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Plan for Active Participation in PKD

By the time the January Forensic is published, Pi Kappa Delta will have issued membership card number 50,000. The larger an organization becomes, the greater becomes the difficulty of keeping communication lines open. We are a communication fraternity, but that fact by itself does not guarantee successful communication among the membership.

"Many heads are better than a few" is an assumption behind the varied activities of Pi Kappa Delta. It takes many heads to produce a good tournament, an excellent individual events contest, a challenging debate, an attractive, relevant Forensic, and a functioning, democratic convention.

Good communicators realize that highly important ideas often come from sources that are not routinely consulted. To talk and to be listened to is therapeutic, even though some of our ideas may never be directly, or even indirectly, implemented. Nevertheless, we have known the satisfaction of having some input into and feedback from a situation in which we are vitally interested.

It is the intention of the Pi Kappa Delta Convention and Contest Committees to provide for open discussion and implementation of matters for the good of the order. As a member of Pi Kappa Delta, you may feel it your privilege, even duty, to provide guidance for the chairmen and members of various committees published in this issue.

Pi Kappa Delta does no one a favor, least of all itself, if it makes spectators, rather than active participants, of its members. As Carl Becker has said, "The chief virtue of democracy, and the whole reason for cherishing it is that with all its defects it still provides the most favorable condition for the maintenance of . . . dignity and the practice of . . . morality. The individual is the essential carrier of that dignity and the agent of that morality."

I believe that all responsible Pi Kappa Deltans would wish our organization to profit from the reasonableness and creative thinking of as many members as possible. I hope that our upcoming National Meeting in Seattle will be able to respond to its membership in an effective manner.
WHEN THE CONVENTION ROLL IS CALLED
Larry Norton, Historian

As one looks back upon Pi Kappa Delta's sixty-four years, several basic beliefs emerge from the written and oral expressions which relate the purposes and ideals of the organization to the policy of convention attendance. These interpretations are drawn from many expressions in The Forensic, from Council and regional executive meetings, and from policy making sessions of the national and provincial conventions.

Before attempting to express the philosophy underlying the attendance requirement at national conventions, let us review the constitutional history, glance at some registration figures, and repeat a few selected statements by early leaders.

It was Thursday, April 3, 1924, and the biennial business meeting of the Fifth National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta was being held on the campus of Bradley Polytechnic Institute in Peoria, Illinois. Upon the recommendation of the National Council, Secretary-Treasurer Alfred Westfall introduced resolutions pertaining to chapter attendance. Amendments were submitted by George Finley and W. H. Veatch, followed by discussion from the floor, including supporting remarks by E. R. Nichols. The final wording of the convention attendance requirement read, "Any chapter failing to have a delegate at the first national convention after the granting of its charter, or any chapter failing to have a delegate at two consecutive conventions shall have its charter suspended. Any charter thus suspended can be regranted only by action of a national convention before which some delegate of the institution appears in person."

Twenty-nine years later, at the Eighteenth National Convention held at Kalamazoo, the word probation was substituted for suspension.

At the Twenty-eighth National Convention in Omaha, an amendment was passed opening the way for chapters to petition to be freed from this penalty for failing to attend some future convention. The alternative was provided by an amendment to
add to the long-standing rule the following sentences: "Under exceptional circumstances, chapters in good standing may petition to be excused from National Convention attendance. Petitions, available from the Chairman of the Charter and Standards Committee, must be filed prior to the National Convention and then approved by a majority vote of the National Council and by the appropriate Province Governor." This is the constitutional story of the attendance requirement for national conventions.

Appeals for better attendance at provincial and national conventions have filled many pages of The Forensic. Attendance has been a primary concern of the national officers from the time that Editor E. R. Nichols, prior to the First National Convention held at Topeka in 1916, wrote, "Don't give up because of distance or expense — raise the money and send a representative." Ten of the 14 active chapters answered roll call at Topeka. Over 70 percent chapter attendance has been recorded at 66 percent of the 29 national conventions. At 9 conventions less than 66 percent of the chapters were represented: 1918, 1924, 1942, 1947, 1955, 1965, 1971, 1973, and 1975. For 8 consecutive conventions following the adoption of the attendance rules in 1924, until the war influence in 1942, the percentage of chapters present never fell below 79 percent and ranged up to 88 percent. The best attendance in recent years was 187 chapters or 78 percent and a total registration of 1068 delegates and visitors at Tempe, Arizona, in 1969.

What are the reasons for an attendance requirement? In the May Forensic of 1924, following the adoption of the constitution attendance provision, the Editor explains, "We feel that this requirement is really justified. The chapter that cannot send a delegate to the convention at least once in four years has something radically wrong with it. Either the institution to which the chapter belongs is weak — too weak to have Pi Kappa Delta in it; or the officers of the chapter or the faculty members of the chapter have not an adequate realization of the meaning of the organization to which they belong, nor an appreciation of the value of atten-
dance at such a gathering in the stimulation of interest in forensics. In many cases we feel that the explanation is just plain and simple laziness on the part of chapter officers or faculty members. We grant that once in a while a chapter may be disappointed in its plans for the raising of money to send a delegate — when the chapter is a long way from the Convention — but most of the excuses which are given for the failure to be represented are weak and would not be given by chapter officers or faculty members who are thoroughly interested and alive."

Two years later another Editor was writing: "This (the attendance rule) was not voted in the sense that it was a penalty on any chapter, but out of the feeling that a chapter which does not attend the conventions misses the best that the society can contribute to the betterment of its forensic activities, and the conviction that the society could not be 100 percent efficient, unless each chapter was doing its share."

In January 1952, President Roy "Hap" Mahaffey wrote, "If Pi Kappa Delta is nothing more than an organization which gives recognition for the superior student who wins prizes; if Pi Kappa Delta is nothing more than a sponsoring organization for forensic programs; if Pi Kappa Delta is nothing more than a formality for granting memberships and keys; then Pi Kappa Delta is worth no more on the college campus than a platform with a public address system used for publicity purposes. Pi Kappa Delta should be the goad that pricks the lethargic portions of those who should be thinking and acting in the promotion of excellence in thought and leadership."

From varied sources, including personal experience, these are some of the basic beliefs which have guided the thinking of our leaders throughout the years as they have made the appeal for convention attendance. The Pi Kappa Delta convention-tournament serves valuable purposes in addition to the ordinary tournament. These conventions are designed to create a competitive climate in which ethical behavior is an integral part of all activities and where the primary concern (Continued on page 7)
The 30th National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta will be held at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle, Washington, March 18-22, 1977. Our national conventions are not the usual tournaments, nor are they the usual conventions. They are instead unique experiences for the talented forensic student. A biennial convention is held for the purpose of fraternal fellowship, business of the fraternity, and the opportunity, not otherwise offered to most students, to meet for friendly competition. In almost all of the competition, members match wits and talent and exchange ideas with students from all parts of the country. This in itself is an experience not available to most forensic students. It is exciting, and the free time can be used to great advantage. There will be free monorail rides to the Food Circus, where the variety of good food at reasonable prices will not be matched at any other place to which you might travel. The experience of the salmon bake, which was the highlight of the 1965 Convention, will be one to be remembered.

Convention Attendance: Be aware of the constitutional requirements. Check Article V, Division A, Section 14. Don’t let Seattle be the second consecutive nationals missed by your chapter. That will mean probation. Remember that attendance is defined as “answering present to roll call at not less than two business sessions of the convention. One of these sessions must be the final session unless the chapter has been excused by the National President.”

Convention and Contest Rules: Be sure to read and reread the rules carefully. Changes have been made from two years ago. Be sure you understand the rules and formula regarding judges, number of entries, and the kinds of events. ALL CONTESTANTS MUST BE MEMBERS of Pi Kappa Delta.

Entry Forms: These will be mailed in late January so that you will be receiving them by February 1, 1977. If you haven’t received them by February 5, please advise us. The entries MUST be returned to show a postmark of no later than March 1, 1977. Except for emergencies, these entries should be accurate. A confirmation of your entry will be returned within a few days of its receipt in this office.

Registration: The registration desks will be open on Friday, March 18, at 8:30 AM. Registration will close at 6:30 PM so that all delegates may attend the province meetings at 7:00 PM and the general meeting at 8:00 PM. If you cannot arrive in time to complete registration before 6:30 PM, please call long distance to permit the contest committees to make their final plans.

Housing: Housing reservations will be made directly with the Olympic Hotel. A reservation card will be enclosed with the entry forms. SEND THE HOTEL RESERVATION FORMS DIRECTLY TO THE OLYMPIC HOTEL. SEND THE REGISTRATION FORM TO THIS OFFICE.

Voting Delegate: Select your voting delegate soon, if you have not already done so. The voting delegate may be either a student or a faculty member but should be well informed on the purposes and ideals of Pi Kappa Delta. The chapter should instruct its delegate on positions to be taken on important issues, such as constitutional amendments and election of officers.

Several new chapters will receive their charters at the opening meeting on Friday.
evening. Be present and welcome them. Dr. Tom Harte, the contest chairman, suggested in a letter to the Council in September that he felt the selection of “Tall Tales” was a good one; he had just heard the first round of speeches in his classes! After reading the message from our student members on the National Council (see the October Forensic, page 32), I too feel that the topic was a good choice. Their item number 11 is truly a “Tall Tale.” I fear that we in the State of Washington cannot claim the highest mountain in the Continental United States. No doubt we shall hear many more “tall tales” in Seattle in March! See you there.

When the Convention Roll Is Called

(Continued from page 5)

of all participants is the development of educational values. If the winning of awards conflicts with these purposes, then winning must be given secondary importance. The leaders of Pi Kappa Delta have always believed that when one becomes a member of an organization, he assumes an obligation to further the purposes and ideals of that organization. Their respect for the values of Pi Kappa Delta membership serves to enhance this belief as it relates to participation in all the activities of the fraternity at all levels. As respected forensic directors, these leaders realize the tremendous influence of a director in developing the attitudes and values of students. Therefore, the director is primarily responsible when a chapter demonstrates either strength or weakness. These leaders know that the local chapter was chartered with the understanding that it assume definite obligations to the fraternity. Therefore, the school, the student members, and above all the sponsor have an ongoing responsibility to carry out their commitment to each other and to the national organization. When this pledge is not fulfilled, the ones who suffer are the students and the alumni members. Leaders are aware that indifference and ineffective budgeting are too often the real reasons for non-attendance at conventions. They know from the feedback from former students that honors achieved in Pi Kappa Delta endure long after a win or loss has been forgotten. That is why Pi Kappa Deltans believe in established goals for achievement. And that is why Pi Kappa Deltans believe that the Constitution and Rituals should continue to direct and encourage these beliefs.

