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Professor Roy D. Mahaffey, head of the department of speech, Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon, is Chairman of the 1955 Pi Kappa Delta National Convention. Known for his ever present smile (that's why the "Hap"), as immediate past national president, and as an efficient, enthusiastic supporter of our national fraternity, we can be assured of another job well done.

Convention Bound

ROY D. MAHAFFEY, Linfield College

This is the time to make our final plans for the National Convention. This will be the last issue of the Forensic before the National Convention and the Editor has asked for suggestions of ways and means.

First of all let me point out a few things which you may not have considered. I have checked with the Automobile Association and they have given me mileage figures which show that 82 of our chapters are within three days' driving distance of Redlands and an additional 40 chapters within four days' driving distance. Add to this those of us which can get to Redlands in one or two days' driving and we have a potential attendance of 140 chapters. Many of you probably do not realize that the distance from our chapter at Western Washington College and our chapter at Montana State College is almost identical with the distance from Kansas City, Missouri; Tulsa, Oklahoma and Houston, Texas. When you think of the chapters in this area you can readily see that distance is no great handicap.

Let me illustrate a little further. At least three of our Pi Kap schools in this area went to the Western Speech Convention and Tournament at Tucson, Arizona, at Thanksgiving time. This involved a trip of at least 1600 miles one way. Here is what we did in that connection. We spent three days driving to Tucson, five days there, and three days driving home. There were five of us and we made the entire trip including tournament and convention registration, transportation, and board and room for $404.50. This would lead me to suggest that those 82 chapters within the three days' driving distance could get to the National and home again with all expenses at the rate of $100 a person, and those who have the four day drive could do it for $135 a person. Immediately you say, "Where do we get the money?"

We have missed only two Nationals since 1924 and our money has come from two sources: (1) the pockets of those who have gone, (2) from the endeavors of the local Pi Kappa Delta chapter.

For practical suggestions what about these?
1. 100 items solicited from people in your community sold at an old-time auction should clear a minimum of $200.
2. 100 cars, arranged for in advance, could be washed in one weekend for $125 profit.
3. One afternoon and evening at the local radio station with ads sold on the single rate basis, all of the programming and announcing carried by Pi Kappa Delta, splitting with the station on a 60-40 basis—$200.
4. Five High School District Speech Tournaments with all services donated for judging—$100.
5. Ten members of Pi Kappa Delta or the speech squad selling blood—$200.
6. One day at a local cafe selling pancakes or ham and eggs or any other community special—$200.
7. A special magazine subscription drive should realize anything from $50 to $150.
8. An all school carnival with a carnival queen, a masquerade ball—from $100 to $1,000.
9. And then there are always the former members of Pi Kappa Delta and the service clubs willing to contribute from $5 to $50.

Just think 140 chapters represented at Redlands drawn together by working on a common money raising project, local community interest in speech, and a never to be forgotten National Convention.

See you there!
Fabulous Southern California beckons for this year’s national convention, April 3 through 8, on the campus of the University of Redlands in the Province of the Pacific.

“The Naval Orange Center of the World,” Redlands has nearly 8,000 acres of the finest eating oranges grown. It is the packing and distributing center for more than 15,000 acres of Southern California’s finest citrus.

Redlands is ideally located in the Southland. Within an hour’s driving time, one can be at such mountain resorts as Arrowhead and Big Bear in the San Bernardino mountains, or at such desert oases as Palm Springs or Apple Valley, or at one of the famous beaches of the Pacific. Redlands is at 1500 feet altitude, but within easy distance are the 10,000 feet-plus altitudes of the nearby mountains, and 230 feet below-sea-level at the Salton Sea.

Visitors may want to see the University of Southern California, or the Los Angeles campus of the University of Southern California. Redlands is less than 2½ hours from Hollywood and Los Angeles. Sightseers enjoy the famous radio, television and movie studios, California’s old missions, the Hollywood Bowl, the Miracle Mile, Mt. Palomar Observatory, Knott’s Berry Farm and Ghost Town, Forest Lawn, the Griffith Park Planetarium, and the Rose Bowl.

Right in the Redlands backyard are the largest vineyard in the world and the Southern California apple and cherry producing areas.

Redlands, a city of 21,000, is known as a California culture center, and yearly many visitors come to see its famed Lincoln Shrine, the Jennie E. Davis Memorial Park, the Redlands Bowl, the University, the Asistencia de Mission San Gabriel, a restored mission outpost, and Smiley Heights where 400 acres from a garden of trees imported from all parts of the world. This garden features banana, rubber, and Persian flowering peach trees, rarities from Hindustan, and cedars of Lebanon.

Easter week in Southern California is noted for changeable weather. Visitors should bring suites or dresses that are lightweight, but heavier jackets or sweaters if it turns cool. But even the April sun in golden California is warm enough for beach outings, so swimming suits are also in order. The UR’s indoor pool, and the beach party being planned will give guests a chance to enjoy the water. Women will need Bermuda shorts or pedal pushers for informal recreation times, and the convention banquet and dancing will require an after-5 dress. The same suits, dresses, etc., worn in contests will be suitable for the Hollywood trip.

Redlands in April is the best time and the perfect place to show off the Southern California climate and landscape. The green of the citrus trees, the surrounding mountains with just a touch of snow on their tips, and the wonderful California sun combine for a perfect setting.

Just one more thing: Redlands has no smog!

THE PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC
—Your Convention Hosts

California Alpha Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta and the University of Redlands are your hosts for the 1955 PKD National Convention. The University of Redlands is a small, liberal arts, coeducational, Christian college. Dr. Egbert Ray Nichols, one of the founders of Pi Kappa Delta, was the Redlands coach until his retirement three years ago.

The campus, surrounded by the beautiful San Bernardino mountains, is laid out on a level quadrangle, with the facades of the Chapel and Administration building forming imposing pictures against the orange trees and the snowy mountains. In the spring, the campus is filled with the sweet odor of orange blossoms from trees forming part of the campus landscape.

The Alpha Chapter members have been busy since fall with plans for the event. The tournament has been lengthened one day to
Housing Accommodations

All delegates to the convention, April 3 through 8 will be housed on the Redlands campus, in one of the nine dormitories. A newly-completed hall for women will be opened to the visitors.

Price of accommodations will be $2 per person per night, including sheets, pillowcases, and one blanket. The dormitories can accommodate 457 men and 452 women, but dormitories can be converted if the registration demands.

Delegates from the East Coast states will be housed free of charge, as is traditional.

Housing may also be secured at reasonable rates at one of the town’s hotels, the Wissahickon Inn, or La Posada Hotel. Rates at these, and in the Redlands motels vary from $2 to $5 per night.

Meal Accommodations

The University has a newly enlarged, air-conditioned Commons with doubled serving capacity. All delegates will be able to receive their meals here for a total cost of $11.25 for the five days. This is approximately 75 cents per meal for 15 meals. The banquet cost will be $2 per person. Meal card costs will be lowered for delegations arriving late.

For in between, the university’s modern student union fountain grill will be open throughout most of the convention.

Church Services

The traditional opening church service will be held Sunday night in the University Chapel, April 3. All delegates that can be in Redlands in time for this initial event are invited to the church services.

THE UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS campus, showing the Chapel, art and music buildings, and men's dormitories. The corner of the science building is in the foreground. Bordering the quad are orange trees, which blossom in the spring. The mountains are the San Bernardino range.
Hollywood Trip
California is the sightseers’ paradise, and arrangements are being made by the convention hosts to cater to every tourist’s choice. Arrangements are being made for tours through Hollywood movie studios and the new multi-million dollar Television City just completed. Tickets to your favorite shows will be secured, also. The trip to Hollywood, scheduled for April 6, will begin right after lunch in the Commons. For $1 per person, sixteen busses will carry the guests to points of interest, to return late that night. A catering service will provide the meal, probably a beach party at night—a favorite California activity. The meal will cost $1. Side trips to the movie star’s residential area, La Brea Tar Pits, Knott’s Berry Farm and Ghost Town will be taken by the groups expressing preferences. “You pays your money and you takes your choice.”

Province Night
Entertainment for the traditional Province night will be provided by a committee chosen among the Province schools, and has not yet been announced. Part of the time will be spent in “Co-rec,” an open house to the swimming pool, gym floor, and square-dancing court that is a favorite among Californians.

Convention and Contest Rules

General
1. Each student and one faculty director of forensics from each college, attending the convention must pay a registration fee of $6.00. This covers the banquet ticket, admission to all meetings and contests and the formal dance. If a college brings additional faculty members who accept judging assignments such faculty members will be issued a banquet ticket at cost and will not be charged the registration fee. The same rule will apply to wives of faculty members. Entry fees for participation in the convention contests and in discussion shall be in addition to this registration fee.

2. Each student delegate to the Convention and each participant in the contests or in discussion shall be a bona fide undergraduate student who has not already had four years of forensic participation previous to 1954-55 and who is carrying a minimum of twelve hours of college work with passing grades at the time of the convention. He shall be a member of Pi Kappa Delta or shall have filed a membership application with the National Secretary and sent in his initiation fee.

3. All entries in convention contests and in discussion must be sent to the National Secretary so as to show a postmark not later than March 3, 1955. Entries mailed later than that date will not be accepted. The entry fee shall be $1.00 for each event entered and shall be sent with the entry blank.

4. There shall be separate divisions for men and women in all events except discussion. Gold medals will be awarded to winners of Superior rating in each contest; certificates to those winning Excellent rating.

5. Certificates of “Superior” will be awarded to the 10% of the chapters with the most points in men’s contests and to the 10% of chapters with the most points in women’s contests. Certificates of “Excellent” will be awarded to the next 20% in each division. Those in the next 30% will be rated “Good” but will receive no certificates. Points will be given in debate as follows: Superior rating—10 points; Excellent 8 points; Good—6 points; participation—2 points. In extemporaneous speaking and oratory a rating of Superior will be given 5 points; Excellent—4 points; Good—3 points; participation—1 point.

6. All contest arrangements not covered by the rules shall be in the hands of the individual contest committees and the Director of Tournaments. Questions concerning any interpretation of contest rules should be directed to the Contest Chairman, Dr. L. E. Norton, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois.

Judging
All competing chapters must provide at least one faculty member who is a qualified judge and who will accept his assigned service as outlined by the judging committee. Individual adjustments in that assignment will be made by the chairman of the committee. No college will be permitted to enter the convention tournament without providing a judge unless the delegation is limited to one student representative. No student member of the delegation will be permitted to serve as a substitute for a faculty judge. A college which cannot meet the requirements of this section or whose faculty representative feels
that he cannot meet his judging assignments is requested not to enter the contests.

