. Mobs and quiet individuals alike often asked him hostile, “loaded” questions about U. S. policies. To these, as well as to easier questions, he always made a point of replying directly, or, as one source put it, “of saying yes or no, instead of *manana*.” In these cases what he said was certainly important, but perhaps of even more importance was the fact that the people knew he had said something. The effect of Mr. Nixon's unwillingness to be evasive was pointed out by an Ecuadoran newspaper, *El Comercio*: “Without a doubt, the Vice President won the greatest triumph to which a man in public life can aspire—the affection of the people.” The reason for Mr. Nixon's “greatest triumph” was that the people believed, because he answered questions simply and directly, that he wanted to make friends and clear up misunderstandings.

On the last half of the trip, the hostility

of the people reduced Mr. Nixon's chances to reach them merely with formal speeches. However, he did engage in informal debating with students. This action was criticized because some politicians and newspapermen here at home felt it was "beneath his dignity" to debate with students. But his dignity did not suffer; on the contrary, his prestige was increased. In this type of debating, we see his *ethos* actively exhibited, since here again Mr. Nixon attempted to create a favorable impression by using candor and straightforwardness, combined with sincerity—all of which are excellent manifestations of one's *ethos*.

Mr. Nixon's other major demonstration of *ethos* was his display of courage. He was confronted with mobs which called him names, spit on him, struck him, and stoned him. Yet he faced these mobs in a fearless, composed manner. Aside from sustaining him in these experiences, Mr. Nixon's courage proved to be an asset in another way. The Spanish people despise fear and have a great admiration for courage, and thus Mr. Nixon's courage in itself earned a great deal of admiration for him. That Mr. Nixon's courage was respected was evidenced by the fact that the Peruvian newspapermen ended their press conference following his encounter with the stone-throwing mobs in Lima with speeches of praise, instead of questions. This incident verifies Aristotle's statement that in order to display *ethos* by proving good will, the speaker must conform to those things which are pleasing to the audience. Therefore, the violence itself afforded Mr. Nixon the opportunity to make a favorable impression upon the Latin American people, who respect courage. This was emphasized in a telegram from *Life* Correspondent Donald Wilson in Lima, Peru: "By his courage and imagination, Nixon has turned a tricky situation into a diplomatic triumph."

We have seen how Mr. Nixon's *ethos* was a very powerful force in his Latin American tour in May, 1958. It is used most effectively in a combination of what the speaker says and what he does, for only in a well-coordinated use of the two can the *ethos* of a speaker most fully succeed in "allaying fear, smothering doubt, and breeding confidence." The basic measurement of *ethos* is considering the prestige of a speaker before he delivers his speech, and considering the effect on his prestige by the

speech. It has been evident that Mr. Nixon's prestige in Latin America increased. In addition, it increased throughout the world. The British, for example, previously had "a haze of impressions left by his political speeches and fostered by his political opponents." After the trip, they congratulated him on "doing brilliantly." However, nowhere did Mr. Nixon's display of *ethos* more greatly enhance his prestige than in his own country. Evidences of this were the welcoming crowd of 100,000 led by President Eisenhower, and the 25,000 letters, telegrams and postcards he received.

So, we see that Mr. Nixon's prestige certainly was increased here and in other parts of the world as a result of his trip. The extent of the increase will never be completely known. But, without a doubt, Mr. Nixon's *ethos* on this trip went a long way toward showing the people of the world, enemies and friends of the U. S. alike, that we are neither warmongers nor cowards. Perhaps more men like Mr. Nixon can better demonstrate to the world what we believe in. Perhaps by demonstrating the "*ethos*" of our nation—by telling and showing all peoples of the world that we want to be their *friends*, neither their *masters* nor their *slaves*—we can still preserve Man and give him his freedom.

THE MAY FORENSIC

Copy deadline for the May FORENSIC is April 21, 1962. Please send your copy as far in advance of that date as possible to the appropriate editor.

Remember—

Alumni News to Professor Frank T. Alusow, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.

Chapter Notes to Professor John M. Burt, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota.

Student Contributions to Professor L. A. Lawrence, Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana.