PI KAPPA DELTA MEMBERS WHO HAVE ACHIEVED HIGHEST HONORS

I-Instruction
CIS-Competitive Individual Speaking
D-Debate

Name, Chapter
Elizabeth Henderson, IL Mu (CIS)
Jeanne Ellen Clark, IL Mu (CIS)
Marjorie Schaer, WA Theta (CIS) & (D)
Kathleen M. Mahoney, PA Lambda (CIS)
Sally Maude Finley, PA Zeta (CIS)
Scott C. McKenzie, PA Nu (D)
Alan Dale Lane, SD Zeta (CIS) & (D)
James V. Kilgore, AR Theta (CIS) & (D)
Landis Kelly Magnuson, NB Alpha (CIS)
David Potter, MN Mu (CIS)
Mary Jo Juneau, LA Eta (CIS) & (D)
David Quimby, MO Eta (D)
Nina R. Olson, WI Delta (CIS)
Jane Rudie, WI Gamma (CIS)
Derald L. Harris, MO Sigma (CIS)
James M. Nelson, WA Kappa (CIS) & (D)

PI KAPPA DELTA MEMBERS WHO HAVE ACHIEVED SPECIAL DISTINCTION

Debra Levey, IL Mu (CIS)
Dennis Bergvall, WA Theta (D)
Catherine Colson, WA Theta (CIS)
Michael Stewart Miller, WA Theta (CIS)
David W. Nixon, PA Zeta (CIS)
Michael McNabb, TX Alpha Epsilon (CIS)
Jennifer Bergstrom, WI Gamma (CIS)
Steve Spear, WI Gamma (I)
Craig Cutbirth, WI Gamma (I)
Susan Aloisi, NY Alpha (CIS)
Teresa Ellen Carver Scifres,
AR Theta (CIS) & (D)
Dennis Mark Chauvin, LA Zeta (CIS) & (D)
Celeste Michelle Condit,
ID Gamma (D)
THE COVER:
The Student Members of the National Council out of Costume

JAMES CLYMER

Jim Clymer, a dean’s list senior and campus leader at Pacific Lutheran University, has racked up a long list of forensic honors in debate, extemporaneous speaking, and impromptu. One of his most notable awards was a superior in extemp. at the last PKD Nationals. Jim, along with five other winners, debated in historic Congress Hall in Philadelphia.

To his PKD role Jim brings wide experience in committee work. Currently he is chairman of both the Campus Video Committee and the Entertainment Series. Last year he ran the Muscular Dystrophy Dance Marathon and was PLU Activities Vice-President. In 1975 he chaired his college’s high school debate tournament.

Jim says:

I believe it is necessary for the student members on Council to express student opinions on forensic competition so that the benefits of such activities can be expanded and improved. The initiation of several new events for the Seattle Nationals indicates, I think, that students are looking for a change and that the National Council is willing to do whatever is necessary to benefit the students participating in Pi Kappa Delta.

I would hope that Tana and I can meet with as many students as possible so that we can get their feelings on forensic competition. I also hope that the social aspects of Pi Kap will give students the opportunity to meet with people from all areas of the country. This kind of fellowship is not found in many national organizations, and I think that we are fortunate to be able to meet as a group every two years.

If anything, Pi Kap has taught me that there is more to communication that a file box full of evidence and a first negative spread. Communication is people, and unless you try to relate to each person on his level, any attempt at communication is useless. Pi Kap stresses the “Art of Persuasion, Beautiful and Just.” I think we should look more carefully at the meaning of our organization’s motto. The key to many social problems might be found if we attempted to communicate and understand one another.

MONTANA JOHNSON

Montana Johnson is a sophomore at none other than Montana State University in Bozeman. She hopes that eventually her major academic field of public relations will lead to a job with a United States company in France. But for the time being, she reports, “During the summer I work on the grounds crew at MSU, and during the winter I work on debate!”

Tana has spoken competitively for four years. In addition to debating, she has done extemporaneous speaking, impromptu, oral interpretation, and duo interpretation.

Tana says:

I’m really excited to be a part of the planning body for our Seattle National Convention and Tournament. During my time as student representative, I hope to do just that: bring the student view into PKD. We have a lot of great ideas in our student membership, and I hope to help bring these ideas together to make PKD better. I think that the schedule for Seattle should do this. We have provided time for the students to get together and meet some of their fellow Pi Kappa Deltans, and I urge everyone to make the most of this time. Also, if anyone has any ideas or suggestions, please feel free to write to Jim or to me. PKD has become a big part of my college experience, and I will always be proud to say I was in Pi Kappa Delta. Hopefully at Seattle everyone will be able to see just how great Pi Kap is.
The Rhetoric of Two Equal Rights Debates

Judith S. Trent

On August 10, 1970, Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths asked the House of Representatives to proceed immediately to the consideration of an article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The first section of the article read:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.¹

Although the ensuing debate led by Martha W. Griffiths was a critical moment in the history of women's struggle for equality and thus worthy of rhetorical consideration, the Equal Rights Amendment debate of August 10, 1970, is even more significant when examined within the historical and rhetorical context provided by another congressional debate on an earlier equal rights amendment.

On March 7, 1884, Susan B. Anthony presented the arguments for Article XVI, a constitutional amendment, to the Senate Select Committee on Woman Suffrage. The first section of the article read:

The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship, and the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of sex, or for any reason not equally applicable to all citizens of the United States.²

The purpose of this paper is to compare the fundamental features which relate the equal rights debate in 1970 to the one in 1884. The comparison will be offered in three areas: the historical context, the rhetorical context, and the rhetorical strategies. This examination should provide a better meaning of understanding not only the rhetorical elements involved but should also contribute to our knowledge of the women's equal rights struggle. If each debate is seen in the context of the other, perhaps we shall better comprehend the salient characteristics of the rhetoric of a 126-year struggle for equality.

The Historical Context

Congresswoman Griffiths' 1970 debate in the House of Representatives occurred forty-seven years after the first presentation to Congress of a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights to women. The first equal rights amendment was introduced in Congress in 1923, three years after ratification of the nineteenth (woman suffrage) amendment. During this ensuing forty-seven years, the resolution had been reported favorably by Senate committees in a number of Congresses and had been passed by the Senate twice but only after the addition of what were, in effect, nullifying clauses.³ Finally, on May 5-7, 1970, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee conducted hearings on the Equal Rights Amendment. The Committee, after hearing testimony from forty-two witnesses, compiled a hearing record of almost 800 pages (which the Committee failed to have printed), and then dropped the amendment.

While the amendment had been introduced, debated, nullified, and sent back to committee in the Senate, the House of Representatives had done virtually nothing with the resolution for forty-seven years. And for twenty years, Representative Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, had kept the resolution bottled up without hearings because he regarded the amendment as a "blunderbuss proposal that will wipe out all the good as well as the bad."⁴ In July 1970, with the amendment trapped in the

Judith S. Trent is an associate professor of speech communication at the University of Akron. Portions of this essay were read at the Speech Communication Association Convention in Houston, December 1975.
Judiciary Committee, and patience with Celler exasperated, Martha Griffiths forced the amendment into the House for a vote by convincing 218 of her colleagues to sign a discharge petition. With the first legislative hurdle thus eliminated, Griffiths (and a staff equipped with source material and pro arguments for cooperative legislators), initiated the first House of Representatives debate on the Equal Rights Amendment. And in less than one hour on August 10, 1970, the House, by a vote of 350 to 15, approved the amendment. Perhaps Gerald Ford, then another Representative from Michigan, best described Griffiths' rhetorical accomplishment when he remarked that the Equal Rights Amendment is a "monument to Martha." When Susan B. Anthony addressed the Senate Select Committee on Woman Suffrage in 1884, it was not the first time Congress had faced the issue of voting rights for women. The first measure providing for a woman suffrage amendment had been introduced in 1866 in connection with a bill designed to extend the vote to Negroes in the District of Columbia. Senator Cowan of Pennsylvania had offered an amendment to strike out the word "male," thus touching off the first debate on woman suffrage in the Senate. But the legislative battle for woman suffrage, in and of itself, formally began in 1878 when Senator Sargent of California (a close friend of Anthony's) introduced the equal voting rights proposal. This bill, known as the "Anthony Amendment," became the battleground for a series of legislative and rhetorical maneuvers until it was finally passed in 1920 as the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution.

In 1882 both houses appointed Select Committees on Woman Suffrage, and both committees presented favorable recommendations to Congress. This action was repeated by the Senate Select Committee in 1884 (following a hearing in which Anthony, leading a delegation from the Sixteenth Annual Washington Convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association, presented the arguments for enfranchisement), and the bill was finally debated in the Senate on January 25, 1887. And although Anthony did not physically lead the Senate debate, the proponents of the amendment requested that the full text of her 1884 speech before the Senate Select Committee be printed in the Congressional Record as part of the debate on the Woman Suffrage Amendment. And although the Senate eventually voted thirty-six to sixteen against the amendment, that the bill had even reached the Senate floor for a vote (the first and last Senate vote on woman suffrage in the nineteenth century) was a major accomplishment which was attributable, in part, to the rhetorical efforts of Susan B. Anthony.

The Rhetorical Context

Despite the fact that the Griffiths and Anthony speeches were separated by eighty-six years of social, economic, and legal changes and that one woman addressed her congressional colleagues while the other spoke as a witness for a Senate hearing, there are sufficient similarities to suggest a common rhetorical context.

