

National Forensic Honor societies. Three of them number among their chapters about a hundred and seventy-five colleges and universities and their growth of recent years is remarkable. A fourth society has a small number of chapters in addition to the three large ones. That these organizations furnish a great stimulus to debating activity cannot be doubted. They are doing an excellent work in increasing the number of debates and in raising the standard of such contests. They are also a great factor in the debate trip and the intersectional contest. Our own university maintains a chapter of the Pi Kappa Delta society. The biennial eastern debate trip is made at the time of the National Convention of this organization, and twice the Redlands team has debated before the delegates in exhibition debate on these trips. The value of such an experience is very great. The National Convention of this society holds a National Oratorical contest, and is planning to inaugurate a National Contest in Extempore Speaking in 1924.

### The Practical View of Debate

This brings us to a consideration of one of the things of greatest significance in the present trend of college debating. The emphasis is being placed upon the rough and ready, extempore type of work, and less and less upon the committed oratorical effort. The much maligned coaches have the real development of their men at heart and, as fast as they can, are subordinating the winning of decisions to real training. The no-decision debate—the open forum debate—the combination of these two—the debate where sides are chosen by the toss of the coin a few minutes before the contest begins—these are guiding posts pointing to the future. The ideal is to develop a thinker on the platform—not an automaton or a marionette whose strings are adeptly manipulated by the coach. The extempore speaking contest is gaining enthusiastic adherents each year and, as I have said, in 1924 will have a National contest. Our own college established such a contest five or six years ago and it is called after the donor of the prize, The Fowler Extempore contest.

It is interesting also to note that among the patrons of our colleges and among the faculty personnel, where there is often a hostility to the stress laid upon intercollegiate athletics, upon dramatics, and upon glee club trips and advertising of this type which occasionally conflicts with the best scholastic results, debating has met with almost universal favor. It is said to have educational value which the others do not possess and is encouraged on this basis. In fact the professor of several years ago found it necessary to encourage debate and foster it in all kinds of ways, for its demise along with the literary society was once threatened. Of late, however, it has been discovered that debate has grown up and no longer needs coddling. In fact there is considerable hostility in certain academic quarters toward debating because it takes time that should be given to studies with definite standing in the curriculum; the trip aggravates this criticism, and the debating enthusiast who neglects his other work arouses pedagogic ire.

The attitude of the student and coach engaged in debate varies but is tending for the most part toward the following attitude: Both are glad to have debate stand upon its merits. They do not want it looked upon as an activity deserving of special favors. They do not wish it to be considered mentally superior to other student activities, for they realize that the other activities have immense value, require brains, and do give a training that educates and develops the student. Merely because debates deal with historical, governmental, sociological, and economic subjects, and consequently demand a certain amount of reading and study along the lines of certain college curricula does not mean that debate is more educational, or the debater deserving of any praise beyond that of students engaging in other college activities. The value of debate does not lie in the information gained in preparation, that is only a small part of its value. It is the mas-

tery of public speaking that counts. The student and coach are beginning to consider that any college activity, debate included, is a service to the college community, and is analagous to the civic betterment projects that business men give time to. Each is trying to serve the community in addition to the performance of his regular work, that is, caring for his individual business interests. To serve the community, one must sacrifice time and money, and, in a measure, neglect business. One is repaid in other ways. The college student is willing to take lower grades than he otherwise might make, to do something for his college. This motive is as true of the football man as it is of the debater. Here they are alike—true sportsmen.

It is true that some debaters ask for college credit for debate work upon educational grounds, wishing to have their cake and eat it, too. But most of them are reasonable enough to agree that college credit should be given only for work done in the class room with the instructor's direction. The day of graduating with football credits or any other student activity credits has practically passed. The debater must be content to take the reward that a mastery of public speaking gives him and be content to sacrifice grades cheerfully and whole-heartedly when it is necessary. It is not often necessary. Unless there are other reasons for low grades, the debater is seldom put in the class of students which does poor work. A good debater acquires the study habit. In that respect debate may be said to be a little more valuable than other activities. Also in giving an equipment for later life in speaking power it is usually more valuable than other activities. The debater is content with these gains, with the valuable personal training in speech that he receives, and with the reward that membership in an honor society gives.

## II. The Intellectual Consideration

Let us now give attention to the second division indicated at the beginning of this paper—the intellectual consideration. Many debaters upon leaving college for graduate school or for teaching or other work in the outside world, have written back to their debate coaches enthusiastically upon the value of their debate training. Many of my former debaters have testified both orally and in writing: "The work I did with you in debating has been more valuable to me than any course I took in college," and some have put it "than any three courses." This is the coach's reward and the kind of reward that gives him a lot of satisfaction. To have developed power in others that will help them to achieve in this business of life is after all the first object of teaching. I have known but one or two debaters who did not make this testimony, and they were men who were forced or drawn into debate from a sense of duty or by persuasion than from their own volition and free-hearted effort.