Wanted—

1. Pictures which reflect the accomplishments, the personalities, even the eccentricities of Pi Kappa Deltans. If some member of your chapter, whether active or alumnus, receives an award, is elected a beauty queen, or is involved in any newsworthy event, send us a picture. We need feature photographs of the kind that will interest all our members.

2. Articles written by student members. THE FORENSIC will pay \$10.00 for each student article which is deemed worth printing. Admittedly, this is not a large sum, and we are sorry we cannot pay more, but surely there are students with ideas on forensics which they want to share with others. Articles should be approximately 1,000 words in length and should be accompanied by the name, school address, and class standing of the author.

Chapter Notes

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE COLLEGE

Dr. Capel would like to call attention to a change in dates for the annual Piney Woods Debate Tournament at Stephen F. Austin State College. Previously held in March the tournament will now take place on February 16 and 17, 1962.

Stephen F. Austin sponsors a High School debate tournament February 23 and 24, 1962. Because the reaction was so favorable to the high school tournament last year, the program has been expanded this year. Two divisions for the high school debate tournament will include Division I: 3-A and 4-A high schools, and Division II: 2-A schools and below. *Of special interest to senior students:* Any or all members of the winning teams who are seniors will be awarded a \$250 scholarship in debate at SFA for the following year. Trophies will be awarded for first and second prize winners in both Division I and Division II.

Stephen F. Austin's debate team will participate for the second year in the Sinclair television debate. On Sunday March 4, 1962, SFA meets Southern Methodist University to debate the general topic—*Higher Standards for Entrance Requirements for State Colleges.*

Subject: Forensics Events of the Past

The Pi Kappa Delta workshop was held this year at SFA; October 13 and 14, 1961. At this meeting Hank Brown, the president of the Texas AFL-CIO represented labor, and Attorney H. L. Deakins from a law firm in Houston represented management. Attorney Tom Sneff, representing a Nacogdoches law firm did the summary of the legal aspects of the proposition.

In general, SFA debate teams will attend ten to twelve tournaments this season with 25 to 30 debaters. Dr. Capel also reports a 50 per cent increase of debate scholarships at SFA this season.



SFA DEBATERS—The above group of SFA students recently returned from Ada, Oklahoma, where they attended the 25th Annual Invitational Tournament at East Central State College of Oklahoma. The debaters received top honors at the tournament, and made the overall highest ratings of any school there. Pictured left to right, front row, are: Miss Janet James of Lufkin; Mrs. Joan Kane, Palestine; Miss Kim Gutteridge, Orange; Miss Martha Bucklew, Houston; and Mrs. Carol Myers, Henderson. Back row: John Fondren, Maydelle; Charles Little, Beaumont; Robert Goodroe, Jefferson; John Hare, Elkhart; Jimmy Palmer, Houston; Rodney Richey, Omaha; and John Patrick Bell, Nacogdoches.

The enclosed photograph should help explain the last entry of past events. The photo shows 12 of the 14 debaters that went to Ada, Oklahoma. SFA scored a Superior in the Novice Division and in the Men's Division and an Excellent in the Women's Division (Decisions based on sweepstake points). SFA also scored the highest number of sweepstake points of all the schools present.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY

Prior to the Christmas recess, thirty-one Baylor University debaters attended five tournaments and participated in a total of eighty-eight debates. They won sixty-two and lost twenty-six debates for a winning percentage of seventy per cent. Their winnings included seven awards for first place or superior rating and eleven awards for second place or excellent rating in various contests.

The Baylor debaters participated in a demonstration debate with North Texas State University before the Texas Speech Convention in October. They engaged the University of Texas in another demonstration debate at the University of Houston workshop in November. Two Baylor teams staged a television debate in November over a local television station. Mike Henke, president of the Baylor debate club, was one of four students invited to participate in a demonstration debate at the Convention of the Speech Association of America in



Left to right: the Cambridge gentlemen, David Saunders and Leon Brittan; and the ladies from Akron, Theda Cumbridge and Patricia Perkins.

New York City. Professor Glenn R. Capp has been busy conducting workshops in debate the past summer and fall; at David Lipscomb College in Nashville, Tennessee; at Hardin Simmons University in Abilene, Texas; at Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos, Texas; at Fort Sam Houston, Texas; and at the Baylor campus.

