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Golden Anniversary Convention

Set for March 19-23, 1963
At Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

Final arrangements for the National Convention which will celebrate Pi Kappa Delta's fiftieth year were completed during the late spring and summer by the National Council and representatives of Southern Illinois University. The Convention will be held on the campus of S.I.U. on the dates of March 19-23, inclusive. Convention headquarters will be in the University Center, which is pictured on the cover of this issue and views from which are to be seen elsewhere in the magazine. Delegates will be housed in beautiful new dormitories located on Thompson Point, on the edge of an attractive artificial lake.

Contest space will be amply provided in the many classroom buildings of this large and rapidly growing university.

As adopted by the National Council at its summer meeting, the Convention Program calls for registration from 1:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on the 19th and for the first business meeting at 8:00 p.m. Important items to be on the agenda for this first meeting will be the election of the Editor of THE FORENSIC and of the National Secretary-Treasurer of Pi Kappa Delta. There will also be a charter presentation to new chapters and a feature speaker of the evening. On Wednesday, March 20, contest
events will begin at 8:15 a.m. with round one of debate and of discussion. A second business meeting for the election of National President and Vice-President will be held in the evening of the same day, as will province meetings. At a third business meeting on Thursday afternoon the National Council will be elected, and that night the Convention Dance will be put on. Set for Friday night is the Convention Banquet at which the Golden Anniversary Awards will be presented and at which a speaker of national prominence will address the fraternity. Final business meeting of the Convention will be held on the afternoon of Saturday, March 23, and announcements of winners will be made as soon as possible thereafter. It is thought that most delegations will be able to make a start for their home campuses early that night. A full program will appear, as usual, in the January Forensic.

In the same issue, a complete listing of all convention and contest committees will be made. Not all assignments have been accepted at this date, but it is felt that it might be to the advantage of chapter sponsors to know at this time the following important committee chairman:

Convention Chairman: Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi

Local Chairman: Jack Parker, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois
Province Coordinator: Harold Larson, Carroll College, Waukesha, Wisconsin
Nominating Committee: Sherod Collins, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville, Missouri
Convention Invitations: Glenn Reddick, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois
Publicity: John Randolph, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri
Constitutional Revision: Theodore Carl, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington
Charter Committee: Georgia Bowman, William Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri
Contest Chairman: Roy Murphy, Southwest Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana
Judging Committee: R. D. Mahaffey, Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon

Any of these chairmen will be glad to answer requests for information.

In general, it looks as though the arrangements which have been made in conjunction with S.I.U. officials are complete and adequate and as though the fiftieth Convention should be one of the best in Pi Kap's history.

The National Council of Pi Kappa Delta pauses long enough in its labors at its summer meeting to take a look at the photographer.
University Center Patio, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.
This is it! The school year of Pi Kappa Delta’s FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY! Welcome back to the campus, to debate activities, and especially welcome back to Pi Kappa Delta business. Much is to be done, both on the local and national levels.

Your National Council met for three days in August near Southern Illinois University to plan and “finalize” details of our forthcoming convention. Committees had to be appointed so they could start functioning. A time schedule had to be worked out for all the events (we are trying to do more in half a day’s less time—and yet avoid any semblance to a “rat-race”). Special events had to be considered and speakers suggested. The selection of fifty famous alumni is still going on.

There will be some changes in the convention format. A new MIXED DEBATE division will be added in response to the suggestion of the last convention. Discussion will be slightly modified. Talent night had to be eliminated, but no doubt will be back at following conventions. Four business meetings will be retained—all of them very important ones. The selection of Editor of THE FORENSIC and Secretary-Treasurer come before the convention this time, as well as the election of the National Council.

The facilities of Southern Illinois University are among the finest we have ever seen. Housing especially is outstanding, with new dormitories possessing private baths for each two rooms. The dorms are located along a beautiful tree-lined lake. The new Student Center has all the recreational facilities one would expect, and is a delight to the eye. We may need 150 classrooms for contests this time, and all efforts are being made to have suitable rooms. The S.I.U. Speech staff and administrative officers have been more than cooperative in making this convention the best ever.

The National Council is preparing publicity for professional journals, newspapers, radio and television. Each local chapter should have a committee to publicize our anniversary, too. Alumni should be contacted, and arrangements made for a local celebration. Our official birthday is May 29.

You can use your official convention booklets to reach alumni and friends. Some chapters plan to sell these booklets to recover the cost of the $25 assessment (each chapter gets 25 copies if its assessment is paid). Consider having a prominent alumnus speak at your chapter banquet or program.

Plan impressive initiation ceremonies this year, and initiate your eligible people. A number of chapters failed to send in new members last year. Talk up Pi Kappa Delta’s Golden Anniversary at the debate tournaments you attend this year. Encourage non-affiliated schools to make application for a charter.

It looks like the “scintillating sixties” will see a “fabulous fiftieth” celebration. Are you laying plans now so that you and your chapter will be present to help celebrate? Remember the date, March 19-23, 1963, at Carbondale, Illinois.
Still More Debate Over Debate

An Answer to Professor Thomas

JAMES C. McCROSKEY

While not being able to claim the privilege of intervening in the debate over debate recently begun in The Forensic on the basis of being an "innocent bystander" as did Prof. Thomas (Forensic, March, 1962), I believe that to let Prof. Thomas' opinions go unanswered would tend to make all of us "innocent bystanders" to an almost completely invalid attack on the foundations of educational debate. This paper is intended as a reply to this attack.

What Prof. Thomas is proposing is, in essence (although he does not call it this), an abolition of educational debate and the adoption of substantive debate for tournament use.

Why do I say that Prof. Thomas is proposing abolition of educational debate and the adoption of substantive debate? To answer this we must first define the terms (as any debater would tell you). Austin Freeley in his recent text Argumentation and Debate probably provides us with the best explanation of the two. Dr. Freeley states, "Debate may be classified into two broad categories: substantive and educational. Substantive debate is conducted on propositions in which the advocates have a special interest; the debate is presented before a judge or audience with power to render a binding decision on the proposition; and the purpose of the debate is to establish a fact, value, or policy. Educational debate is conducted on propositions in which the advocates usually have an academic interest; it is presented before a judge or audience usually without direct power to render a decision on the proposition—indeed, in educational debate the judge is instructed to disregard the merits of the proposition and to render the decision on the merits of the debate; and the purpose of the debate is to provide educational opportunities for the participants."

From this we see that debate in legislatures, courts, civic meetings, television, etc., is substantive in nature. Here the people debating and the people listening are intrinsically involved in the decision that will be made in regard to the resolution. On the other hand, debates in tournaments and in debate clubs are educational in nature. Here the people debating are merely using the resolution as a means of developing and displaying their talents in the effective use of argumentation. The audience is interested in the debate primarily as a debate and is not necessarily concerned with the topic itself at all.

Now let us turn to Prof. Thomas' suggestions and see (if I may use some debate terminology) whether they are either necessary or desirable.

1. No debater should be required to defend both sides of a proposition. It is interesting to note the way Prof. Thomas states this position—that no student should be required to defend both sides. I know of no debate instructor who does require students to debate both sides. If a student firmly chooses not to debate both sides he then either chooses to debate only in tournaments with one-side debating or doesn't debate at all. In all parts of our country, there are plenty of one-side tournaments [and single or home-and-home debates] to enable a student to obtain adequate experience this way if he chooses. Thus, the students who debate both sides choose to do so; they are not forced to do so.

But even if students were forced to debate both sides, there would be no harm in it. In fact, it is very beneficial to do so. The
usual attack against both-sides debating is on the basis of ethics. The opponents claim that it is unethical to speak for something that you do not believe, and thus contend both-sides debating should go. This attack is simply invalid when we look at it with a view of the nature of educational debate clearly in our minds. In educational debate the student is not standing before his audience saying that “this resolution is correct and thus should be adopted.” Rather he is saying, “Our arguments for this resolution are better than our opponents’ arguments against it, thus we should be awarded the decision.” They don’t say it this way of course, but this nevertheless is their real position. There is certainly nothing unethical in this—nor will there be the next hour when they believe that they are presenting better arguments against the resolution than their opponents are presenting for it.

The true or right position on a topic is rarely at one of the extremes represented by the affirmative or the negative. Rather it usually falls somewhere in between. Because this is true, it is my belief that a competent team instructed by a competent debate instructor can stand for their own beliefs, no matter which side of the topic they are assigned, in the vast majority of the debates they will enter. How is this true? Most topics provide a vast opportunity for selection in the affirmative case a team will use. Each topic has a large variety of reasons which can be expressed for its acceptance and even the most prejudiced can usually find some which he can accept. On the negative, the problem is even more remote. If a negative debater cannot find anything in an affirmative case with which to honestly disagree, he is unique indeed. While there might be some exceptions, a reasonable generalization would be that all affirmative cases have some weaknesses which even the most prejudiced individual could attack.

Clearly then, both-sides debating is not undesirable, and the elimination of it would not be beneficial to educational debate.

2. Debate must become... a discussion having as its purpose to “contretize” opinions. To this I would ask, “whose opinions are you going to “contretize?” The judges? The opponents? The timekeeper? The audience? Let’s look at this a moment to see how absurd it really is. First of all, the judge. Most of the judges are debate coaches who have been working on the topic along with their debaters throughout the season. His opinions are usually well set, either affirmative, negative, or some more reasonable position in between. To expect a couple of high school or college students in thirty minutes, with their opponents having equal time, to significantly sway the judge’s real opinion is to expect the ridiculously impossible. If we were to do this, the bias of the judge, which too often slips into debates even now, would become the major factor in all decisions. This is hardly desirable.

Well, how about the opponents? While it might occur in rare instances, a debater who can convince his opponents is truly a freak of nature. To expect this would be like expecting Sen. Goldwater to convince Sen. Humphrey that he should vote for Gen. Walker for president in a thirty minute argument with Sen. Humphrey getting equal time. I don’t believe Sen. Goldwater could do it, capable as he is, and neither do I believe that our high school and college debaters are more capable than Sen. Goldwater.