Historians have referred to Susan B. Anthony not as the "orator" of the suffrage movement but as the "incomparable organizer who gave the movement its force and direction for half a century." Although ideologically committed to many social reforms, Anthony's primary effort revolved around extending the franchise to women. To achieve that goal, she organized dozens of conventions and state suffrage associations, published tracts, wrote articles, drafted resolutions, circulated petitions, edited a multi-volume history of the movement, established a national association in which she held numerous offices, traveled almost continuously throughout the country for fifty years giving an average of seventy-five to one hundred speeches a year, and lobbied and spoke before congressional committees in Washington. As an article in The Hearth and Home of January 22, 1870, said:

She is the Bismark; she plans the campaigns, provides the munitions of war, organizes the raw recruits, sets the squadrons in the field. Indeed, in presence of a timid lieutenant, she sometimes heads the charge; but she is most...
effective as the directing generalissimo... She presided over the treasury, she cut the Gordian knots, and when the uncontrollable get by the ears at the conventions, she is the one who straightway drags them asunder and turns chaos to order again. In every dilemma, she is unanimously summoned.10

Thus, Susan Anthony had a reputation as a promoter, organizer, and a tireless worker for suffrage reform. She was well known and apparently respected by the people who thronged to hear her speak.11 The Louisville Journal of November 28, 1867, observed that "Miss Anthony has been before the public for years and always has won the applause of the multitudes in whose cause she has been a standing champion."12

Representative Martha Griffiths has been referred to as a "fighter for the Movement,"13 as "that most valuable of persons in the women's movement — a realist — a sort of Richard J. Daley of feminism,"14 and as an advocate, persuasive not so much in oratory, but in the "diligent homework and quiet persuasion used behind the scene of battle."15 A consistent advocate for many social reforms during her nineteen years in Congress, Griffiths nonetheless termed the legislative battle for the Equal Rights Amendment as the "greatest achievement in my House career."16

Although Griffiths controlled the House debates on the discharge petition in July and on the amendment which followed in August, much of her contribution was organizational work done before the debates. Griffiths' office was the center of ERA action as she mobilized supporters to help her push for the amendment. Her staff had the necessary source material, the arguments, and contacts with women's organizations throughout the country — all of which were shared with cooperating legislators.17

The Equal Rights Amendment was not Griffiths' first contact with women's rights. In 1965, after working for years to eliminate sex discrimination in the social security system, she succeeded in amending the social security law to provide women with benefits and to provide survivor benefits for children of working mothers. In 1966 the Congresswoman initiated an attack on the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission for its failure to crack down on sex discrimination (a job the Commission had been created to do by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act). Griffiths' battle with the EEOC was one of the factors in the formation of the National Organization for Women in June of 1966:

She issued a blistering statement against the EEOC attitude at a very opportune time, just before state commissions on the status of women were to hold their annual joint meetings. Then she had reprints made and distributed and that was the meeting where NOW got started.18

Thus, Martha Griffiths had developed a reputation among colleagues in Congress and leaders in women's organizations as a quiet yet diligent persuader who was recognized primarily for her ability to mobilize and organize people and ideas toward her goal of bringing women into the mainstream of American life.

The second similarity in the rhetorical context of the two amendment debates is the point in time in which they occurred. In discussing the importance of "rhetorical timing" to speech criticism, Bruce Gronbeck argued that throughout history most discourse has belonged to an "epoch, a place, a man — a time" and that the role of "timing" is determined by "exigencies within a so-called 'rhetorical situation,' which can grow, mature, and decay through chronological time."19 Thus, "timing," wrote Gronbeck, is "part of that which makes rhetorical discourse 'appropriate' to an occasion and audience."20 I suggest that not only were the Anthony and Griffiths addresses a product of a specific epoch or period in the women's movements but that the time was the same: the debates occurred at chronologically the same point in the life cycle of both the nineteenth and twentieth century movements. In addition, I would argue that the "timing" of these rhetorical actions was significant to the continued life cycle of each movement.

While the terminology used to distinguish the progression of a social movement differs slightly among theorists, I have borrowed the schema used by Marie Rosenwasser and have placed both movements (as of March 1884, and August 1970) at the end of the second (Action and Reaction) stage of
In her analysis of the women’s liberation movement, Rosenwasser characterized the second stage of a movement as a period of organized but sporadic confrontations with power agents, growing membership, maturing leadership, more extended media coverage, formation of diverse organizations, and the possibility of counter-movement development.

For the suffrage struggle, the years surrounding 1884 were a time of heightened vitality and enthusiastic campaigning. The activity of the period was primarily political and included a variety of techniques such as: 1) organizing state suffrage associations, 2) sending networks of suffrage speakers and writers throughout the country, 3) conducting state referenda campaigns, and 4) lobbying in Washington for a federal amendment.

By 1884 there had been a profound change of public attitude. Woman suffrage was not accepted by the majority of Americans, but neither was it any longer considered the province of eccentrics and crackpots. The movement began to have a few influential friends in Congress, and the annual conventions of the National Woman Suffrage Association were not only occasions for hearing before congressional committees and lobbying but of White House receptions. Moreover, the leadership was perceptibly changing during this period. More and more professionals, writers, and women of substantial means began charting directions for the suffrage associations. In addition, the movement was developing a number of able speakers, and support was found among the growing number of women’s clubs and the network of community activities (temperance, missionary, charity, education, trade union, and church) in which women were taking leadership.

Another indication of growing support was the increasing number of people who attended suffrage meetings. As the reform advocates spoke throughout the country, their meetings usually filled whatever building they used. By 1883 the state and national conventions, as well as the local meetings, received newspaper coverage.

However, as Rosenwasser indicates, the Action and Reaction stage also is characterized by opposition. The suffrage movement was no exception, as evidenced by the fact that from 1867 to 1910 the American and National Woman Suffrage Associations conducted 480 campaigns in thirty-three states, just to get the suffrage issue submitted to voters. Of those 480 campaigns, only seventeen resulted in actual referendum votes, and only two of the referenda were successful.

Many of these anti-suffrage votes were in response to the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, whose members also campaigned for suffrage in the west and midwestern sections of the country. The liquor interests, often well organized and financed, campaigned against suffrage because they believed that if women were given the vote they would in turn advocate prohibition. Thus, the temperance movement aided in providing some of the opposition to the suffrage movement. In addition, in 1884, a few months before Anthony addressed the Senate Select Committee, a new group of anti-suffragists organized for the purpose of telling Congressmen that “women did not want the vote because it would wreck marriage and the home.”

The suffrage movement was not, in 1884, without its opponents.

Finally, I suggest that the “timing” of Anthony’s speech was important to the suffrage struggle because it provided not only necessary encouragement, but the momentum generated by it contributed to the ability of the movement to enter the next stage of development. By 1884, although the cause of woman suffrage had made remarkable progress, the movement was nonetheless thirty-six years away from its goal. The Anthony address, as part of the first and last Senate debate on woman suffrage in the nineteenth century, represented a partial victory. The amendment had finally been debated on the Senate floor and had received sixteen votes. And while suffrage had not gained congressional approval, the debate aided in providing the amendment (and thus the movement) with the legislative legitimacy it had never had, thus becoming a catalyst for more vigorous and unified rhetorical and non-rhetorical activities in subsequent years.
In the same way, the 1970 Griffiths' debate was the catalyst for an event which contributed to the positive reinforcement and momentum necessary for the women's liberation movement to enter the next stage of its development.

When Martha Griffiths initiated the House debate on the Equal Rights Amendment in August 1970, the women's liberation movement was at the end of the second (Action and Reaction) stage of its development. The movement, although chronologically young, had already planned and executed a number of rhetorical and non-rhetorical activities designed to focus attention on perceived grievances and/or to confront establishment institutions. Examples of these activities were demonstrations against the Miss America Pageant, legal suits against several major universities regarding discrimination practices toward female employees, and marches on the fiftieth anniversary of the nineteenth amendment. And as the movement grew in terms of membership and activities, it not only received more extended coverage from the media, but it also began to fragment into factions which were diverse in method and ideology. Women who were less concerned about working from within establishment structures formed organizations such as The Feminists of New York and the Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy From Hell (WITCH). Finally, the publicity generated from the movement stimulated the development of formalized opposition, and counter-movements such as the Pussycats or Happiness of Womanhood were organized. Thus, in 1970, the women's liberation movement was concluding the second stage of its life cycle. It had confronted the power agents, had captured media attention, had become diverse in form and ideology through the formation of splinter organizations, and had sparked the organization of counter-movements. But what had not been achieved, but was sorely needed, was a tangible victory — something for all factions to work for, a difficult yet attainable goal.

The Griffiths' debate on the Equal Rights Amendment provided the vehicle that could lead to this concrete achievement. It not only occurred at the end of the second stage of the movement, but its timing was significant for the progression of the movement to the next segment of its development. When the amendment was passed by the House, the way was paved for subsequent campaigns for Senate confirmation and state-by-state ratification, thereby providing those tangible rallying points around which the movement could grow and prosper. And although splinter factions developed within the movement, grass roots organizations continued to push for ratification. Congressional approval of the Equal Rights Amendment was both an accomplishment and a focal point of activity for all but the most radical factions within the women's liberation movement.

So then the Griffiths debate of 1970 and the Anthony debate of 1884 were rhetorically similar in this second way. Each occurred at the conclusion of the second stage of the movement of which they were a part, and the timing of each debate was significant in transporting the movements to the next level of their life cycles.

The Rhetorical Strategies

Despite the fact that the Griffiths and Anthony addresses differed from each other in terms of their placement within the congressional debates (Griffiths opened and closed the House debate and Anthony testified in the middle of the Committee hearings) and in terms of their length (Anthony's speech was much longer than Griffiths), there are sufficient similarities to suggest common rhetorical strategies.

The first similarity can be found in the way each speaker organized her message. Although the speeches differed greatly in length, they were structured in remarkably similar ways. For example, each woman began by identifying the enemy: the federal courts (specifically the Supreme Court) for repeated failures to include women as a class of citizens entitled to equal protection under the laws. Griffiths introduced her speech with an indictment of the Supreme Court:
Mr. Speaker, this is not a battle between the sexes — nor a battle between this body and women. This body and State legislatures have supported women. This is a battle with the Supreme Court. There never was a time when decisions of the Supreme Court could not have done everything we ask today.31 And Anthony began with an attack on New York's courts, which had fined her for voting in the 1872 election, and concluded the argument by referring to the Supreme Court decision that “the amendments were made for black men; that their provisions could not protect women; that the Constitution of the United States has not voters of its own.”32

Another similarity was that once the speakers had labeled federal courts as the enemy, they proceeded to enumerate court inspired inequities, concluding with the charge that equal rights and protection under the laws had been extended by the Supreme Court to every other minority group.

The third, and perhaps most interesting organizational strategy in the two addresses, was the continuous refutation of anti-amendment arguments. Throughout her speech, each woman presented almost an identical recitation and refutation of the traditional anti-women equal rights arguments. Griffiths, for example, went to the heart of the opposition's case against the ERA (military service for women, separate restroom facilities, hour and weight lifting laws, and child-support and alimony laws), mentioned each issue, and refuted it. Correspondingly, Anthony spent the last third of her speech reviewing how and why state-by-state referendums on woman suffrage would not work. In each instance, the advocate obviously perceived the need to reassure and/or finally persuade her pre-dominately male audience that previously heard, traditional opposition arguments were not valid and thus constituted no sufficient reason to reject the amendment. Thus, the organizational similarities of the speeches were heightened by the continuous utilization of anticipatory refutation.

The fourth similarity in the organization of the speeches was the pledge of each advocate that the proposed amendment would not significantly alter people's lives or conditions. Included in each speech was a discussion of the effect of the amendment on women, on previous legislation, and on society (men) in general. For example, Griffiths hastened to assure the House of Representatives that the ERA would not have widespread repercussions throughout the country: "In 1964 the Civil Rights Act granted far more rights to women and other minorities than this amendment ever dreamed of. That act applies against private industry. This amendment applies only against government."33 And Anthony, apparently anxious to avoid the usual Senator's idea that women, if granted the vote, would change the structure of politics and society, stated:

My opinion is that when the whole arena of politics and government is thrown open to women they will endeavor to do very much as they do in their homes; that the men will look after free-trade or tariff; and the women will do the house-keeping of the government, which is to take care of the moral government and the social regulation of our household.34

Thus, each message appears to have been structured similarly: identify and isolate the enemy; offer elaborate examples of the injustices perpetrated by the enemy; refute all counter arguments which have been used by the enemy repeatedly to deny justice; and finally, extend comfort and peace of mind to those who could render the enemy useless.

