

# THE FORENSIC

---

SERIES 10

NUMBER 2

---



OF

PI KAPPA DELTA

OCTOBER, 1924

T r y - O u t N u m b e r



# PI KAPPA DELTA DIRECTORY

*National Officers until June 30, 1926*

- NATIONAL PRESIDENT—Professor Alfred Westfall, Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- NATIONAL FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT—Professor W. H. Veatch, University of California, Southern Branch, Los Angeles, California.
- NATIONAL SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT—W. C. Dennis, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa.
- NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER—Professor G. W. Finley, Colorado Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado
- NATIONAL HISTORIAN—Professor Egbert Ray Nichols, University of Redland, California.
- STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES ON THE NATIONAL COUNCIL—  
Paul M. Watson, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky.  
Geraldine Phillips, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.
- NATIONAL COUNSEL—Mr. J. D. Coon, Union Savings Building, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC—Professor Alfred Westfall, Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- CHARTER COMMITTEE—Professor W. H. Veach, Chairman; Professor Alfred E. Leach, Baker University, Baldwin City, Kansas; Professor F. S. Siebert, Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Illinois.
- INTERCHAPTER RELATIONS COMMITTEE—Professor W. C. Dennis, Chairman; Dean Allan C. Lemon, Intermountain Union College, Helena, Montana; Professor Franc L. McCluer, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri.
- INTER-FRATERNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE—Dr. John R. MacArthur, Dean, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California; chairman; Professor Glenn Clark, Macalester College, Saint Paul, Minnesota; Professor F. B. McKay, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Michigan.
- PUBLICITY COMMITTEE—Professor E. R. Nichols, Chairman; Professor Julia H. Watson, Central College, Pella, Iowa; Professor H. P. Boody, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin.

## CHAPTERS

### ARKANSAS

- Alpha—Henderson-Brown College, Arkadelphia.  
Beta—Ouchita College, Arkadelphia.

### CALIFORNIA

- Alpha—University of Redlands, Redlands.  
Beta—Occidental College, Los Angeles.  
Gamma—California Institute of Technology.  
Delta—College of the Pacific, Stockton.  
Epsilon—University of California, Southern Branch, Los Angeles

### COLORADO

- Alpha—Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins.  
Beta—Colorado Teachers' College, Greeley.

### CONNECTICUT

- Alpha—Connecticut Agricultural College, Storrs.

### ILLINOIS

- Alpha—Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.  
Beta—Eureka College, Eureka.  
Gamma—Carthage College, Carthage.  
Delta—Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.  
Epsilon—Hedding College, (Inactive), Abingdon.  
Zeta—Monmouth College, Monmouth.  
Eta—Illinois State Normal University, Normal.  
Theta—M'Kendree College, Lebanon.  
Iota—Northwestern, Naperville.  
Kappa—Lombard, Galesburg.

### INDIANA

- Alpha—Franklin College, Franklin.

### IOWA

- Alpha—Iowa Wesleyan University, Mount Pleasant.  
Beta—Central College, Pella.  
Gamma—Des Moines University, Des Moines.  
Delta—Morningside College, Sioux City.  
Epsilon—Simpson College, Indianola.  
Zeta—Parsons College, Fairfield.  
Eta—Upper Iowa University, Fayette.  
Theta—Coe College, Cedar Rapids.  
Iota—Western Union College, Le Mars.  
Kappa—Buena Vista College, Storm Lake.

### KANSAS

- Alpha—Ottawa University, Ottawa.  
Beta—Washburn College, Topeka.  
Gamma—Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan.  
Delta—Southwestern College, Winfield.  
Epsilon—Fairmount College, Wichita.  
Theta—Kansas State Teachers' College, Pittsburg.



Eta—Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina.  
Theta—Kansas State Teachers' College, Emporia.  
Iota—College of Emporia, Emporia.  
Kappa—Baker University, Baldwin City.  
Lambda—Sterling College, Sterling.  
Mu—Bethany College, Lindsborg.  
Nu—Kansas State Teachers College, Hayes.

## KENTUCKY

Alpha—Georgetown College, Georgetown.  
Beta—Center College, Danville.  
Gamma—Kentucky Wesleyan College, Winchester.  
Delta—Transylvania, Lexington.

## MAINE

Alpha—Colby College, Waterville.

## MICHIGAN

Alpha—Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.  
Beta—Olivet College, Olivet.  
Gamma—Hope College, Holland.  
Delta—Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing.  
Epsilon—Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti.  
Zeta—College of the City of Detroit, Detroit.

## MINNESOTA

Alpha—Macalester College, Saint Paul.  
Beta—St. Olaf College, Northfield.  
Gamma—Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.  
Delta—Hamline University, Saint Paul.