Maybe the timekeeper? Here is a person that we just might appeal to. He usually doesn’t know anything about debate, the topic, or for that matter timing either. I would hate to think that I was training students to present their arguments on this level.

Our last hope is the audience. Unfortunately, I must ask, “What audience?” I believe that I would be safe in saying that at least 75 per cent of tournament debates are carried on without any audience, save a judge and timer. The bulk of the remainder of the audiences are made up of debaters primarily concerned with the debate as a debate and with copying down evidence for later use.

In short, if we were to attempt to adopt this recommendation we would be trying to adapt substantive debate to the tournament situation where it simply would not work.

3. Forensic skill must not be judged by the hobgoblin of a foolish self-consistency...

Even the extremity of an absolute shift of sides should not be ruled out of possibility.... Congressmen do it. While I certainly agree with Prof. Thomas that it
is desirable for debaters to agree on points that are obvious in the debate, I certainly cannot see the logic in the extreme position expressed above. If we may go back to the definitions again, there is a significant difference between congress and academic debate in their very purpose. A student debater is charged with the responsibility of developing the best case for whatever position he is taking. If he is to admit that a major portion of the position he expresses is wrong in light of the opponents' attack, he is admitting that he has not fulfilled his responsibility to the resolution. If he completely goes to the other side, he admits complete failure in his responsibilities. What would debate be like if we accepted such actions as permissible? A bright negative team might well stand up and say, "We agree with this resolution too. But we think that it is even better than the affirmative has indicated. Thus, we will show how it is better." Absurd? It certainly is. But this is what Prof. Thomas' suggestion really advocates. It could hardly be considered either necessary or desirable.

4. The conventional "decision" must give way to a judgment of the debaters as debaters . . . winning and losing will have to be based essentially on a combination of speaker ratings. Whether I would agree with Prof. Thomas here or not depends on his meaning of "speaker ratings." If we take "speaker ratings" to mean the evaluation of a debater on a numerical scale as to his excellence in the art of argumentation as represented in the debate, I am in full agreement. For if this were done, the team with the better rating would clearly be the winning team. If we allow the decision to be thrown out however, and a tabulation of speaker ratings to determine the top teams we will obtain a wholly undesirable result. Judges are inconsistent enough in giving decisions, witness the many 2-1 and 3-2 decisions each year. But they are far more inconsistent in ratings. I once participated on a panel of five judges who agreed on the decision. The ratings on a 25 point scale ranged from 11 to 24 for the same team in the same debate. To make this a basic factor in anything other than breaking ties is certainly not desirable.

On this point I would have even further disagreement with Prof. Thomas if he interprets speaker rating to mean delivery. With delivery as even a separate factor included in a rating scale injustice is often done. Debate is primarily training in argumentation, not in oratory. Many times I have witnessed debates when one team was very solid in argument and the other team top orators. The orators receive higher "speaker ratings" because of the delivery factor on the scale, but they are not the better debaters and should not receive the decision.

5. To have been "the national question is the kiss of death to any topic of discussion: once debated, it can never again be revived. What a waste of our national resource in brainpower. At last Prof. Thomas and I have a point of agreement. I would only object to bringing back a topic within three years after it was used. This would have students debating the same topic for two years of their career. One year is certainly sufficient, if not more than sufficient, for any student on the same topic.

While I, too, find things in educational debate which I think should be changed and improved, I cannot accept most of the suggestions of Prof. Thomas as being improvements. I believe them, on the whole, to be unnecessary and so undesirable as to threaten the basic foundation of educational debate. Those of us who are not "innocent bystanders" should rise to defeat soundly these suggestions whenever and wherever they are proposed.

---

**GIVE OUR FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY A BOOST**

If you are sending out invitations to debate tournaments, why not make a point of mentioning somewhere that this is Pi Kap's fiftieth year? If your school paper carries feature stories, why not assign to someone on your speech squad the task of writing up an account of Pi Kap's history and accomplishments. (If your sponsor has not already received one, a sample news story on the subject can be obtained from our national president.) Is there any speech occasion into which you can introduce some of the interesting facts about Pi Kap's growth to the largest forensic fraternity in the world, larger than all the other collegiate societies combined. Do your part to make this a great Golden Anniversary Convention!
American education has come under fire. Compared to a Russian pupil of comparable age, the American student is very deficient in the fields of science and mathematics, lags in language study, and is at least a year behind in any subject matter. The awakening “Why Johnny Can’t Read” has been aptly changed to the disturbing “What Georgi Knows That Johnny Doesn’t.” This information is by now trite knowledge concerning an explored subject.

But there is one aspect of our educational system that is of particular significance to us as Pi Kappa Deltans. Although as an end result Russian knowledge may be a challenge to American education, the Russian student has never been taught to reason independently, to evaluate, to think critically, to judge, to weigh evidence and form an opinion from that evidence. The Russian teacher would never ask, “What do you think about that? Could there be another side to this story? Now that you have weighed the pros and cons, what is your opinion?” This inadequacy of Russian education is like putting a cover on the cup that runneth over.

Can you imagine intercollegiate debate in Russia? I have entered debate, oratory, and extemporaneous speaking contests for the past six years. I never gave much thought at the time to the fact that I dealt with some rather controversial subjects—foreign aid, the farm problem, the education system, labor unions, and medical care. I always thought of these contests as an activity, not a privilege. But even something as common to Pi Kappa Deltans as a weekend tournament is an excellent example of American freedom of speech.

I have often heard that the Russian student learns images or labels—such as communism, democracy, equality—without ever realizing what they mean. For example, if you asked a Russian scholar what communism is, he would most probably answer that it is the Russian economic system in which the people commonly own the property and means of production and thus are materialistically equal. If you or I were to point out the difference between the living standards of Khrushchev’s hierarchy and the Russian peasant, the scholar would probably be too flabbergasted to answer. He has never really analyzed what equality (or communism) is.

The American student, on the other hand, readily recognizes the fallacy here. He knows what communism is because he has studied it carefully; he knows what equality is because he has analyzed it thoroughly. Finally, he knows the two don’t exist side by side in Russia because he has something basic to good education—the freedom to think and the freedom to reason.

But, American education has come under fire, and certainly there is room for improvement. At least, however, Johnny knows the means to learning what he doesn’t know, and this makes him far superior to Georgi, who knows only what he knows.

A STATEMENT ON THE PEACE CORPS

The United States is sending some of its most outstanding young men and women as Peace Corps Volunteers to the developing nations. As teachers, engineers, nurses, coaches and surveyors, and in community development work, these Volunteers are providing leadership and knowledge to people throughout the world.

Fraternities and sororities have prided themselves on their ability to attract and develop leadership. Responsibility, too, has come with this leadership.

Let me suggest that an even greater responsibility and challenge awaits you now. The chance to serve overseas, and thus to continue the work of more than 4,000 Peace Corps Volunteers now in the field, offers a rare fulfillment and experience. Inform yourself about the Peace Corps and how you may become a part of it after college. Contact the Peace Corps Liaison Officer on your campus, or write directly to PEACE CORPS, College and University Division, Washington 25, D. C.

—R. Sargen Shriver, Jr., Director

Dwight Bastian is a junior at Carroll College, Waukesha, Wisconsin.
National Debate Proposition And Discussion Question

For American Colleges and Universities, 1962-1963

As of August 7, 1962, the Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate of the Speech Association of America announces the results of the preferential poll of directors of forensics of American colleges and universities to determine the debate proposition and discussion question for nation-wide use during the 1962-1963 forensic season. As shown by the tabulation on the reverse side of this page the results are:

NATIONAL DEBATE PROPOSITION

Resolved, That the non-communist nations of the world should establish an economic community.

NATIONAL DISCUSSION QUESTION

What should be the role of the Federal Government in regulating the economy?

The Committee appends no qualifications or definitions to the announced proposition or question: any "official" interpretations by the Committee are forbidden.

If circumstances should arise which render the regularly selected proposition or question unsuitable, the Committee may, by two-thirds vote, rephrase the proposition or question, or select an entirely new proposition or question. Your representative on the Committee will be pleased to supply further information concerning the rules under which the Committee operates.

Those directors of forensics who will be in attendance at the convention of the Speech Association of America at New York, New York, in December, 1962, are cordially invited to attend the open meeting of the Committee. Details of time and place will be listed in the convention program.

Unaffiliated Colleges ............. Murray A. Hewgill, Speech Dept., Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Tau Kappa Alpha ................. Nicholas M. Cripe, Speech Dept., Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana

Delta Sigma Rho ................. Austin J. Freeley, Speech Dept., John Carroll University, Cleveland 18, Ohio

Phi Rho Pi ...................... Lloyd P. Dudley, 3605 Golf Course Road, Grand Rapids, Minnesota

Pi Kappa Delta ................. Roy D. Murphy, Speech Dept., University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana

American Forensic Association . Kim Giffin, Speech Dept., University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas (Chairman for 1962)
**SUMMARY OF NATION-WIDE PREFERENTIAL POLL OF DIRECTORS OF FORENSICS TO DETERMINE THE DEBATE PROPOSITION AND DISCUSSION QUESTION FOR THE (1962-1963) FORENSIC SEASON**

**Debate Proposition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Unaff.</th>
<th>TKA</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>PKD</th>
<th>AFA</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved, That the non-communist nations of the world should establish an economic community.</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved, That the United States should withdraw the Connally Reservation from its Declaration of Adherence to the International Court of Justice.</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved, That the United States should extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist Government of China.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved, That the United Nations should establish a permanent police force.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved, That Berlin should be placed under the jurisdiction of the United Nations.</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unaff.</th>
<th>TKA</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>PRP</th>
<th>PKD</th>
<th>AFA</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What should be the policy of the United States on disarmament?</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we best meet the problems of automation?</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should be the role of the Federal Government in regulating the economy?</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the United States best meet the challenge of communism in the Western Hemisphere?</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the American public best meet the problems of political extremism?</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above tabulations each first-place vote was scored five points, each second-place vote four points, each third-place vote three points, each fourth-place vote two points, and each fifth-place vote one point.
National Council, in August meeting, makes plans for the Golden Anniversary Convention of Pi Kappa Delta in 1963. Shown from left to right, in their session at Giant City State Park, near Carbondale, Illinois, are John Randolph, Roy Murphy, Theodore Karl, Georgia Bowman, Harold Larson, Raymond Yeager, Harvey Cromwell, and D. J. Nabors.