The second similarity exists in the lines of argument used by each advocate. In both the 1884 and 1970 messages, Congress was urged to pass the amendments for the same four reasons: 1) women have equal responsibilities in supporting government, so they should have equal opportunities guaranteed by that same government; 2) other minorities have been extended equal rights by federal legislation; 3) it is morally wrong to continue discrimination against one segment of the population; and 4) all of society, men and women, would benefit when equal rights are extended to include women. Anthony argued that taxation and representation were inseparable; Griffiths said that the burden of establishing government and the opportunity to participate fully in it must be guaranteed. Anthony argued that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments had extended the
provisions of the Constitution to Negro men, but the courts denied their application to women; Griffiths said that the 1964 civil rights legislation guaranteed jobs to black men, but the courts denied the application to women. Anthony argued that all of the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution meant equality for all people, and Griffiths said that the law must be on the side of right and justice. And Anthony maintained that the first step toward social regulation and good society in towns, cities, and villages was the “ballot in the hands of the mothers of those places,” while Griffiths argued that if there were more women in positions of business and governmental power, more attention would be paid to education, housing, health care — in short, “people problems.”

Thus, similar rhetorical strategy as demonstrated in the organization and lines of argument employed by Anthony and Griffiths have suggested yet another basis for comparing these two rhetorical events of the nineteenth and twentieth century women’s equal rights movements.

Conclusion

The absence of critical studies comparing the nineteenth century women’s suffrage movement and the twentieth century women’s liberation movement suggests that speech communication scholars may believe the struggles have no analyzable yet similar rhetorical elements. Perhaps they do not, in the sense that it is possible to find both substantive and methodological differences between the leaders and members of the two movements. Yet when two women, each recognized for her organizational and promotional skill, initiate a congressional debate on feminine equal rights legislation, when each debate occurs at chronologically the same time in life cycle and is significant to the continued development of each movement, and when each woman presents identically organized and substantively similar messages, we should conclude that there are analyzable similarities in the rhetorical context and strategies of both debates. Such similarities deserve critical attention.

A paper of this breadth can but suggest two dimensions for an Anthony-Griffiths or nineteenth-twentieth century study of feminist rhetoric. In the process of suggesting a general orientation to study the women’s movements, this paper examined the historical incidents surrounding the two examples of discourse, analyzed significant contextual and message elements, and established similarities not only in the substance of the speeches themselves but also in the context from which each speech grew. But the methodology (as applied to the women’s movements) demands further exploration, via analysis of other elements in the rhetorical transaction and correlated either to Susan B. Anthony and Martha W. Griffiths or to other female orators from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Once critics have undertaken sufficient studies of these types, we will better understand the rhetoric of the long struggle for equality — the women’s equal rights movements.
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CONVENTION AND CONTEST RULES

GENERAL

1. Each student and one faculty director of forensics from each college attending the convention must pay the $40 registration fee. The fee for each extra judge and guest is $25.

2. Each student delegate to the convention and each participant in the tournament must be a bona fide undergraduate student who has not already had four years of forensic participation and who is carrying a minimum of 12 hours of college work with passing grades at the time of the convention. He must be a member of Pi Kappa Delta or must have filed a membership application with the National Secretary and sent in his initiation fee.

3. All tournament entries must be sent to the National Secretary so as to show a postmark not later than March 1, 1977. A school cancelling or dropping entries after 12:00 noon (Pacific Standard Time), March 16, 1977, will be obligated for full fees. A school cancelling or dropping entries after 12:00 noon (Pacific Standard Time), March 11, 1977, but before 12:00 noon (Pacific Standard Time), March 16, 1977, will be obligated for one-half fees.

4. All questions regarding tournament events not covered by the rules will be decided by the specific contest committee and the Contest Chairman. Questions concerning interpretation of tournament rules should be directed to Thomas B. Harte, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701.

JUDGES

1. All competing chapters must provide judges in proportion to the number of entries. The formula for determining the number of judges to be provided follows:

   Let X equal the number of debate teams entered.

   Let Y equal the number of entries in individual events.

   Formula: 4X + Y = 10.

   Explanation: If under this formula a chapter's total is less than 10, only ONE judge must be provided. If the total is 10 or more, TWO judges are required. All judges should expect to judge at least 10 rounds of competition. Schools whose judges fail to fulfill assignments may be charged $10 for each round missed and may be ineligible for individual or group awards.

2. An exception to the above rules provides for those colleges whose entire delegation is limited to one student representative.

3. No student member of a delegation will be permitted to serve as a judge.

AWARDS

1. Gold medals will be awarded to winners of superior ratings in each event. Certificates will be awarded to winners of excellent ratings. Certificates will be awarded to the school for each student who receives a rating of superior or excellent.

2. Sweepstakes points will be awarded to each chapter participating according to the following formula:

   In debate:
   - Superior rating 10 points
   - Excellent 8 points
   - Good 6 points
   - Participation 2 points

   In individual events:
   - Superior rating 5 points
   - Excellent 4 points
   - Good 3 points
   - Participation 1 point

3. Superior sweepstakes awards will be made to the 10 percent of the chapters accumulating the highest number of sweepstakes points. Excellent sweepstakes awards will be made to the 20 percent of the chapters ranking next in number of sweepstakes points.
Individual Events

GENERAL

Entries
1. Each chapter may enter two contestants in each event.
2. Contestants must be present at the beginning of each round (except in extemporaneous speaking; see specific rules) and should remain until the round has been concluded. This rule precludes scheduling individual contestants in events that are held simultaneously.
3. Failure to meet either the general rules or the rules specified below for each event will result in a contestant’s being ineligible for any final rating.
4. Judges will provide time signals to contestants. Time cards will be available for those who wish to use them.

Rounds
1. There will be three rounds of competition in each event. Each contestant must participate in three rounds to receive a final rating.
2. All sections of each event will be scheduled simultaneously according to the published convention schedule. The number of sections will be determined by the number of contestants entered in each event.

Judging
1. Judging for oratory, extemporaneous speaking, informative speaking, speaking to entertain, and oral interpretation will be done by two judges in each section in each round. The judges will rank only the four highest ranking speakers, indicating first, second, third, and fourth place. All others in each section will be ranked fifth. Judges will include written comments on the ballot. Judges will not reveal rankings or decisions to the contestants.
2. Specific rules for judging discussants are listed under the specific rules for Discussion.

Awards
1. Superior ratings will be awarded to the top 10 percent of contestants in each event.
2. Excellent ratings will be awarded to the next 20 percent.
3. Good ratings will be awarded to the next 30 percent.

SPECIFIC

Oratory
1. Orations must not exceed ten minutes in length and shall contain no more than 150 words of quoted material exclusive of direct discourse, dialogue, or other stylistic devices created by the speaker.
2. Orations should be the original work of the contestants and should be designed to convince, inspire, and/or motivate.
3. A typed copy of the oration must be submitted at registration. A typed cover sheet for the oration must include the name of the school, the legible signature of the student attesting to the originality of the oration, the number of words, the number of quoted words and attesting that the oration has not been delivered prior to this school year. All quoted material should be documented in footnotes. The oration delivered should conform to the manuscript, and it must be delivered without notes or manuscript.

Extemporaneous Speaking
1. The general area will be: “U.S. Foreign Policy.” Subtopics for each round shall be:
   Round I. “The United States and the Communist Bloc.”
   Round II. “The United States and its Allies.”
   Round III. “The United States and the Third World.”
   Specific topics for each round will be drawn by the Contest Committee.
2. Speeches must not exceed six minutes in length. An additional maximum two minutes will be allowed for an impromptu answer to the question asked by a judge at the close of the original speech.
3. Topics for extemporaneous speeches will be posted in a designated room at five minute intervals. Speakers will choose from posted topics and must
speak in the order in which they draw. Speakers will report to their assigned sections one-half hour after drawing.

Oral Interpretation
1. The program of each contestant for each round must not exceed eight minutes in length, including material read from manuscript, an extemporaneous introduction, and transitions.
2. The content of each program may include more than one selection with the arrangement centered on an integrated theme. Each contestant may offer a different theme in each round, or he may use the same theme in more than one round. He must, however, present three different programs employing published literature of quality.
   Round I — poetry.
   Round II — prose.
   Round III — dramatic literature.

Informative Speaking
1. Informative speeches should be essentially non-persuasive, dealing with concepts, processes, ideas, or objects.
2. Audio-visual aids may be used but are not required. The tournament management cannot be responsible for supplying equipment or special facilities.
3. The speech may be memorized or delivered extemporaneously. It may be delivered with or without notes but not more than eight minutes will be allotted each speaker.
4. The speech shall be the original production of the speaker and shall not have been delivered prior to the current school year.

Speaking to Entertain
1. Speeches to entertain should be designed primarily for audience enjoyment. They should be thematically unified, in good taste, and develop a significant point.
2. The topic for this event is “Tall Tales.”
3. The speech may be memorized or delivered extemporaneously. It may be delivered with or without notes, but no more than eight minutes will be allotted each speaker.
4. The speech shall be the original production of the speaker and shall not have been delivered prior to the school year.

Discussion
1. The question for discussion will be: “What should be the policy of the federal government toward the development of alternative sources of energy?”
2. Each round will last a maximum of an hour and a half. Groups may find it necessary or desirable to schedule “unofficial” meetings at times other than regularly scheduled contest rounds. Unofficial group meetings will not be judged.
3. Each small group will submit for judging a written report which summarizes the findings and recommendations of the group.
4. The pattern for each round of discussion will be as follows:
   Round I: General orientation meeting for all contestants and judges. Small groups meet and organize.
   Rounds II-VI: Small group discussion. Groups may use this time as they see fit. Ideally, each group should cover several stages during this time block. 1) Definition and delineation stage. (What is the nature, extent, and significance of the problem? What terms of the question need defining?) 2) Problem-analysis stage. (What are the probable causes of the problem? By what criteria should probable solutions be measured?) 3) Solutions stage. (What possible solutions are there? What is the best solution for the problem?) After round VI and before round VII each group will submit a written report of their findings and recommendations to the Discussion Contest Committee.
   Round VII: Evaluation stage. (Did the group arrive at its solutions by the most desirable means? How do the participants feel about the level and nature of the interpersonal interaction?) Contestants will share their evaluations of each other during this
time. During this round the written reports of the groups will be evaluated and the top three reports selected.