## MISSOURI

Alpha—Westminster College, Fulton.  
Beta—Park College, Parkville.  
Gamma—Central College, Fayette.  
Delta—William Jewell College, Liberty.  
Epsilon—Missouri Wesleyan College, Cameron.  
Zeta—Culver-Stockton College, Canton.  
Eta—Central Missouri State Teachers' College, Warrensburg.

## MONTANA

Alpha—Montana Wesleyan College, Helena.  
Beta—Montana State College, Bozeman.

## NEBRASKA

Alpha—Nebraska Wesleyan University, University Place.  
Beta—Cotner College, Bethany.  
Gamma—Doane College, Crete.  
Delta—Hastings College, Hastings.  
Epsilon—Grand Island College, Grand Island.  
Zeta—Kearney State Normal, Kearney.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Alpha—Jamestown College, Jamestown

## OHIO

Alpha—Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.  
Beta—Heidelberg University, Tiffin.  
Gamma—Hiram College, Hiram.  
Delta—University of Akron, Akron.  
Epsilon—Otterbein College, Westerville.

## OKLAHOMA

Alpha—Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts College, Stillwater.  
Beta—University of Tulsa, Tulsa.  
Gamma—Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee.  
Delta—Northwest State Teachers' College, Alva.  
Epsilon—Oklahoma City College, Oklahoma City.

## OREGON

Alpha—Linfield College, McMinnville.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Alpha—Grove City College, Grove City.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Alpha—Wofford College, Spartanburg.  
Beta—Presbyterian College of South Carolina, Clinton.  
Gamma—Newberry College, Newberry.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Alpha—Dakota Wesleyan College, Mitchell.  
Beta—Huron College, Huron.  
Gamma—Yankton College, Yankton.  
Delta—South Dakota State College, Brookings.  
Epsilon—Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls.  
Zeta—Northern State Teachers' College, Aberdeen.  
Eta—Augustana College, Sioux Falls.

## TENNESSEE

Alpha—Maryville College, Maryville.  
Beta—Tusculum College, Tusculum.

## TEXAS

Alpha—Southwestern University, Georgetown.  
Beta—Trinity University, Waxahachie.  
Gamma—East Texas State Normal College, Commerce.  
Delta—Howard-Payne College, Brownwood.

## WASHINGTON

Alpha—College of Puget Sound, Tacoma.

## WISCONSIN

Alpha—Ripon College, Ripon.  
Beta—Carroll College, Waukesha.



# PI KAPPA DELTA

announces

L. G. BALFOUR CO., ATTLEBORO, MASS., OFFICIAL JEWELERS



PRICE LIST, SEPTEMBER 1, 1924.

## LARGE SIZED KEYS

With two pearls, two rubies, or pearl and ruby .....	\$4.50
For other jewels add the following amounts to the above price:	
Sapphires, each .....	.75
Turquoise, each .....	.75
Emeralds, each .....	1.50
Diamonds, each .....	4.00
Price for changing jewels .....	.75
For smaller lavalier keys deduct 75c from the price of larger keys.	

In addition to above prices add 50c which is a fixed charge made by the society to cover the cost of handling orders and mailing keys.

Address all orders to Professor G. W. Finley, Greeley, Colorado.  
Explanation of Key Jeweling:

## DEGREES

Fraternity, ruby eye.  
Proficiency, pearl eye.  
Honor, emerald eye.  
Special Distinction, diamond eye

## ORDERS

Oratory, ruby circle.  
Debate, pearl circle.  
Instruction, emerald circle.  
Honorary, sapphire circle.  
Orat. and Deb., turquoise circle  
Orat., Deb., and Inst., diamond circle

## PI KAPPA DELTA STATIONERY

*Embossed Stationery for All Occasions*

Letters to the folks at home  
Formal notes of every description  
Business letters  
Social Correspondence  
Cards

With your Fraternity embossing or a personal monogram

*Adds 100 per cent to the Distinction of the message*

Price list, samples and special information mailed on request

FOR PARTY FAVORS—Look over the 1924 BALFOUR BLUE BOOK or write for special suggestions. The specialty you have in mind can doubtless be worked out to advantage.

BANQUET MENUS—A large and complete line is now under the supervision of a separate department, and requests for information, samples or prices, will receive careful attention.

**L. G. BALFOUR CO., ATTLEBORO, MASS.**

Official Jewelers and Stationers to Pi Kappa Delta

All orders will be shipped C. O. D. for carriage charges and for balance due, if any. Orders should be accompanied by a 50 per cent cash deposit.



# THE FORENSIC

---

SERIES 10

OCTOBER, 1924

No. 2

---

## TRY-OUT NUMBER

---

### *CHOOSING INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATORS*

CHAS. A. MARSH

Former National President.