Gallery Lounge, University Center, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois. Delegates may rest in comfort here between events at the convention.
 Criteria for Choosing
A National Debate Topic

WAYNE N. THOMPSON

I

Numerous complaints each year regarding the choice of the national debate topic indicate that the many existing commentaries on choosing a resolution, though of unquestioned excellence, have failed to supply satisfactory guidance.

Although the present contribution also will fall short of providing an infallible guide, supplementing existing treatments should be of value. The following article, which is based upon personal observation and thought, states five criteria, adds to the existing explications of each, and applies and tests a topic which is under consideration for 1962-1963.

First, how significant is the question likely to be during the season it is to be debated? The significance of a resolution depends, in part, upon whether its adoption would produce a critical difference. The 1954-1955 topic, "Resolved: That the United States should extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist Government of China," proved to be poor, for both affirmative and negative were unable to prove that the proposed change would affect the world situation materially. Since the adoption of the affirmative proposal apparently would have had no real effect upon maintaining world peace, stopping the spread of Communism, strengthening American prestige, or any other important contemporary issue, both "needs" and "new evils" had a hollow ring.

Second, to what extent will debating the question contribute to the educational growth of our students? Beyond the obvious dictum that a topic should lead students to areas of research which result in an un-

derstanding in depth of a worthwhile topic lies the more searching question "How much room for creative thinking does the resolution provide?"

Whereas some annual propositions can be divided through analysis into "ready-made" obvious arguments and nothing else, others at first conceal the potential dividends of extensive research and creative thought. The annual resolution should belong to the latter type—perhaps the application of a basic economic principle to the proposition can yield a contention which less industrious and thoughtful students have overlooked; possibly data on a seemingly unrelated field can support a relevant argument which a person doing narrow, unimaginative research never will find.

"Resolved: That the legal voting age should be reduced to eighteen," for example, provides opportunity for argumentation at much more challenging levels than comparing legal ages for frequenting bars with those for voting. Data from public opinion polls indicate whether an actual difference exists between youth and their elders in their attitudes toward current issues, and information from varied sources bears upon whether the characteristics of youth are those which good voters possess.

In short, the well chosen annual resolution should provide an opportunity for the invention of sound, relevant arguments which go beyond those which debaters of average industry and ingenuity devise. Such a topic, it should be noted, permits a team to attain variety without resorting to far-fetched, strained, unrealistic cases.

Third, is significant and pertinent material available? Some questions, even though worthy of adoption because of excellence in other respects, fail to meet this third criterion because the truly pertinent information is classified. The 1958-1959 resolution on the suspension of nuclear testing exemplifies the difficulties which

Wayne N. Thompson, Head of the Speech Staff at the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, has served for eighteen years as a college director of forensics and has just retired as the chapter sponsor for Illinois Psi. Dr. Thompson's article was submitted in July, well before this year's topic had been chosen.
the classification of evidence poses. Both affirmative and negative teams, forced to rely upon educated expert guesses and the portion of the data on testing which had been declassified, were in the unsatisfactory position of drawing arguments from inferior materials. Probably any military question entails this same difficulty.

Positively viewed, this third test is particularly well met when government documents and reports of research foundations provide a large amount of highly reliable, accessible data. In contrast to the resolution so soundly based is the one in which research materials are largely limited to popular magazines and to books presenting secondary evidence.

Fourth, will the question be reasonably stable, yet changing in its details? The committee which frames propositions always has succeeded in avoiding a question which became unendoatable because of subsequent world events. No question has ever had to be discarded or reworded, nor has the affirmative view at the start of a season ever become the negative case at a later time.

The opposite extreme—the overly stable, deadly resolution—sometimes has been the national choice. “Resolved: That Congress should be given the power to reverse decisions of the Supreme Court” probably was the most “stationary” question of recent years. Little, if anything, happened during the debate season to provide new evidence, to modify the status quo, or to suggest new contentions. A good first affirmative speech in November was equally good in April—and not a word had to be changed.

By this fourth criterion the suspension of nuclear testing perhaps was the best of the recent questions. Debaters had to read the paper the morning of a tournament lest some of their evidence be disproved, and those who did not revise their speeches at least every two weeks courted disaster.

A great many questions have met the fourth criterion at least fairly well. Not only have wider ranging research and deeper analysis brought about new cases as the season has progressed, but also in many years new evidence and changes in the world situation have created variations in the meaning of the resolution.

Incidentally, a well-chosen topic eliminates the justification for the complaint that two semesters is too long a time to debate the same proposition. The writer suspects that most of those voicing this charge are members of complacent, unimaginative squads who fail to keep up with the question as new developments occur.

Fifth, is it debatable? So long as academic debating is wedded to the need-plan formula of case construction, the first test of debatability is “Can the affirmative establish a need?” If this test is met, both teams have a fighting chance, and a good debate at least is possible.

Rigid, unenlightened, non-Aristotelian judging is sufficiently common to add an unwarranted dimension to debatability—that extensive empirical evidence must be available to the affirmative. Many judges, overlooking the Aristotelian principle that the appropriate test is whether a speaker has found the best available means of persuasion, blackball any affirmative team which does not use the type of evidence which they approve.

But even if a topic encompasses empirical data, it approaches undeatability if the burden of proof is misplaced. For example, the wording “Resolved: That the United States should discontinue direct economic aid to foreign countries” created an unnatural, unreasonable burden in contest debate which existed nowhere else. Whereas in Congress proving that aid does no good and thus is useless constitutes a damaging attack, in academic debate the custom of requiring the affirmative to show the existence of an evil resulted in the unfair and unrealistic expectation that foreign aid be proved harmful.

Realization by the framers of the resolution that the issue in Congress actually occurs only at the moment that a new appropriation bill for economic aid is pending and that the burden of proof legislatively is upon these advocating the new appropriation would have led to a wording which would have placed the burden properly—“Resolved: That Congress should enact a new program of direct economic aid when the present one expires.” Or perhaps a proposition of value would have been still better—“Resolved: That our program of direct economic aid is successful.”

II

So much for the explication of the five criteria; now for an application of them to a topic which is being considered for the national proposition for 1962-1963—“Resolved: That the United States should join
the Common Market." This prospective resolution, in the opinion of the writer, meets all five tests.

First, it would be significant, for the proposal, if adopted, would have important consequences. Our joining the Common Market would affect the economy of the United States (or at least sectors of it), it would affect the economy of its present members, and it would affect the political and even the military strength of the Western World.

Second, it would present opportunities for far-ranging research and for a number of relevant affirmative cases. Economic principles would be applicable to predictable effects of our joining the Common Market, and inferences based upon those principles could supply valid contentions. The economic geography and the power of political blocs in the several countries would suggest issues and provide evidence for estimating future probabilities.

Third, it would provide ample opportunities for research. Not only would sources in which the term Common Market is not even mentioned be available to the ingenious but also the body of literature directly upon the topic is ample and growing. The Reference Department of the Library of the University of Illinois at Chicago found last March that the number of books and articles was substantial and that these were catalogued and indexed in such a way that students would have little difficulty in finding material. Special documents, including the 1960 U. S. House of Representatives volume A Study of Euro-

pean Regionalism: A New Era in a Free World and the 1962 volume of the Economic Joint Committee of Congress European Economic Community and the United States, already were available, and more seemed likely to appear.

Fourth, although the likelihood of action by Congress is sufficiently remote that the question should be reasonably stable, the probability of political and economic developments should make the question varied and timely.

Fifth, statistical data, examples, and other types of "acceptable" evidence exist in sufficient variety and abundance to permit the construction of a first affirmative speech which will meet the tests of almost all judges and thus give both affirmative and negative teams a fair chance. The resolution also seems fully debatable in every other sense—whether the United States should or should not join the Common Market is certainly a moot question, and wording the proposition so that the burden of proof will be correctly placed should not be difficult.

III

In conclusion, the choice of appropriate criteria for choosing a national debate resolution and the definition of these criteria by an explication of their practical ramifications in the world of debate as it currently exists are matters of practical importance to both the students and the coaches. The purpose of the present article has been to give added dimensions to certain criteria which many articles and textbooks already have considered in some of their facets.

HAS YOUR COACH BEEN ACTIVE IN PI KAPPA DELTA FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OR MORE? DO YOU KNOW OF ANY COACH WHO HAS SERVED THE FRATERNITY THAT LONG? IF YOU DO, PLEASE SEND THE NAME TO THE SECRETARY-TREASURER, D. J. NABORS.

Pi Kappa Delta would like to give long-overdue recognition to its most faithful coaches during the Golden Anniversary Convention at S.I.U. Of course, the National Secretary and the other national officers know who most of these twenty-five year men are, but they need to make sure that no one is over-looked. If your coach has been active in Pi Kappa Delta work for twenty-five years or more, won't you please send in the name to Mr. Nabors? If you know of some one, please send in that name. And if you are in doubt, send in the name anyhow; the Secretary can always check his files and records to discover length of service.
A Sample Constitution

For Local Chapters of Pi Kappa Delta

(The national officers of the Fraternity are frequently asked for a sample constitution which can be used by the local chapters. If yours is a new chapter, or if your constitution has been mislaid, this reprint will be of interest to you.)

CONSTITUTION

Article I. Name

This society shall be known as the ........ chapter of Pi Kappa Delta.