Round VIII: General meeting for all contestants. Top three written reports identified. Each of the top three groups will be given time to outline their findings and recommendations to the other contestants.

5. Judging for discussion differs from other individual events in several ways. During rounds I through VII each group will have a resident judge who will stay with that group for the entire event. During rounds II through VI contestants will also be evaluated by traveling judges who will circulate through the panels. Contests will not be evaluated during round VIII. Contests will be asked to evaluate the other members of their panel, but contestant evaluations will be used only for pedagogical purposes (to be shared during round VII) and will not be used to determine a contestant’s final rating. The final rating of each contestant will be based 50 percent on the evaluation of the resident judge, 25 percent on the evaluation of the traveling judge, and 25 percent on the evaluation of the written group report.

b) A maximum of one team in the Championship Division.

c) A maximum of two teams in the Traditional Division.

2. Experience and expertise are criteria for entries only in the Championship Division. In this division each member of the team entered must have won 50 percent of his tournament debates during the 1976-77 season, with his record having a minimum of 20 debates.

3. Substitutions may be made in the Traditional Division only. NO substitutions may be made in the Lincoln-Douglas (one-man) or Championship Divisions.

Rounds
1. There will be eight rounds for all teams in the Championship Division and the Traditional Division. There will be six rounds for all teams in the Lincoln-Douglas (one-man) Division. In the Championship Division two teams will participate in a final ninth round.

2. Each team entered will participate in an equal number of affirmative and negative rounds.

3. Pi Kappa Delta does not condone lengthy preparation periods between debate speeches nor does it condone practices conducive to such delay. Consequently, preparation time is limited to two minutes between constructive speeches and to one minute between rebuttal speeches.

Judges
1. For all rounds except the final round in the Championship Division, one judge will be used.

2. Judges may make comments to debaters but will not reveal decisions.

Awards
1. Superior ratings will be awarded to the top 10 percent of the teams in each division.

Debate

GENERAL

Divisions
1. There will be three divisions: Championship, Traditional, and Lincoln-Douglas (one-man).

Entries
1. Each chapter may enter a maximum of three debate teams in this tournament, in any combination not to exceed the maximum listed for each division.

a) A maximum of two entries in Lincoln-Douglas (one-man) Division.
2. Excellent ratings will be awarded to the next 20 percent.
3. Good ratings will be awarded to the next 30 percent. Win-loss records will be used as the first criterion for award determination; ties will be broken by employing team ratings.

Scheduling
1. Where the division is large enough to permit, every fourth team will be seeded on the basis of performance earlier in the year, so that every team will meet only two seeded teams during the course of all the rounds. Exceptions to this rule are noted in specific rules for the Championship Division, and will also be necessary in the Lincoln-Douglas (one-man) Division. Seedings will be determined by the appropriate committee with the assistance of the province governors and qualified Pi Kappa Delta members in the respective areas.

SPECIFIC
Lincoln-Douglas (one-man) Debate
1. SUBJECT: The general area from which specific topics will be selected is: “The process of selecting the American President.” Topics will be chosen by the Committee and announced prior to the rounds in which they are to be debated. The topic for the first two rounds will be a proposition of fact; the topic for the third and fourth rounds will be a proposition of value; the topic for the fifth and sixth rounds will be a proposition of policy. Each team will debate once on the affirmative and once on the negative on each topic, and all teams participating will debate the same topic in each round.

2. FORMAT:
   
   Definitions 2 min.
   Agreement of terms 3 min.
   Affirm. constructive 8 min.
   Cross-exam. by negative 3 min.
   Neg. constructive 10 min.
   Cross-exam. by affirm. 3 min.
   Affirm. rebuttal 4 min.
   Negative rebuttal 6 min.
   Affirm. rebuttal 4 min.

Championship Debate
1. SUBJECT: The national topic, “Resolved: that the federal government should significantly strengthen the guarantee of consumer product safety required of manufacturers.”

2. SCHEDULING: In this division scheduling will follow the general form outlined above under “General Debate Rules” up to and including the sixth round. In the seventh round hidden quarterfinals will be held. In the eighth round hidden semifinals will be held. In this manner each team participating will debate 8 rounds, with the finalists not announced until after 8 rounds have been completed. A final round (ninth) will be held between the two winners of the semifinal round.

3. FORMAT: A cross-examination style of debate will be observed in this division. The debaters will decide which affirmative speakers will question the negative speakers and which negative speakers will question the affirmative speakers, but each participant will question and be questioned. Time limits for speeches will be:
   
   First affirm. constructive 8 min.
   Cross-exam. by negative 3 min.
   First neg. constructive 8 min.
   Cross-exam. by affirmative 3 min.
   Second neg. constructive 8 min.
   Cross-exam. by neg. 3 min.
   Second neg. constructive 8 min.
   Cross-exam. by affirm. 3 min.
   First neg. rebuttal 4 min.
   First affirm. rebuttal 4 min.
   Second neg. rebuttal 4 min.
   Second affir.n rebuttal 4 min.

Traditional Debate
1. SUBJECT: The national topic, “Resolved: that the federal government should significantly strengthen the guarantee of consumer product safety required of manufacturers.”

2. FORMAT: The traditional 10-5 format will be used.
PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

1. ARTICLE V, Division A, 14 (Convention Attendance).* Paragraph 1: Strike the entire first sentence and the first word of the second sentence. Insert the following lines: "All undergraduate chapters are required to attend the National Convention. Any chapter failing to have a delegate at the first National Convention following its installation shall be placed on probation. Any Chapter accumulating two consecutive unexcused absences from attendance at the National Convention shall be placed on probation. Any Chapter accumulating three consecutive unexcused absences from attendance at the National Convention shall forfeit its charter. Probationary status can be lifted . . . ."

2. ARTICLE V, Division C, 2, Paragraph 1: Substitute "six" for "five" general council members in the first sentence and strike the second sentence and substitute, "Of the six general council members, three shall be student representatives."

Paragraph 4: In the first sentence after "following manner:" insert "The first student representative shall be elected at a business meeting of the National Convention; the Nominating Committee shall submit two or more candidates and nominations may be made from the floor." In the final sentence substitute "third" for "second" and substitute "second" for "first."

3. ARTICLE XI, Paragraph 1: Add "or by a three-fourths vote of the Chapters in a referendum taken at the Province Conventions in a given year. Proposed amendments which are initially submitted at the National Convention shall be placed before the Province Conventions the following year."

Paragraph 3: Strike the entire paragraph and substitute: "All proposed amendments to the Constitution must be in the hands of the chairman of the Constitutional Revision Committee in time to meet publication deadlines in The Forensic and must be published in The Forensic mailed at least a month before a final vote is taken."

*In the Constitution as revised at the 1973 Omaha Convention, the Convention Attendance provision was in Article V, Division A, 13. (See The Forensic, October 1973, p. 7.) At the 1975 Philadelphia Convention, an Alumni Chapter provision became number 13, and all subsequent paragraphs of Article V were renumbered. (See The Forensic, May 1975, p. 15.)

Seattle's monorail, built for the 1962 World's Fair, shuttles passengers from downtown Seattle to the City Center in ninety seconds. One City Center feature guaranteed to interest students and coaches is the Food Circus.
A VICE-PRESIDENT WHOSE JOB
IS NOT INCIDENTAL

The Forensic editor, Carolyn Keefe, interviews Vice-President Jim DeMoux, who also serves as chairman of the Charter and Standards Committee. The photos were taken at Seattle’s Olympic Hotel during the Summer Meeting of the National Council.

Keefe: What are the main functions of the Charter and Standards Committee?
DeMoux: Charter and Standards is a standing committee provided for by the National Constitution. The Constitution charges Charter and Standards with three responsibilities: first, to pass upon chapter petitions for membership and to make recommendations to the National Council concerning these petitions; second, to devise standards for evaluating the activities of the individual chapters and to make recommendations to the National Council or national convention for strengthening weak chapters, and; third, to make recommendations to the National Council or national convention for the revocation of charters.

Keefe: Who, besides you, is involved in the work of the Committee?
DeMoux: During the convention four other people assist with the activities and decisions of the “committee.” At other times, which is most of the time, I work “all by my lonesome.” Well, actually, I do have a little elf who lives in the second-from-the-bottom file drawer in my office. My department chairman keeps telling me to get rid of him, but he doesn’t eat much and besides, my children can really use the shoes.

Keefe: How does a chapter petition to join PKD?
DeMoux: Very easily. A school simply indicates an interest by writing to me or any other member of the provincial or national organization. The request is then forwarded to Ted Karl, the national secretary-treasurer, who sends out petition forms, the instructions, and descriptive brochures about Pi Kap. It is really important that the petition forms be sent out from the National Office. This is the only way of ensuring that a prospective chapter will get all of the appropriate forms and explanatory materials.

Keefe: What must a chapter do (or not do) in order to be placed on probation?
DeMoux: If a chapter wants to stay off probation they should never win a decision from one of my teams! I’m hoping to make this a provision of the National Constitution, but so far Jack Starr’s Constitutional Revision Committee has refused to give me a hearing. Seriously though, most chapters going on probation do so because their local membership has fallen below five persons, or because the chapter has failed to have a representative at two consecutive national conventions.

Keefe: Please explain the steps the National Council is taking in regard to “lapsed” chapters.
DeMoux: The National Council has directed me to contact the chapters that have been on probation since the Omaha Convention in 1973. The purpose of the contact is to determine the intentions of these schools toward Pi Kap and to see if there is anything the national organization can do to encourage their participation. If a school indicates their inability and unwillingness to rectify the cause of their probationary status, I will recommend that their charter be revoked.

Keefe: Why is the National Council tightening up on the delinquent chapters?

DeMoux: Delinquent chapters hurt the organization philosophically and financially. Philosophically, a delinquent chapter has not lived up to its promise to support the goals and activities of the organization. No organization can survive if its membership doesn’t demonstrate commitment through active participation.

As a minister’s wife you are familiar with St. James’ admonition to the early saints that they should “show their faith by their works.” I think James’ advice is equally applicable to the membership of Pi Kappa Delta. It doesn’t do any good for us to just give lip service to the goals and principles of Pi Kap.

From a financial point of view, delinquent chapters are a drain on the organization. These chapters provide little income from new members or national convention fees. At the same time they represent a constant outlay of mailing and material costs for The Forensic, convention information, and the like.

Finally — and forgive me for getting “wound up” on this one — delinquent chapters are a drain on human resources. The total “man hours” (you won’t tell my feminist friends I used a word like that, will you?) expended by
the National Council and the province leadership, just to stay in contact with these chapters, is tremendous. Not all that time is wasted because quite a few chapters do eventually come around. But many others never respond at all.