California Epsilon

University of California, Southern Branch.

Los Angeles, California.

Note: Under this plan the University of California, Southern Branch, in the past two years has won 24 out of 29 debates.

In reply to the request of the Editor for a statement of the method used in selecting varsity debaters at the University of California, Southern Branch, I wish to say that the writer has tried, in the past few years, about every system of "try-outs" of which he has ever heard. The "try-out," as that term is usually understood, has been found to be a very unsatisfactory method of choosing debate teams, and has been discarded in favor of the plan now used, which, for want of a better term, may be called the "open squad" system.

Perhaps I can do no better in describing this method of selecting debaters than to give an account of how the plan was actually used in a specific instance last year. As soon as the question for the Southern California Conference debates was chosen, a call was issued for all men who desired to try for places on the teams to meet at a stated hour. Sixty men responded. A systematic study of the question was begun at this meeting and was continued at subsequent meetings for a period of three weeks. The men were given opportunity to participate freely in the discussions. At the end of three weeks each man was required to hand in a written argument of about seven or eight hundred words, and also to give extemporaneously a five minute speech. In both the written and the oral argument, each man was expected to limit himself to the discussion of a single phase of the question, in order that his ability to develop a point might be judged. As a result of these efforts the squad was reduced, by the coach, to about thirty men. The men remaining on the squad continued their intensive study of the question for another period of about three weeks, meeting regularly two hours per week for an exchange of views. At the end of the second period of three weeks, each man again presented both a written and an oral argument, and the squad was now reduced to twelve men. After this second trial no man was retained on the squad who did not at that time give promise of being able to make a place on a team, but at the same time no man had any assurance that he would be used in a debate.

Now the men were divided affirmative and negative, and each group had separate meetings for the purpose of constructing a brief. General meetings were also held, at which each side criticized the brief of the other side, and opposing speakers presented oral arguments. Each man next decided in which position he preferred to speak, that is, whether first or



second speaker on his side. (In the Southern California Public Speaking Conference two men debate teams are used). He then handed in a complete speech for his particular place on the team, and presented complete oral arguments in practice debates. If a man wished to prepare speeches for both first and second positions, or on both sides of the question, he was permitted to do so. Some men chose to do this and some debated in more than one position before the end of the season.

About one week before the date of the first debate, the coach announced the names of the four men who would represent the University in that contest. Up to that time no man on the squad had had any definite assurance that he would be called upon to debate. In the one week remaining these two teams met in practice debates and received the suggestions and criticisms of the other members of the squad.

In the Southern California Conference three rounds of debates are held two weeks apart, each school meeting the other six members of the conference. In the week following the first round, the squad discussed the work that had been done by the teams in the first debate, and each member of the squad presented revised arguments. By the end of the week the coach announced what changes, if any, he wished to make in the personnel of the teams for the second round of the series. The same program was followed between the second and third rounds.

This in brief is the plan we use to select intercollegiate debaters. The system is modified somewhat to meet the exigencies of each particular debate or series of debates, but the same general plan is used regardless of whether there is to be only one debate, or a series of debates, on the proposition. The number of men remaining on the final squad is determined by these two factors: first, the maximum number of men it will be possible to use in the series; second, the number of men who have shown sufficient ability and who give promise of being able to make places on the teams. The number of eliminations before the final squad is determined is also varied to meet the particular circumstances.

This system, we believe, has some very decided advantages over other methods of choosing debaters. It will be observed that it is similar to the plan generally used in selecting athletic teams. The men are chosen AFTER they have been given opportunity to demonstrate their ability. In the ordinary "try-out" the men are usually selected on the basis of a short speech, sometimes on the subject to be debated, but frequently on some other subject, but BEFORE they have made an extensive study of the question. It has been my experience that a man may be able to make a very fine showing in a five minute speech, and then later prove to be a very poor debater. He told all he knew in the five minutes. On the other hand a man may be eliminated on the basis of a short speech, who would with further study and training develop into a strong debater. Furthermore, team-work is essential if you are to have strong debating teams. Under the old "try-out" system it is impossible to judge a man's ability to work with his fellows. This can be fully observed under the "open squad" plan. Personally, I do profess to have the ability, by listening for five minutes to a man whom I have never heard before, to decide whether or not he has the making of a good debater. In the "open squad" system I have several opportunities to hear a man speak on the question; I observe his participation in the general discussions, and I note his reaction to the work of the other men.