Article II. Purpose

The purposes of this society shall be:
1. To serve as an honor society to all undergraduates who meet minimum national constitutional requirements in the various fields of forensic endeavor.
2. To stimulate interest in forensic activities upon the campus, to encourage participation in these various events by both members and non-members, and to encourage attendance upon these events, and in general at all times to promote the welfare of forensic activities, both as individuals and as an organization.
3. To maintain the ties between the local chapter and the national office of Pi Kappa Delta, as also the ties between the local chapter and similar chapters throughout the state, the province, and the nation.

Article III. Membership and Meetings

A. REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERSHIP.

1. Membership shall be open to all those who meet the requirements of the National Pi Kappa Delta Constitution.

B. METHOD OF SELECTION.

1. The interpretation of these requirements shall be the responsibility of the Pi Kappa Delta Council, i.e., the officer and the faculty sponsor.
2. The faculty sponsor, after the conclusion of the forensic season, shall submit a list of eligible candidates to the Council for their approval.
3. Upon approval, the faculty sponsor shall notify the eligible candidates, provide them with application blanks from the national office, and immediately upon payment of initiation fees to the Secretary-Treasurer such candidates will automatically be considered as elected by the organization, and to be eligible to initiation.

C. MEETINGS.

1. Initiation of new members, and election and installation of officers shall be held at the regular spring meeting as early as possible between the end of the forensic season and the middle of May.
2. Other meetings of the entire chapter may be held periodically throughout the year at the call of either the President of the chapter or the faculty sponsor.

Article IV. Officers and Duties

A. OFFICERS.

1. The officers of this society shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary-treasurer.

B. METHOD OF NOMINATION, ELECTION.

1. The Pi Kappa Delta Council shall act as a nomination committee and submit, if the number of personnel of the society permits, two names for each office for the ensuing year.
2. For the office of president, no nominations are to be allowed from the floor; for all other officers, such nominations may be made.

C. DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

1. The President shall preside at all regular and special meetings of the chapter, and perform such other duties as normally a President does perform in assuming direction of the affairs of the chapter.
2. The Vice-President shall preside over the meetings in the necessary absence of the President and assume his office if a vacancy should occur between vacations or during the school year, in which case a new Vice-President may be elected. It shall also be the special duty of the Vice-President to act as Forensic Manager. In that capacity, he shall con-
sult with the Chairman of the Speech Department and cooperate in arranging details of schedule and finance for the various forensic activities. He shall, after consultation with the Director of Forensics, prepare an estimated budget for the year’s activities, conduct correspondence with other schools relative to debate schedules, assume the responsibility of hospitality arrangements for visiting teams, and initiate suggestions for the improvement of the conduct and management of the debate season.

3. The Secretary-Treasurer shall have charge of all finances and correspondence of the chapter, shall submit reports of the same. He shall keep minutes of the meetings of the Chapter together with their order and degree. He shall distribute the copies of The Forensic to the members. He shall have the responsibility of providing application blanks to new eligible members, and to applicants for advanced standing, and to conduct the necessary correspondence and financial arrangements regarding the same. He shall send news of the local chapter and of forensic activities at ........ College to The Forensic, and assume responsibility for publicizing Pi Kappa Delta activities and meetings through bulletin boards, posters, and local newspapers.

Article V. Executive Council

A. MEMBERSHIP.

The officers of Pi Kappa Delta and the Director of Forensics shall constitute the Executive Council.

B. MEETINGS.

This group shall meet at periodic intervals when there is business to transact, at the call of the Director of Forensics or the President of the Chapter, to consider matters of policy in the forensic program of the college.

C. PURPOSE AND GENERAL DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.

The prime purpose of the Council is to act in an advisory capacity and to stimulate the spirit of cooperation between the Speech Department and the honor society. It is understood that the final decision on matters of finance, schedule, and personnel shall rest with the Director of Forensics.

D. SPECIFIC DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL.

1. The Council shall act as indicated in Art. III, Sec. B. 1 to determine eligible candidates to Pi Kappa Delta.

2. The Council shall act as a nomination committee as indicated in Art. IV, Sec. B. 1 and nominate two nominees for each office for the ensuing year.

Article VI. Amendment

This constitution may be amended by two-thirds vote of the active membership.

COACHES TO RETIRE FROM FORENSICS

The Forensic has learned with regret of the retirement from coaching—but not from active teaching—of Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois at Chicago, and John W. McCain, Jr., McKendree College. Professor McCain has been in charge of forensics at McKendree for the past five years and is well known to many coaches in the Midwest. He is retiring to give more time to his duties as chairman of the division of languages and literature.

Professor Thompson has been director of forensics at Navy Pier for the past fifteen years, where his teams have compiled outstanding records. In the Debate Newsletter which told of his resignation Dr. Thompson declared: “No other part of my work in fifteen years at the Chicago Undergraduate Division has brought me such deep satisfaction as forensics, and leaving the field is not easy. Forensic activities, especially debate, may be the most valuable educational device in the entire program of a university, and doing work in which one believes is a high privilege. My pleasure in seeing undergraduates improve their abilities in speaking, organizing ideas, thinking clearly, and expressing their thoughts has indeed been great, and I have followed with pride the achievements of many of our alumni. My closest friends on other campuses have been my fellow debate coaches, and my finest memories of this campus are those of our debaters of both the recent and the more distant past.”

Fortunately for forensics, both of these retiring sponsors leave their tasks to capable hands. At McKendree, the new sponsor will be Dr. Robert D. Cox; at the University of Illinois it will be Dr. Ted Jackson, for the past two years co-director of forensics at I.S.N.U.
Another Pi Kappa Deltan Becomes a College President

Late last June it was announced by the trustees of Rio Grande College, Gallipolis, Ohio, that Dr. Alphus Rolland Christensen had been elected to become the 11th president of the College. Dr. Christensen, before assuming office on August 1, was director of special services at South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. D. Christensen succeeded Dr. Paul R. Lyne, who retired for reasons of health. Following below is a brief sketch of Dr. Christensen’s life and many accomplishments.

Alphus R. Christensen, professor of speech at South Dakota State College, was born October 23, 1913, at Starbuck, Minn. He attended high school in Revillo and Milbank, where he was graduated in 1931.

He attended Augustana College for two years, then moving to South Dakota State, where he received a bachelor of science degree in sociology and speech in 1938. He completed his master of arts degree in speech at Northwestern University in 1941 and received his doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Minnesota in 1954.

Dr. Christensen has taught speech at Webster and Yankton high schools. He served in the U. S. Navy during World War II and with the Veterans Administration at Brainerd, Minn., before coming to State College.

He has been a member of the State College faculty since 1946, serving as Speech Department head from 1951 to 1958. He also has served terms as director of special services and administrative assistant at State College.

During his tenure as forensics coach, State College speech and debate teams ranked high in contests throughout the nation.

Active in professional and social organizations, he is a member of Toastmasters International, American Association of University Professors, Kiwanis, and Speech Association of America, among others.

Dr. Christensen is married and the father of three children, Julie Ann (born Sept. 24, 1942), Alphus R. II (born April 7, 1944), and Mark (born Oct. 13, 1948).

NOTICES FROM THE NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER

1. The $25 special assessment is now due. Less than 25 per cent of the chapters have paid. Why not send in your check now and put your chapter squarely behind a full-scale celebration of Pi Kappa Delta’s Golden Anniversary Convention.

2. Due to increased handling charges it will be necessary to increase the price of all keys by 25 cents, effective immediately.
Thoughts of a Debater

We Lost, But Let Me Tell You Why—
Or They Did It Again

TRULA GUIOU

What can one say when you continually lose debates? Well, it isn’t easy, but there are some pretty effective retorts. Naturally, the reason does not rest in you, your preparation or ability or your coach. Not at all. Then why do you lose debates? The greatest disturber of your peace just happens to be the stealthy “friends of the opposition,” the enemy opponent. His faults are many. First, he’s too serious about debate; he attacks and destroys your arguments. After all, son, this isn’t fair—it’s only an educational experience; so why not go easy? We’ll do the same for you. Your rebuttals are certainly enlivening—even I’m impressed—disturbing thought. But please wipe that sneer off your face. What, misquoted again! Never fails. This is just too much. No, I didn’t say that. I did! Hum, can’t believe it—amazing what one does under pressure. Well, I certainly didn’t intend to say that; so I’ll clarify the entire argument by simply retracting my original statement. Anyway, if there’s anything that I can’t stand, it’s sarcasm emanating from the lips of a debater. You’d think that he was debating for his daily bread.

Mr., please get off the judge’s desk, she can hear you. What a personal contact man. I always like to stick close to the lectern—think that it gives a more stable, sophisticated appearance. Time’s up—hallelujah! My time to speak? What was that thing that he said about our major contention? Don’t whisper so loudly—the judge’s looking at us.

“Yes, ma’am, I’m ready. No, I certainly had no intention of delaying the debate.”
Smile, smile, smile.

“Madam Chairman, Honorable Judge, Esteemed Timekeeper, worthy opponents, admirable colleague, and ladies and gentle-

men of the audience. (Four and one-half minutes to go!) We of Jones University are always happy to pay honor to the Peabody School and participate in their forensic activities. Before I say one more thing, I must compliment the tournament directors and the Jones University debate squad. The tournament has been run very efficiently and effectively. Who could ask for more in one day—ten rounds of debate beginning at 7 a.m., ending at 8 p.m. Of course, I especially appreciated the two hour rest period that we had this afternoon while more tournament judges were secured. Speaking of judges, I do feel obligated to reveal that the one single aspect of the tournament which has impressed me the greatest is the well qualified, objective, cooperative, friendly, empathic, civic-minded citizens who have agreed to serve as judges of this educational and exceptionally inspirational experience. (Ah, three minutes to go!) I do believe that it will be necessary to devote the remainder of my time to a summation of our case, that is, of the affirmative case. The affirmative case is the case for the question, and that is where we stand. I would make a few statements about the negative, but I must admit that we have already effectively disproven their statements and accusations. And since the negative presented no constructive case, our case now rests. I can sum up the affirmative position in one phrase—we uphold and support everything we presented, with the one exception, the statement which my colleague accidentally made that the negative unfortunately interpreted as a major contention. We used references; in fact, we documented everything. You will notice that my colleague has just begun to spread out all of our information on the desks in the room for your inspection and approval. Are our opponents doing this? No. Did

(Continued on page 23)
SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE

The Connecticut Beta Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta located at Southern Connecticut State College is planning an active 1962-63 season. Last year, our debators participated in a total of 116 rounds of debate on the national topic. We competed in twelve inter-collegiate debate tournaments. In addition to participating in many forthcoming tournaments, our Forensic Union will hold audience-decision debates with other colleges. In December, we will hold our second high school workshop. This event was very successful last year. Four varsity debators debated the high school topic, and answered questions about debating techniques. Over 130 students from 16 Connecticut high schools attended the workshop.