Oratory

1. Contestants. Each Pi Kappa Delta chapter may enter one orator in the men's and one in the women's contest.

2. Orations. Orations shall not exceed 10 minutes of speaking time and shall contain not more than 150 words of quotations. All orations must be certified by the coach as being the original work of the contestants. All quotations shall appear definitely as such in the manuscript. Each contestant shall present a typewritten copy of his oration to the National Secretary of Pi Kappa Delta at the Convention Registration desk on April 3, 1955. The oration delivered in the contest must conform to the manuscript submitted. The manuscript will not be returned.

3. Contests. The contests shall be held simultaneously, the number of such contests being determined by the number of contestants entered, it being provided that not more than seven speakers shall appear on one program. Each orator shall appear in four rounds.

4. Method of Judging. Three judges shall be appointed in each contest. Each judge shall rank the three highest ranking speakers, first, second, and third. In tabulating the results, all other speakers in each contest will be given a ranking of four. No judge shall tie two speakers for first, second, or third places. The judges may comment on the speakers at the close of the round, but should not reveal their decisions.

5. Rankings. The orators ranking in the upper 10% will be rated "Superior"; those in the next 20% will be rated "Excellent"; those in the next 30% will be rated "Good."

Extemporaneous Speaking

1. Contestants. Each Pi Kappa Delta chapter may enter one speaker in the men's and one in the women's contest.

2. Subject. The subject will be "Defense Plans for Western Europe." This subject will be divided into four areas.

3. Subtopics. The Contest Committee shall arrange for the securing of sufficient and suitable subtopics for each of the four areas.

4. Drawings. One hour before the time of speaking in each contest, the contestant shall draw by lot for a subtopic. It is expected that the speech will be prepared by the student without the assistance of anyone.

5. Contests. The rules for these contests shall be the same as those for oratory.

CONVENTION PROGRAM

Redlands, Calif., April 4-8, 1954

April 3, Sunday
12:00 noon to 12:00 P.M. Registration

April 4, Monday
8:30 A.M. Business Meeting and Charter Presentation
10:15-12:00 A.M. Discussion, Round I
10:15 A.M. Drawing for Extempore, Round I
11:15 A.M. Extempore, Round I
1:30 P.M. Debate, Round I
3:00 P.M. Debate, Round II
4:30 P.M. Oratory, Round I
8:00-10:00 Social Hours (cards, dancing, cokes, etc.)

April 5, Tuesday
8:30 A.M. Debate, Round III
10:00-12:00 A.M. Business Meeting
12:15 P.M. Province Governors' Luncheon
2:00 P.M. Discussion, Round II
2:00 P.M. Drawing for Extempore, Round II
3:00 P.M. Extempore, Round II
4:30 P.M. Debate, Round IV
7:00 P.M. Oratory, Round II
9:00-11:00 P.M. Informal Dance

April 6, Wednesday
8:30 A.M. Oratory, Round III
10:00 A.M. Debate, Round V

April 7, Thursday
8:30 A.M. Discussion, Round III
8:30 A.M. Drawing for Extempore, Round III
9:30 A.M. Extempore, Round III
10:30-12:00 A.M. Conference Committee Discussions
11:00 A.M. Province Meetings
1:30 P.M. Debate, Round VI
3:00 P.M. Debate, Round VII
4:30 P.M. Discussion, Round IV
8:30 P.M. Province Night

April 8, Friday
8:30 A.M. Oratory, Round IV
9:30-11:30 A.M. Discussion: General Assembly
9:30 A.M. Drawing for Extempore, Round IV
10:30 A.M. Extempore, Round IV
1:00 P.M. Debate, Round VIII
2:30 P.M. Business Meeting
6:30 P.M. Convention Banquet, Announcement of Winners
6. Length of Speeches. Speeches shall not be more than six minutes. Each speaker shall be given a warning by the timekeeper at the expiration of five minutes.

7. The Question Period. Each speaker shall be asked one pertinent question by a judge at the close of his original speech. The speaker must answer this question impromptu; maximum time for the answer, two minutes.

8. The Method of Judging. The method of judging shall be the same as that for oratory.

9. Ranking. The method of ranking shall be the same as for oratory.

**Debate**

1. Each Pi Kappa Delta chapter may enter one team in the men’s division and one team in the women’s division. No mixed teams shall be entered.

2. Substitutions. There may be free substitution of debaters from round to round providing the names of those to be used are included in the entry lists.

3. Question. The official Pi Kappa Delta question shall be used in all debates.

4. Speeches. Each debater shall have two speeches, one of ten minutes and one of five. The affirmative shall introduce the constructive and the negative shall introduce the refutation speeches.

5. Rounds. All teams will take part in eight rounds of debate, the pairings of which are to be arranged by the contest committee and posted for round to round.


7. Decisions. Decisions will be rendered by single judges, who may comment on the debate but who should not announce their decisions to the debaters.

8. Rankings. All teams winning all or seven of the eight rounds shall be awarded the “Superior” rating. All teams winning six debates shall be rated “Excellent.” All teams winning five debates shall be given a rating of “Good.”

9. Drawing. In order to avoid a drawing in which strong teams will meet only strong teams and weaker teams meet only weaker teams, every fourth team will be seeded on the basis of performance earlier in the year. Under this plan every team (including every seeded team) will meet two seeded teams and two only during the course of the eight rounds. Ratings of various colleges shall be determined by the Debate Committee with the assistance of the Province Governors and qualified Pi Kappa Delta members in the respective areas.

**Discussion**

1. Subject. How can the American Educational System best meet the needs of our society?

2. Procedure. There will be four rounds of two hours each plus a conference committee and a final round of advocacy on the convention floor.

   Round I. Problem-analysis stage. (Defining and limiting the problem. What is the problem? What are its manifestations and how serious is it?)

   Round II. Problem-solution stage. (What is the cause of the problem? By what criteria

---

**Extemporaneous Speaking Topic**

**MEN AND WOMEN DIVISION**

**NATIONAL PKD CONVENTION**

April 4-8

**DEFENSE PLANS FOR WESTERN EUROPE**

The following areas of study will be used in each of the four rounds of speaking:

1. The history and background of Western European Defense.
2. NATO and Western European Defense.
3. Obstacles to Western European Defense.
would proposed solutions be measured? What possible solutions are there?)

Round III. Solution stage. (What is the best solution to the problem? What solution or solutions, in the case of a minority report, does each section wish to recommend?)

Conference. One committee man from each section to meet jointly and to examine all solutions, eliminate duplications and report back to the various sections.

Round IV. Final consideration of solutions in the same discussion sections.

Final Round: General Assembly. Speeches of advocacy and adoption of solutions by the convention. (Only those entered in discussion are eligible to participate in the debate on the floor. Other delegates form the gallery.)

3. The chairmanship shall rotate among members; each chairman shall function for one hour.

4. Each college will be permitted to enter one man and one woman; however, there will be no separate section for men and women.

5. One member from each section shall be selected in the third round to serve on the conference committee.

6. During round four each section should decide what solutions it believes in firmly enough to present for adoption on the convention floor. Since there will be a definite limit on the amount of time given each section during the debate on the floor, each section should decide how it wishes to allot this time among its own members. Majority and minority solutions should be allowed proportionate time.

7. Participants in discussion are to be evaluated on a three point scale: excellent, good, and fair. The top 30% will receive 3 points toward the sweepstakes; the second 30% will receive 2 points and the remainder 1 point. No awards will be given in Discussion. To merit these points a student must participate in the first four rounds and answer roll call in the final round. (General Assembly)

8. A faculty observer will sit with each section. It shall be his function to check attendance, to serve as a guide in procedure, and to evaluate the participants.

9. A Speaker, a Clerk, and a Parliamentarian will be appointed from faculty representatives to act during the conference between rounds three and four and during the final speaking on the convention floor.

10. The Contest Committee for Discussion will draw up a set of standing rules for the use of participants. Copies will be available at the registration desk in Kalamazoo. The rules will cover such things as limits on debate, roll call votes, the order of resolutions on the agenda, etc.
The President's Page

As I write this page, it looks as though most of the foolish furor over this year's debate question has just about blown over. Of course, I am no prophet; and it is always possible that events now unforeseen might bring us to debating something other than diplomatic recognition of Red China by next April in Redlands. The statement of President Eisenhower, however, that he would be inclined to trust the judgment of West Point cadets and Naval Academy midshipmen and let them publicly debate the question to their heart's content has done a great deal to clear the air. And the joint resolution of the Questions Committee, printed elsewhere in this issue, argues convincingly that debate on even a controversial issue like the Red China one is fully in line with American traditions of free speech.

Actually, some of the things which have been said about the question are pretty silly, and perhaps the whole hullabaloo is only a symptom of the terrible pressures under which we live today—pressures which magnify our fears and make clear thinking difficult. Consider, for instance, the charge that the question compells students to debate "half the time on the Communist side of the question." Linked to this argument was the charge that "the naming of the Red China topic showed a desire to indoctrinate students." Both claims, it seems to me, were based on a simple misunderstanding of the question. And, as countless affirmative teams have been pointing out, "Recognition does not necessarily mean approval." I have heard quite a few debates by now, yet I have not heard an affirmative which voiced even a qualified approval of Communist China. Instead, affirmative teams are basing their arguments around the question of whether or not it would be advantageous to the U.S. at this time to open regular channels of diplomatic communication with Red China. And as for indoctrination, my experience has been that college debaters are a clear-thinking, hard-headed lot. They usually emerge with sound conclusions by the end of a year of study.

With the decision of the service academies to bar debate on the topic I have no quarrel. After all, their problem is not quite the same as that of the average liberal arts college. Although I would be in agreement with Eisenhower that the cadets are still students, even though they are technically in military service, nevertheless so persuasive an authority as Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times has argued in favor of the bar. I would only note in passing that the cadets have argued topics as controversial as this in the past—and without any apparent damage to the nation.

In any case, whatever our opinions on this matter, let us be grateful that this is America, that there is no party line to which we all have to conform, and that we are still free to argue about what we shall argue about, as vociferously as we like!
From the Secretary's Desk

Only fifty per cent of the chapters have responded to the request for information concerning their plans for the year, however this group has made tentative plans to have nearly 400 representatives at the Redlands Convention. If those not reporting match this number the 1955 convention may set a postwar record for convention attendance. Entry blanks for the National will be mailed to reach you by February 1, and should be returned with a postmark not later than March 4.

Keep in mind that all delegates must be Pi Kappa Delta members or have made application for membership. Petition forms will be available at the registration desk for those who have not sent in membership applications before the convention.

The constitution requires that all chapters not represented at the 1953 convention must have a representative present for two business sessions unless excused by President Randolph.