Keefe: Can a chapter placed on probation be reactivated? How? Have you seen this happen during your term(s) of office?

DeMoux: They certainly can. There are many reasons why a chapter may run out of steam — the sponsor may leave, the budget may get cut, the students may lose interest. In some cases the forensic goals of the school may change and may no longer be compatible with those of Pi Kap schools.

From my experience I would say that the single most important factor in influencing a chapter’s activity is the sponsor. If the sponsor is motivated, nothing can stop them. If the sponsor doesn’t care, almost nothing can help them.

Many schools have reactivated during my relatively short tenure on the National Council. As much as I would like to, I can’t claim credit for these reactivations. I think most of the credit would have to go to province governors and local sponsors who have regular contact with the weak chapters.

The reasons for a chapter “turning around” are as numerous as the reasons why one goes sour. Here again, though, the single most important factor seems to be the sponsor.

Keefe: How many active chapters do we have now?

DeMoux: I’m not sure of the exact count. We have added chapters and dropped some during my tenure with Charter and Standards. My best guess without checking the records is that we have about 375 total chapters with perhaps 250 actives.

Keefe: What are your biggest headaches on the job as chairman?

DeMoux: I would have to say that it’s the paper work. As my mother can certainly testify, writing letters is not my strong suit. This job requires a great deal of correspondence, and sometimes I really have to force myself to knuckle down. Mountain Bell, our local subsidiary of ATT, has taken out a multi-million dollar life insurance policy on me — if I die they go under. My monthly phone bill reads, “A) How much did you earn this month? B) How much do you have left after taxes? C) Send in B.”

Keefe: Have you had any amusing experiences on this job?

DeMoux: One of the funniest things has to be what happened last night. After our business meeting finally ended at 1:30 AM, Evan Ulrey, Tom Harte, and I decided that we wanted something to eat. None of the facilities in the hotel were still open at that hour, so we went out to try and find a restaurant. We walked for more than an hour before finally locating a place that was open. The place was teeming with “local color” who seemed to think we were the strange ones. I suppose we were a bit odd since we were the only ones wearing suits, and everyone else was dressed to conform to the standard of nonconformity. The food, however, was excellent, but I’ll have to admit I didn’t look at it too closely.

It was during the walk back to the hotel that the really funny thing happened. Two “ladies” in a car pulled up to the curb and called out something to us. Tom Harte, being the fine southern gentleman he is, walked toward the car to find out what the ladies wanted. As he neared the car, one of the ladies said something — Tom whirled around and came back to us, obviously embarrassed and said that the women had tried to make him “an offer he couldn’t refuse.” The car then pulled away and we thought the incident was closed.

We walked to within about two blocks of the hotel and were waiting
for the light to change when the same car came around the corner. This time the ladies yelled out some comments that indicated how unhappy they were that we hadn’t even been willing to negotiate. I guess that will teach us to stay out of the low rent district at 3:00 AM!

Then there was the time in Omaha when the fellow tried to burglarize my room — while I was asleep in the room. But that’s another story. Now who says the National Council never has any fun?

 Keefe: I know you’ve had some other “close calls,” those in regard to installation deadlines. Do you have any good stories about these incidents?

DeMoux: Yes, I have had a number of circumstances where chapters were trying to rush their petitions through in order to meet some deadline. The situation that comes to mind, however, had all the potential for a “horror” story but eventually turned out all right.

The University of Arkansas at Fayetteville made application to join Pi Kap. When I received the petition form, I made out ballots and sent them to members of the National Council so that they could vote on the petition. When the ballots were returned by the National Council, they were accidentally placed in the file folder of another school from Arkansas.

Some time later I was going through my files and found a petition form for Arkansas-Fayetteville and a notation that ballots had been sent out — but no returned ballots were in the file. So, I wrote to Mary Ingalls, the sponsor at Fayetteville, and explained that I had made a mistake. In the meantime I rushed new ballots to the National Council. As soon as I heard from the Council, I wrote to the province governor and asked that the chapters be polled just as quickly as possible. As luck would have it (and bad luck at that), there was a delay of several months getting the province poll completed.

I wrote to Mary several times during the course of this fiasco to reassure her that this was not typical of the way Pi Kap operates and that we really did want them to be members. Mary, bless her heart, patiently and pleasantly replied to my letters and said that they were ready whenever we were. Although she had every reason to be very upset with me and the organization, Mary remained calm and cool throughout the whole unfortunate episode. She must be quite a lady — I’m looking forward to meeting her in person.

Oh, I almost forgot to tell you the end of the story. The University of Arkansas at Fayetteville is now one of us.

Keefe: Would you like to see any changes made in the basic operation of the Committee?

DeMoux: I think the system works pretty well as it is. The key thing is for the chairman of Charter and Standards to keep in close touch with the other members of the National Council. The overall system works best when “the communication networks are warm from constant use.” That’s a line from one of my old lectures — my students won’t let me use it anymore, and it is too good to throw away. On second
thought, my students were probably right. You can be my witness — I pledge never to use that line again.

What Charter and Standards really needs is a change in personnel. I think the glue in all the envelopes and stamps I have to lick is starting to affect my brain. Have you noticed the men who have been following me since we arrived in Seattle . . .!

**SEND CHAPTER NEWS TO:**
Ada Mae Haury
Associate Editor
The Forensic
Bethel College
North Newton, KS 67117

Please type (double space) all reports. Clear black and white photographs are welcomed.

**UNITED STATES COAST GUARD JOINS PI KAPPA DELTA**

The first federal institution to join Pi Kappa Delta, the United States Coast Guard Academy, was installed as the Connecticut Delta chapter of the Province of the Northeast on Thursday, September 9, 1976, at the home of the chapter sponsor and USCGA director of forensics, Lt. Paul Regan.

Seven charter members were admitted to the order, in the presence of six pledges. Captain Ron Wells, head of the humanities department at USCGA, Mrs. Wells, and Mrs. Regan were also present as guests. Veteran squad member Bob McLaughlin became chapter president and achieved the degree of special distinction in the orders of debate and competitive individual speaking. All others joined at the degree of honor, with Don Selle and Tom Leveille as two-order men, and John Young, Joe Loadholt, Keith Schleiffer, and Glen Robbins as members of the order of individual competitive speaking.

Dr. Seth C. Hawkins, director of forensics at Southern Connecticut, served as installing officer. It was his thirteenth chapter installation, believed to be an all-time PKD record.
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE
49433 Virginia E. Beecroft
49434 Jodene Hrudka
49435 Mark V. Chapin
49436 Frank L. Csuin
49437 Paul Frederick Emmons
49438 Ella Howitt
49439 Richard A. Hudson
49440 Sandra S. Lee
49441 Laura Lee Peterson
49442 Janet M. Siranni
49443 Mary Catherine Timmerman
49444 Mike Wartman
49445 Leona Marie Wellnitz
49446 Barry Wilson
49870 Eva Kay Roupas
49871 Dana John Wachs
49899 Thomas Michael Sermersheim

EASTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
49447 Sally A. Wellman

AUSTIN PAY STATE UNIVERSITY
49448 John B. Bunnell
49449 Joseph F. Straw
49715 David Charles Mason

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS
49450 Rasa Ona Lucas
49451 Larry Winfield

MARIETTA COLLEGE
49452 Stephen E. Maher
49453 Joseph Phillip Urso
49454 W. Wade Luckhardt
49455 Katherine F. Keith

LINFIELD COLLEGE
49456 Gary Walker

IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
49457 Mike Axline

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
49458 Stephen Lindsay Dunaway
49878 Donald J. Schulte

NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
49459 Donna Borden
49460 Chris Zeller

BLACK HILLS STATE COLLEGE
49461 Richard Paul Tiezen
49462 William David Shulz
49463 John L. Jernigan
49464 Barbara Hilton

FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
49465 David Eugene Thayer
49528 John P. Glover
49559 Karl J. Leon
49560 Carolyn Jane Dillon
49627 Kevin Richard Fitzgerald

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
49466 Kathleen D. Brenner
49467 Julie M. Schlosser
49468 Thomas Henry Siegel

WINONA STATE UNIVERSITY
49469 Stephen Geck

PLATTSBURGH STATE UNIVERSITY
49470 Richard Higgins
49471 Kerran L. Sanger
49472 Gerald J. Ducharme
49473 Susan A. Haskin
49474 Frank A. Dorrance
49475 Thomas Crosby
49476 DeVon Cohen
49477 Terry LaValley

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
49478 Cheryl Ann Brandt
49479 Kris Jensen
49480 Dorothy D. Belgalka
49481 Linda Jacobson
49482 John G. Molle
49483 Andrew John Rist
49484 Langdon Jorgensen
49485 Perry Plumart
49486 Denise Prouty

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
49487 Billy Joe Hill, Jr.

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
49488 Scott Lee DeNier
49489 Marlfa Sue Donato
49490 Mary Beth Hughes
49491 Richard Poshard
49492 Dean K. Sasman
49631 Vicky Lynn Seavers

NORTHEAST LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
49493 Martelle Marie Lattier
49494 Terry Denise Hickman

MOORHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY
49496 Dave Bridgeford
49497 LuAnn Kae Peterson
49667 Carol Gaede
49668 Laurie Champ
49669 Nancy E. Wolterstorf
49670 Kent B. Ellington
49671 Marleen Kay Zimmerman
49672 William Gregory Fried
49673 Laura J. Chamberlain
49674 Barry Allar
49675 Connie Schwantz
49676 Jeffrey Stanley
49677 David Moberg
49678 Kim Martin
49679 Sandra Alleen Moses
49776 Michael Stephen Pratt

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
49498 Gregory Mattern
49846 Dr. Carolyn Gillespie
49847 Colleen Sannes
49848 Dean R. Summers
49625 Richard Thompson

EVANGEL COLLEGE
49499 Cynthia Hutchison
49500 Ronald W. Fitzwater
49501 Rhonda Williams
49502 Barry Duane Bowen
49503 Paul Frank Lyn
49504 Ann Dipietro
49632 Cynthia Rich

BRIDgewater STATE COLLEGE
49505 Stephen Antonio Prophet
49506 Mary Chris Kenney
49507 Peter Lapierre

NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE
49508 Nancy Lee Borchard
49509 Deneise Hofer
49510 Pat Gab
49773 Kimberlie S. Nesheim
49774 Edwin Paul Fischbach
49775 Peggy Wiechmann

BETHEL COLLEGE (KS)
49511 Barbara Ann Unruh
49512 David W. Abel
49513 Linda Vetter
49514 Elizabeth M. Goering
49515 Alan Huxman
49516 Dolores D. May
49517 Mark Ediger
494518 Lois Voth
49519 Jan Niles
49520 Troy Siegfried
49717 Deborah Lehman