Officers for the 1962-63 season were elected at the last meeting in May. They are: President, Larry Fitzgerald; Vice President, Tom Barthlett; Secretary-Treasurer, Judy Martin; and Corresponding Secretary, Cathy Miller. Other varsity members include Dennis Keenan, Marilyn Moore, John Enscoe, Bill Bones, Enrica Pizzorusso, Joe Knapik, Clem Najjar, and Mike Turner.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT CHICAGO

New members of Pi Kappa Delta during the second semester in 1962 were Sue Edwards, Ronald Marich, and Gerard Kaye. The annual initiation ceremony was held at the Como Inn just before the debate banquet. Karen Jahnke, David Kahn, and Howard Gordon carried out the ritual. Terrell Schwarz, an alumnus, was initiated along with the new student members.

In some respects the final portion of the 1961-62 season was most successful. On March 30-31 an 8-4 record at the Midwest Forensic Association Tournament at Marquette brought UIC a fourth place finish. Sue Edwards and Bob Sebastian split six decisions on the affirmative, while Karen Jahnke and two colleagues won five and lost one on the negative. Dave Kahn debated the first three rounds, and Howard Gordon the last three. Out of 56 partici-pants Karen ranked third in individual scoring with 130 points in six rounds; Dave and Howard combined scored 131 to make UIC the top negative team in quality points in the tournament. Our only loss was to an Augustana team, whose two speakers finished first and second in individual scoring with 132 and 133 points respectively.

The same weekend another unit, including two debaters engaging in their first competition, won five and lost three at the Urbana Novice Tournament. John Bayalis and Gerard Kaye won three times in four attempts, while Roy Ysia and Ron Marich divided their four contests. The debaters were the guests of alumnus Ed Campbell, who owns and operates both the Medea and College Hall in Champaign. Kaye and Marich began their debating careers auspiciously; both won certificates of excellence.

A week later two UIC units compiled a 9-7 record in the Chicago Area Tournament. Karen Jahnke and Tim Hoffman won three and lost one, and a second negative unit of Dawne Wood and Marich compiled the same mark. The affirmative, however, was less successful. The Gordon-Sue Wartell team won two and lost two, and the Bayalis-Bill Poetsch combination finished with a 1-3 mark.

The final event of the year, the Pi Kappa Delta Illinois-Missouri Joint Regional Tournament, brought an in-and-out season to a happy and triumphant conclusion. The women’s team of Sue Edwards and Karen Jahnke won five and lost one and topped all teams in quality points with 27 of a possible 30 to finish second only to William Jewell. The quality rating was superior.

The men’s team with Howard Gordon debating both sides did even better by going through undefeated for undisputed first place. Newcomer Ron Marich debated the negative, and Sue Wartell (not a misprint; PKD has an odd eligibility rule for men’s debate) took the affirmative. The final debate against Augustana really brought the season to a climax, for Sue and Howard were meeting fourth-year debater Dave Tomlinson and Howard’s former high school teammate, Kirsons, who
was a third-year college debater. Both teams had known for about twenty-four hours that the contest was to occur, and the tension mounted as the time approached. For Howard, and to a lesser extent for the rest of us, the season could not have come to a happier end.

**BUENA VISTA COLLEGE**

Buena Vista College forensic squad achieved one of the finest records ever compiled by any team in the school’s history, during the 1961-62 season.

Intercollegiate competition involved 168 decision debates plus participation in discussion, extemporaneous speaking, oratory, and interpretative reading. Other events sponsored on the campus included: Twelfth annual high school forensics conference attended by over three hundred high school students, who were judged by advanced speech students under the supervision of Professor Gladys Kuehl, director of forensics; the eighth annual all-college oratory contest, in which Joe Meusey, Jim McDiarmid, and Luella Wohlers were the winners of the trophies; the fifth annual after-dinner speaking contest, which was won by Gordon Linn, Maryann Nitzke, and Ruth Eickstaedt; an exhibition debate to which the public was invited.

Speakers also presented assembly programs at high schools in the area, and provided entertainment for service clubs, women’s organizations, and church groups. A regular feature was the weekly discussion program sponsored by Station KAYL on the “Matter of Opinion” show. Students also made several appearances on television.

After winning the sweepstakes trophy for the championship at the Iowa State Forensics tournament held at the State University of Iowa, the squad climaxed the season by winning first place in sweepstakes honors in total points of men’s and women’s divisions at the Bi-Province Pi Kappa Delta tournament held on the campus of South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. David Lampe and Lynn Phelps were the highest ranking men’s debate team in the tournament with no defeats and straight Superior ratings. Joe Meusey had the highest total score of all entrants in discussion and also received a Superior in Oratory. Ed Bodaken earned Superiors in both Discussion and Extemp Speaking.

By virtue of winning first place in the Men’s Division of oratory at the Iowa State Tournament, Joe Meusey attended the Interstate Oratorical Contest held on the Northwestern University campus in April.
The formal banquet for initiation of new members and installation of officers was held on May 12, with seven new members being initiated, including Colleen Anderson, Ed Bodaken, Gordon Linn, Carol Pewsey, James Walling, and Luella Wohlers. New officers for 1962-63 are: Ruth Eickstaedt, president; Luella Wohlers, vice-president; Carol Pewsey, secretary-treasurer; James Walling, corresponding secretary.

UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND

This fall the Alpha Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta in Washington at the University of Puget Sound will be directed in its activities by a new slate of officers: Al Schlenk, president; Verna Peterson, vice-president; Annie Werts, secretary; and Joan Butler, historian. Our advisor is Mr. Jack Kingsly.

Our first function is a coffee hour on the 25th of September for all interested Freshmen in forensics. It will serve as a “get acquainted” and “let’s get going” party.

New members initiated in the spring of 1962 were: Rick Green, Dave Holloway, DuWayne Bobert, Joan Butler, Sheila Marrs, Marilyn King.*

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

The Westminster College squad will get off to an early start this fall by attending the novice tournament to be held October 13 at the University of Missouri. Other events on the schedule for the year will include hosting the annual state tournament of the Missouri Speech Directors, set for March 15-16. Local members of Pi Kappa Delta will assume much of the work in seeing that the contests and entertainment go off smoothly. Of course, the big event of the year will be the Pi Kap Golden Convention at S.I.U., but other tournaments have been scheduled too.

With six members of last year’s winning squad returning, Missouri Alpha hopes to make a good showing in 1962-63. In full charge of debate this year will be Mr. Calvin Stoney, Instructor in Speech.

* She did her initial work at Western Washington College of Education in Bellingham and then was initiated at Puget Sound.

Beauty of style and harmony and grace and good rhythm depend on simplicity.

—Plato

Thoughts of a Debater

(Continued from page 20)

ey document their statements? No, not with acceptable references. What references did they cite? U. S. Now, The Hourglass—all magazines. In comparison, we used the federal government and cited a specific agency; this was our authority. And now, since we cannot accept our opponent’s documentation, let us examine their presentation to ascertain if it is applicable to our case and argument. No, it is not. They concentrated their entire effort on one major contention—a statement made, as I have already stated, accidentally by my colleague in his first speech—a statement which I am forced to retract as it was a part of another case which we have now discarded and is not applicable to our present one. Unfortunately, my colleague is a creature of habit. And now that that’s settled; so is our case. We can add nothing more about the negative “stands on the floor,” because they only talked about us. Consequently, I am sure that the most honorable judge will concur with us—with the affirmative—that our valid authorities, the United States federal government, and our case, which is now included in all well-known debate manuals, will be the only accepted presentation in this debate. Once more we thank you and will leave you with the thought that we hope to return again for this tournament next year. The affirmative thanks you.” Smile, shake hands. Must admit that that was a pretty effective speech!

Of course we won; they didn’t make one statement applicable to our presentation. They were sarcastic, but maybe it pays off. They stood directly in front of the judge, but maybe judges like that. They were good speakers, but that’s not all that should count in debate. Sure had a lot of material, didn’t they? They won the West Point Tournament last year, you say? Oh, well, I think that we beat them anyway; the judge kept shaking his head everytime I made a statement. Better get to our next round. If we didn’t win, it’s not a fair deal. Come on, let’s go.

The music that can deepest reach And cure all ill, is cordial speech.

—Emerson
From Huron College comes news of the following alumni:

**Tom Stolen,** 1960 graduate, is sales manager of the shoe department at the local J. C. Penney Store.

**Carolyn Bird,** 1960 graduate, is teaching English and Speech at St. Paul Park High School in St. Paul. ... She is now Mrs. Curt Christenson. (Curt is also a former Huron College student.)

**Gordon Peters,** 1960 graduate, now has his M.A. Degree in government from the University of South Dakota and has just returned from six months’ active service in the National Guard.

**Fred Hendricksen,** 1956 graduate, returned to the campus this fall to address the Homecoming convocation... he is presently attending the law school at the University of South Dakota.

**Don Mendel,** 1956 graduate, has an assistantship in the government department at the University of South Dakota this year and is working on his M.A. Degree in government. He formerly taught and coached debate at Doland High School, Doland, South Dakota.