A large number of new sponsors have been reported this year. If you know of other new sponsors please send us this information. Correspondence often goes astray when it is forwarded to someone who is no longer on the campus. Keeping the Pi Kappa Delta official mailing list up to date is a continuous problem.

Several chapters have written for a list of their membership, past and present, as recorded in the national office. With changing officers from year to year, local records are sometimes lost or incomplete. This office will supply a complete list of past memberships providing too many requests are not received at the same time. Please allow at least ten days if this service is requested. Such records may reveal alumni of prominence that may have been overlooked.

Prof. J. T. Von Trebra of Wisconsin Epsilon has written for a duplicate card for the president of Wisconsin State College, Whitewater. Dr. Robert C. Williams, president of Whitewater is a graduate of Central College, Iowa, and was one of the first hundred members. He holds membership number 98 and key number 43. Dr. Williams has joined a number of Pi Kappa Delta alumni who have become successful as college presidents.

SEE YOU AT REDLANDS
The editor is very happy to present the following excellent articles on the techniques of debate. They contain practical advice for both beginning and advanced debaters. Glenn R. Capp is chairman of the department of speech and coach of debate at Baylor University and is a past national president of Pi Kappa Delta. Larry E. Norton is director of forensics at Bradley University and is a present member of the national council. Emmett Long is director of forensics at George Pepperdine College and is a past governor of the Province of the Pacific.

Debating the Affirmative

Glenn R. Capp, Baylor University

The Problem

Recently a letter from an organization that sponsors a national contest in debate stated in part: “I am enclosing a list of twenty-five debate propositions used for our National Convention debates. I am also enclosing an excerpt from an article that was rather critical of the fact that the negative won twenty out of twenty-one times. . . . I was asked by our National Officers to make a study of this criticism to determine whether the . . . was guilty of phrasing the propositions badly. Our Officers are also interested in knowing whether there are ways in which such a preponderance of victories on one side might be reduced. . . . I shall appreciate your sending me your reactions. . . .”

The enclosed critical analysis read in part: “There is no need for the negative side to study the case, all it has to do is to stick to a canned, ‘They haven’t proved anything,’ which will do as well for one subject as another; and there is no use for the affirmative to waste time on studying, either, for they are licked from the start.”

Parts of my letter in reply stated: “In my opinion, there is nothing wrong with the statement of these topics. They present well balanced propositions. The preponderance of wins for the negative must be accounted for on other grounds.

“I believe there are two reasons for excessive negative decisions. In the first place unless a great deal of work is given to preparing, it is much easier to debate the negative of any proposition. I can imagine that most of your people are busy men who can give only a relatively brief time to preparing. From the nature of the negative side, which need only tear down an idea, it has the initial advantage. In working with my own students, we give at least seventy-five per cent of our attention to building the affirmative case early in the season.

“Secondly, I am wondering if the situation you describe cannot be helped by your choice of judges. My experience shows that debate directors or former directors judge more on the accomplishments in a debate and less on their belief on the questions than any other group. We get more negative votes where we use business men as judges. How would a panel of judges for your debates consisting of the following strike you: two business men, two debate directors, and one educator from a field outside of speech.”

High school and college debaters have also testified to the difficulty of winning on the affirmative side, especially early in the debate year. This article proposes to discuss certain techniques and procedures designed to help overcome this seeming inequality.

Nature of the Affirmative Side

First, consider the general nature and philosophy of the affirmative side. The affirmative on any properly worded policy question should be the aggressor. Since the affirmative proposes a change in an existing political, economic, or social policy it must assume the burden of proving its case. No justification for change accrues unless an improved condition results. The negative, therefore, has the presumption in its favor at the beginning of the debate.
The procedures of burden of proof and presumption of argument come largely from legal procedure. The defendant in any legal action is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. Rights of the individual predominante. While varying degrees of proof exist, the preponderance of legal procedure favors the defendant. Liberty loving people prefer that an occasional guilty person go free than that innocent people be found guilty. This emphasis on the rights of the individual distinguishes the concept of the free world from that of dictatorial governments. This same principle pertains to college debate. An existing order is considered best until a better one can be proved. The affirmative must prove its case not only as good as the status quo, but better.

Debate procedures also borrow from policy-determining groups. The affirmative in a college debate may be compared to the proponent of a measure in a deliberative assembly. To prevail in a policy-determining group, the proponent must show that a proposal will remedy an existing problem better than the present system; otherwise, why change?

In short, the affirmative must maintain the offensive throughout the debate. A recent sports story stated that a certain football team won because it controlled the ball. During the last half the winning team ran forty-nine offensive plays, while the losing team ran only twenty-three. The winning team was the aggressor, as the affirmative side must be in a debate. The affirmative speakers must keep their case constantly before the audience and judges. In maintaining the offensive the affirmative has three obligations: (1) to present a prima facie case—one that is capable of winning as originally planned; (2) to uphold the case from attacks made by the negative; and (3) to answer the negative counter-arguments.

Present a Prima Facie Case

A case sufficient to win if not answered consists primarily of three factors: (1) a problem exists; (2) the affirmative proposal can correct that problem; and (3) the affirmative proposal will bring about advantages in addition to the correction of the problem. Should the negative introduce a counter proposal, the issue of which plan can best correct the evils then becomes a basic issue.

In proving that a problem exists the affirmative must show that the existing evils are sufficient to demand a change. Ordinarily an affirmative team cannot present all of the evils which exist; it should give the strongest evils, being careful to concentrate on those which can be corrected by its proposal.

An important question for the affirmative concerns how much time to spend in developing the problem. Some affirmative teams do not spend sufficient time. In a recent tournament two affirmative teams gave the entire affirmative case in the opening speech. Such procedure is questionable. It does not allow sufficient time to support the specific evils with adequate logical proof. After the first affirmative speech the constructive phase of the debates stopped. The remainder of the debates consisted largely of a rehearsing of the first affirmative’s arguments. No standard answer can be given to what constitutes sufficient proof, but too much is better than too little. The degrees of proof required will vary with different propositions, but ordinarily the first affirmative speaker cannot develop more than the issue of need adequately if he gives the proper analysis and introduction to the debate.

Above all, the evils developed must be an outgrowth of conditions that can be corrected by the proposal called for in the proposition. Beware of presenting extraneous problems outside the subject matter of the proposition. Concentrate on those phases of the problem on which you have a natural advantage from the conditions which actually exist. Let the prevailing condition help you prove your case.

Your second problem concerns how to correct the evils. This involves the question of how detailed a plan should be given. Many affirmative teams present too detailed a plan. The time limits in a debate constitute a limiting factor. In some instances the proposal called for in the proposition may be sufficient. For example, this year’s question for recognition of the Communist government of China by the United States to an extent contains the plan in the proposition. The affirmative needs only to show how the proposal can be put into operation, the approximate time required to inaugurate it, and any conditions of recognition which the affirmative considers appropriate. The affirmative cannot, however, evade the practicability of its proposal by hiding behind the word “should.” The term “should” implies the possibility of the proposal being put into operation and how it would work should it be adopted. A good affirmative team will first outline the minimum details and conditions of its proposal, and then will show how it can correct each evil.
In addition to correcting shortcomings of the present system, often times the affirmative may point out additional advantages and thus strengthen its case. This procedure may constitute a good strategical device because the negative must answer these points. In doing so it will have less time to concentrate on the evils which the affirmative advanced and the means of correcting them. What differentiates added advantages from the correcting of the problem, depends upon how the affirmative develops its issue of need. For example, on the question of recognizing Communist China the matter of improving trade relations might be advanced as an added advantage if the trade problem is not presented as an evil. The same would be true of the effect of recognition on the attitudes of Asiatic countries and our allies.

In summary, the affirmative side must give first attention to presenting an adequate constructive case. It must present a case sufficient to prove to the average, reasonable and prudent person that its course of action should be taken. Some affirmative teams fail because their cases as originally planned are not sufficient to overcome the presumption that favors the negative at the beginning of a debate on any properly worded policy question.

**Answer Attacks Made by Negative**

While the affirmative’s first duty consists of presenting an adequate constructive case, its duties do not end there. It must uphold its case from the attacks made on it by the negative. In performing this important function, the affirmative often makes several mistakes.

Some affirmative teams let the negative get them off of their cases and on to the negative objections throughout the debate. Remember that the affirmative must prove its case. This it cannot do unless it keeps the affirmative case constantly before the audience and judges. A good strategical device for the affirmative consists of briefly restating its case at the beginning of each speech. The affirmative speakers might well say, “Now here is the affirmative case restated briefly, how has the negative answered. Against our first issue the negative made two objections which I shall take up in order.” After giving your counter arguments and evidence, conclude that the issue still stands. Then the affirmative speaker restates the second issue of his case, summarize the objection made against it, and attempts to answer them. Thus, the affirmative keeps its case moving throughout the debate, and answers negative objections only for the purpose of rebuilding its own case.

Often negative teams succeed in narrowing a debate to one or two main objections upon which they have a natural advantage from the existing evidence and reasoning on the point. In most cases the affirmative will find it advantageous to keep its entire case going. If the negative abandons certain arguments the affirmative should emphasize that the arguments have been gained by failure of the negative to reply. While the affirmative has the “burden of proof” on its original case, the negative shares the “burden of rebuttal” with the affirmative and consequently must answer an argument at any time during the debate that the presumption favors the opposition. The burden of rebuttal means the obligation to reply to an argument. Once the negative fails to reply to a prima facie argument, it automatically concedes the point. If the affirmative remembers this principle, it can often prevent the negative from narrowing the debate to one or two objections on which it has a natural advantage.

In attempting to uphold its case some affirmative teams make the mistake of restating supporting arguments and evidence which it gave originally in advancing the point. You should reserve additional reasons and evidence for the purpose of reconstructing your case. Perhaps this mistake stems from the erroneous impression that some debaters have that “new material cannot be given in the rebuttal speeches.” This principle means simply that you cannot wait until your rebuttal speeches to complete your constructive cases. New evidence and additional reasons are desirable in rebuttal speeches on issues already introduced into the debate. Otherwise, the rebuttal speeches would consist of a restatement of what was said in the constructive speeches. Some affirmative teams seem to disregard the specific manner in which the negative answers a point and restates the point as advanced originally. Keep your case going throughout the debate by answering the specific objections made against it, adding new ideas and fresh evidence throughout the debate.

Affirmative debaters often make the mistake of over-zealous claims on what they have done and what the negative has failed to do. In a recent debate an affirmative speaker began his rebuttal speech by summarizing an important issue and stating that the negative had remained significantly silent on the point.
This claim would probably have made a more favorable impression on the judge had not the preceding negative speaker spent half of his rebuttal speech on the point. The judge was curious to know whether the affirmative speaker simply had not listened to the preceding speaker or whether he thought the judge had not. Psychologically, most people respond more favorably to understatement than to overstatement. Yet many affirmative speakers make sweeping claims for themselves and minimize all out of proportion what the opponent has done. What actually transpires in the debate usually makes more of an impression on the judge than the sweeping claims of opposing speakers.