HARDING COLLEGE
49521 Jon Mark Wrye
49522 Earl Franklin Dulany, Jr.
49523 John Martin Jordan
49524 Kim Talaifeiro
49525 Jeff Broadwater
49526 Rebecca Ann Ulrey
49527 Bradford Allen Scott
49644 Julie Jones

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY
49529 Thomas Edison Smith
49530 Linda Ann Hoffman
49531 Kerry Jane Emrick
49532 Lisa Diane Anderson

HASTINGS COLLEGE
49533 Heidi Ann Haynes
49534 Benjamin Salinas
49535 Scott Tracy Schuppam
49536 Christie Lynn Mudder
49537 Anne E. Winsor
49572 R. Craig Parsons
49573 Kirk Edward Brumbaugh
49574 Matthew Francis Hudson
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, Chapter, College, and Province Number</th>
<th>Chapter President</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA&lt;br&gt;D E L T A—Troy State University-9</td>
<td>Gerald D. Baxter</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA&lt;br&gt;A L P H A—Northern Arizona University-4</td>
<td>John C. Reinard</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ETA—Arizona State University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G A M M A—University of Arizona-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS&lt;br&gt;A L P H A—Henderson State University-6</td>
<td>James E. Dockery</td>
<td>Arkadelphia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ETA—Ouachita Baptist University-6</td>
<td>Jill McMillan</td>
<td>Arkadelphia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z ETA—Harding College-6</td>
<td>Evan Ulrey</td>
<td>Searcy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E TA—University of Central Arkansas-6</td>
<td>Rasa Jucas</td>
<td>Conway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T H E T A—University of Arkansas-6</td>
<td>Wayne Easley</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I O T A—University of Arkansas-6</td>
<td>David Ray</td>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA&lt;br&gt;A L P H A—University of Redlands-4</td>
<td>Bill Southworth</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G A M M A—California Institute of Technology-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D E L T A—University of the Pacific-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z ETA—Pepperdine College-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E TA—San Diego State College-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I O T A—California State University-4</td>
<td>Steven R. Brydon</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M U—Humboldt State University-4</td>
<td>Suzanne Larson</td>
<td>Arcata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N U—Fresno State University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Loyola University-4</td>
<td>Bud Zeuschner</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O M I C R O N—California State University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R H O—California State Polytechnic University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S I G M A—U.S. International University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T A U—California State University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U P S I L O N—University of California-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P H I—Sacramento State College-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C H I—California State College-Stanislaus-4</td>
<td>John Krieger</td>
<td>Turlock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO&lt;br&gt;A L P H A—Colorado State University-1</td>
<td>Robert Trapp</td>
<td>Ft. Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ETA—University of Northern Colorado-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G A M M A—Western State College-1</td>
<td>Gunnison</td>
<td>Alamosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D E L T A—Adams State College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E P S I L O N—University of Southern Colorado-1</td>
<td>Larry Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT&lt;br&gt;B ETA—Southern Connecticut State College-11</td>
<td>Karen Hyfantis</td>
<td>Seth C. Hawkins</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G A M M A—Central Connecticut State College-12</td>
<td>Paul Wenger</td>
<td>New Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA&lt;br&gt;B ETA—Stetson University-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>DeLand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA&lt;br&gt;D E L T A—Georgia Southern College-9</td>
<td>Clarence McCord</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO&lt;br&gt;A L P H A—College of Idaho-10</td>
<td>Kathy Clayson</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G A M M A—Idaho State University-10</td>
<td>W.N. Corbin</td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORENSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter President</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James B. De Moux</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nampa, Boise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie J. Robinson</td>
<td>Donald Littlejohn</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrla Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eureka, Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Redick</td>
<td>Edwin A. Hollatz</td>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butch Maltby</td>
<td>Dale Hemple</td>
<td>Wheaton, McComb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Jack Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>DeKalb, Elsah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hale</td>
<td>Marvin Kleinau</td>
<td>Carbondale, Decatur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacksonville, Greenville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Schermer</td>
<td>Sandra Madsen</td>
<td>Storm Lake, Des Moines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oskaloosa, Decorah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Martin</td>
<td>Michael S. Twedt</td>
<td>Ottawa, Topeka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Zvaldi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winfield, Emporia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hammer</td>
<td>Gary C. Horn</td>
<td>Salina, Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Terlip</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin City, Sterling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Behnke</td>
<td>Ada Mae Haury</td>
<td>Hays, North Newton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leland Lengel</td>
<td>McPherson, Dodge City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Elliott</td>
<td>Margaret Greynolds</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dominique</td>
<td>Ron McCrory</td>
<td>Pineville, Shreveport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Biles</td>
<td>Marty Beasley</td>
<td>Lafayette, Ruston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeAnn McCorkle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natchitoches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, Chapter, College, and Province Number</th>
<th>Chapter President</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Northwest Nazarene College-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Boise State University-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Illinois Wesleyan University-3</td>
<td>Marie J. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Eureka College-3</td>
<td>Donald Littlejohn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eureka, Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Bradley University-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monmouth, Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Monmouth College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—McKendree College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—North Central College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Wheaton College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Western Illinois University-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Augustana College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI—Northern Illinois University-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO—Principia College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGMA—Eastern Illinois University-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAU—Millikin University-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPSILON—Southern Illinois University-3</td>
<td>Bill Hale</td>
<td>Marvin Kleinau</td>
<td>Carbondale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI—Illinois College-3</td>
<td>Robert Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacksonville, Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI—Greenville College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Schermer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEGA—Olivet Nazarene College-3</td>
<td>Sandra Madsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storm Lake, Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA GAMMA—Southern Illinois University-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oskaloosa, Decorah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Franklin College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Central College-2</td>
<td>Jeanine Parent</td>
<td>Bette Brunsting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Morningside College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sioux City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Simpson College-2</td>
<td>Douglas Larche</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana, Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Upper Iowa College-8</td>
<td>Charles B. Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Coe College-2</td>
<td>Ted L. Reis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Rapids, LeMars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Westmar College-5</td>
<td>Sandra Madsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storm Lake, Storm Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPAPA—Buena Vista College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des Moines, Oskaloosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Drake University-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decorah, Orange City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—William Penn College-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Luther College-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI—Northwestern College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPA—Ottawa University-1</td>
<td>Ken Martin</td>
<td>Michael S. Twedt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Washburn University-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Zvaldi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Southwestern College-1</td>
<td>Tim Hammer</td>
<td>Gary C. Horn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Kansas State College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emporia, Salina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Kansas Wesleyan University-1</td>
<td>Laura Terlip</td>
<td>H. Francis Short</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Kansas State College-1</td>
<td>Dorothy Behnke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin City, Sterling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPAPA—Baker University-1</td>
<td>Barbara Unruh</td>
<td>Ada Mae Haury</td>
<td>North Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—Sterling College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leland Lengel</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Bethany College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Harper</td>
<td>Dodge City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Ford Hays State College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Bethel College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMICRON—McPherson College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI—St. Mary of the Plains College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Georgetown College-9</td>
<td>Susan Elliott</td>
<td>Margaret Greynolds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Louisiana College-6</td>
<td>Michael Dominique</td>
<td>Ron McCrory</td>
<td>Pineville, Shreveport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Centenary College-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marty Beasley</td>
<td>Lafayette, Ruston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Univ. of Southwestern La.-6</td>
<td>Jim Biles</td>
<td>DeAnn McCorkle</td>
<td>Natchitoches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Louisiana Polytechnic University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Northwestern State University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Chapter, College, and Province Number</td>
<td>Chapter President</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Southeastern Louisiana University-6</td>
<td>Win Welford</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Lake Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—McNeese State University-6</td>
<td>Pam Boersig</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Northeast Louisiana University-6</td>
<td>R. J. Bicker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shreveport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Louisiana State University-6</td>
<td>Frank J. Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>Robert A. Clark</td>
<td>Wofford G. Gardner</td>
<td>Orono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—University of Maine-12</td>
<td>Dave Dawson</td>
<td>Phyllis Bosley</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Williams</td>
<td>Frostburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Towson State University-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Frostburg State College-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>Peter La Pierre</td>
<td>Susan Miskelly</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Bridgewater State College-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Tufts University-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>Cheryl Mulvaney</td>
<td>Robert C. Fischer</td>
<td>Olivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Olivet College-7</td>
<td>Sharon Mahood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Hope College-7</td>
<td>Doug Leitch</td>
<td>Gilbert Rau</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—University of Detroit-7</td>
<td>Debbie Erickson</td>
<td>Dudley D. Cahn</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Central Michigan University-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Gardner</td>
<td>Big Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Ferris State College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Northern Michigan University-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—Detroit Institute of Technology-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Adrian College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>Kurt Sumner</td>
<td>Scott Nobles</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Macalester College-8</td>
<td>James W. Pratt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—St. Olaf College-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Gustavus Adolphus College-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Hamline University-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—College of St. Thomas-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Concordia College-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—St. Mary’s College-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—University of Minnesota-8</td>
<td>Joyce Holte</td>
<td>Hazel Scott</td>
<td>Winona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Moorhead State University-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duluth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—St. John’s University-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moorhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Southwest State University-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collegeville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Bethel College-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Winona State University-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>Steve Geck</td>
<td>Walter J. McCormick</td>
<td>Winona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Millsaps College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Mississippi State University-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Mississippi State University for Women-9</td>
<td>Marilyn Norris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Mississippi College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Delta State College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew M. Jones</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—William Carey College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Westminster College-2</td>
<td>Kelly Klopfenstein</td>
<td>Barry Salsbury</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Central Methodist College-2</td>
<td>George A. Frey</td>
<td>Sieghard Krueger</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—William Jewell College-2</td>
<td>Paul Gieringer</td>
<td>James J. Floyd</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Central Missouri State University-2</td>
<td>Keith Syberg</td>
<td>C.T. Draper</td>
<td>Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Northeast Missouri State University-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Harte</td>
<td>Warrensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Southeast Missouri State University-2</td>
<td>Susan Farmer</td>
<td>James Leu</td>
<td>Kirkville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Northwest Missouri State University-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Drury College-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Rockhurst College-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI—University of Missouri-2</td>
<td>Ron Eddie</td>
<td>Walter H. Murrish</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO—Evangel College-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonna Dalan</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGMA—Southwest Baptist College-2</td>
<td>Darrell L. Moore</td>
<td>Bob Derryberry</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORENSIC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, Chapter, College, and Province Number</th>
<th>Chapter President</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Rocky Mountain College-10</td>
<td>John Bliss</td>
<td>Robert H. Lyon</td>
<td>Billings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Montana State University-10</td>
<td>Larry Sweet</td>
<td>L.A. Lawrence</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Eastern Montana College-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Larry K. Hannah</td>
<td>Billings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Carroll College-10</td>
<td>Dan McGowan</td>
<td>H.A. Smith</td>
<td>Helena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—College of Great Falls-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom O’Brien</td>
<td>Great Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—University of Montana-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Polsin</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Ray</td>
<td>Butte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Nebraska Wesleyan University-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alice Jaswal</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Doane College-1</td>
<td>Christine M. Foisey</td>
<td>Alice Berigan</td>
<td>Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Hastings College-1</td>
<td>Mike Einspahr</td>
<td>Dale E. Black</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Kearney State College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Hill</td>
<td>Kearney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Chadron State College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Wheeler</td>
<td>Chadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—University of Nebraska-1</td>
<td>Paul Hoffman</td>
<td>Dwight Connely</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Wayne State College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Midland College-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Deahl/Richard Thiede Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—University of Nevada-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil McFarland</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Monmouth College-12</td>
<td>Pamela Mickens</td>
<td>William Yaremchuk</td>
<td>Long Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—New Jersey Institute of Technology-12</td>
<td>Gary Prince</td>
<td>Clarence E. Johnson</td>
<td>Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Trenton State College-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Ottinger</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—New Mexico State University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil McFarland</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Eastern New Mexico University-6</td>
<td>Timothy Ashmore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Ithaca College-11</td>
<td>Paula Alicandro</td>
<td>Franklin Sharp</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—State University College-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geneseo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—State University College-11</td>
<td>Sharlene Scott</td>
<td>B.W. Reed</td>
<td>Brockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—State University College-11</td>
<td>Michael Costelloe</td>
<td>A.R. Montanaro, Jr.</td>
<td>Plattsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Hunter College-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI—St. Francis College-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>John P. Monaghan</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—College of St. Rose-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Appalachian State University-9</td>
<td>Bill Bird</td>
<td>Terry W. Cole</td>
<td>Boone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Pfeiffer College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misenheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—North Dakota State College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Mulkerin</td>
<td>E. James Ubbelohde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Dickinson State College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dickinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—North Dakota State University-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Mayville State College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Baldwin Wallace College-7</td>
<td>Bryan Cermak</td>
<td>James A. Ross</td>
<td>Berea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Heidelberg College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leanne Wolff</td>
<td>Tiffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—University of Akron-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Akron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Otterbein College-7</td>
<td>Dan Hawk</td>
<td>Jim Grissinger/Don Hines</td>
<td>Westerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Marietta College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>K. Wayne Wall</td>
<td>Marietta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Bowling Green State University-7</td>
<td>Jeffrey Barnett</td>
<td>Ray Yeager</td>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Kent State University-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—University of Dayton-7</td>
<td>George Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Mount Union College-7</td>
<td>Robert De Bula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Youngstown University-7</td>
<td>Ralph Harris</td>
<td>Sam C. Geonetta</td>
<td>Mount Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Ohio Northern University-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMECRIAN—Malone College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Roberts</td>
<td>Ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI—Defiance College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan J. Younger</td>
<td>Defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter, Chapter, College, and Province Number</td>
<td>Chapter President</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHO—Rio Grande College-7</td>
<td>John Graham</td>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGMA—Wright State University-7</td>
<td>James E. Sayer</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Oklahoma State University-6</td>
<td>Fred Tewell</td>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Oklahoma Baptist University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Oklahoma City University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—East Central University-6</td>
<td>Bob Payne</td>
<td>Ada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Southeastern State College-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Durant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Central State College-6</td>
<td>Douglas Duke</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Phillips University-6</td>
<td>Jennifer Rowland</td>
<td>Enid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Southwestern State College-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weatherford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Panhandle State College-6</td>
<td>James H. Roach</td>
<td>Goodwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Bethany Nazarene College-6</td>
<td>W. L. Murrow</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEICRON—Cameron University-6</td>
<td>Candace Sterett</td>
<td>Lawton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Linfield College-10</td>
<td>Gary Walker</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Gleason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Lewis &amp; Clark College-10</td>
<td>Dave Tollmen</td>
<td>Steven B. Hunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Portland State University-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—University of Portland-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Southern Oregon College-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Grove City College-10</td>
<td>Regina Wild</td>
<td>Erich Frohman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Bloomburg State College-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Geneva College-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaver Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—California State College-12</td>
<td>Betty Jo McDonough</td>
<td>Patrick Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Clariion State College-7</td>
<td>Kimberly Lemon</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—East Stroudsburg State College-12</td>
<td>John Ageledinger</td>
<td>Roger Hufford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—West Chester State College-12</td>
<td>Tim Anderson</td>
<td>Clarion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Lock Haven State College-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean C. Reeder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—Mansfield State College-11</td>
<td>John Heim</td>
<td>East Stroudsburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Edinboro State College-7</td>
<td>Elaine Murphy</td>
<td>A.G. Kershner, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI—Shippensburg State College-12</td>
<td>Charles Agnew</td>
<td>West Chester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEICRON—Wilkes College-12</td>
<td>Marcia Stratton</td>
<td>Lock Haven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHDAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Dakota Wesleyan University-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Huron College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Huron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Yankton College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yankton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—South Dakota State University-5</td>
<td>Paul Rohde</td>
<td>Harold Widvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Sioux Falls College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Northern State College-5</td>
<td>Nancy Borchard</td>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—Augustana College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Zeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Dakota State College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Black Hills State College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Pfau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—University of South Dakota-5</td>
<td>Mike Cole</td>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—South Dakota School of Mines-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Maryville College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Follette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Huron College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Yankton College-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Tennessee Technological University-9</td>
<td>Rick Travis</td>
<td>Blair F. Beasley, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Carson-Newman College-9</td>
<td>Stan Roden</td>
<td>Robert Woodland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Middle Tennessee State University-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dick Finton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—David Lipscomb College-9</td>
<td>Robert Whiting</td>
<td>James Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Tennessee Wesleyan College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Schott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Tennessee State University-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—Austin Peay State University-9</td>
<td>Sandra Watkins</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Tennessee Nazarene College-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Fisk University-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| FORENSIC |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State, Chapter, College, and Province Number</th>
<th>Chapter President</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—East Texas State University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Howard Payne College-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brownwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Mary Hardin Baylor College-6</td>
<td>James H. Plank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Texas Christian University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—North Texas State University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Hardin Simmons University-6</td>
<td>Paul King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—Baylor University-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—Stephen F. Austin State University-6</td>
<td>Charles Collet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU—Texas A &amp; I University-6</td>
<td>Marin Perez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMICRON—University of Houston-6</td>
<td>Craig Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI—Lamar University-6</td>
<td>Dennis Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI—Midwestern University-6</td>
<td>Trevallyn Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI—University of Texas-4</td>
<td>Melody Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMEGA—West Texas State University-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Norwich University-11</td>
<td>Keith A. Gould</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Old Dominion University-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—University of Puget Sound-10</td>
<td>Mark Lyon</td>
<td>Carl Clavadetscher</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Seattle Pacific College-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Hansen</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Whitworth College-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—Pacific Lutheran University-10</td>
<td>Doug Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>Jeff Wiles</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—Western Washington College-10</td>
<td>Blane Smith</td>
<td>Larry S. Richardson</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—St. Martin's College-10</td>
<td>Cathi Rudolph</td>
<td>Nicholas Rausch</td>
<td>Olympia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—Eastern Washington State College-10</td>
<td>Mike Schmidt</td>
<td>Larry Kraft</td>
<td>Cheney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Whitman College-10</td>
<td>Bill Hudson</td>
<td>Remy Wilcox</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Marshall University-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>William N. Denman</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—Morris Harvey College-7</td>
<td>Eugenia Whittington</td>
<td>Roselynn L. Freeman</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—Shepherd College-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Marks</td>
<td>Shepherdstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA—Ripon College-3</td>
<td>Beth Galler</td>
<td>Bonnie Buza</td>
<td>Ripon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA—Carroll College-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig W. Cutbirth</td>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMMA—University of Wisconsin-8</td>
<td>Peter Leyh</td>
<td>Greg Olson</td>
<td>River Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELTA—University of Wisconsin-8</td>
<td>Nila Olson</td>
<td>Richard Haven</td>
<td>Whitewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSILON—University of Wisconsin-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Walsh</td>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZETA—University of Wisconsin-8</td>
<td>Keven Greaney</td>
<td>Thomas Jonas</td>
<td>Platteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA—University of Wisconsin-3</td>
<td>Earl Roethke</td>
<td>Bruce M. Baylor</td>
<td>Kenosha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THETA—Carthage College-3</td>
<td>Deborah Oliver</td>
<td>M.T. Nicolai</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTA—University of Wisconsin-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Starr</td>
<td>Menomonie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPPA—University of Wisconsin-Stout-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stevens Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMBDA—University of Wisconsin-8</td>
<td>Fred Lokken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU—University of Wisconsin-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUMNI CHAPTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard B. Hammerstrom</td>
<td>Eau Claire, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Williams Alumni Chapter #1 at University of Wisconsin-Whitewater-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peoria, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley University Alumni Chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Flanagan</td>
<td>Liberty, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C. Harvey Alumni Chapter at William Jewell College-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alamosa, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams State College Alumni Chapter-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marie Robinson</td>
<td>Bloomington, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University Alumni Chapter-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sioux Falls, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana College Alumni Chapter-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-mortems give us explanations when explanations serve no useful purpose to what’s dead. Small comfort to the deceased that pneumonia instead of cancer killed him or to the murder victim that he was shot before he drowned.

