

as length for first presentation, and 5 to 8 minutes for refutation. Seven replies speak of contracts; 4 report not to believe in any regular rules; 6 provide that no new material shall be introduced into last refutation; at least 3 instruct judges that both content and form are of importance; 2 place content above form in importance; 15 report no "set rules" without stating definitely whether they have written contracts; 7 report elaborate rules.

Quotations:

"I am personally opposed to all elaborate schemes, aimed to make judges act wisely or rascals behave. Cannot be done by rule."

"We have given up the use of set rules, for we have found that judges usually ignore them. We ask judges to determine in accordance with their ideas of effective debating."

"Do not depend upon unwritten code of honor. It varies too much from institution to institution."

4. Do you forbid special tactics in debating, such as the use of charts or other visual aids? How can questionable practices be eliminated?

Charts ruled out in 17 institutions; not specifically forbidden, but either rarely used or never used in 10; submitted 24 hours in advance in one case (which rule has eliminated use for years); charts allowed and sometimes used in 8: use of charts reported as encouraged in 2 cases. No definite rules or agreements forbidding any practice in 31 institutions. Personal letters tabooed in 3 institutions; scouting in 2. In 14 replies definite statement is made that no trouble has occurred recently in regard to ethics in debating. In 5 cases, where charts are now sometimes used, person replying to questionnaire states they should probably be eliminated.

Questionable practices are considered in conference with opponents in 9 institutions; 10 others would eliminate, in the future, any college that had proved unfair in a debate; at least 10 would leave all such matters to be determined by a sense of honor and sportsmanship rather than by agreement or definite ruling.

"Questionable practices may be eliminated in the same way that you create sportsmanship anywhere—by having coaches of high character who play for the love of the game and would rather lose than win dishonorably—by instilling this spirit into the debaters."

"We are trying to insist that debate be a sportsmanlike activity; a supervised student activity. We are willing to risk trusting our opponents. We are trying to enlarge our local debating interest by the squad system and amiably to risk losing debates in order to give more fellows a chance."

"Take the emphasis off winning. You might, in a few cases, once in awhile, justifiably kill a judge or two, or those who act as judges."

"Questionable practices in intercollegiate debating can be eliminated largely by the total exclusion of professional or faculty coaching."

"I think faculty coaching desirable, since it tends to eliminate sharp practices and the 'anything-to-win' policy, and it gives unity of development."

"Questionable practices can best be eliminated by the use of the trained judge. Then they become a losing game."

"Do away with formal verdict of the judges." (To eliminate doubtful practices.)

"Questionable practices can be eliminated only by conference and agreement."

"The most questionable practices are outgrowths of overemphasis on decisions. Unfortunately, nobody can be proved guilty of such overemphasis. Perhaps the best we can do is to refuse to debate with people whose ideals and methods are questionable, but that isn't always practicable."

"But to those of us particularly in the Special Sciences there seems such a vast and practically untouched opportunity to develop in later adoles-

cence straight, objective thinking by less devious and at least less unwholesomely competitive exercises that we feel we have no time for debating under existing rules." (The college has given up debating.)

5. To what extent do your rules allow faculty coaching? The use of the wording not strictly that of the individual debater?

No restrictions by rule or agreement, and more or less faculty coaching is reported in 45 institutions; 19 reported partial coaching, usually of a general, supervisory type; 7 report that debating is supervised by a faculty committee, without definite coaching; 2 rule out all faculty coaching or advice of any kind, and 2 others pay little attention to debating; 6 confine coaching to delivery only, not to argument; 5 report special attempts to encourage student originality; 3 declare that the faculty coach should be totally eliminated.

"I am interested to know the answers you get to question 5. I wish something could be done to eliminate the damnable practice, all too prevalent, of coaches preparing the debate."

"All charts or visual aids to be used by any team are to be submitted for inspection to their opponents 24 hours before the contest. As a result of this rule, I have seen no charts used in years. Personally, I believe charts are unfair as commonly employed."