Answer Negative Objections
Although the affirmative’s constructive case and its defense form the chief concern of the affirmative in a debate, in most debates its obligations do not end there. Often negative teams advance an issue that takes the form of “the affirmative proposal will introduce new evils” or “the disadvantages of the affirmative proposal will outweigh its advantages.” The affirmative must answer such negative objections. Both the attitude and technique of such answers may be important.

Usually the answers to negative positive objections should come at the conclusion of the constructive and reconstructive processes, already discussed. Such transition to their consideration may well take the following form: “You will note that the affirmative has presented a case for its proposal consisting of these issues. . . . The negative arguments against our plan were five in number which we have attempted to answer. Now there remains four disadvantages which the negative has advanced. Let us see if they are valid or controlling objections to our proposal.” Follow this transition by your answers and then return to your original case to show where the objections were not adequate to overcome the advantages you presented. You answer the arguments for the purpose of showing that your case still prevails and thus keep the affirmative constructive case constantly forward in the debate.

On some occasions negative teams seek to get the affirmative team off of their own case by presenting numerous objections, often trivial, for the purpose of causing the affirmative to waste time. The affirmative need not succumb to such strategy. Usually only a few valid objections exist on any proposition; the negative classifies them into numerous sub-points. The affirmative may well show where several of them stem from the same principle, and thus by answering the principle several points may be answered by one argument. By grouping all the objections under two or three main principles, the affirmative may answer successfully all of them in short order.

The affirmative does not have the obligation to respond unless an argument is presented in sufficient logical detail to create a presumption in favor of the one presenting it. On occasion the affirmative may shift the obligation for further proof back to the negative by stating that “we shall be happy to deal with the negative objections if the gentlemen will show where they are valid or how they apply to this debate.” Use this technique where negative teams list numerous points with insufficient reasons and evidence. Never attempt to answer an argument when you already have the advantage on it.

In summary, college debate procedures do not give an advantage to the negative side. A sincere and successful attempt has been made to equalize the procedural methods. A preponderance of negative decisions early in the year usually occurs because of inadequate preparation and a lack of knowledge on how to present the affirmative case most advantageously. This article purported to call attention to the necessity of preparation and to review some of the strategical advices essential to successful affirmative debating.

Planning The Negative Case

LARRY NORTON, Bradley University

At the beginning of any debate, the negative team, without any planning whatsoever, is winning with the status quo. Then the affirmative starts to unfold its case and the negative begins to adapt by using one of four possible approaches which has been previously decided upon. These approaches are: (a) straight refutation, (b) the status quo, (c) a modified status quo, or (d) a counterplan.

Before deciding upon the best approach toward any given debate proposition, certain assumptions relating to debate should be reviewed. It is assumed that a problem exists, that this problem is in the solution stage, and that all persons concerned are interested in
finding the best possible answers to the problem. Not only do we assume that dissatisfaction exists with "things as they are" but that several solutions to the problem are or have been under consideration. This we assume, since we know that there is seldom just one possible solution to any problem, particularly a problem of national or international significance.

A debater's preparation for evaluating a solution includes, therefore, an understanding of the total problem of which a given debate proposition is one possible solution. In the case of this years national topic, this means that the debater must approach it by way of studying a problem which might be stated something like this: "How can the United States combat the spread of Communism in Asia?" The debater should realize that the status quo is one of several courses of action under consideration. Any solution which can justifiably replace the present system must be presumed to offer greater advantages than the present system. It may be insufficient to show that for a proposed solution, other than the status quo, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. The same may be true of the status quo. In fact, when a present policy has become controversial, it is quite conceivable that its disadvantages may be slightly greater than its advantages. Thus the affirmative proposal may have greater disadvantages than advantages, yet be more acceptable than the status quo.

Now with these thoughts in mind, we return to the choice of approach for the negative. This choice or general plan, all too frequently, is not clearly determined and therefore is not set forth early enough in the first negative constructive speech. Our first possible approach, straight refutation, is seldom a popular choice because, while revealing weaknesses in the proposed solution, it ignores the fact that all things are relative. In debate they are related to the status quo and the negative must not only show the disadvantages of the affirmative proposal but that such disadvantages outweigh the disadvantages of the status quo. In other words, in order to participate in a search for the best possible solution, the negative should do more than attack. In the straight refutation approach, the negative may by implication stand for the status quo. Yet, if constructive reasons for such a stand are not stated, we have no basis for comparative judgment. Therefore, the straight refutation approach, though quite commonly recognized as an acceptable debate practice, is difficult for the writer to justify. Straight refutation when combined with one of the other approaches is more desirable.

The status quo approach is selected when definite accomplishments can be pointed to under the present system. In such a case the negative shows that satisfaction exists and proceeds to direct its primary attack on the affirmative need. The weakness of the approach is that it assumes a society without change. It tends to disregard the obvious fact that weaknesses in the status quo have caused the problem to become the subject of discussion and debate.

A more practical approach toward most problems is the modified status quo. This approach recognizes that, although the present system or policy is basically sound, some modifications are always both possible and desirable in a dynamic society. This approach conforms to the democratic way of meeting new situations by gradual modification of present policies and programs. To produce the best results, the modified status quo is combined with straight refutation. The need outlined by the affirmative is minimized. The negative then shows that the remaining need can be better met by minor adjustments in the present system than by the affirmative proposal.

The counterplan approach is frequently used as a strategic device and when thus used is difficult to justify. The negative, in taking such an approach, is saying that in its opinion there is a better solution than either the present system with or without modifications, or the affirmative proposal. In such a situation a more profitable debate could be held with the counterplan as the proposition and the negative assuming the supporting role. The affirmative may be justified in saying to a negative presenting a counterplan: "we shall be glad to meet you on this proposition some other day but for now, let's get back to the topic for debate." The added burden of proof which a negative is forced to assume when presenting a counterplan usually makes it an impractical approach.

In the final analysis, the specific debate proposition and the specific approach of an affirmative team will be factors in determining the negative's most effective stand.

The national debate topic for the current year appears to be one which, on the basis of early season experience, lends itself best
to the combined approach of straight refutation and support of the status quo. As is too often the case in early season debates the negative teams have specialized on the straight refutation approach but as the season develops this will undoubtedly be strengthened by increasing support of the status quo.

The basic approach to a given question having been determined, the negative is now ready to plan specific details. If at all satisfactory, it will accept the affirmative definition of "diplomatic recognition." Be cautious of accepting terms that are narrowly defined. Sometimes it is a definite advantage for the affirmative to present a specific definition or narrow interpretation. Remember that until solutions to a problem have been determined, definitions should be kept somewhat general and flexible. If terms are unacceptable, give definite reasons and request the affirmative to make revisions in line with the inherent meaning of the question.

The most frequent reason for a negative teams loss is that it does not satisfactorily handle the weaknesses of the status quo which have been presented by the affirmative. Therefore, it will be important for the negative to emphasize from the very beginning of the debate, that the weaknesses and evils pointed out by the affirmative are not a product of our policy of non-recognition. This "negative" approach may be the best means of upholding the status quo and will be strengthened by whatever positive results can be casually related to a policy of non-recognition. It is likewise important that the negative shall begin early in the debate to raise doubts and objections as to the wisdom of extending diplomatic recognition.

What then is the planned approach of each speech within this broader plan? The first negative speaker, after accepting or rejecting the definition of terms and clarifying the negative stand in the debate will probably choose to refute directly one or more main affirmative contentions before presenting the arguments upholding the status quo. The positive arguments thus become the climax of his speech.

The second negative speaker will strike again at the affirmative need and supplement the first speaker’s evidence supporting the status quo. His main obligation and opportunity lies in refuting the projected advantages of recognition presented by the second affirmative. Since affirmatives commonly present a broader need than their solution could possibly remedy, it will be appropriate to point out in many debates that only a minor part of the need will be met by diplomatic recognition. His principal objective will be to show that diplomatic recognition, far from being advantageous to the United States and the free nations will actually weaken their position in Asia. The conclusion of his speech, at least the last two minutes, will be devoted to an excellent summary. There will be summaries planned for every speech of course, but here is an ideal place in the debate, at the close of the constructive arguments, to summarize the entire debate and in terms favorable to the negative stand.

The first negative speaker in rebuttal will, if necessary, devote a brief amount of time to need. His main contribution to the negative cause will be to narrow the debate to the one or two issues which have become paramount as the debate has progressed. The affirmative has had the opportunity to set the issues at the beginning but now the negative has a distinct advantage in selecting those which shall be the focus of attention during the rebuttal speeches. Many affirmative teams go on the defensive and stay there as a result of effective limiting of issues in the first negative rebuttal speech. The first speaker will combine this procedure with a pointing up of the obligations resting upon the affirmative for the establishment of its case.

The second negative rebuttal speaker will re-emphasize the reasons for non-recognition, pile up unanswered objections to diplomatic recognition, anticipate final affirmative rebuttal arguments, repeat what the affirmative must do to establish its case, and conclude by highlighting at least one constructive argument.

The debater with a general plan carefully determined, will be capable of making necessary adaptations in the course of the debate. Having something definite to deviate from gives one confidence to deviate or adapt as well as the assurance of returning to the predetermined plan.

And finally, it may be wise to give a little forethought to delivery. Negative speakers, probably because they are attacking so much of the time, tend to become pugnacious. Regardless of what approach you are taking, remember that you are an advocate. As such you are trying to present a point of view in the most attractive and reasonable light. Then use voice and action in such a manner as to enhance the attractiveness and reasonableness of that point of view.
Rebuttal Technique
EMMETT T. LONG, George Pepperdine College

ANY DISCUSSION of this subject must proceed from a statement of one's opinion about the basic purpose of debate as we engage in it in the American intercollegiate tournament. In the January, 1952, Western Speech Journal, this author stated such opinions:

The Debate Tournament Judge is in the position of determining which of two debate teams has presented the better arguments on a given question. He is asked to determine which team did the better debating, not which team was more persuasive to him personally. He is, therefore, evaluating the skill of two groups in finding materials and shaping them into arguments, their understanding of and skill in using the accepted constituents of logical proof...he is not a judge of audience response. It should be noted that this article brought several rebuttals.

On the basis of this author's understanding of debate, rebuttal should serve to compare the cases of the two sides and attempt to establish the following:

1) destroy the lines of reasoning of the opponent's case;
2) present additional evidence to support one's own arguments and defeat opponent's arguments;
3) emphasize the advantages of one's case.