AN INTERNATIONAL INCIDENT

History repeated itself at Akron U. this year—England and the U. S. clashed again and the U. S. won. Just as in history, the two opponents finally ended up friends and allies. For the record, here is the story of the new conflict.

When Pat Perkins and I were asked to debate the team from England's Cambridge University in AU's biennial event, we were very pleased and quickly accepted. We selected our debate topic from a list of twelve they sent us, ranging from "Chivalry Is Dead" to "Better Red Than Dead." From the biographies of our two opponents we expected them to be very intelligent, formal, and gentlemanly in the true sense of the word. Mr. Frank Alusow, our Director of Forensics, had arranged for us to have dinner with them before the debate and had planned a small party at his house afterward. Pat and I looked forward to a very intellectual evening of discussing (and perhaps solving) some of the world's problems. We learned that we were the first two-woman team the Britishers were debating, and the event seemed even more interesting. We looked forward to it with great enthusiasm.

Then, a week before the Cambridge team was to arrive, a United Press International story appeared in our local paper, headlined NO CHIVALRY AT CAMBRIDGE. The story read:

A girl law student who broke tradition and sneaked into the all-male Cambridge Union Society's meeting was pushed down Tuesday night and knocked unconscious.

Jill Boulind, 19, and two other girls crashed the debate. Witnesses said all three were pushed down by shouting male undergraduates when they were discovered.

I think you can understand why Pat and I lost a lot of our enthusiasm to meet the Englishmen. If Cambridge men were so

violently aroused when three girls even tried to *listen* to them, how would they react when two girls not only listened but debated them? Now when we saw the posters on campus announcing that the British were coming, we felt as Paul Revere must have felt when he saw the lights in the tower announcing the same thing.

The Black Monday of the debate arrived too soon. Pat and I were rather late for the dinner and resolved to stay only long enough to force down our meal and then leave. Mr. Alusow introduced us to David Saunders and Leon Brittan. The brilliant, scintillating conversation we had anticipated two weeks ago was instead mere commonplace: How was your trip? How do you like America? Is Akron very large?, etc. Then David made a witty remark which Pat couldn't resist, and she immediately replied to it. Leon returned with another witty remark and the conversation lost any touch of the ordinary. Pat and I will remember it as one of the funniest and most fascinating conversations we've ever had.

The debate that evening was just as enjoyable. We debated the topic "Red China Should Be Admitted Into the U. N."—David and Leon on the affirmative, Pat and I on the negative. The house divided against the motion by four votes, and the U. S. won again. (But please remember that this was with an audience obviously prejudiced in our favor. As in the historical struggle, we were fighting on our own land.)

At the party that evening, we completely revised the opinion we had held of them before they arrived. Perhaps a one-word description of them would be "charming." We were very sorry to see them leave; and if we have the opportunity to participate in another international forensic event, we'll accept eagerly. If your school ever has the opportunity to meet the Cambridge debaters, we sincerely urge you to do so. If it's not interesting and fun for everyone concerned, we'll turn in our PI KAP keys.

THEDA CUMBRIDGE
Junior at the
University of Akron

ST. OLAF COLLEGE

The Minnesota Beta of Pi Kappa Delta at St. Olaf College in Northfield will celebrate its fortieth anniversary this spring. The three hundred St. Olaf alumni who have been members of the chapter are in-

vited to an anniversary banquet on May 18, 1962.

This anniversary year marks the beginning of a drive to raise funds for a St. Olaf Pi Kappa Delta Forensic Scholarship for qualified speech students.

On February 1-3, 1962, the Pi Kap chapter sponsored its Seventh Annual High School Speech Tournament. Thirty high schools from five states participated in debate and three individual forensic events. The sweepstakes winner this year was Duluth Denfeld High School from Duluth, Minnesota.

The St. Olaf Pi Kap Chapter's President is Lois Christensen, and the advisor is Dr. Theodore Nelson.

This year has also found the St. Olaf debate squad, under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Wilkens, traveling to many tournaments. Teams have participated in nine tourneys in five states.

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

Officers elected for the coming year are Gary Collier, President; Steve Mann, Vice-President; and Al Haber, Secretary-Treasurer.

Former debater and PKD member at U.C.L.A., Prof. Paul Rosenthal, has been added to the staff and will be Assistant Director of Forensics this year.