Finally, under the method described above, I am able to get more and better work out of the men. The uncertainty of making a place on the team causes the men to put forth their best efforts. This avoids the very common danger that after a man has been picked for a debate team he will "lay



down" on the job and compel his colleague to carry the burden. And then the fact that a man may be removed from a team even a few hours before a contest, for sufficient cause, keeps all the men on their mettle. It is our aim to have every man who remains on the final squad participate in at least one contest, but it is understood that there is no obligation to use every man. Last year four men worked hard and faithfully throughout the entire season and yet were not used in a single contest. It was the testimony of these men that, while there was of course some disappointment in not being able to make the team, they felt that the training and development received in working up the question was ample reward for the time and effort expended. In athletics men will go out on the gridiron night after night and take punishment from the first team in the hopes that before the end of their college course they may win the coveted letter in football. I believe it is possible to develop a similar situation in debating.

---

### **WHY NOT A DEBATER'S INTELLIGENCE TEST.**

D. C. ECKERMAN

Debate Coach, Michigan Delta, Michigan Agricultural College,  
East Lansing, Michigan.

How to conduct debate tryouts! If a debate coach can solve that problem, he will have eliminated one of his hardest jobs and will have done the greatest single thing possible toward building successful teams. Now, the purpose of a tryout is not only to get the squad of the best eight men out of all the possible candidates, but also to help the coach determine on which team each man belongs and which position on the team he should fill.

In the limited space available, I can best express my ideas on this subject by telling how I propose to conduct the tryout for my men's teams during the coming year. I am going to use a combination system, consisting of three parts.

The first part of this combination tryout system will be the regular debate contest where each candidate prepares a speech on the subject for debate. There will probably be forty candidates for the teams. These will be divided into two groups and a contest held for each group in which every man will present a constructive speech and a rebuttal.

From the two groups the judges will select the best twenty or twenty-two debaters, and then another contest held to reduce this number to about fifteen men. Although the use of this method ends here, the ranking of these fifteen men according to their performance on the platform will have a bearing on the final selection. But, it seems to me, the use of this platform contest as the only means of reducing the number of candidates to a squad of eight men, is bound to be more or less unsatisfactory.

The second part of this combination tryout system is a series of mental tests. Now, mental tests are given to many different grade and groups of individuals, and to find out quite a variety of things about these individuals. There are tests for accuracy, tests for speed, tests for concentration, analysis, memory, reasoning, and many other things. Obviously, in order to make mental tests servicable in debate tryouts, the coach must decide just what the purpose of these tests is to be, and then work out tests which really measure the abilities and capacities in those respects.

I intend to give tests which will measure concentration, analysis, and reasoning ability. No one test will reveal all three, but a series of them can be given which will do the job. Not only must the right kind of tests be



given, but the results must be interpreted properly. Experience will help to do this.

The use of such tests has several advantages. They can be given to a group in a comparatively short time and the results can be tabulated quickly. The tests can be used for any group of debaters, average, above the average, or below. The results are always relative. Furthermore, the tests do not determine the individual's knowledge of any particular subject as much as they test his capacities. And, after all, that is what the coach wants to know about his men.

This phase of the tryout is new. In fact, I have neither used it myself nor heard of any other coach using it. But I believe it can be made a great help in selecting teams. I am now concerned with the development and application of mental tests so that they may serve in the place indicated.

There yet remains a third part of my combination tryout system. It is my good fortune to be acquainted with a man who is a splendid character analyst. I have already had an opportunity to see and know something of his work, and have such confidence in his judgment that I have asked him to help select the varsity debaters during the coming year. He will base his judgment on what he sees of the men in the regular platform contests, the mental tests, and personal conferences.

Some may say that the system outlined here is complicated and elaborate. It may be, but I am willing to try anything if it will help me to do the job indicated in the first paragraph of this article.

I have never come to the end of a debate season without wishing that I had known at the beginning of the season as much about the abilities and capacities of the men as I did at the end. Probably no system of tryouts will ever reveal everything that a season's experience will, but there surely are some methods which can be used in addition to the present system and which will tell some of the things which the coach would like to know but which the present system does not tell him.

I may not be on the right track yet, but I believe I am going in the right direction.

## CONDUCTING DEBATE TRY-OUTS

E. C. BUEHLER, Director of Department of Public Speaking, Kansas Beta  
Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas

The debate coach wants the best available material to appear in the matched debates and wants this material to make the best possible showing. Our problem is, then, to find this material, give it a satisfactory trial, and determine in a way its superiority. The Editor suggests four divisions of the problem of try-outs. (1) getting the best material to enter; (2) aiding the student in preparation; (3) selecting the best material; (4) placing the winners on the teams.

I should like to discuss the problem by making a two-fold division; (1) *creating a universal enthusiasm and interest in debate*; (2) *formal procedure in conducting the try-outs*. The first part will bear largely upon the first of the Editor's problems and the second part will bear upon the last three.