It is the purpose of constructive speeches to build the case. This means all arguments of both sides must be presented in this period of the debate along with a reasonable amount of rational demonstration and/or evidence. It cannot be overemphasized that constructive time (this includes the negative) should be spent in developing the case. It should not be spent primarily in rebuttal. Of course, the cases must clash, misunderstandings must be cleared up and all points of difference should be brought out in the constructive. However, the greatest sin of debaters in constructive time is the failure to present a prepared, organized, logically arranged, rationally developed, and evidence-supported case.

Against this backdrop the author's remarks on rebuttal technique should be seen. Let us consider this matter in the following ways:

1) responsibility of each rebuttal;
2) taking notes;
3) using evidence;
4) delivery.

Responsibility of Each Rebuttal

The first negative rebuttal is the most difficult of all because it immediately follows ten minutes of negative constructive speaking. If the preceding speech has stayed with its responsibility, the rebuttal is much easier. The five minutes should be spent in

1) rebuilding first negative constructive arguments,
2) reviewing the cases of both sides,
3) showing the basic weaknesses in the affirmative case.

Item (1) can be covered by second negative constructive, but this author believes it is better for this to be done in rebuttal because it gives a substantial burden to this speech and it allows the speaker who presented the arguments to rebuild them.

The first affirmative rebuttal is also difficult because it can fall into the pitfall of starting at the wrong point and trying to cover too much and covering nothing clearly or thoroughly. This speaker must remember this; all basic arguments of the negative must be answered by the end of this speech. To accomplish this, the speaker must crystallize and answer the arguments of the second negative constructive. He usually must ignore the preceding speech and he usually has no time for summary. He is the hatchet man; he must chop down every negative argument previously unanswered. The speaker should remember two important things:

1) don't try to answer a shot-gun negative by answering each argument—group them, show improper elaboration by negative;
2) don't try to answer new arguments presented by the preceding speaker; merely point out they are illegal.

The second negative and affirmative rebuttals are similar. Both should restate the cases and show superiority by comparison. Both should rebut the speech which has just been given. The negative rebuttal should in addition hit hard the fact (if it happens) that the affirmative at this point has failed to deal with negative arguments. This frequently happens if the first affirmative rebuttal fails to answer all basic arguments. The negative speaker has the right to call for a decision to the negative regardless of what last affirma-
Taking Notes

Note-taking is hard to learn. It is frequently disorganized, hard-to-read, and too extensive. One should have a scheme of note-taking something like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of Constructive Speech</th>
<th>Opposition Attack</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The important thing to note is that a good rebuttal is one which is organized in terms of one’s constructive arguments and continues to develop them. Notes should be brief. The goal is to be able to jot-down a word or two to symbolize the opposition’s point and a word or two to symbolize the intended reply. Wordy notes result in poor rebuttals; keep them short.

Using Evidence

Most debaters develop an evidence file, made out on small cards. Outside of the obvious need for affirmative and negative divisions, it is difficult to assign absolute categories for further divisions. A filing system afterall is good if it works for the person using it and each person should develop his own logical system. One big error of debaters is to depend too much on quotes, if not on evidence. To be sure all good arguments must include essential available evidence, but many debaters are slaves to the quote file. First, use your head; your own ability to out-reason the opposition, to find flaws in their chain of logic. An evidence file should be reasonably brief to be useful. It should contain only material which can be called evidence, not just opinions which have little value when balanced by an opposite opinion.

Delivery

Practically all debaters speak too fast in rebuttal. They attempt to cover too much. Frequently debaters really win the debate and lose the decision because, “They got it out, but failed to get it over.” No judge, no listener can be expected to follow complicated reasoning given with machine-gun rapidity. The debater should learn to accept this dictum: it is better to say something slowly and clearly rather than communicate nothing to the listener.

IN MEMORIAM

Dr. Pearl Cliffe Sommerville, one of the ten founders of Pi Kappa Delta, passed away at the Brakow Hospital, Bloomington, Illinois, October 28, 1954—the fortieth anniversary of Illinois Alpha which he established at Illinois Wesleyan University. He had been in ill health since undergoing surgery last spring.

Dr. Sommerville held Pi Kappa Delta key number seven, was a member of the first charter committee, sponsored Illinois Alpha as chapter number six, and served Pi Kappa Delta in executive positions and as a constant, enthusiastic member and supporter. On last April 7, he wrote, “I have been speaking before audiences for over fifty years and you can truly imagine that my interest in forensics and Pi Kappa Delta has not declined any at all.”

As a public school teacher and superintendent, college and university professor, minister, public speaker, and author, Dr. Sommerville devoted over half a century to the ideal of a thoroughly educated and moral people. As a leader of men, counselor and director of youth, humanitarian, scholar, friend, he built an immortal monument through creating a closer fellowship and an increased human kindness. He exemplified the art of persuasion beautiful and just and Pi Kappa Deltans are grateful for founders such as he. His was the way of the pioneer, the pathfinder, based on the philosophy,

To all upon my way
Day after day
Let me be joy, be hope! Let my life sing!
As debate coaches and teachers of speech, we are interested in those procedures which will provide the greatest educational benefits for our students. In keeping with past practices of including suggestions for improving forensic and debate activities, decisions, and speech preparation, the present article by Dr. Murrish is submitted for your consideration. Before assuming his duties as director of forensics at Illinois Upsilon, Dr. Murrish served as director of forensics at Nebraska Wesleyan University, 1949–52.

Should Debaters Judge Their Own Debates?

WALTER H. MURRISH, University of Southern Illinois

One debate, which appears endless, is concerned with discovering the most effective method of judging debates. Although college students have been engaging in intercollegiate debate contests since 1892, we are still far from agreement in interpreting judging criteria.

This disagreement is manifested in the split decisions handed down by the “expert” judges. Furthermore, I am told, debaters themselves are sometimes dissatisfied with the verdict of their judges.

Criticism of debate judging often extends to an indictment of the activity itself. It is frequently contended that the over-emphasis on winning of decisions may destroy the inherent values of forensic competition.

I think that all of us who have debated or coached debaters are convinced that this activity is an essential tool of decision making in a democratic society. We recognize that the challenge and subsequent re-examination of ideas and proposals through intelligent debate have produced the instruments of social progress.

With this premise as our point of departure, it is necessary that we seek to improve our judging techniques in such a way that they are consistent with the basic philosophy upon which college debating is predicated. It was with this view in mind that I undertook an investigation of debate tournament procedures. This study was made at the University of Denver in 1953. One high school and two college tournaments, involving more than three hundred debates, were included in the experiment.

The investigation involved a comparison between evaluations of the debates submitted by both the contestants and the critic judges. The contestants submitted evaluation forms at the conclusion of each tournament (before the official decisions were announced). These forms included: (1) The ranking of opposition debate teams from first through last. (2) The designation of which team, in the opinion of the contestants, should have been awarded the decision.

At the close of the tournament, the contestant ballots were compared with the official decisions submitted by the critic judges. It should be remembered that the contestant evaluations did not influence the official tabulations.

The results of the study disclosed an unusually high correlation between contestant and critic appraisals. An examination of the two college tournaments, Tau Kappa Alpha and Rocky Mountain Speech Conference, revealed that the contestants and critics were in agreement about two-thirds of the time in respect to the decisions. By contrast, the debaters in the high school tournament sponsored by the National Forensic League agreed with the decisions of the judges in about half of the total instances.

Similarly, contestant rankings of opposition debate teams bear a close correspondence with the official critic evaluations. This was especially true in the Tau Kappa Alpha competition where the rankings of the teams based on critic decisions were almost identical with the team standings as determined by contestant rankings.

A “multiple” judging experiment was conducted in the fourth round of the TKA tournament to provide a broader base for comparison. Five critic judges (college debate coaches) were assigned to judge a debate between two teams, undefeated in their three
previous contests. The contestant evaluations disclosed that all four debaters would have awarded the decision to the affirmative. However, the official ballots indicated that four of the five critic judges voted for the negative. This illustration indicated the willingness of winning debaters to give due credit to the argumentative skill of their opponents.

The data compiled at these three tournaments suggested that debaters are capable of exercising a considerable amount of objectivity in judging their opponents. The results indicated that team rankings as determined by opposition evaluations agree substantially with rankings based on critic decisions.

Even more striking is the fact that the majority of the debaters agreed with the critic determined decisions in the two college tournaments studied.

As a supplement to the study I included a report on two tournaments in which the official results were based solely upon contestant evaluations. It was discovered that the winning teams in these two tournaments (the Grand National at Fredericksburg, Virginia and the University of Texas) had also established a better than average record in their previous critic judged debates.

Consequently, it appears that contestants can be expected to evaluate their opposition in much the same frame of reference as critic judges.

What conclusions may we draw from these findings? It is not my purpose to suggest that all tournaments be judged entirely by the contestants. Instead, my observations have led me to endorse the basic pattern of the critic judge concept. I feel that my investigation indicates that debaters and critics are basically agreed as to what constitutes effective debating despite surface manifestations which indicate otherwise.

However, I do feel that contestant evaluations, when used in conjunction with critic decisions, can play an important part in the implementation of our forensic program. I have found indications that debaters become more self-reflexive and objective by virtue of the contestant evaluation process. When debaters submit judgments of this type they are appraising the total situation of which they are a part. As they examine their opposition in this manner they are also evaluating their own liabilities and assets.

If we are to train debaters to become more intelligent and responsible speakers, it is important that we provide them with an opportunity to evaluate their own deficiencies as well as their proficiencies. I am convinced that contestant evaluations provide a functional methodology for the partial attainment of this objective. As debaters learn to be more self-reflexive, it would seem that a higher degree of ethical responsibility would ensue. We are all aware of the debater's complaint that the last affirmative rebuttal speaker misconstrued the negative stand. Deliberate misrepresentation and unethical presentation would have little value in a contestant judged situation. One debater expressed this idea very succinctly when he commented, "There is no point in being unethical or discourteous when your opposition is also your judge."

Therefore, it is my recommendation that other tournament directors seek to employ contestant evaluations as a supplement to critic judged tournaments. If debate is to survive as a contest activity, it must be justified as a learning technique. Self-objectivity is the focal point of all learning. Let us provide debaters with this opportunity through the evaluation of their own debates. By so doing we tend to reduce the advantage of glib tongues and sophisticated devices and to emphasize the value of sound argument and sincere, conversational speaking.