"The over-coached team will probably lose on the platform if the debate is intelligently judged."

"When a team starts on a debating trip with three suit cases full of debate cards, crammed with data that the coach and his assistants have gathered during a six-months' study of a question, then the height of the ridiculous in debating has been achieved."

6. How do you select judges in your various intercollegiate contests? If you are not satisfied with present methods, kindly outline a method you think would prove more fair.

A list of ten, fifteen, twenty, or more names is submitted to visiting colleges for approval in 26 institutions; the visitors select three judges from list submitted by entertaining college in 4 cases; visitors prepare similar list of fifteen or more from which entertaining college chooses in 4 cases; two judges from home list, one from list of visitors are selected in two instances; one from home and two from visitors are selected in one instance; single expert judge used in 9 colleges; no-decision or forum plan used in 6 colleges; 3 others report they will try expert this year; 3 others report they will try the no-decision type of debating this year; home college selects judges in 8 instances, in two of which this method is reported as not giving satisfaction; judges selected by outside umpire, wholly or partly, in 11 instances; judges are selected by alumni committee of both colleges in 6 cases.

"The main trouble at present is incompetence, not often intentional unfairness."

"I have never discovered a satisfactory judging system."

"The best way out that I see is to cease to judge on the debate and judge on the question. A debate should seek to discover the truth. A judge should not be asked to decide whether the affirmative or negative team puts forth the best forensic effort, but he should vote that the evidence supports either one side or the other. If this were done, it would not be necessary to have judges. The whole audience could act as judges. Then debating would become of service. Instead of going to a debate to watch a forensic display, people would come to receive enlightening information on the questions of the day and could go away better informed than when they came."

"I had just as lief an opponent should hand-pick his judges as not, so long as he picks men known to be honorable. As for their favoring one side or the other, nobody can guess how that will influence their votes."

"A disagreeable difficulty is to guard against 'underground' connections between men proposed as judges and the college proposing them."

"Too many are influenced by pre-conceived notions on the subject. We like no-decision debates, and they have proved to be all right."

"I believe that we can have debates just as eagerly fought out and just as earnest without a decision as with it. After the formal debate we throw the question open to the house for general discussion. To conduct this part successfully needs an experienced chairman."

7. Certain preferences are expressed. No-decision or judgeless debates are preferred by 8 where some other method is now used. The expert judge is preferred by 12 who now use other methods. Removal of emphasis on winning is mentioned by 11. Several speak favorably of the "Oxford Plan." One college suggests that the judges might vote, not on the merits of the debate, but on the merits of the question. Several others believe the judge should be one who has debated or who has taught debating in college.

"I favor no-decision, forum debates. After trying all other systems, I believe it more conducive to emphasizing the true purpose of debate, and to discourage demoralizing incentives. The search for truth should be held supreme, not the winning of a decision."

"I don't think the American university student will ever come to have a passion for public discussion in the sense that the Oxonians have it, but the old style debating is dead as an activity here, and the Oxford Union idea is the only thing I can think of that will revive it." (This comes from a university having about three thousand students.)

"We hope soon to institute a system whereby each judge shall have nine points to award. He might give his decision as A. College 5, B. College 4. Under present conditions, if each judge felt as in the example the decision would be 3-0 in favor of A. College. Under the new plan, the decision would be 15-12, in favor of A. College, which would more nearly represent the opinion of the judges."

"We feel, also, that something must be done to make debating less of a superficial sport and more of a real educational effort to find and spread the truth. To this end we are going to try the no-decision debate and also the debate with two votes by the audience, one before and one after on conviction."

"A system that would score a debate by a point system like 55 to 45 might help."

Information in regard to the success of any of the plans suggested in this report, or any other plans, will be welcome. Any other information contained in the replies to the questionnaire will be gladly sent, except that it will not be possible to inform others as to particular methods used in a certain college by name.—Address Prof. H. A. White, 509 East Chestnut St., Washington, Pennsylvania.