A busy year has been scheduled, with our participation planned at 19 tournaments.

NEBRASKA STATE COLLEGE

The Nebraska Zeta Chapter, at Kearney, helped with the annual intercollegiate debate and discussion tournament on the Kearney campus on Nov. 18. This event annually draws schools from a seven state area. This year our special guests were the U. S. Air Force Academy debaters from Colorado Springs. Two handsome trophies were given to the winning debate team and the winning school in discussion.

On January 5 and 6, 1962, the local chapter sponsored the High School Debate and Speech Tournament on the Kearney campus. This event has grown to be the largest high school event in Nebraska of its kind. Medals and trophies were given to high ranking contestants.

Under the direction of student presi-

dent Alice Mackey, the Kearney chapter plans to have an initiation for new members in the near future. Recently a fall dinner meeting was held of the local chapter where plans were made for the year. H. L. Ahrendts is chapter sponsor with associate sponsors, C. Fred Phelps and Robert Larson.

TOURNAMENT INVITATION— NEW STYLE

Who could resist an invitation like this? It comes from the fertile mind of Dr. Jim Grissinger, Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio.

"Honorable Judge, Worthy Opponents, Friends . . . my partner and I are delighted to be here at Otterbein¹ today² to debate this very important topic.³ Our case consists essentially of one major point⁴. . ."

¹ The Otterbein Holiday Tournament.

² December 9, 1961.

³ Anti-Trust and all that jazz.

⁴ Write this date on your forensic calendar.

"NO, VIRGINIA"

Jean Wright is denouncing Santa Claus during her opening speech on the motion:

"Santa Claus is a gigantic hoax." On Thursday afternoon from 3:30 to 5, some 60 students matched wits and arguments during a session of the University of Akron's weekly Forensic Union, popular audience-participation debate procedure. For the past five years, just before Christmas, Santa Claus has been debated in one motion form or another. This year, for the first time, Santa Claus lost in a close division of the house.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

At the invitation of the Kent State Chapter, three Pi Kappa Delta schools met on February 15, 1962 for an evening of non-competitive fellowship and discussion on the Kent State campus. Attending were students and faculty from Akron University and Baldwin-Wallace as well as Kent.

After an opening half-hour of conversation and coffee, the group watched a closed-circuit showing of the Army television film, "The West Point National Debate Tournament," obtained from the National Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor. This was followed by an hour's lively discussion of the question, "Are debaters victimized by the tournament system?"



Pictured are Bob Leatherman, chairman; for the motion, Dieter Wegner and Jean Wright; against the motion, Theda Cumbridge and Penny McFarland; and, of course, Santa. All are members of Pi Kappa Delta.

Suggested by Dr. James N. Holm, faculty advisor at Kent, the program was for the purpose of getting Pi Kappa Delta members and their non-member associates together for fellowship on a non-competitive basis, and to promote increased intercollegiate cooperation in the direction of interesting students in speech as an academic field of study. Cooperating were Dr. James Ross of Baldwin-Wallace, and Prof. Frank Alusow of the University of Akron.

Additional meetings for the same purposes are planned by the three schools.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

Forensics at the University of Dayton, Ohio Lambda, has come of age this year. Among notable honors won in three tournaments, are: 1. A gold medal to Jim Herbert, a junior, for first place in Extempore Speaking in the Annual Tournament at Du Quesne University in November. 2. Norman Mitchell, a senior, won Excellent in the final Oratory competition in the big tournament at Illinois State Normal University in January; Jim Herbert won a Superior in Extempore, ranking third in that event; and these two, with John Sikora and Jay Kohr, rated Excellent in Debating. 3. Back home in Ohio, these four speakers tied for first place with debaters from five other colleges in the Annual Ohio Men's Debate Tournament. Each received a medal for excellence but lost in the "lottery" for the grand prize—the Tournament Trophy.

Incidentally, Jim Herbert, author of "University Corner—Reading Rack," is a featured columnist in *The UD Flyer News*.

What Next? The year is yet young. Interesting forensic events beckon and challenge. The Province Tournament at Ypsilanti State University, April 27-28 is definitely on our schedule. We hopefully await "bids" from West Point, and from English University Unions urging us to "Come!" Expense money will—we hope—be advanced. Out our way there is no law to prevent pleasant dreams.