More Probing of the Cadaver

E. L. Pross, Texas Christian University

In the March, 1954, issue of THE FORENSIC, Professor Robert L. Scott presented a most interesting analysis of the degree of putrefaction presently attained by the corpse of intercollegiate oratory. After some twenty-five years of experience in coaching and judging original oratory at both the high school and college levels, I can certainly agree with Professor Scott that each year judges of oratory "groan more painfully at the thought of sitting through another session." I disagree with him as to the fundamental cause of these "groans," and doubt if the solution he suggests would get at the cause of that situation.

Professor Scott presents an excellent summary of the potential values of original ora-
tory but objects to the facts that the speech must be memorized, that delivery techniques may be deliberately planned and rehearsed, and that seldom in life situations does the speaker prepare a talk with this degree of thoroughness. These are three valid criticisms. Rebuttal to these objections is possible, but in fairness we must admit that in all forensic events there are obvious weaknesses as well as virtues. The point is, do we judges of oratory “groan” because of the fact that we are about to hear a series of carefully prepared memorized speeches, given with the best techniques of body and action of which the students are capable? I think not! We squirm and find excuses to be elsewhere because we know that inevitably the majority of those speeches will be either representative of a species of semantic exhibitionism or dull beyond human endurance. I charge further that we coaches are primarily at fault for this situation.

What is the secret of the really great speech? Obviously, the speaker must have superior delivery. Most of our intercollegiate orators have that. There must be language facility, and again our students usually do a creditable job. There must be effective organization and appropriate content. The majority of our orators do a fairly effective piece of work on these matters. There must be a subject appropriate for the speaker, the audience, and the occasion. It is the neglect of the first item of this requisite that I believe is primarily responsible for the precarious health of intercollegiate oratory today.

I can recall, without the slightest degree of nostalgia, some of the orations I have heard during this past year. A fifteen year old native-born Texas high school student talking on “What Freedom of the Press Means to Me.” A college senior from a small Louisiana town, who had never lived in a metropolis, shedding crocodile tears over the grievous problem of “Slum Town.” A pink-cheeked college freshman, solving the narcotics problem. A charming and winsome sophomore lass ridding the world of the menace of the hydrogen bomb. Need I go on? Every coach of forensics has drowsed through these horrors.

I suspect that you, like me, have heard some unforgettable student orations. Analysis of these seems to indicate that in every case the orator was speaking from the heart, on a topic very close to his life and one in which he had a profound personal conviction, a belief which he ardently desired to share with others. Let me mention the subjects of a few such memorable orations that I have heard. The dark-complexioned girl with the slight French accent who, as a resident of Casa Blanca, married an American soldier and eventually returned with him to study at a small Wisconsin college. She saw in that rural community the seeds of the same racial intolerance that had blighted her childhood and she pleaded that this must not happen in America. Or the speech of a hearing therapist who, after many hours of clinical work with deaf children, described the needs for greater public interest in these unfortunates. Or the veteran who, in 1947, protested vigorously and effectively against efforts of his fellows to obtain special privilege in American life. Or the student from a rural area who, in 1934, pleaded the cause of the American Farmer. These orations were not based upon: “Well, coach, what shall I talk on this year?”; an article or two in a popular magazine; midnight oil the evening preceding the tournament; a superficial knowledge of the problem and an even more immature and superficial analysis of the possible solutions to that problem.

I believe that the selection of a topic for intercollegiate oratory should be a matter of considerable serious thought and discussion between the coach and the would-be-orator. If the student can find no topic upon which he does have a sincere and deep conviction, upon which he is genuinely qualified to speak by virtue of some direct or considerable indirect experience—that student should not be permitted to compete in oratory. This procedure would eliminate three of the five orators who represented my school last year. I suspect intercollegiate oratory would have survived and even appreciated the absence of this trio.

Professor Scott’ suggested solutions, that we substitute manuscript reading for memorized orations, is most interesting. This procedure would develop certain practical skills not maturated by our present methodology. But I suspect the reading of “Slum Town” would be just as dull and counterfeit of intellectual integrity as was its memorized counterpart. I fear that faced with a battery of orators, securely armed with manuscripts, the “groans” of prospective judges would turn to moans of real anguish. I firmly believe that Quintilian’s famous precept, applied specifically to the selection of the oratory topic, would do more to resurrect intercollegiate oratory than would the substitution of a manuscript for memorization.
Chapter Notes

ILLINOIS STATE NORMAL UNIVERSITY

Governor R. A. Micken of the Illinois Province writes:

The whole province is buzzing with preparations for the season and working toward the national session in California. I know we will have a good year in the Illinois Province, and I seriously believe that this area will be well represented at Redlands. Eta Chapter, here at ISNU, has scheduled fourteen tournaments, a dozen radio panels under the title, "The Students Look At . . .", and a number of service clubs and assembly appearances. We will, of course, play host to the annual ISNU Invitational tournament on the seventh and eighth of January. These numerous activities we hope to carry on with our forensic squad of about thirty, and the help of Stan Reeves, '52, who is working on his masters here and acting as assistant in forensics. Lloyd P. Dudley, Illinois College, is secretary-treasurer of the Province of Illinois.

TOURNAMENTS HELD AT WASHINGTON STATE

Inland Empire Men's Debate Tournament, November 8-9: first—Washington State College; second—Montana State University; third—University of Idaho.

Columbia Valley Debate Tournament, November 5-6. There are two factors about this tournament that are different: (1) Since it is the first tournament of the area and is primarily to enable a coach to look over his material under fire, we never break ties but stop after six rounds. (2) Instead of having Senior and Junior Divisions, we have adopted golf terms and the first two teams entered from each school go into the championship flight. All other teams go into the practice flights. Men Championship Flight: first—University of Oregon; second—University of Idaho, Willamette University, Whitman College, University of Washington. Men Practice Flight: first—Williamette University; second—University of Idaho; third—College of Puget Sound, University of Idaho, Pacific University, University of Washington, St. Martin's, Washington State, Seattle Pacific. Women Championship Flight: first—University of Oregon, Willamette University, Washington State, Seattle Pacific. Women Practice Flight: first—University of Oregon, Seattle Pacific; third—Washington State.

KANSAS SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

Kansas Delpha chapter of Pi Kappa Delta at Southwestern College in Winfield has been engaging in an all-out drive to interest new members and to keep in touch with the old.

In order to do this, the organization first sponsored a mixer for all present members and those interested in speech activities, during the second week of school. The response was very excellent, especially among the freshmen, and Southwestern now has an outstanding group of new debaters working hard to earn admission into Pi Kappa Delta.

November sixth was Homecoming Day on the Southwestern campus, and the local chapter took advantage of the chance to greet old members by giving a luncheon in their honor during the noon hour. This has become an annual affair, giving members, both old and new, an opportunity to exchange experiences concerning debate and oratory. A large group turned out, and, as the saving goes, a good time was had by all. Gene Lowry, chapter president, extended formal greetings, Jo Ann Robieson related the organization's activities during the past year, and Dr. Jack Howe, senior debate coach, was introduced.

The annual Invitational High School Debate Tourney was held at Southwestern November 19 and 20 with 38 teams from 9 different High Schools in the state entering. Top honors were taken by El Dorado in the experienced division and Haven High School in the inexperienced bracket. Pi Kap members were kept busy judging, tabulating results, making pairings, and doing all the other details that go into a successful tournament.

1954-55 is going to be an active year for Southwestern debaters, with four meets to be held on the campus and many others to attend, but no one seems to mind, least of all the squad itself. For they feel, like so many others, that forensic activities are the best activities.
PITTSBURG KANSAS TEACHERS

Kenneth Mosier, Guy Sutherland, and Colleen Racob presented a discussion of the United Nations at the local Rotary Club, October 26.

OKLAHOMA EAST CENTRAL COLLEGE

Lelia Little and Jo Arnold won five of six rounds of debate at the Louisiana Tech tournament to tie a team from Louisiana Tech for top honors in the women’s division. Lelia is a sophomore who received a rating of superior in the PKD Provincial last spring. Jo is a freshman and was participating in her first debate tournament.

The East Central tournament was held during the first weekend of December. It was a forensic progression of nine rounds in which five different types of speaking were used on the general area of the debate topic. It consisted of four rounds of debate, two of discussion, one each of parliamentary debate, extempe, and informational speeches. The final grade for the tournament was the average score for the nine rounds.

IOWA CENTRAL COLLEGE

Nine students have represented Iowa Beta in tournaments held at Bradley University and Grinnell College. Mary Buwalda, Walt Henrichsen, Beulah Roorda, Doris Meerdink, Dave De Nelsky, Howard Sylvester, Joan Jones, and Carolyn Coleman participated in the Grinnell Conference. At the Bradley tournament Buwalda, Roorda, Meerdink, Phyllis Vandehaar, and Menrichson participated in debate, discussion, extempe, and oratory. Miss Cunera Van Emmerik, the newly elected governor of the province of Missouri, accompanied the students.

BRADLEY INVITATIONAL SPEECH TOURNAMENT

Fifty-one colleges and universities attended the eighth annual Bradley Invitational Speech Tournament on November 19-20. Four hundred and fifty contestants and coaches came from seven mid-western states.

Activities actually commenced on Thursday evening, November 18 with a public forum on the national discussion question. Representatives from four colleges participated. Wisconsin State Teachers of Eau Claire was represented by Rose Pribil, Notre Dame University by Charles Doherty, Central Missouri State
Winners of the Alabama College intra-mural discussion tournament sponsored annually by Alabama Beta. Left to right: Scottie Gamble, Louise Lenoir, Yvonne Worrell, Sadie DeWeese, and Patsy McAlliley.

College by Roy Halverson, and St. Olaf College by Frank Nelson.

On Friday, Caterpillar Tractor Co. sponsored a luncheon for the after dinner speakers and judges. The highlight of the tournament was the banquet for the four hundred and fifty participants held Friday evening in the Robertson Memorial Fieldhouse. The two students winning superior awards in after dinner speaking were the featured speakers. They were Robert Kaliban of Loras College and Ralph Zimmerman of Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire.

Greenville College of Illinois and St. Mary's College of Minnesota were undefeated in debate. Other Superior debate teams represented the following schools: Augustana, Bowling Green, Northern Illinois State Teachers (two teams), DePauw, Notre Dame, University of Chicago, Lake Forest, University of Illinois — Chicago, University of Illinois, Wheaton. One hundred and forty-two debate teams participated in four rounds of debate. There were 132 affirmative decisions; 132 negative.

In other events there were one hundred and twenty-two entries in discussion, ninety in extempore, thirty-three in oratory, eighteen in after dinner speaking, thirty-five in folk-tale telling, and twenty-six in radio newscasting.

Schools receiving more than five Superior and Excellent awards were: Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire, Notre Dame, DePauw, Greenville, Wheaton, St. Marys, Bowling Green, Northern Illinois State Teachers, Illinois State Normal University, Loras, Washington University, Northwestern Schools, University of Illinois, St. Olaf, Bradley, Southern Illinois University, Missouri Central State College, Wisconsin State College at River Falls, and Drake.