It would be strange, however, if all took the attitude toward the intellectual benefits of debate that coaches, debaters, and friendly students and faculty members take. There are many people, and occasionally they are writers, who do not believe that there is any earthly good in debates, intercollegiate or otherwise. For them the Congressional debate is "bunk" and "hot air" that never changes a single vote, whereas we know it to be true that debate in Congress does often cause amendments to bills and important changes in legislation. Congressional debate is important criticism—often-times even when the speeches (as the scoffers aver) are printed in the Record and never delivered.

There are some cynics who feel that if college students must debate they should confine themselves to such subjects as concern them and about which they may be said to know something. One writer in the N. Y. Nation wants them to chronicle small beer instead of trying "to settle the problems of immigration, tariff, and strikes over night."

On the other hand, Professor Baldwin remarks: "The sheer knowledge of public questions displayed on intercollegiate platforms is worthy of any (149)

platform; and it can not be acquired without methods of study that are of far wider use." Professor Baldwin must be an optimist, however, for he also says: "It is far easier to find a dull play than a dull intercollegiate debate." Set over against this opinion the very sage remarks of the gum-chewing, flapper co-ed, devotee of the movies and matinee fan, "I hate debates. I think they are horrid. I never go. Of course our boys are wonderful speakers, but debates are dry. They always talk about a lot of things I don't care anything about. Come on, Clara, it's time to dress for the hop." Upon this, one is ready to appreciate Professor Baldwin's remark, "The requirements of debating are too much for students who are merely retentive or merely facile; that is why it attracts men of initiative and tenacity."

Professor Baldwin and many others point out the danger of allowing a debate to become a battle of coaches. Under the old system of committed speeches the coach spoke through his debaters, and it was a war of coaches. That is why the evolution of debate demanded a rebuttal speech from every debater. The debater who travels on his coach's brains is here exposed. Especially is this true as the extempore nature of debate becomes more established. The debater must have some gray matter of his own to succeed. If he has it, he is handicapped in speaking another's case. The coach cannot dictate a case. He should draw it from the debaters by skillful question, by consultation and by study with them. He should seek to get them to argue with him in order to sharpen their controversial powers. Baldwin says, "The coach is of more service if he learns the subject from the debaters than if he in any way teaches it to them." He is right. My own personal success as a coach has been greatest under these conditions.

#### The Very Pert Remarks of One Mr. Hale

I now wish to present to you some very, very illuminating remarks upon college debating made by one Robert Hale of Boston, taken from an article in the N. Y. Nation of Dec. 23, 1915, supp. page 10-11.

"There are few men possessing an unbiased mind or a retentive memory of their own undergraduate days who would venture to defend the intellectual standards of our undergraduates. The cult of vacuity in academic halls is too brazen to be overlooked. . . . The cause is not found solely in luxurious fraternity houses or professionalized athletics, or even in stupid instructors. Modern educational methods have done more harm even than modern plumbing to the undergraduate mind." After blaming the system of instruction he says further: "I do not venture to cover the whole field of iniquities wrought by the so-called elective system." He then goes on to comment on "two forms of abuse common in, and peculiar to the modern American College. First, is the writing of themes. The second is debating." Vicarious thinking is the evil he charges as "best studied in their most virulent forms in daily themes and intercollegiate debating." He then takes up the daily theme in the unfair manner of a man who does not know what he is talking about but is sure he does. He implies that the teacher assigns all subjects and that the student, having no thoughts of his own on a "sunset" or some other foolish topic, writes an infinite lot of insincere twaddle and "guff" which ought to please the teacher. This is the evil of vicarious thinking. Poor Mr. Hale does not know the first fact that students are required to find their own topics, and may write their own precious thoughts—that is exactly what the teacher is striving most to get—an expression from the student—not a copy of someone's thoughts or a reflection of his own. If Mr. Hale was ever a teacher, he was a poor one—at least his ignorance of theme courses is appalling.