**Don Larson,** 1960 graduate, is teaching speech at Kirkhoven High School in Minnesota.

* * *

University of Illinois at Chicago, always one of THE FORENSIC's best reporters, informs us that—

Nineteen alumni attended the annual banquet and the newly founded alumni reunion: **Larry Robbins** (’50, ’51), an attorney in Chicago and partner in the firm of Robbins and Robbins; **Dr. James Hunter** (’49, ’50), a heart specialist in Chicago; **Dick Rostrom** (’52), in sales work for a paper company; **Roland Cassata** (’52, ’53), an attorney in Chicago and debate coach at the American Institute of Banking; **John Insalata** (’52, ’53, ’54), assistant legal counsel for the National Automatic Merchandising Association; **Kent Kirkwood** (’53, ’54), an employee of the Social Security Administration; **Terrell Schwarz** (’52, ’54), an attorney in Chicago; **John Peterson** (’56, ’57), an engineer with a North Shore firm; **Martin Farrell** (’56, ’57, ’58), Du Page County Chairman of the Heart Fund; **Nick Beeler** (’57, ’58, ’59), now in an IBM training program; **Ed Campbell** (’58, ’59), owner-operator of both men's and women's residence halls in Champaign; **Charles Goldstein** (’58, ’59), a student in the College of Law at Urbana; **Irwin Rosen** (’57, ’58), the debate coach at West Morton High School; **Adrienne Asher** (’57), a secretary at the Stritch Medical School; **Patricia Rogers** (’58, ’59), an industrial designer in Chicago; **Ronald Epstein** (’59), a stockbroker; **Eileen Markham** (’59, ’60, ’61), a student at Urbana majoring in speech; **Eugene Sterbis** (’60, ’61), a student at Urbana majoring in chemistry; **Mary Lou Hampes** (’61), a student at North Park College.

Several of the alumni who were unable to attend the five-year and the ten-year reunions at the time of the annual banquet sent messages. **Dr. Ronald Shellow** (’52, ’53) is in Miami. **Earl Kunstman** (’50, ’51, ’52) is a clinical psychologist in Detroit. **Marilyn Yerkovich** (’57) is a high school teacher of general science and biology. **Laertes Bell** (’57) is a student at John Marshall Law School. **Vincent Peterson** (’57) is coaching debate at North Thornton Fractional High School. **Jeanine Greene Jasica** (’57) wrote in part: “I went downstate after I left the Pier and in January of 1959 I finished work on my B.A. in English Education. I made Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi. I came back home, started teaching English (and coaching debate) at Oak Lawn Community High School, and in April of that year I married Raymond V. Jasica.” Jeanine has started work toward the M.A. in English at the University of Chicago. She and her husband are the parents of one son, born in January, 1961. **George Mckenna** (’57) wrote in part: “While no longer debating, I am still in academia, for I'm now working on my Ph.D. at Fordham University. I received by bachelor’s degree from the University of Chicago, and my master's from the University of Massachusetts. Last year I was employed as a research assistant for a law professor in ... Lincoln, Nebraska.” George hopes to be a college professor of political science. His letter to Martin Farrell also contained an entertaining and fairly accurate description of the debate trips which he used to take “with Dick Mora, Marty Farrell, Bill Haase, Dick
Fischmar, Paul Rothstein, John Peterson—or some combination thereof."

James Montgomery ('51, '52) was mentioned in a news story last fall as one of three attorneys representing a citizens' group which was protesting the policies of the Chicago Board of Education in assigning pupils.

Carl Rostrom ('52) the last four years has been in the sales department of the Chicago office of the International Paper Company. Carl and Mrs. Rostrom have two children.

James Nolan ('52, '53) is in the English Department of York Township High School, Elmhurst, where he has charge of the debate program. Jim told Dr. Thompson in December that he planned to bring his team to UIC for the January tournament for public high schools.

Roland Cassata ('52, '53) in 1961-62 was the debate coach for the Chicago chapter of the American Institute of Banking. His full-time employment is as an attorney on the staff of the George Barrett law firm. Roland served as one of the UIC judges for the Chicago Area Forensic League debates at Loyola on November 10.

Dr. Malcolm Sperling ('52, '53) will finish his residency at the West Side Veterans' Hospital, Chicago, in July and will move to Claremore, Oklahoma, where he will be on the staff of the Indian Hospital, U. S. Department of Public Health Service. Malcolm's field is general surgery. As an undergraduate, Malcolm twice represented UIC at the national tournament at West Point.

John Insalata ('52, '53, '54) is a counsel for the National Automatic Merchandising Association. At the late October convention and exhibit of new equipment at McCormick Place, John was toastmaster for a banquet and escorted Drew Pearson, the well-known newspaper columnist, on a tour of the building. John travels a great deal. He spent his 1961 summer vacation in Mexico, and this year he plans to visit the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Rita Goran Siegal ('53) wrote in part at Christmas time: "We are expecting our second child in March, and Bud has just moved Budd Engineering into new offices at 7101 N. Western so we are quite busy now." Rita and her husband live in Chicago.

Eric Vesely ('53, '54) has returned to Chicago where he is a Data Processing Analyst at the new General Electric Computer Center on LaSalle Street. In November, Dr. Thompson visited Eric and received a demonstration of one of his machines.

Ronald Barnard ('54, '55) was mentioned in a news story in the Sun Times in February. He had informed Governor Kerner of an 1875 law which the Governor could have used to disband a private "army" which was drilling near Collinsville.

Richard Sullivan ('56) wrote in March to report that he had just taken a position as a representative of the Allstate Insurance Company, which is a subsidiary of Sears, Roebuck. Dick's office is in the new Oak Brook Shopping Center. He and Mrs. Sullivan have three children and expect a fourth child in August.

Martin Farrell ('56, '57, '58) and Barbara Frances Gaul were married at the Saint Mary of the Woods Church on Saturday, February 17. Barbara was a debater at Illinois (Urbana), and she and Martin first met on a debate trip. The reception was held in the evening at the Lake Shore Club. Martin is the DuPage County Chairman for the Heart Fund. He and Barbara will live in Chicago. Former UIC debaters whom Dr. and Mrs. Thompson saw at the reception were John Insalata ('52, '53, '54), Patricia Rogers ('57, '58), who had recently graduated at Urbana, and John Peterson ('56, '57). John is a sales engineer for the Radiation Counter Laboratories, Inc., Skokie. In February he also was a part-time student at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

* * *

...From the armed forces information services comes news of alumni in uniform. Army National Guard Specialist Four Jerry W. Sechrist, son of Mr. and Mrs. Myrtle L. Sechrist, 516 Houston St., Kilgore, Tex., recently completed the five-week personnel administration specialist course at The Adjutant General's School, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.

Specialist Sechrist is regularly assigned to Headquarters Company of the 86th Infantry Division's 111th Engineer Battalion, an Army National Guard unit in Port Arthur, Tex.

Sechrist, 25, is a 1954 graduate of Kilgore High School. He received a B.A. degree from Stephen F. Austin College, Nacogdoches, and is a member of Pi Kappa Delta,
Phi Theta Kappa and Alpha Psi Omega fraternities.


Lieutenant Cassreino was trained in the duties and responsibilities of an artillery officer. He received instruction in communications, artillery transportation, tactics and combined arms, gunnery and target acquisition.

The lieutenant entered the Army last November.

A member of Pi Kappa Delta fraternity, Cassreino is a 1957 graduate of Fortier High School in New Orleans and received a bachelor's degree in science in 1961 from Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge.

MAJOR GENERAL RALPH C. SMITH

The only general entitled to wear a Pi Kappa Delta key, as far as we know, is Major General Ralph C. Smith, who commanded the 27th Division in the invasion of the Marshall Islands. General Smith attended Colorado State College, graduating in 1917. He debated the question of compulsory military service with Oklahoma Aggies. General Smith holds the 163rd membership card issued by the society and key No. 61.

While in college General Smith entered Battery A of the Colorado National Guard. He was commissioned in November of that year. In 1917 he served on the Mexican border. In 1917 he went to France with the First Division. He was wounded in the Argonne, and later served in the army of occupation at Coblenz.

After the war he was an instructor at West Point, at Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia; and at General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth. In 1935 he graduated from the Army War College in Washington. He took the course at L'École de Guerre in Paris, France. He served as chief of operations branch, military intelligence division, the War Department General Staff, in 1958. In 1940 he was made executive officer of the military intelligence division.

In 1942 he was made a Brigadier General and assigned to the 76th Division. He was commissioned Major General in the fall of 1942 and sent overseas in command of the 27th Division. This division participated in the invasion of the Marshalls and the action at Tarawa.

“I didn’t know I was going to be a soldier when I entered debating,” said General Smith. “But forensics has proved to be excellent training for what I have been doing in the army.”

STUDENTS, WATCH YOUR TONGUE

Angelo Patri

“Speak that I may know you.” Your tongue betrays what you are, what you think, the quality of you. You are judged and placed by the words you use and the voice that utters them and, like it or not, the judgment is accurate. You speak with the voice and the language of the person you are, not with that of the person you hope people think you are.

Fine clothes and good grooming serve to open doors to you, but when you speak all that is forgotten. It is your tongue that speaks the first, last and imperative word. “She is good looking but the minute she opens her mouth it is all over.” “He makes a good appearance but he talks like an ignoramus.” You have heard this many times and know it to be true, yet the evil thing persists.

In every high school there are students who, in spite of all teaching, all warnings, make a game of using crude speech. They have the mistaken idea that it is beneath their dignity to talk grammatically, to use an adequate vocabulary, to cultivate a good speaking voice and some charm of manner. All this is “sissified” to them. They believe that crudeness is an indication of a strong personality. It is nothing but the indication of crass ignorance, inexcusable ignorance.

Your speaking voice is your introduction to strangers. If it is pleasant to hear, they will listen. If it is harsh, strident, misplaced, they will turn from you and close not only their ears but their minds against you.

You will be bundled with the duds and the dead ones. Stand at the entrance of any high school and listen to the students talk.

Listen to the voices, the choice of words, the expression of ideas, and pick out those you would like to hear again. You will have the top students of the school. That ought to mean something to you.