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

Twelve students have represented Mississippi Gamma in discussion and legislative activities this fall. They were: Gwendolyn Posey—chapter president, Marianne Shaw, Elizabeth Hildebrand, Carolyn Fleeman, Bettye Long, Pat Keen, Edna Frances King, Carolyn King, Peggy Lack, Sally Ann McLeod, Glenda Pevey, and Martha Jo Ashley. The group received the best campaign award at the Mississippi Youth Congress and have won seven Superior ratings.
RESULTS OF THE REFERENDUM

The following statement was formulated by the Committee on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion at a meeting in Chicago, November 27 and 28. The Committee had received about a dozen criticisms of the debate proposition selected during the summer by national referendum. The number of criticisms itself was not alarming, especially since several came from schools which have not had an active debate program. It was the nature of the criticisms which caused leading educators, the press, and the radio and television to take an awakened interest in intercollegiate debate. Some of these criticisms were apparently prompted by a lack of understanding of the nature of debate and some by a misinterpretation of the real issues in the proposition. But whatever the reason, there were implied threats to the American tradition of free inquiry. These implications were sufficiently evident that outstanding leaders including President Eisenhower felt called upon to reaffirm the right of American youth to participate in public debate on controversial issues.

The Committee and Dr. Karl Wallace, President of the Speech Association of America, decided that certain points should be made clear to the public. These points which are to be noted in the statement are: the way in which the questions are selected, that no school is obligated to use the questions selected, that the basic issue in the current debate question is whether recognition would help to combat Communism and to secure the interests of the United States, and that distrust of discussion and debate cannot be condoned in a free society.

Both affirmative and negative speakers have been equally opposed to Communism, and the basic issue is whether recognition would help to combat Communism and to secure the interests of the United States.

In heret in the controversy over the char-
acter of the current debate question, the committee believes, is an alarming distrust of the processes essential to a free society. The distrust is clearly manifest in the disposition to forbid the testing of governmental policies in the crucible of public inquiry and debate. The Committee is convinced that distrust of free speech is distrust of democracy itself; and confidence in the basic American freedoms must be manifest above all in school and college. Accordingly, in harmony with the resolution adopted by the Speech Association of America at its 1952 convention, the Committee herewith declares "that we reaffirm our belief that the United States of America stands in present danger from the suppression of free speech rather than from the full use of all institutions which bring information and honest belief to the public forum.

T. Earle Johnson (Tau Kappa Alpha)
Chairman
Laurence E. Norton (Pi Kappa Delta)
Robert G. Gunderson (S.A.A.)
Austin J. Freeley (A.F.A.)
Winston L. Bremerick (Delta Sigma Rho)
Karl R. Wallace (S.A.A.)
President

FREE DEBATE AND DISCUSSION
Harry H. Anderson, Oklahoma A. and M. College

The position of the U. S. Military Academy, the U. S. Naval Academy, and of teachers colleges in Nebraska not to debate the national Pi Kappa Delta question concerning the admission of Red China to the United Nations, recalls a long trend of events in the history of school debates.

In 1828, when ground was broken for the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, the first railroad in the United States, there was nationwide commotion. The same year the school board of Lancaster, Ohio, addressed the following letter to a debating society of young men:

"You are welcome to use the schoolhouse to debate all proper questions in, but such things as railroads and telegraphs are impossible and rank infidelity. There is nothing in the word of God about them. If God had designed that His intelligent creatures should travel at the frightful speed of 15 miles an hour by steam, He would have clearly foretold through His holy prophets. It is a device of Satan to lead immortal souls down to hell."

Arguments that now seem fanciful had great weight in 1828 and served to increase difficulties railroad promoters had in securing charters from the government. Country gentlemen were told that the smoke would kill birds, oats and hay would be off the market, cows would not yield their milk in the neighborhood of one of the infernal machines, and that steam would vanish before storm and frost. Railroads were called the greatest distortion of common sense ever heard of. One class was told that a locomotive would travel too fast for safety, another was told that it would be too heavy to travel at all.

And then there was the case of the first steam-powered ship which crossed the Atlantic, bringing, among other articles, a book, in which the author proved conclusively, that steam could never be used successfully to power ships across bodies of water.

Ridin' the Provinces

Dear PKD's:

I hope this issue of the Forensic finds you busy with plans to attend the National Convention at Redlands, California, April 4-8. Pre-registration reports indicate a large attendance and information received from California emphasize that this convention is the one to attend!

SEEN HERE AND THERE—

PKD's who are not with PKD schools: PAUL RILLING, now debate coach at Emory University; JAMES LADD from Phillips University, on leave to complete his doctorate at Florida University; ANNABEL HAGOOD and DON ECKROYD, Alabama University; WILLIAM SMITH, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; HOLLIS TODD, Mississippi College.

Active Members: HERMAN PINKERTON, Tennessee Tech; DONALD SPRINGER, Alabama College; MARY LOUISE GEHRING, Mississippi Southern; HARMON TILLMAN, now debate coach at Millsaps College; JOHN CRAMER, Arkansas State; DONALD GRAHAM, Northwestern Louisiana; JACK CARTER, Louisiana College; National Council Member ROY D. MURPHY, Southwestern Louisiana Institute; National Secretary D. J. NABORS, Oklahoma East Central; past National President GLENN R. CAPP, Baylor University; SCOTTIE NOBLES, now working on his doctorate at L.S.U.; W. E. WALLACE and R. L. McILVENNA, Millsaps College.
CONVENTION AND CONTEST COMMITTEES*

P. K. D. National Convention
Redlands, California
April 4-8

1. Convention Chairman
   Roy D. Mahaffey, Linfield College
   Assistant, Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern
   Louisiana Institute

2. Province Coordinator
   T. F. Nelson, St. Olaf College

3. Parliamentarian
   Forrest H. Rose, Southeast Missouri State
   College

4. Nomination Committee
   Sherod J. Collins, Northeast Missouri State
   College
   Charles T. Battin, College of Puget Sound
   Cunera Van Emmarick, Iowa Central College

5. Resolutions Committee
   Cedric L. Crink, Oklahoma Southwestern
   State College

6. Convention Invitations
   Committee
   Ed Betz, College of the Pacific

7. Committee on Convention
   Evaluation
   Ira G. Morrison, Phillips University
   Ralph A. Micken, Illinois State Normal
   University

8. Committee on Convention
   Publicity
   Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State College
   For Women
   Emil F. Pfister, Michigan Central College of
   Education

9. Tournament Committee
   Contest Chairman: Larry Norton, Bradley
   University; Assistant, Ethel Kaump, McKendree College
   Judging: Emmett Long, George Pepperdine
   College; Roy C. Nelson, Colorado A & M
   Men's Debate: Allwin D. Monson, Concordia
   College; Charles Masten, University of
   Southern California
   Women's Debate: Emogene Emery, Hardin-
   Simmons University
   Women's Extemporaneous Speaking: Marion
   E. Hawkins, River Falls State College;
   Edna Sorber, Southwestern College
   Men's Extemporaneous Speaking: Harold L.
   Ahrendts, Kearney State Teachers College;
   Paul J. Pennington, Louisiana Poly-
   technic Institute
   Discussion: Gilbert Rau, Central Missouri
   State College

*List is incomplete

I HEAR—

First Lt. WILLIAM R. WILCOX, Central
Missouri State, '49, is now aide to deputy
commanding general at Ryukyu Command
Headquarters, Okinawa. Cpl. ROBIN C.
STEVENS, San Diego State, '51, is a clerk in
the 529th Signal Company, Fort Carson, Col-
orado, participated in round-the-clock mock
combat, "Exercise Breechblock," an artillery
maneuver held at the foot of Pikes Peak dur-
ing the latter part of October. Sgt. GEORGE
D. MEINHOLD, Midland College, is a sten-
ographer in the engineer section of the
Korean Communication Zone headquarters.
Professors M. G. CHRISTOPHERSEN, Uni-
versity of South Carolina; FRANKLIN
SHIRLEY, Wake Forest; GREGG PFIFFER,
Florida State; WILLIAM SMITH, Alabama
Polytechnic Institute, and ANNABEL HA-
GOOD, Alabama University, all PKD's, have
been elected members of the District VI com-
mittee for the West Point Tournament. The
Northwest Chapters and the Pacific Chapters
have assessed themselves $10.00 and $50.00,
respectively, to help make the Redlands Na-
tional Convention a success. MARY ROB-
ERTS, Pittsburg Kansas Teachers, is on leave
studying at Louisiana State University; Dr.
ROBERTSON STRAWN is serving as debate
coach this year. CUNERA VAN EMMERIK,
Iowa Central, participated on the program of
the Southeast Speech Association held at
Grinnell College, November 13. She spoke on
the subject, "What I Look for in Judging Con-
test Speaking."

This issue includes the pictures and a brief
biography of the members of the National
Council from whom our next national presi-
dent will be elected. I thought you might like
to see and know something about them.

The chairman of the judging committee
asked me to urge all judges and students to
meet their assignments promptly at the Na-
tional. A few tardy judges and contestants can
ruin a carefully prepared schedule.

Space for this issue has been a premium so
I'll close with a reminder to send me news of
your chapter for the March issue (deadline
February 15). How about some group pic-
tures and personal data of your chapter mem-
bers who will attend the National.

All reports on the National Convention in-
dicate this is the National. Don't miss it. I'll
see you in Redlands, April 3. Good luck and
go West come spring!

Sincerely,
Your Editor
Meet the National Council

• Theodore F. Nelson is chairman of the department of speech at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. He holds the B.A. degree from Gustavus Adolphus College, M.A. degree from the University of Minnesota, and the Ph.D. degree from the State University of Iowa. He is a past governor of the Province of the Upper Mississippi, was elected to the National Council at the Stillwater Convention, 1951, and has served as National Vice-president since the Kalamazoo National Convention, 1953.

• Larry E. Norton is director of forensics at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois. He holds the B.A. degree from Carleton College, M.A. degree from the State University of Iowa, and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin. He is a past governor of the Province of Illinois, host of the Peoria National Convention, 1949, and has served as a member of the National Council since the Stillwater Convention, 1951.

• Miss Ethel Kaump is chairman of the department of speech at McKendree College, Lebanon, Illinois. She holds the B.A., Ph.M. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Wisconsin. She is a past governor of the Province of the Lakes, was hostess of the 1953 National Convention at Kalamazoo and was elected to the National Council at the Kalamazoo Convention, 1953.