He then turns to debating. "The college debate is, if anything, a more devitalizing and devastatingly pernicious influence. The inter-scholastic, interclass, intercollegiate debate is inoriginality made competitive. Debating is properly the alternative advocacy of two opinions. In colleges it

is a game played by teams like football. The teams are coached for the big debates just as the football team is coached for the big game. The three most docile students make the debating team." When they have made the team, they go to work with redoubled energy under the coach. When their fleshy brothers (of the athletic field) become giants of physique on meat and prunes, they are strengthening the mental sinews on statistical almanacs and volumes of the Congressional Record. (He has a funny idea of the source of debate speeches and debate inspiration.) The evening of the big debate comes. There are three judges, generally two neutral professors and a lawyer. By a supreme effort, they listen to the debate and keep a tabulated record of points according to some arbitrary schedule. Ultimately they announce the victorious team to the accompaniment of well modulated enthusiasm. The audience is generally exiguous. In small colleges freshmen are frequently required to attend. Nobody in his right mind wants to listen. The unforgivable thing in a debate is to make an "unsupported assertion." If a debater says, "I believe in high protection," it is as bad as a fumble. The other team is sure to score five points. What the debater should say is, "We of the affirmative shall endeavor to show you that high protection is for the best interests of the nation. Senator So-and-So in a speech—which in fact was never made and never would have been listened to if it had been) at page 922 of Volume such and such of the Congressional Record said, etc., etc.

"It is easy to satirize and it is hard to write temperately." Here I pause to note the justice of Mr. Hale's last remark—It is easy to satirize—he had a sneaking idea undoubtedly that that was about all he had accomplished. He has over-stated his case; he has not written temperately—as he would fain have us believe. "College debating is the worst possible training for public life. . . . I do not believe any American with the forensic training of an American university ever achieved success in public life without consciously rejecting all that he ever learned in these 'debating teams.'"

This indictment is severe. As I look back over the roll of my debaters, I find that none of them is in the penitentiary because of what he learned in debate, none is in the poor house, and none is in Patton (the California Insane Asylum). Some of them are holding responsible positions in newspaper offices, Y. M. C. A.'s, college faculties, and some are even exercising their perverted minds and issuing their vicarious thinking in the pulpit. I tremble when I think how much vicarious thinking my past debaters are turning loose upon an already too, too sordid world. What a tragedy! Why didn't I meet Robert Hale at a beer night when I was at Harvard and get set right before I became a party to all this injury to an unsuspecting world!

No, Mr. Hale, a college debate is not merely a contest in citing authorities with some honorable judges present to criticize the work. Nor is the English system which you laud so laudable. Any system which does not provide for a rebuttal which is in the nature of extempore rather than carefully prepared work is not the wisest system. Let us develop men, not "vicarious thinking"—so why laud a system which gives the very best opportunity for "vicarious thinking?" It is peculiar what inconsistencies a critic like Mr. Hale can fall into. Merely because England has produced some great statesmen from her universities he concludes that her debate system is the entirely correct one. Nothing developed in his own country quite suits Mr. Hale.

With reference to the intellectual value and training of intercollegiate debate the weight of experience, authority (which he despises) and of the best thinking are against his conclusions—to say nothing of the testimony of the debaters themselves.

### III. The Moral Consideration

Let us turn from this intellectual indictment of Mr. Hale's to one of more

serious nature—made by a man of international reputation. Let me quote from the Outlook a passage taken from the first chapter of the Autobiography of Theodore Roosevelt.

"Personally, I have not the slightest sympathy with debating contests in which each side is arbitrarily assigned a given proposition and told to maintain it without the least reference to whether those maintaining it believe in it or not. The present method of carrying on debates encourages precisely the wrong attitude among those who take part in them. There is no effort to instill sincerity and intensity of conviction. On the contrary, the net result is to make the contestants feel that their convictions have nothing to do with their arguments. I am exceedingly glad that I did not take part in the type of debate in which stress is laid, not upon getting the speaker to think rightly, but on getting him to talk glibly on the side to which he is assigned, without regard either to what his convictions are or to what they ought to be."

Mr. Roosevelt strikes out from the shoulder in his characteristic way at the heart of the thing. Is debating fundamentally bad morally? This is the question he raises. Is it bad for a man to support in an intellectual exercise something which he does not believe? Must a man always be in dead earnest or may he be allowed to play intellectually? Does a man always play tennis to win or does he consciously let another player win occasionally when it is within his own power to win? Is he morally tainted if he does such a thing? What about the man who enters a debate without previous bias toward either side? Must a man always take sides? Having once taken a point of view, does it hurt him morally to try to see the other fellow's point of view and to try to state it attractively and in its best form?

#### Criticism of Mr. Roosevelt's Opinion of College Debating

Personally, I think Mr. Roosevelt was wrong. The testimony of most college debaters will controvert him also. The average college man is willing to admit that he has no right to take sides without study. He is assigned a side without knowing what he really believes. He does not always come out supporting the side he supported in the debate. If he did, there would be a moral wrong in debate for it would always be converting men to beliefs that they might not otherwise hold.