### I. CREATING INTEREST AND ENTHUSIASM FOR DEBATE

Among the students as a body there must be a prevailing, general interest and enthusiasm and a wholesome respect for forensic activity. This interest must be universal in the student body, not sectional, not centered in one fraternity, in a literary club or in a handful of over zealous "martyr-complexed" students. Too often the college debater and orator is considered a



"freak," a "radical," a "nut," a "sister" who lacks the red blood to hit the line. Such an attitude does not foster a popular interest for debating.

During the first few weeks of the school year, a systematic campaign for arousing interest in debate should be conducted. Each school of course, must work out its own methods of creating interest. I venture the following merely as suggestions. We, for the most part are observing them at Washburn this year. (1) Have a special bulletin printed and distributed among the students at the first of the year. This bulletin should have carefully prepared statements showing the benefits derived from experience in debate and a schedule of local forensic events, matched debates, and pending trips. (2) Have a forensic rally meeting some evening. At this meeting have a special program; prominent faculty members or citizens may give inspirational talks on the value of training in speaking. The whole purpose is to create enthusiasm for forensics, to sell the idea of participating in debate to the students. (3) Have members of Pi Kappa Delta, members of the faculty, and the coach to interview personally, some of the more promising, indifferent, and timid students. (4) Early in the year have some rousing contest, such as an extemporaneous debate on some issue which is red hot, or an extemporaneous speaking contest on the "National Political Situation." Have some meeting which has some life to counteract the common notion that all forensics is dry as dust. Then, if interest and enthusiasm once catches fire early in the year, the rest is easy. Then the spirit of competition, the right kind of publicity, the fun of the game will bring results, under wise and competent direction, of course. After the student is once sold on the idea of trying out for debate, he should be left largely to his own resources. He must be adequately and promptly informed, however, of the regulations of the try-outs. This can be done through bulletins, announcements, and personal interviews.

---

## II. FORMAL PROCEDURE IN CONDUCTING THE TRY-OUTS

The purpose of the try-out is to find the best available material, give it a satisfactory trial, and determine in a fair way its superiority. Before the final teams are selected I advocate the selection of a debating squad. The squad should consist of all students who have come through the try-outs showing the highest promise for team qualification. The squad members should be determined in the following way; (1) the veteran debaters of two or more years' experience may become members of the squad without a try-out. (2) There should be a tryout for all other candidates. Those who are obviously superior will be selected and those who are obviously inferior will be eliminated. (2) A second try-out should be held for all who could not participate in the first and for those who were not eliminated. This is to give the doubtful ones, the promising ones, another chance and to discover the good green raw material. We now have a squad of, (1) experienced debaters, (2) obviously superior students, (3) doubtful, promising, and raw material.

In the try-out, candidates make seven minute constructive speeches and three minute rebuttals, all using the one official question. Opponents for refutation are assigned at the try-out. In the second try-out, the speaker uses the opposite side used in the first try-out. The first try-out is held about a month after the question is announced; the second try-out should follow the first in a week or ten days. The squad is selected by judges consisting of the coach and two other competent members of the faculty.

We now have our squad in which every member is on an equal basis. No one is sure of a place on the team. The veterans must make good if they are to hold their place. Usually there are from three to ten more on the squad than is required for the total number to be used in debating. The squad should be met by the coach from four to eight times and given



rigid training. This may include formal debates, individual clashes, open forum, single point rebuttals, heckling, briefing, etc. In the squad work the coach observes growth, willingness to work, ability in speaking, and capacity for straight thinking. At his own discretion the coach should call off squad practice and announce the teams with no alternates. It is better to give the side of the question and order place on the team after the various chosen debaters have spoken on various issues and sides on the platform in the semian work which is to follow. The place on the team, the side of the question, is a matter of diplomacy and strategy of the coach.

### ***THE SOCIETY SYSTEM AT ST. OLAF.***

J. D. MENCHHOFFER  
Debate Coach, Minnesota Beta  
St. Olaf College  
Northfield, Minnesota.

The following is a brief explanation of the method used in the selection of intercollegiate debaters at St. Olaf. Everyone here seems to be very well satisfied with the method.

The problem of the debate try-out at St. Olaf is best discussed by an explanation of the society system at our institution and its relation with intercollegiate debating. There are ten men's literary societies, the members of which are chosen from all of the four classes at the college. Inter-society debating is the basis for intercollegiate debating. Every year each society is represented in the inter-society debates by eight men. These eight men compose two teams, three speakers and an alternate for each team. Thus each year eighty men spend eight weeks in hard work in preparation for the inter-society debates. The effort to obtain the debate cup, which is won by the society gaining the greatest number of decisions, is intense. The question debated is the one chosen for the intercollegiate debates.