• Roy D. Murphy is chairman of the department of speech at Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana. He holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees from Wittenberg College and has completed additional study at Ohio State University. He has served as associate editor of the Forensic, governor of the Province of the Lower Mississippi and as a member of the National Council since the Kalamazoo Convention, 1953.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and College</th>
<th>Chapter President</th>
<th>Sponsor and Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>Sylvia Weaver</td>
<td>Donald Springen, Montvallo J. T. Walsh, Spring Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td>William H. Stites, Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>Ouachita College</td>
<td>John Cramer, Jonesboro Aikadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>Ron Tabor</td>
<td>Eugene R. Moulton, Redland Lester R. McCready, Pasadena Ed Betz, Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>LaVerne Batie</td>
<td>Roy C. Nelson, Ft. Collins Roy L. Debber, Greeley Jess Gern, Gunnison De Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO A. &amp; M.</td>
<td>Ralph Webb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western state college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>John B. Stetson University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>David B. Strother, Athens H. E. Smith, Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>James Richard Hull</td>
<td>Marie J. Robinson, Bloomington I. H. Sparline, Eureka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho state college</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Morgan, Carthage L. E. Norton, Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Mills, Monmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka college</td>
<td>Nancy Herriman</td>
<td>Ralph A. Micken, Normal Glen Reddick, Naperville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage college</td>
<td>Neil Claussen</td>
<td>Frederic Fadner, Alton C. L. Mystrom, Wheaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley University</td>
<td>Bill Wolf</td>
<td>Harold F. Schory, Macomb Martin H. Holmes, Rock Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth college</td>
<td>Paul Rienann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois state normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North central college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurtleff college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western state college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana college</td>
<td>Felix Nealo</td>
<td>Erwin H. Schwiebert, Caldwell Carl L. Isaacs &amp; Wayne E. Hoogstrant, Pocatello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern illinois state teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois state college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principia</td>
<td>James K. Skipper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern state college</td>
<td>Dan Carter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James millikin university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville college</td>
<td>Patricia Lowry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern illinois university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>Beulah Roorda</td>
<td>Cunera Van Emmerick, Pella Frederic W. Hile, Sioux City Indianola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central college</td>
<td>Donald Clark</td>
<td>George A. Hinsbaw, Fayette J. T. MacKenzie, Cedar Rapids Alice Kruse, LeMars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morningside college</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ralf L. Toune, Jr., Dubuque Ray Berrier, Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simpson college</td>
<td>Stanley Schmoldt</td>
<td>Eskaloosa Kenneth Berger, Decorah Gladys N. Kuehl, Storm Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper iowa university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coe college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>westmar college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dubuque university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drake university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>william penn college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luther college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buenn vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and College</td>
<td>Chapter President</td>
<td>Sponsor and Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KANSAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa University</td>
<td>John Ross</td>
<td>Bob Davis, Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn Municipal University</td>
<td>Eugene Lowry</td>
<td>Charles J. Logas, Topeka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern College</td>
<td>Jim Trent</td>
<td>Edna C. Sorber, Winfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State Teachers College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Preston, Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Marthabel Maughlin</td>
<td>Lilybelle L. Carilley, Salina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State Teachers College</td>
<td>Bill Brown</td>
<td>Robertson Strawn, Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker University</td>
<td>Marian Kaufman</td>
<td>Baldwin City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling College</td>
<td>Kenneth Brown</td>
<td>C. C. Campbell, Sterling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany College</td>
<td></td>
<td>George A. Hinchaw, Lindsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hays State College</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. R. Start, Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. T. Wilkoff, North Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maurice A. Hess, McPherson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **KENTUCKY**      |                  |                     |
| Georgetown College | Richard Allison  | William A. Cowley, Georgetown |
| Centre College    | Virginia Tull Ragland | Wes T. Hill, Danville |
| Kentucky Wesleyan College | | , Winchester |

| **LOUISIANA**     |                  |                     |
| Louisiana College | Bubba Wyly       | Jack N. Carter, Pineville |
| Centenary College | Nathan Stansbury | Joseph Gifford, Shreveport |
| Louisiana Polytechnic Institute | Phyllis Wilcox | Wilma Baugh, Ruston |
| Southwestern Louisiana Institute | | Roy D. Murphy, Lafayette |
| Northwestern State College | | Donald L. Graham, Natchitoches |

| **MAINE**         |                  |                     |
| University of Maine | Stanley Clish | Wofford G. Gardner, Orono |

| **MICHIGAN**      |                  |                     |
| Kalamazoo College | James Linholt    | Mrs. Harold Krieger, St. Paul |
| Hope College      | Leroy Ness       | Theodore F. Nelson, Northfield |
| Michigan State College | | Evan E. Anderson, St. Peter |
| Michigan State Normal College | | Theadore Smith, St. Paul |
| University of Detroit | | Allwin D. Monson, Moorhead |
| Central Michigan College of Education | Loren Grey | Brother J. Phillips, Winona |
|                     |                   | Joseph Robbie, Minneapolis |

| **MINNESOTA**     |                  |                     |
| Macalaster College | Gwendolyn Posey  | Harmon Tillman, Jr., Jackson |
| St. Olaf College  | Laura Ann Wilber | Charles E. Lawrence, State College |
| Gustaveus Adolphus College | | Harvey Cromwell, Columbus |
| Hamline University | | Mary L. Gehring, Hattiesburg |
| College of St. Thomas | | |
| Concordia College | | |
| St. Mary's College | | |
| St. Catherine | | |

| **MISSISSIPPI**   |                  |                     |
| Millsaps College  | Steve Adamson    | John Randolph, Fulton |
| Mississippi State College | Donald Browning | Harold C. Svaneoe, Fayette |
| Mississippi State College for Women | Richard Byrne | Edward W. Gaul, Liberty |
| Mississippi Southern College | Lucrelia M. Schneider | L. L. Leftwich, Canton |
|                     | Ronald Bailey | Gilbert Rau, Warrensburg |
|                     | James Abbott | Sherod J. Collins, Kirksville |
|                     | James Compton | Forrest H. Rose, Cape Girardeau |
|                     | Joe Hessler | C. Gratton Kemp, Marshall |

| **MONTANA**       |                  |                     |
| Montana State College |                   | K. D. Bryson, Bozeman |

| **NEBRASKA**      |                  |                     |
| Doane College     | Bonnie Tucker     | Mrs. Florence Walt, Crete |
| Hastings College  | Paul Scherer      | Robert Tuttle, Hastings |
| State Teachers College | | H. L. Ahrends, Kearney |
| University of Omaha | | Alfred Sugarman, Omaha |
| Midland College   |                   | Prof. D. L. Wolfarth, Fremont |
| State Teachers College | | Lenore P. Ramsey, Wayne |
| Nebraska Wesleyan University | | A. J. Mueller, Lincoln |

---
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State and College

NORTH CAROLINA
- Wake Forrest College
- Lenoir Rhyne College
- Appalachian State Colleges

OHIO
- Baldwin-Wallace College
- Heidelberg College
- Hiram College
- University of Akron
- Otterbein College
- Marietta College
- Bowling Green State University
- Kent State University

OKLAHOMA
- Oklahoma A & M College
- University of Tulsa
- Oklahoma Baptist University
- Oklahoma City University
- East Central State College
- Southeastern State College
- Central State College
- Phillips University
- Northeastern State College
- Southwestern State College

OREGON
- Linfield College
- Lewis & Clark College

PENNSYLVANIA
- Grove City College

SOUTH CAROLINA
- University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA
- Dakota Wesleyan University
- Huron College
- Yankton College
- S. D. State College
- Sioux Falls College
- S. T. S. Northern
- Augustana College

TENNESSEE
- Maryville College
- State Teachers College
- Tennessee Polytechnic Institute
- Carson-Newman College
- Middle Tennessee State College

TEXAS
- Trinity University
- Howard Payne College
- Mary Hardin-Baylor College
- Texas Christian University
- North Texas State College
- Hardin-Simmons University
- Baylor University
- Sam Houston S. T. C.
- Southwestern Texas State College
- Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College
- Texas A. & I. Abilene Christian College

WASHINGTON
- College of Puget Sound
- Seattle Pacific
- State College of Washington
- Whitworth College
- Pacific Lutheran

WEST VIRGINIA
- West Virginia Wesleyan
- Marshall College

WISCONSIN
- Ripon College
- Carroll College
- Oshkosh State Teachers College
- River Falls State Teachers College
- Whitewater State Teachers College
- Eau Claire State Teachers College

Chapter President
- Leroy Carlyle
- David C. Wright, Jr.
- Effie Vale
- Robert Cowles
- Paul Barrett
- Jim Jones
- John G. Peterson
- Sarah Pledger
- Helen Nash
- Enrique Gonzales-Gerthan

Sponsor and Address
- Franklin R. Shirley, Wake Forrest
- Albert Keiser, Hickory
- Effie Vale
- Robert C. Keeler, Bowling Green
- Paul Barrett
- Jim Jones
- John G. Peterson
- Sarah Pledger
- Helen Nash
- Enrique Gonzales-Gertham
- Charles Erwin, Berea
- Archie Thomas, Tiffin
- Warren D. Mitchell, Hiram
- R. H. Sandefur, Akron
- Ruth A. Wilcox, Marietta
- Donald C. Kieckner, Bowling Green
- Harry H. Anderson, Stillwater
- Corbett Rushing, Shawnee
- Jake Hoover, Oklahoma City
- D. J. Nabors, Ada
- Ruth Hatchett, Durant
- Joe C. Jackson, Edmond
- Ira C. Morris & A. E. Lambert, Enid
- Oscar Ingram, Tahlequah
- Cedric L. Crink, Weatherford
- R. D. Mahaffey, McMinnville
- Neil Sabin, Portland
- H. M. Burrowes, Grove City
- M. G. Christopherson, Columbia
- George McGovern, Mitchell
- Harold C. Larson, Huron
- R. J. DeLaubenfels, Yankton
- A. R. Christenson, Brookings
- Paul Roten, Sioux Falls
- William Dodge, Aberdeen
- Hugo A. Carlson, Sioux Falls
- Mary Glydias Pieper, Maryville
- Chase S. Winfrey, Johnson City
- Herman Pinkerton, Cookeville
- E. W. Sydnor, Jefferson City
- Robert B. Capel, Nacogdoches
- Fred Barton, Abilene
- Charles T. Battin, Tacoma
- Paul F. Rosser, Seattle
- W. H. Veatch, Pullman
- W. L. Martin, Spokane
- Theodore O. H. Karl, Parkland
- B. W. Hope, Huntington
- Walter F. Brunet, Ripon
- Benton H. Scott, Waukesha
- Oshkosh
- Marion E. Hawkins, River Falls
- V. T. Von Trebra, Whitewater
- Grace Walsh, Eau Claire