At times a student comes out of a debate, after having supported the side in which he did not believe, supporting his original convictions with even greater intensity because of the study he has made. Most often he comes out of a debate just as he went in—still in doubt as to what he believes—often disillusioned for he has found fallacy and error in both contentions and has discovered that if there is truth it lies somewhere between the opposing contentions.

Mr. Roosevelt made the mistake of attributing to the college man the mind of a man like himself, farther on in life, who is pretty sure of what he believes. Of course, Mr. Roosevelt may have been just as sure of himself and his views when he was a college man; but the average college student is not. The average lad is willing to admit that he is not capable of judging outright what is right or wrong without investigation. Mr. Roosevelt's quarrel with debating is that it occasionally puts a man with strong convictions, who is sure of his attitude toward a question, on a side in which he does not believe. We admit that this can happen but it does not necessarily happen and is not a condemnation of debating so much as it is the mistake of the coach who misplaced his man for reasons perhaps good in themselves, but not perhaps as weighty as the one Mr. Roosevelt advances. Most coaches know that if a man has a really violent predilection toward one side or the other he is usually valueless to the team if put on the opposite side. One does not discover this type of debater often; when he does, he usually has a budding demagogue. The men who are always right in this world are more or less the bane of society.

My contention is simply that it is possible for a man to debate with an intellectual interest quite detached from moral considerations or his personal beliefs. This is not necessary when his beliefs are not formed. If he is honest, the mere taking of one side or the other is not going to corrupt his moral judgment.

My observation of college debaters does not convince me that they are moral scoundrels because of their experience in college debating, even if they supported in a debate some contentions in which they did not believe. I do not know whether the worthy Colonel had some unfortunate experiences with double-sided mentalities produced in college debating or whether he was merely stating an opinion. Even if he had one or two unfortunate experiences with men of this type, it would not make a case against debating for too many other more powerful factors may have entered into the moral making or unmaking of the men he may have had in mind.

Colonel Roosevelt certainly had some friends who lived up to his indictment of the college debater in supporting policies of political parties in that insincere way he supposes a college man to debate. I do not know if the Colonel was condemning these men—they may not have been college debaters—and again they may have been—but it would be interesting to know what he would say about Taft's League of Nations' stand and his subsequent support of Harding. Or of Lodge's stand and his previous remarks on separate peace with Germany, and his part in the Four Power Treaty lately negotiated in Washington which does in deceitful and obscure words what the much maligned Article X of the League Covenant did in a frank and open way. Oh, yes, of course a man may change his mind—Oh, yes; Oh, yes! But upon what consideration—Ay there's the rub!

I do not believe Mr. Roosevelt could demand more of a debater than he did of a statesman or of a political leader. It is true Mr. Roosevelt hated insincerity and his political friends whether college debaters or not gave him plenty of reason to hate it. The fact is that debating is not to blame—for it does not make or break the character that a man brings to it. His moral bent is usually determined beforehand or, if during his college career, by other considerations too numerous to mention here.

### **The Real Moral Danger**

The moral troubles I fear in debate are not those of insincerity arising from being put on the side in which one can not believe. They arise in downright dishonesty, in falsifying evidence in order to win, in direct misquotation and misrepresentation to make a case appear something that it is not. Debating affords a great opportunity for this sort of dishonesty. It also affords a fine opportunity for character building when the temptation to take unfair advantages are resisted in a manly way. Football gains one of its chief moral defenses in what it teaches a man to rise above and overcome in being a true sportsman and a gentleman. Debating parallels football again here.

Just the other day one of my debaters told me that he had received a letter from a debate opponent of the year before. The "worthy opponent" had written to confess that he had deliberately misquoted my debater in the contest of the previous year, and he was writing to apologize and to ask forgiveness. It was on his mind that he had done an unworthy thing and he wanted to make it right. We need not fear greatly that debating is going to corrupt young men with consciences like this—at least not permanently. After all, morality lies in the man.

### **Dangerous Propaganda**

The thing I fear most of all is the propagandist—the man who wishes the college debater to grind his ax. He may deceive the debater and, (153)

through him, the public. One of the chief values of a debate coach is to keep his men informed as to this and that game.

Experience will soon forewarn and forearm the unsuspecting youth who might otherwise accept too much of what filters into his debate material as the gospel truth because it is in print.