The intersociety debates for the women are similar to those of the men, excepting that participation is limited to the six societies, the membership of which is restricted to the three upper classes. Thus each year forty-eight women take active part in intersociety debating. The question used is the one chosen for the women's intercollegiate debate.

One week after the intersociety debates are over the intercollegiate debaters are chosen. This is usually about two weeks before the Christmas vacation. By the time the society debates are held the best available material is ready to try out for the intercollegiate debates. Students, trying out are placed on regular teams of three men each and the try-outs are conducted as a series of actual debates. However, in these debates almost as much time is devoted to the rebuttal speeches as to the constructive speeches. The big advantage in this method is that a student's debating ability is judged and not his speaking power only. Patience and co-operation is needed on the part of those selecting the debaters. This has never been lacking at St. Olaf.

After the debaters are chosen they are placed on the respective sides of the question according to their convictions. During the past three years we have had but one debater who upheld the side of the question which was contrary to his convictions. Although he was asked to give only substantial arguments it was felt that he did not exhibit as much zeal and enthusiasm as he otherwise would have done, had he been on the opposite side. In choosing the leaders of the teams and putting the debaters in their respective places, the debating instructor has had the advantage of observing them in the society debates as well as in the try-out debates.

I feel that there are obvious advantages to this method which I have not pointed out and but few disadvantages.



## MARYVILLE USES FACULTY JUDGES

ETHEL DE HAVEN

Tennessee Alpha, Maryville College,  
Maryville, Tennessee.

The following is a statement of the procedure we follow in dealing with the problem of try-outs for debates, and of the tentative changes in that procedure for this year.

I. Several lines of activity are pursued in persuading available material to enter the try-outs.

Perhaps the most important and effective is the scouting done by the coach and experienced debaters present at the beginning of the year. Each one, through personal acquaintance with those who appear to him as good material invites them to become contestants in the preliminary debates.

The performances in the literary societies, particularly in the men's societies, furnish a field for the observation of good debate material. Likewise, certain courses of study reveal promising candidates. These two fields of observation, the evident interest on the part of some of the prospective candidates, and the personal acquaintance of the experienced debaters with the rest of the students constitute one of the most important elements in the securing of a numerous group of interested candidates for the preliminary debates.

Such scouting is supplemented by articles in the college newspaper. These articles are directed toward the end of rousing the interest of students in general in things forensic and to further the cause of securing candidates for the preliminary debates. A tentative addition this year to these customary processes is an open meeting of the local chapter of Pi Kappa Delta. To this meeting each member will invite as many of his acquaintances as he wishes. Of course, the aim will be to bring to that meeting those who we think will be good debaters or orators and make it an opportunity for any who are interested to show their interest by their presence. The program at such a meeting may include a prospectus of the debating season, a discussion of the honors to be gained in forensics, a presentation of the various oratorical contests and the honors to be gained in them, a report of the national convention held last year, and other related topics. In brief, the general aim of such a meeting would be to put forensics before an interested portion of the student body in a manner to arouse their enthusiasm and support.

At as early a date as seems compatible with the general interest shown the prospective candidates meet, the date of the preliminary debates is announced, the question or questions presented, and sides of the question and places in the preliminary debate program are drawn.

II. The preparation for the preliminary debates has generally remained a problem to be solved by each individual debater by force of his own originality. However, custom has shown that the coach and experienced debaters were willing to instruct the fledgling debaters in the general principles of research and of argumentative outlining. In girls' forensics two formal meetings of the candidates followed the first meeting and at these meetings the general principles of research and of argumentative outlining were given either by the coach or an experienced debater.

A tentative addition to this procedure this year may be adopted in girls' forensics, in that a definite place in the preliminary program and consequently a pre-arranged opponent for each speaker will not be made known until the day of the program. Such an arrangement we feel would open the way for unlimited discussion of the question without the temptation to re-



hearse with one's own opponent. Informal and formal meetings of the candidates may then be held and the question freely discussed and opportunity given for practice in speaking before one's fellow students prior to the date of the preliminary try-out.

III. At the preliminary debates the selection of the best team material is made by three judges, none of whom is the coach and all of whom are usually members of the faculty. The coach is of course present at these debates. Each of these judges grades each debater on his familiarity with the question, the force, clearness and validity of his argument, his delivery, and the probability of his improvement with coaching. In regard to the last point, the judges are instructed to account for such a circumstance as the temporary defects in the delivery of a debater making his first appearance. The whole list of candidates is ranked according to the averages of the judges' grades, and the eligibility for teams is indicated by this ranking.