The other day a friend did a post-mortem on a now defunct, formerly prestigious, publishing house. “The trouble was,” she opined, “that a bunch of new salesmen didn’t go after contracts. They thought the respected name would do the trick forever, but it didn’t.”

The what-went-wrong analyzers feel better, I suppose, when their data is processed. Why the candidate got killed at the polls, why the predicted football champs were slogged before playoffs, why the speech stopped breathing halfway into the “attention step” — such post-mortems provide jobs for pollsters and reporters and professors. But unless the survivors profit from the ex-post facto examinations, there seems little value (apart from curiosity satiation) in wondering why the dead got that way.

When my friend was reflecting on the demise of a great corporation, I thought about that classic speech of Bruce Barton’s, “Which Knew Not Joseph.” Being the sagacious adman he was, Barton knew that a product — or whatever — must be kept before the public eye day-by-day. “The fact that you told your story yesterday should not lead you into the delusion of supposing that you have ever told it,” Barton warned. New generations, like pharaohs, rise up knowing nothing of a once popular product.

Barton, of course, was more interested in preventing death than in explicating it. His admonition to keep the product visible and appealing makes good sense to all of us who want to spare our chapters the futility of a post-mortem. Every year the graduating PKD’ers take with them their knowledge and memories of the fraternity. Within four years, or less, a chapter can be dead. Thus, all the officers and sponsors have a continuing responsibility to make the ideals and activities of Pi Kappa Delta known to each succeeding class.