Watch Your tongue.
NEW MEMBERS OF PI KAPPA DELTA

Alabama College
35083 Mary Elaine Kilgore
35084 Robert Edward Dobbs
35085 Katy Sue Meredith
35086 Anita Louise Hewell
35087 Elmeda Armstrong

South Dakota State College
35088 Bruce D. Johnson
35089 Janelle M. Schlimmegen
35090 Donald V. Barnett
35091 James G. Felt

Mississippi College
35092 Bobby Sweede Gerry
35093 James H. Westbrooks

University of Arizona
35094 John A. Roberts
35095 John Patrick Maitreyean
35096 Michael Matchay

Ripon College
35097 John Newhard

Southern State—South Dakota
35098 Randy Bennett James
35099 Dorothea Kube
35100 Larry N. Hornstra
35101 Sharon Elaine Fossune
35102 Keith Edward Brosz
35103 Gwen Petersen
35104 Larry D. Wolf
35105 George J. Wasika
35106 Sharon Kay Wright
35107 John J. Kutilek

St. Olaf College
35108 Glen Richard Schutte
35109 Carol Jane Brown
35110 Vicki Van
35111 James Heion
35112 Douglas Lind

Middle Tennessee State
35113 Cлемма Carole Soufard
35114 Richard James Schoonman

David Lipscomb
35115 Raymond Gerald Fulkerson
35116 Robert Lee Hendren, Jr.
35117 Jessie E. Like

William Jewell College
35118 Maila J. Brewer
35119 A. J. Wilson, Jr.

Eastern Michigan University
35120 W. Cary Weatherhead
35121 Audrey G. Finger
35122 Dolores Johns

Maryville College
35123 Jane Dodez
35124 Gloria Sturmfels

Southeastern College—Kansas
35125 Ward E. Loyd
35126 Sue Stauffer
35127 Paulaubeth Henderson
35128 Duane Lyon
35129 Miron A. Morrill

Appalachian State
35130 Linda Caroline Petty
35131 Jerry Dean Rowland
35132 Thomas Crowell Rhyne
35133 William Ladson Wallace

Phillips University
35134 E. Ann Andrews

Lamar Tech
35135 Vivien Leigh Powers
35136 James Havis Smith, Jr.
35137 Mary Elizabeth Tucker

Morningside College
35138 Dean Summerbell

Central Methodist College
35139 Linda Ann Lester
35140 Patricia Gayle McClenahan

Huron College
35141 Sharon R. Sackett

Colorado State—Greeley
35142 Dr. Sam Gates
35143 Dr. Orvel Trainer

Norfolk College of William & Mary
35144 Morton G. Stone
35145 William R. Stewart
35146 William C. Bright, Jr.
35147 John R. Ashe
35148 Garnett F. Taylor
35149 Stanley J. Dobson
35150 Joseph P. Govle
35151 Stanley L. Morris, Jr.
35152 James E. Bryan
35153 Osborne F. Morgan, Jr.

University of Southwestern Louisiana
35154 Mary Kathryn Champagne
35155 Don deBoisblanc
35156 Charles L. Dupin
35157 William Goodson
35158 Ann S. Jennings
35159 Charles Moremns
35160 Nancy Reddell
35161 P. A. Riehl
35162 Pat Stephens
35163 Mike Thompson
35164 Joel E. Wright
35165 Eleanor Yazbeck

San Fernando Valley State College
35166 Jeff Sobel
35167 Sharon Achen
35168 Harriet Fleming

University of Illinois—Chicago
35169 Ronald R. Marich
35170 Susan H. Edwards

University of Detroit
35171 William A. Check
35172 Lawrence Michael Green
35173 Sandra Anne Menzies
35174 Robert F. Pearl
35175 Joanne M. Ruppe
35176 Diana Jean Zyskowski

Texas Western College
35177 Dexter M. Mapel

Central Methodist College
35178 Scott Brooks

Central College—Iowa
35179 Leland Ryken
35180 Robert Wayne Webter
35181 Wayne Hugan

Augustana College—Illinois
35182 Mary Louise Enstrom
35183 Barbara Amosoon

Eastern Michigan University
35184 Richard L. Lipsey

Pacific Lutheran University
35185 Larry Hitterdal
35186 Rosalyn B. Fannin
35187 Charles Stanley Trom
35188 David G. Stein
35189 Marsha Dee Selden
35190 Ruth Elizabeth Pettit
35191 Richard D. Finch
35192 Gordon C. Gray
35193 Ruth M. Ellia
35194 Sandra Ann Ellingson
35195 Keith Swanson

Concordia College
35196 Olaf A. Storaasli
35197 Darel Swenson

Mississippi College
35198 Lionel Helfen
35199 Skeet Osborne
35200 Ruth Jeanette Swindell
35201 Eleanor Ruth Foster
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>35202</td>
<td>Bettye Jayne Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35203</td>
<td>Mary Lou Dimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35204</td>
<td>George Theodore Ressler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35205</td>
<td>Mary Lou Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University</td>
<td>35206</td>
<td>Margaret E. Ogden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Institute</td>
<td>35207</td>
<td>John Wesley Winter, II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays, Kansas, State College</td>
<td>35208</td>
<td>Deloris M. Musgrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35209</td>
<td>Gloria Dizmang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central College</td>
<td>35210</td>
<td>Mary Lou Scherts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivet Nazarene College</td>
<td>35211</td>
<td>Athel McCombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35213</td>
<td>Jo Anne Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35214</td>
<td>Theodore L. Lemke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35215</td>
<td>Joyce K. Kaylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35216</td>
<td>Edmund Boyd Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>35217</td>
<td>Gerald F. Uelmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35218</td>
<td>Charles T. Moffitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35219</td>
<td>Michael J. Yost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otterbein College</td>
<td>35220</td>
<td>Kaye Ann Koontz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35221</td>
<td>Thomas C. Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35222</td>
<td>Linda Lou Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin-Simmons University</td>
<td>35223</td>
<td>John Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson College</td>
<td>35224</td>
<td>Carole Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35225</td>
<td>Robert W. Boatler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35226</td>
<td>Carolyn Cudd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia College</td>
<td>35227</td>
<td>Lowell Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35228</td>
<td>Weyland Milford Beeghly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35229</td>
<td>Kenneth Leroy Ullom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35230</td>
<td>James Bosserman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta College</td>
<td>35231</td>
<td>Lois Lommen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35232</td>
<td>Stan Kano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern State College</td>
<td>35233</td>
<td>Patricia Straughn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35234</td>
<td>Frederick Davis Nott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35235</td>
<td>Dorothy Sharon Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35236</td>
<td>Sandra M. Smoyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35237</td>
<td>Martha P. Kensler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35238</td>
<td>Angelo Fiatearulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35239</td>
<td>Judythe Ann Stephan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips University</td>
<td>35245</td>
<td>Elna Claire Baeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35246</td>
<td>Talbot Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>35247</td>
<td>Billie Sue Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35248</td>
<td>Jeri Goss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35249</td>
<td>John Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35250</td>
<td>Dale Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35251</td>
<td>Bill Duff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35252</td>
<td>Benjamin H. Sheppard, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35253</td>
<td>Donna Gayle Butts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35254</td>
<td>Johnny Baum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin</td>
<td>35255</td>
<td>Joan Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35256</td>
<td>Robert Goodroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35257</td>
<td>Carl Adkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State Teachers College</td>
<td>35258</td>
<td>Bill McCarthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Harvey</td>
<td>35259</td>
<td>Robert J. Edgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>35260</td>
<td>Richard A. Dumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35261</td>
<td>Mary Ann Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35262</td>
<td>Marjanne Creegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35263</td>
<td>Priscilla Dawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35264</td>
<td>Robert E. McCurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35265</td>
<td>Dr. Elbert Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther College—Iowa</td>
<td>35266</td>
<td>Pat Regan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35267</td>
<td>Dean Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35268</td>
<td>Judith Schul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35269</td>
<td>Bonnie Sanderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35270</td>
<td>Sandra Sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35271</td>
<td>Paul Pederson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of S. W. Louisiana</td>
<td>35272</td>
<td>George Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State College</td>
<td>35273</td>
<td>Bill Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35274</td>
<td>Wanda Lee Chitwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35275</td>
<td>Jerry C. Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35276</td>
<td>Howard G. Kirksey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35277</td>
<td>Wallace R. Maples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35278</td>
<td>John B. O’Hara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State College</td>
<td>35279</td>
<td>Michael R. Slavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35280</td>
<td>Linda M. Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35281</td>
<td>Paul D. Mark Lucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35282</td>
<td>Candy Trimble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35283</td>
<td>Randolph Shreve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>35284</td>
<td>Mary Frances Woodhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35285</td>
<td>David Hardy Crites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35286</td>
<td>John Gary Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>35287</td>
<td>Daniel J. O’Neill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35288</td>
<td>Craig Humphrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron College</td>
<td>35289</td>
<td>Harvey Wallman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35290</td>
<td>Noel Gene Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin-Simmons University</td>
<td>35291</td>
<td>Thomas David Yeilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35292</td>
<td>Paulette Bates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips University</td>
<td>35293</td>
<td>Joyce Basey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Institute</td>
<td>35294</td>
<td>Robert Elmer Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35295</td>
<td>Donald Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista College</td>
<td>35296</td>
<td>James Walling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35297</td>
<td>Wendell Quelprud Halversan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding College</td>
<td>35298</td>
<td>Evelyn Rickett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35299</td>
<td>Doyle G. Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doane College</td>
<td>35300</td>
<td>Martin Bienenfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35301</td>
<td>Murray Schmechel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35302</td>
<td>Elaine Ohlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Tech.</td>
<td>35303</td>
<td>Linda Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35304</td>
<td>Frank Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35305</td>
<td>James Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35306</td>
<td>Lynda King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35307</td>
<td>Sandra Hensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>35308</td>
<td>John M. Helgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State</td>
<td>35309</td>
<td>Edward Norton Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi College</td>
<td>35310</td>
<td>Carole Hedgepath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35311</td>
<td>Riley Munday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35312</td>
<td>Fred Berger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pacific</td>
<td>35314</td>
<td>Linda Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35315</td>
<td>David F. Quadro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35316</td>
<td>Weldon Theodore Moss, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35317</td>
<td>Gary Albert Wiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35318</td>
<td>Paul M. Wheatley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35319</td>
<td>Stanley Zimmerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35320</td>
<td>Virginia Ann Kerber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35321</td>
<td>Raoul Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35322</td>
<td>Claudia J. Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35323</td>
<td>Robert C. Dohoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35324</td>
<td>Roger D. Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>35325</td>
<td>Sheila Marrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35326</td>
<td>DuWayne H. Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35327</td>
<td>Joan Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville College</td>
<td>35328</td>
<td>Jane Hickey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of Arizona
35374 Patricia Whitehead
35375 Philip Supina
35376 Hugh Linton
35377 Royanna Lebrecht
35378 Leonard Bower
35379 Hugh Gordon Blount
35380