College debating has assumed such importance on the public speaking platform of the country that the alert and careful man "higher up" who is involved in most of life's little problems is not overlooking anything. The idea of using the college speaker to spread his doctrines and tenets appeals mightily. Therefore he prepares carefully to supply the debater with so-called information and debating material. A good many thousands of dollars are spent annually in certain quarters to supply the college man with material for his discussions. We notice it particularly this year—in fact every year that we debate an industrial subject, or one remotely connected with it in any way. I have brought along a few exhibits which will give you an idea of just what I mean. The Open Shop Encyclopedia, bulletins from the National Erector's Association, The National Manufacturers' Association, and from the American Federation of Labor. Allow me to call your attention particularly to this pamphlet challenge to newspapers. It exposes the situation in a rather astounding manner. It seems to me that no one could expect a college man to enter such a debate as the one on the union or non-union shop, with his beliefs firmly entrenched. What difference does it make which side he is to take? He will learn the truth, if he does enough reading, regardless of the sides in the debate. He will never get the truth in any other way. The newspapers that he reads are not bringing it to him. He has no real right to trust his prejudgments. That would be as foolish as to gulp down all the doctrine of high protection merely because his father was a Republican. Honesty demands investigation before the mind is made up, and a college man is too young and inexperienced to trust his early judgments. If colleges are worth anything at all it is their mission to teach young men to think for themselves, regardless of whether they reach the same conclusions their fathers or their professors hold. A fair protection from propaganda is necessary for a time; after that I maintain that the college debater will work out his own salvation, and moreover that he will be a man and an able one. Let me close with the words of President Gray, of Bates College, in his speech at the "send-off" of the debate team to Oxford, England: "To present a proposition with clearness and force before an audience is no mean accomplishment. Quite apart from the particular vocation to which a college graduate may devote himself, the ability to be at home on one's feet before an audience opens up a wide variety of opportunities for public service. This should be one of the contributions of the college to the state."

In these words he states the case for college debating.

---

### *THE PI KAPPA DELTA DEBATE QUESTION*

As a result of the vote taken last spring on questions for the coming season's debates, the following was chosen by a large majority:

Resolved: That the United States should adopt the cabinet-parliamentary form of government.

This question obtained 52 points. The question coming second was:

Resolved: That the central government should be one of residuary powers and our state government that of enumerated powers.

This obtained 23 points. The third choice, which obtained 20 points, was:

Resolved: That the present jury system should be abolished.

---

An amendment to abolish all forensic activities between literary societies is proposed to the Student Assembly Constitution of Baldwin-Wallace.

*EXCHANGES*

As we go to press, we can record a fair number of exchanges coming to us. It takes a certain amount of prodding on the part of the national officers to secure a hundred per cent representation. When it is realized that the exchanges enable the editor of THE FORENSIC to pass the news around the Pi Kappa Delta circle and to make us a really national organization, there are few chapters that do not make the serious effort to have their college paper among the number represented. We are pleased to greet several new papers which interest us very much. IS YOUR COLLEGE PAPER ON THIS LIST? IF NOT, WHY NOT?

Occidental.  
 University of Redlands Campus.  
 California Tech.  
 Rocky Mountain Collegian (Colorado Aggies).  
 Monmouth Oracle.  
 The Franklin.  
 Washburn Review.  
 Southwestern Collegian.  
 Ottawa Campus.  
 Emporia College Life.  
 Georgetownian.  
 Michigan Normal College News.  
 St. Olaf's Messenger.  
 Park Stylus.  
 William Jewell Student.  
 Missouri Wesleyan Criterion.  
 Montana State College Weekly Exponent.  
 Doane Owl.  
 Hastings Collegian.  
 Nebraska Wesleyan.  
 Cotner Collegian.  
 Heidelberg Kilikilik.  
 Orange & Black of Oklahoma A. & M.  
 Blue Stocking of Presbyterian College of South Carolina.  
 South Dakota Industrial Collegian.  
 Maryville College Highland Echo.

*BOUND VOLUMES OF THE FORENSIC*

The National Historian, who is custodian of the files of The Forensic, wants the following "ancient" numbers to complete four volumes of the first six series of The Forensic.

Series 2. No. 1—February, 1916. Three copies.

Series 2. No. 2—April, 1916. Four copies.

Series 2. No. 3—June, 1916. One copy.

Series 5. No. 2—May-Je-Oct., 1919. Two copies.

Look through your old files and see if you can produce one of these missing numbers. They are worth fifty cents apiece.

Through the efforts and co-operation of Dr. Macarthur, Professor Marsh, Former National Treasurer Roy Painter, Former Historian J. H. Krenmyre, and John A. Shields, one of the National Founders, and Professor Nichols, also one of the National Founders, ten copies of the first volume of The Forensic have been gathered together and bound.