GROVE CITY COLLEGE

The chapter at Grove City College in Grove City, Pennsylvania, initiated the season by setting up a booth at the annual "Organization Fair" during the first week of the semester. Admittedly, this fair is a gimmick for inviting prospective freshmen

into various campus activities, and the incumbent members of Pi Kappa Delta labored through the evening to persuade new students to investigate the merits of debating and so forth. A clever motif, invented by President Jan Machen, proffered the slogan, "Travel With Pi Kappa Delta," as a come-on pitch. It was successful and invoked inquiries that were zealously answered by Pi Kap members.

This year's crop of freshmen who professed interest in debate was more promising than ever. In novice tournaments early this Fall, several of these newcomers gave good accounts of themselves and evinced hopeful signs of becoming first-rate debaters in seasons to come. To date, we have participated in three novice tournaments and two for varsity. The annual Speech Week during February fifth to the ninth was a success. At present we are preparing for a tournament on this campus on March 10, 1962.

CHICO STATE COLLEGE

The Iota Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta at Chico State College has been reorganized recently. The organization has been inactive on this campus for the past four years, and it has become active again. Fourteen new members were initiated on January 4, 1962, and four new officers were installed at this time. The new members are: Richard Silen, Mike Kimerer, Gene Shelton, Stan Hershey, Marjorie MacDonald, Neil McIntyre, Beverly Carter, Thaine Allison, Jean Richardson, Stanley Henderson, Bobbie Riedle, Diana Brambrink, Charles O'Neil, and Carol DeMorst. The new officers are: Stan Hershey, president; Gene Shelton, vice president; Marjorie MacDonald, secretary-treasurer; and, Jean Richardson, recording secretary. A picture of nine of the members and the advisor, Dr. Lloyd Jones, is printed herein.

LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE

The officers of the California Lambda Chapter are John Pridonoff, President; Tal Jones, Vice President; Linda Wolf, Secretary-Treasurer; and Linda James, Corresponding Secretary-Historian.

At the February meeting, Dr. Walter Fisher spoke to chapter members on the subject of speech textbooks. Dr. Fisher received his B.A. and M.A. in speech at San Diego State College, and his Ph.D. at the

University of Iowa. He is now a professor of speech at Los Angeles State College and is completing a textbook on speech.

Recent activities of the chapter include a series of exhibition debates at local high schools in the Los Angeles area. These debates provide debaters with the opportunity to speak before audiences and at the same time promote forensics in the high schools. Also, Pi Kappa Delta represented the debate squad in an organization day on L. A. State's campus.

At the Western Speech Association's convention and tournament in Fresno, David Fox placed 4th in Junior Men's Extemp, and Charlene Bustard and Linda James placed first in Senior Women's Debate. Linda Farley, Arlene Tafoya, Jim Martin, Art Simonian, and Walt Notheis also represented L. A. State at Fresno.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

The University of Arizona is well underway on a forensics tournament schedule that anticipates participation in fourteen meets. Accomplishments so far include: fifth place in senior division of the University of

Wichita tournament, from which Gordon Blount received a gavel as the second best speaker in the tourney; a trophy for the first place in junior impromptu won by Philip Supina at the Western Alternate in Los Angeles; and the first place trophy for junior division debate at the University of New Mexico tournament won by Jon Kyl and Dennis Cox. The Arizona Gamma chapter is looking forward to hosting the eleventh annual Desert Invitational Tournament, February 22-24.

TENNESSEE POLYTECHNIC

Debaters from Tennessee Tech at Cookeville, Tennessee, this year are challenging the school's record as far as consecutive wins are concerned.

David King and Bill Carrington, juniors, have lost only one debate out of 20. They were judged the best negative team at the Dixie tournament in Mercer, Georgia, and took the men's sweepstakes trophy in the Millsaps tournament with eight wins.

Carrington was judged best speaker at Mercer.

The team of Bill Ballard, a sophomore,



WINNERS FROM TENNESSEE TECH—Left to right: Bill Ballard, Leonard Crawford, Jr., Bill Carrington, David King. The trophies being held represent first place at the Mercer tournament, Western Kentucky meet, and the All-Southern tournament of Decatur, Georgia.