IV. The placing of the eligible candidates in teams is a prerogative of the coach. Consideration of the candidates' preferences has been noted occasionally but the best combination of experience, logic and brilliance in view of the probable composition of the opposing teams is regarded as the primary consideration. As soon after the preliminary debates as possible the coach meets the necessary number of the highest ranking preliminary debaters and assigns them to their teams. Their positions on those teams are usually announced after each candidate has submitted an outline of the question to be debated. Of course this outline is not the only decisive factor in determining the assignment of a debater to a place on a team. The coach's knowledge of the debaters' ability in the preliminary debates and elsewhere influences his first assignment of places. This first assignment has not often been changed, but, if the coach perceived that one debater would contribute to the making of a better team if he were working on another part of the question, there followed a shifting of places.

---

## DEBATE TRY-OUTS AT INTERMOUNTAIN COLLEGE

ALLAN C. LEMON, Dean.

Montana Alpha,  
Intermountain Union College  
Helena, Montana.

Your division of the try-out problem is a good one. At this college we have very little trouble with the first part of the problem—getting the best available material to enter. Our extensive debating program has done more than anything else to arouse interest. The best material as a rule appears. If a few good people do not come out a personal word will generally get the desired results.

Second—helping with the tryouts. We are following the policy of having members of the Pi Kappa Delta coach the members of the Freshman and Sophomore teams for their annual battle. A cycle series within the literary society helps the people participating to get the question well prepared. These debates are held before the intercollegiate tryouts. In addition to these plans we are conducting a class for intercollegiate debaters. This class meets once a week for discussion, making of briefs, and general work on the intercollegiate question. College credit is given for this work.

Third—selecting the best debating material. After the coach has seen these people in action and knows what they have done in class it is an easy matter to select the best material. However, our coach has followed the system of placing practically all who try out on teams. Our college



has adopted the policy of training just as many as possible, regardless of whether or not they will win decisions. That this policy has not been disastrous, however, is shown by the fact that out of 35 debates in the last six years Intermountain has won 26, even with second and third rate men on the teams. We believe it has been due to the hard work the members of the teams have put into it.

Fourth—placing the winners in positions. Put a person with a clear head and lots of fire for the last place. Get one that can think on his feet and can summarize argument clearly. For first place pick a man with pleasing, dignified delivery and who has the ability to set forth the issues in one, two, three order. After picking the first and last speakers, the second man will be found to fit his position with much picking.

---

## ***WILLIAM JEWELL'S WAY TO GET INTEREST IN DEBATE.***

CASPAR HARVEY

Debate Coach, Missouri Delta,  
William Jewell College,  
Liberty, Missouri.

In reply to President Westfall's request I am glad to outline the ways which are used at William Jewell College to arouse interest in debate and to manage the tryouts to the mutual satisfaction of both the coach and the contestants.

In the first place the Board of Trustees of the college makes it obligatory on all students to pay two dollars a year into the forensic fund which is expended under the direct control of the debate coach. Every student is given a season ticket to all varsity forensic functions and contests. The other two things which serve to arouse interest and to get the best material to tryout for the teams are: A schedule that means several long trips; and a reputation on and off the campus that our debate squad is one of the hardest ones to make in the state.

The president of the college gives one or two entire assembly days at the first of the school year to debate. Then we have a general tryout with faculty judges in which each contestant debates for himself as in the ordinary try-outs. Then the faculty judges rank each contestant. With these rankings before him the coach makes up as many teams as the number of contestants demand taking care to make the opposing teams as evenly matched as possible. These teams debate for a decision before judges who decide only which team wins a decision as in a regular debate. At these debates the coach sits as the single judge of the rankings of the contestants for the freshman and varsity intercollegiate debate teams. Then the coach announces the two squads the freshman squad and the varsity squad. Men who have reached the rank of second degree in debate in Pi Kappa Delta are automatically considered on the varsity squad because of this ranking.

We generally work on only one question during a year and the squad is divided into the affirmative and negative divisions. Each division has its leader appointed by the coach. The squad elects its own captain. The college presents to each man who makes Pi Kappa Delta the key and his dues. The student does not make this expenditure himself.

To me the greatest problem in arousing interest in debate among those students who represent the best in college life is the problem in getting the intercollegiate debates judged properly. Because of the fact that many coaches "manage" to get friendly judges to serve in intercollegiate debates,



the best students will not always enter in forensics that are to lead to inter-collegiate endeavor. To me the greatest step that can be taken in forensic endeavor will concern the proper selection of the judge. The single expert judge system is the best system without qualification or exception. Of course, the problem is to find a single expert judge. College debate coaches of many years' experience are such judges. To me the coach who will not permit his team to be judged by such men does an injury to all forensic endeavor.