All of the older chapters could easily have bound copies of the first volume if the numbers sent each chapter for this purpose had been put in the college library and saved.

Any chapter can have the second volume of The Forensic (beginning  
 (155)

with Series 7, No. 1), if someone in the chapter will put one copy of each issue in a safe place. Each chapter should take care of this matter and see that the college library has every number of The Forensic from now on. The National Historian has extra numbers, beginning with Series 7. The charge for each is fifty cents. The money goes to the National Treasury. The Historian also has a limited number of copies of the First Forensic and of several of the other numbers for sale.

---

The following is an interesting extract from a letter written by our National Secretary-Treasurer:

"Last year we placed 401 keys. We have averaged better than one hundred a month so far this year. May was our big month. And how it does take postage to mail out these keys. I always send them by registered mail. And while I am frequently able to mail several in one envelope, there are, nevertheless, many envelopes to mail at twelve cents each. Sometimes, when there are several keys in one envelope, the postage is more. I sent twenty-five one day, which is \$3 for registered postage alone. Not one has failed to reach its address so far. My postage has been running around fifteen and twenty dollars a month. Stamps go rapidly when you are mailing circular letters to seventy-five chapters and sending out a hundred keys a month by registered mail."

If anyone thinks that our Secretary-Treasurer's office is an honor and nothing more, the above will undeceive him.

---

Professor W. Ross Marvin, Debate Coach at Bradley Polytechnic, writes as follows:

"The chapter has done an immense amount of good here at Bradley. Doubtless some idea of our activities has been given you in the letter which the boys have sent. We have now twelve members and shall have eight experienced men back next year. We have tentatively scheduled six debates. This is a situation which has never existed here at Bradley as far as I can learn. We award our debaters their keys, something which has been a big help in getting the men out. It is also excellent advertising for the chapter to have so many men about the campus wearing the keys."

---

Franklin College is preparing to meet Butler and Earlham in debate in one series and Wabash and Manchester in another. The question to be used is, Resolved: That the war debts owed the United States by her allies be cancelled. A women's triangular is suggested for Franklin, Denison, and Kalamazoo. Professor L. H. Harris and Professor Ernest Shideler are in charge of debate and oratory at Franklin College. Miss Lucile Booker, vice-president, is taking charge of the chapter until the return in the second semester of B. K. Johnson, the president.

---

During the last week in May, Heidelberg University inaugurated an Annual Freshman Extempore Speaking Contest for the recently established William A. Reiter Memorial Prize in Oratory. Dr. Kennedy, dean of the College, and Professor Williams, head of the Department of Education, were recently elected to membership in Ohio Beta. Professor Van Kirk, debate coach of Heidelberg University, has been elected president of the Ohio Intercollegiate Debating Conference which includes Ohio Northern, Hiram, Otterbein, Muskingum, Baldwin-Wallace, Wittenberg, and Heidelberg.

---

Kansas Beta at Washburn College has been given complete control of forensic activities.

# THE FORENSIC OF PI KAPPA DELTA

*Issued Four Times a Year*

November, January, March, May

J. R. MACARTHUR, Editor

EGBERT RAY NICHOLS, Business Manager

Subscription Price ..... \$1.50 a year

Subscription free to Active Members who have paid dues of ....\$2.00 a year

Entered as second-class matter January 26, 1916, at the postoffice at Redlands, California, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Office of Publication, Facts Commercial Press, Redlands, California.

Address all copy to J. R. Macarthur,

Editor Pi Kappa Delta Forensic, Pasadena, California.

Vol. II, Ser. 8

NOVEMBER, 1922

Number 2

## OUR NEW PRESIDENT

On July 1st, Professor Chas. A. Marsh assumed his duties as National President of Pi Kappa Delta. There is something peculiar about this office in that every man elected to that honor seems destined to move to the golden state of California. Mr. Nichols, the first to hold the office, soon after received a call to leave Wisconsin and come to the Pacific Coast to his present position at the University of Redlands. Mr. Macarthur managed to remain in Kansas for his first term of office; but had just entered upon his second when he decided to accept a position with the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. And our new chief, with no word at the Indianola Convention of deserting Iowa, receives an offer from the Southern Division of the University of California in Los Angeles and accepts. These three men have already met and expect to meet many times in the interest of Pi Kappa Delta.