Pacific Lutheran University
35381 Mrs. T. H. Karl
35382 Mr. K. N. Roe

Southern Connecticut State College
35383 Thomas A. Bartlett
35384 Enrica Pizzorusso
35385 Joseph John Knappik
35386 Lawrence E. Fitzgerald
35387 Catherine Ann Miller
35388 Judith Ann Martin
35389 Marilyn J. Moore

South Dakota School of Mines
35390 David G. Hill
35391 Michael Leonard Stensaas
35392 Richard Frank
35393 Leo Michael Skinner
35394 Myron Roger Compton
35395 Kenneth Smith
35396 Wayne Ivan Makuff
35397 Everett Dean Trevor

North Central—Illinois
35398 Lyle Allison

University of Pacific
35399 Jane Ermine Drobnick

Loyola University of Los Angeles
35400 William George Izabal
35401 Thomas J. Woods
35402 Lawrence A. Callaghan
35403 John Torelli
35404 John P. Farrell
35405 Rev. Terrence L. Mahan, S.J.

University of Kansas City
35406 Dr. Carleton R. Schofield

Puget Sound
35407 Richard Green

University of Arizona
35408 Margaret Bartholomeaus

Carthage College
35409 John Wayne Holland

Macalester College
35410 Robert Stahmann
35411 David Hollaway

Grove City College
35412 Mary Linda Sorber
35413 Daryl J. Dean
35414 Ralph J. Karn, Jr.

Findlay College
35415 Ken Bowers

Stetson University
35416 Gerald Studier

Seattle Pacific College
35417 Richard N. Weber

North—William & Mary
35418 Osborne J. Morgan
35419 Stanley L. Morris
35420 William R. Stewart
35421 Robert D. Mahanes
35422 James E. Bryan

Western Washington State
35423 N. Paige Crimmins

Gustavus Adolphus College
35424 Myrna Lee Zielske
35425 Luther Luedtke

Bowling Green State College
35426 Marya Bednerik
35427 Robert Morrison, Jr.

University of Omaha
35428 Phyllis Edith Taylor
35429 Stanley Zwerling
35430 Arlene Grossman
35431 Joseph Norbert Lasean
35432 Larry James Hicks

Coe College
35433 John Casey, Jr.
35434 Bruce Pangborn
35435 Rachel Ann Stewart
35436 Mary Una Head
35437 Merle Pickles

Baylor University
35438 Clifford Nelson Humphrey, III
35439 Mignon Furqueron
35440 Karolyn Kelly
35441 Linda Kay Wall
35442 Harry S. Spicer
35443 Larry Amerine
35444 Ronnie Rudd

University of Kansas City
35445 Elizabeth Ann Jensen
35446 Robert Reid
35447 Charlotte S. Hill
35448 Stephen Sturdevant
35449 James Clifford Fulbright
35450 Daniel Koden

William Jewell College
35451 William M. Fulderson, Jr.
35452 Grant L. Johnston
35453 Paul Wayne Kuhlman
35454 Larry Matthews
35455 Guy Robert Moore
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State College for Women</td>
<td>Sariba Deaton, Monita Helen Thompson, Shirley Wells, Ann Bauch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin State—Oshkosh</td>
<td>Judith Cerutti, Robert Ihrke, Philip Fritz, Zona Jones, James LaBelle, William O'Brien, Robert Smith, Judith Wessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas State College</td>
<td>Edward E. (Gene) Lewis, Donald Dean Lacy, Mary Lemond, Henry Ohring Werner, James Portis Ribble, Sarah Dedama Carr, Elaine G. Paul, Nedra Black, W. J. Helm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Paul H. Carlson, Kenneth H. Haines, Arend Paul Boer, Lila Lindberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana College—Illinois</td>
<td>Steven Sanford Baxter, Robert A. Carp, James H. Cook, Joyce A. Mineemoyer, Donald H. Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, L. A.</td>
<td>Charles E. Purzycki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabor College</td>
<td>Joseph Lewis Budger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td>Ralph M. Earles, John M. Jaworoky, Dale Suderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jewell College</td>
<td>Dennis Clair Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster College</td>
<td>John C. Landis IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver-Stockton</td>
<td>Victor O. Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Conn. State College</td>
<td>Patricia Long, Robert Edgar Helsabeck, Mary Beth McDonald, James E. Harms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Dennis E. Keenan, William J. Foley, John R. Enscoc, Clemens F. Najjar, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana College—Illinois</td>
<td>Khalil Abu-Rish, Daniel R. Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Montana College of Ed.</td>
<td>Larry E. Marcus, Robert E. Garies, Gary Cunningham, Dona McManis, Prof. Earl A. Kofler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ill. University</td>
<td>Sharon Hodgson, Dennis Sullivan, Susan Amelie Stevenson, Ronald L. Lomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois—Chicago</td>
<td>Theodore V. Kundrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td>Marilyn Reifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hills</td>
<td>Richard Crawford, Norman Williamson, Robert Houston, Myra Marr, Sharon Laurie, Jon Dahlberg, Shirley Smocuk, La Von Cundy, Marion Wilheam, Mira Satterlee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth College</td>
<td>Karen Brown, Janet Henning, David Lauredsen, Joseph Miles, William Hanford, Ream A. Lazaro II, Donald Stevenson, Thomas Dailey, Howard Estes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg College</td>
<td>Richard Gebhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley University</td>
<td>Eileen Corcoran, Judith A. Robinson, Shirley Braun, Linda Swin, Larry Brennan, Douglas Bock, Joseph Scarcist, Mary Akers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Missouri State College</td>
<td>Robert Cotter, George Fountain, Lona Moeller Lewis, Frances Jean Morris, Priscilla Porter, Marilynn Wallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg College</td>
<td>Barbara Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman College</td>
<td>Lawrence Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>William C. Primm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Missouri State College</td>
<td>Bill Hardesty, John Miller, Brenda Kay Lawrence, Austin Mueller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene Christian College</td>
<td>John Weldon Ferguson, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Iowa University</td>
<td>Robert Earl Smith, June Goosby, Lynn D. Nelson, William J. Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State College</td>
<td>Barbara McShane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>Penny McFarland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Editor Signs Off

So much of what transpired at the August meeting of the National Council is of immediate interest to all Pi Kap members that I shall devote my page this issue to mentioning some of the action taken.

The chief purpose of the meeting, of course, is to set up all the details of the Convention: to arrange a schedule of events, to select the members of the various contest and convention committees, and to make whatever changes seem desirable in the contest rules. In all of this, the recommendations of the Committee on Convention Evaluation from the last Convention are studied carefully. It is a pleasure to report that the Council this summer was able to adopt practically all of the recommendations of the 1961 committee headed up by Robert Capel. The rules in oratory, for instance were revised to read that "all orations shall be memorized and delivered without notes. The reading of orations from manuscript shall be prohibited." In debate, an effort will be made to secure and use a ballot which asks the judge to give criticisms and ratings to both teams. In addition, instructions to judges will be revised to answer criticisms made. In extemporaneous speaking, where the suggestions made were largely of a procedural nature, the contest committee here will be asked to phrase less detailed topics, to phrase them so that they sound less alike, and to improve the method of drawing for topics so as to equalize the difficulty of topics for all contestants.

Outside the area of contest events, the Council concurred heartily with the resolution of the committee to condemn the tendency of some coaches to speak disparingly of the work done in other sections of the country. The Council, however, like the 1961 committee, was uncertain as to how such coaches could be punished. The Council endorsed the recommendations on judges: that local judges be used at all costs once they have been asked to appear, and that the host school and province be urged to make every effort to obtain judges who understand the procedures in events they are asked to judge.

The Council, again in line with recommendations made, has set registration at a time so as to make it possible for all chapters to register in advance of the first business meeting. At this first meeting, the election of national officers will begin promptly, and the elections will be completed by the third day of the Convention. Those who wish to make nominations for any national office are invited to submit nominations now, either to the Council or to the chairman of the nominations committee, as prescribed in the National Constitution. The chairman of the committee is Professor Sherod Collins, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville, Missouri. In this way it will be possible for the delegates to learn of all nominees by the first or second business meeting. The recommendation of the committee on evaluation that more business meeting time be allotted for discussion has been followed as best it could be in what is really a four day convention. Finally, arrangements have been made with S.I.U. to tape the remarks of convention speakers, so that copies may be had by those wishing for them.

Elsewhere in this issue, the work of the Council on the program of events and the selection and appointment of the various committees is summarized. (See page three.) The pressure from several provinces to inaugurate a division of mixed debate was discussed, and it was decided to try such a division, at least for 1963. Other matters discussed are almost too numerous to mention, but a few of them may be stated briefly here. It was decided to combine the March issue of THE FORENSIC with the Convention Booklet, in order to save on printing costs of the Convention. It was decided to request the Pi Kappa Delta be assigned one delegate on the Legislative Assembly of the Speech Association of America. It was decided that some suitable recognition, such as a scroll, be given to past national officers of Pi Kappa Delta, also that recognition be given to all coaches who have been active for twenty-five or more years in Pi Kappa Delta. Other matters on which final action could not be taken at the time will come before the Convention itself.
THE ART OF PERSUASION

—BEAUTIFUL AND JUST