It is for this reason that we have the coach of debate at William Jewell College select his debate teams with the freedom the football coach does. The rankings of judges does not enter into his selection unless the coach cares to consider them. The contestants are debating as teams to win a decision and the coach can see whether they are doing this. The coach has no connection with anyone until after he has debated on a team for a decision.

## **COLLEGE OF PUGET SOUND MOVES TO NEW CAMPUS**

LYNETTE HOVIOUS, Debate Coach

Washington Alpha, College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington

The College of Puget Sound is now entering upon a new era. We have moved to our new forty acre campus, where our new buildings are being erected. Four buildings will be in use this year: Jones Hall, Science Hall, Women's Dormitory, and the Gymnasium.

With a four hundred student body, you may not consider our problems typical of those confronting larger schools but we have an interested group in debate.

Soon after college opens in the fall, a student body chapel period is given over to a debate rally. There is a farce debate between two varsity debaters. This is followed by a more serious outlining of debate affairs by the debate coach and the student debate manager. On the evening of the same day, a big debate dinner is held at some hotel down town. This dinner is presided over by the student debate manager. Snappy speeches are made by an energetic freshman, a downtown business or professional man, some one representing the administration, from the debate coach, who outlines the plans for the year, and a varsity debater. To this dinner are invited prominent professional and business men of the city, who are interested sponsors of debate, the college president, the dean, any faculty member who may be interested. A special invitation is given all students interested in debate. Stress is placed upon the fact that this dinner is open to everyone. The dinner held at the end of the spring semester, is an exclusive, formal affair, open only to varsity debaters, city guests, and Pi Kappa Delta members. About forty attend this fall banquet at which time, the debate manager asks all those interested in trying out for either freshman or varsity teams, to hand in their names at once. From these names, the debate manager lines up his teams for the actual debate try-outs, which are held before three faculty judges—the coach always being one of the three.

The question and dates for freshman tryouts, for both men and women, are posted soon after the debate dinner. Later the dates for the varsity try-outs are posted.

By this time, we find that much interest is being shown and at least we have selected the most interested, if not the best available material. And I sometimes think that a student with sincerity of purpose, outdistances the student, who may be better equipped, but who, because of his brilliance, has so many affairs that no affair receives his best attention.

The Pi Kappa Delta members of this chapter are doing excellent work



in sponsoring the freshman debates. Freshman debates, both for men and women, are held with the University of Washington. These debates are arranged by our secretary of the Pi Kappa Delta, and the debaters are trained by the president of Pi Kappa Delta, assisted by other members, and advised by the professor of public speaking. These debates are over by January 1.

Any man or woman in college, carrying twelve hours of work with a passing grade, is permitted to try out for varsity debates. Three faculty judges, the coach being one, select the varsity debate squad from the varsity tryout debaters. These debates have a six minute main speech and a three minute rebuttal. The teams line up as in actual debate.

As to helping the student prepare the material: At the present, the one professor in the department has so many duties that it has been impossible for her to oversee tryout material. When this is possible, the tryouts will be open to the public. At present they are not. Such a possibility would greatly add to the debate interest.

Our student body has not aggregated over four hundred. From the list which try out for varsity debates, the faculty judges are able to know the students personally, and from these tryouts the squad teams are selected. From these squads the coach uses her own judgment in the placing of the debaters. She has found that in a team of two she selects a slow, logical thinker to team up with a witty, sparkling, versatile man. The quick thinker is given the last rebuttal.

---

## *CASH PRIZES AWARDED WINNERS AT COE.*

B. D. SILLIMAN

Debate Coach, Iowa Theta, Coe College,  
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

The problem of selecting the members of our intercollegiate debating teams is the least of my worries. The task of preparing the case is of course the most difficult, but among the correlary problems that of arranging a satisfactory schedule, and that of obtaining judges are the most troublesome.

In order to arouse the interest of the students in participation we give the matter a large amount of publicity. The coach makes a personal announcement publicly during the regular chapel exercises. This publicity is supplemented with personal effort by the coach and members of the chapter to induce participation. In this way about thirty are usually on hand to compete in what is known as the first preliminary.

From the contestants in the first preliminary twelve are selected to compete in the final preliminary which is held about two weeks later. In the final contest, known as the Dow's Debate, the six members of the teams are selected. Prizes of \$25 and \$15 are awarded to the winners of the first two places.

In the two preliminaries two different sets of judges are used. Judges should include qualified men and women who are in no way connected with the college. In order that there may be no favor or prejudice or favor because of a contestant's scholarship or lack of standing with the faculty. Furthermore the number of judges should be at least five in each contest so that the law of averages can take care of any radical votes. It is highly important that the coach be not absolutely bound by the decision of the judges. He should reserve the right to select the teams as he sees fit, using the decisions as a guide, but having the liberty to overrule the judges where he feels that manifest error has been committed.