Speaking of our new National President reminds us that we saw recently an excellent article on "Forensics at Morningside," written by an intercollegiate debater. In it occurs a justly merited tribute to Professor Marsh which we quote: "The head of the public speaking department is the Dean of his profession in the middle west and one of the recognized leaders in the public speaking work in the United states. . . . The greatest credit in the success of Morningside forensics should be given to Professor Marsh. Tribute was paid to his ability when he was recently elected president of the national Pi Kappa Delta organization. As president of this organization, Professor Marsh is put in touch with the general policy of college forensics through the entire country. . . . The hundreds of students who have gone out from the college with an adequate training in public speaking and close contact with a manly Christian character have carried his reputation far beyond the power of any word of appreciation here."

## IMPORTANT NOTICE

ALL COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO THE ROUTINE WORK OF PI KAPPA DELTA SHOULD NOW BE ADDRESSED TO THE NEW SECRETARY-TREASURER, PROFESSOR ALFRED WESTFALL, FORT COLLINS, COLORADO.

The action of the Fourth Biennial Convention last spring replaced the former offices of National Secretary and of National Treasurer by this new office of Secretary-Treasurer, the policy of the Order being to concentrate in one central office and under one person the host of details which heretofore have been cared for by several national officers. To Professor Westfall, therefore, should be sent not only membership and charter dues and orders for keys or changes in jewelry, but also requests for application blanks, for membership cards, for copies of THE FORENSIC, and for information generally. To him should be sent early in the year data concerning the officers of the local chapters and the number of members in the chapter as well as the names of graduate members to whom copies of the magazine should be sent. To the Editor of THE FORENSIC should be sent only chapter letters, exchanges, articles, or communications intended for publication. WHEN IN DOUBT AS TO WHICH OFFICER TO ADDRESS, ALWAYS ADDRESS PROFESSOR WESTFALL.

Attention to the above instructions will greatly help our new central office to function efficiently. We earnestly request the officers of local chapters to co-operate with Professor Westfall. Pi Kappa Delta is in the midst of a great expansion. The consistent support of the chapters will enable the national officers to realize their long-cherished hopes for the organization.

---

SIZE OF CHAPTERS

Much discussion has arisen of late over this question. Some of our chapters are exceedingly large, especially in those institutions where the extensive system of debate is practiced. Other colleges with the intensive system have a small chapter roll. One or two have stated definitely that they are going to make the conditions of entrance into Pi Kappa Delta more difficult in order that the winning of the key may be considered a greater honor. This matter we feel to be something for the local chapter to decide for itself. There are some points, though, that we wish the chapters to bear in mind. Pi Kappa Delta in general is committed to a broadly democratic policy. It shows this in its desire to number in its chapter roll all institutions of recognized academic rank which maintain forensics of a worthy type. It would not for worlds admit either an unworthy person or an unworthy institution. It does not, however, in general favor the exclusive idea. Then, too, admission to Pi Kappa Delta is merely a beginning. The greatest honor is that of winning the degree of Special Distinction and few there be who attain thereto. Might it not be possible by establishing a too exclusive policy to discourage some exceedingly worthy material which might have been induced to continue and finally develop truly meritorious work? Of course, the mere appearance on the intercollegiate debate platform should not necessarily entitle the student to membership in Pi Kappa Delta. His performance there must be the determining factor. We doubt the wisdom, however, of making, as some chapters have suggested, a numerical limit to the membership of a chapter. We feel that every student who has worthily represented his institution in intercollegiate forensics and whose character commands the respect of his associates should have an opportunity to enter our ranks. The exclusion of an outstanding student should be based upon very sound reason. Another point to be considered is whether or not the cause of forensics in the student body is strengthened

by a larger chapter. In many institutions forensics have a hard struggle to secure recognition and financial support. A good sprinkling of Pi Kappa Delta members in the offices of the student organizations often helps the cause. On the other hand, a student who feels that he was entitled to recognition and was unjustly deprived of it may lead a strong opposition to what is a worthy but not always a popular cause. Keep before you the ideals of our Order. Do not be led too far by any exclusive idea. It doesn't ring true to the democracy of Pi Kappa Delta.

---

### THE SMALL COLLEGE

Not very long ago, one of the brethren, well meaning, of course, raised his voice asking if we were not admitting to Pi Kappa Delta too many small colleges, institutions, some of which, according to him, were not of very high standing. Let us explain the policy of our Order as we understand it. Pi Kappa Delta from the first has been the forensic honor society of the small college—so-called—of the technical school, and of the normal. Be it thoroughly understood that we place no chapters in colleges which have not a four years' course leading to the bachelor's degree. A word as to standing. What is it that determines the standing of some of our smaller colleges with the larger institutions? Is it not often their scientific equipment? Now it is entirely possible for a college to maintain a severely classical and cultural course of an excellent standard and at the same time not to be able to afford or even to care to afford the money necessary to bring the scientific equipment up to the standard demanded by some of the associations of colleges and universities. How do forensics fare in these cultural institutions? Is it not often the case that they are conducted on the highest possible plane? Does it not often happen that debate and oratory are numbered among the most important college events of the year, especially when there is not enough money to support intercollegiate athletics? We can think of one state university that was so often defeated by two or three of the small colleges in the state that it finally refused to engage in any more contests, saying that these institutions were "not in the university class." Pi Kappa Delta is an honorary forensic society—primarily. We ought to and certainly shall see to it that no institution academically unworthy is granted a chapter of our Order; but once that condition is satisfied, our main concern will be to see that the college which gives evidence of a high standard of forensic work will be granted a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta if it applies for one. Let us not depart from that broad democratic spirit in which our Order was founded. Let us build up from Atlantic to Pacific and from Canada to Mexico, a network of chapters that shall foster the art of persuasion, beautiful and just, and that shall send out from our college halls men and women fitted to take their places worthily in these United States of ours.

---

"This ought to be our banner year. We are now in a position to undertake big things. 'Persuasion is the only true intellectual process,' said Matthew Arnold. Certainly there is much that we can do in imparting the methods and ideals of true persuasion to the present college generation. I feel more than ever before how important and worth while our work really is."

PROFESSOR ALFRED WESTFALL.

## OUR NEW CHAPTERS

In our last issue we announced the chapters which had been granted at the Convention, namely, to Hiram College, Central College (Iowa), Grove City College, College of Emporia, Upper Iowa University, Baker University, Monmouth College, and the revival of the inactive chapter California Beta chapter at Occidental College. Since the Convention, chapters have been granted to the Oklahoma Baptist University (Oklahoma Gamma), Presbyterian College of South Carolina (South Carolina Beta), Missouri Wesleyan (Missouri Epsilon), Des Moines College (Iowa Gamma re-chartered), Saint Olaf's College (Minnesota Beta). College of the Pacific (California Delta), Tusculum College (Tennessee Beta), University of Akron (Ohio Delta), Culver-Stockton College (Missouri Zeta), Northwestern State Teachers' College (Oklahoma Delta), Centre College (Kentucky Beta).

Not all of these chapters have as yet been installed. Grove City was installed by the Colorado Alpha team on its debate trip; Monmouth by Arthur Decker, Gerald E. Moore, and Velma Lewis of the Hedding chapter; Upper Iowa University by J. H. Krenmyre, former National Historian; Baker by Professor R. H. Ritchie of Ottawa; Oklahoma Baptist by Wallace C. Blakey of Central College, Missouri, and C. S. McGinnis of Fairmount; Missouri Wesleyan by a representative of William Jewell; Saint Olaf's by Dr. J. C. Hazzard, and Leland Case of Macalester; Tusculum College by C. F. Nesbit of Wofford and Ralph Armstrong of Maryville; Culver-Stockton by Professor M. E. Chapin of Carthage; Northwestern State Teachers by Wallace C. Blakey. Arrangements were made for the installation of Hiram and the College of Emporia but the reports have not reached us. The Presbyterian College of South Carolina, Centre College, the University of Akron, and the College of the Pacific deferred their installation until this fall.

To all our new chapters we extend the most cordial greetings and the warmest welcome. We know that you are worthy of us and that you will co-operate with us in bringing about a revival of public speaking that will fit many more of our college men and women to hold worthily their places as citizens of our democracy. We have now over seventy-five chapters. If Pi Kappa Delta is a good thing for these seventy-five, must it not be equally good for another two or three hundred colleges which are doing forensic work of a meritorious character but which have no chapter of an honorary forensic society? The new chapters will take their share in the missionary work which will place other chapters in the institutions worthy of our Order.

A glance at the map will show us that through these new grants several more states are becoming strong centers of Pi Kappa Delta. The Zeta chapter at Culver-Stockton places Missouri well to the front among the states. Oklahoma now has four chapters, California four, and Ohio three. In our last issue we spoke of the gratifying development in the Southeast, something for which the Wofford chapter is largely responsible. We have a wonderful field for expansion on the Atlantic seaboard between Maine and South Carolina. We have entered New York and our former National Historian has gone to that state. If his presence there is followed by the same development that followed his presence in Michigan, we shall not long lack chapters in that quarter. In our next issue, we hope to announce another chapter in the Northwest. Between South Carolina and Georgetown, Texas, there are not a few colleges that are worthy of consideration. The National Council has before it already some three or four petitions, a good beginning for the new year. The present year is always the best year that Pi Kappa Delta has had. Let us all—the new chapters and the old—make it so.