California Alpha.—The debate subject for the year chosen by the Southern California Public Speaking Conference is: Resolved, that Congress should have the power to nullify decisions of the Supreme Court by re-enacting legislation declared unconstitutional. This is the Pi Kappa Delta second choice subject. The decision of the conference to use this question will affect the following institutions: University of Southern California, University of California Southern Branch, Occidental, Pomona, University of Redlands, Whittier, California Institute of Technology, LaVerne, and University of Arizona. The last two named are not members of the conference but usually debate the same subject.

The Redlands chapter is in the throes of raising money for the Eastern debate trip to the convention, having lost money on a play last year for the first time in history. The chapter will probably sponsor a play again this fall under more likely conditions.

*REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER***Upon the Final Returns of the Vote in Selecting the Official Pi Kappa Delta Question.**

We give only one statement of each question. It is not necessarily the official statement.

1. Sixty-nine points: **RESOLVED:** That the United States should enter the World Court of the League of Nations as proposed by President Harding.

First choice of:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Kansas State Agricultural College. | 11. Montana State. |
| 2. Center (Kentucky). | 12. Newberry. |
| 3. Kalamazoo. | 13. Yankton. |
| 4. Dakota Wesleyan. | 14. Franklin. |
| 5. College of Puget Sound. | 15. Simpson. |
| 6. Redlands. | 16. Saint Olaf. |
| 7. Montana Wesleyan. | 17. Tusculum. |
| 8. South Dakota State. | 18. Huron. |
| 9. Colorado Teachers. | 19. Washburn. |
| 10. Oklahoma Baptist. | 20. Colorado Aggies. |

Second choice of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Culver-Stockton. | 3. Westminster. |
| 2. Nebraska Wesleyan. | |

Third choice of:

- | | |
|----------------|--------------|
| 1. Baker. | 3. Carthage. |
| 2. Grove City. | |

2. Twenty-four points: **RESOLVED:** That the Supreme Court should be denied the right to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional.

First choice of: Carthage.

Second choice of:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Northwestern Teachers (Okla). | 5. Maryville. |
| 2. Franklin. | 6. Huron. |
| 3. Akron. | 7. Saint Olaf. |
| 4. Sterling. | 8. Washburn. |

Third choice of:

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Olivet. | 4. Oklahoma Baptist. |
| 2. Kansas Aggies. | 5. Kansas Teachers. |
| 3. Puget Sound. | |

3. Seventeen points: **RESOLVED:** That our present system of immigration should be continued for ten years.

First choice of: Grove City.

Second choice of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Center (Kentucky). | 4. Dakota Wesleyan. |
| 2. Tusculum. | 5. Kalamazoo. |
| 3. Yankton. | 6. Gustavus Adolphus. |

Third choice of:

- | |
|----------------------|
| 1. Redlands. |
| 2. Montana Wesleyan. |

4. Sixteen points: **RESOLVED:** That the federal government should own and operate the coal mines.

First choice of:

- | |
|---------------|
| 1. Maryville. |
| 2. Bradley. |

Second choice of:

1. Baker.
2. Montana Wesleyan.

3. Montana State.

Third choice of:

1. Macalester.
2. Saint Olaf.

3. Nebraska Wesleyan.
4. Colorado Teachers.

5. Fifteen points: RESOLVED: That the United States should subsidize the American Merchant Marine.

First choice of:

1. Sterling.
2. Baker.

Second choice of:

1. Puget Sound.
2. Bradley.

Third choice of:

1. Central (Iowa).
2. Akron.
3. Gustavus Adolphus.

4. Washburn.
5. Kansas Aggies.

6. Fourteen points: RESOLVED: That the United States should adopt an industrial court on the same plan as the Kansas Court for the settlement of industrial disputes in the case of public service companies.

First choice of:

1. Akron.
2. Nebraska Wesleyan.

3. Macalester.

Second choice of:

1. North Normal & Industrial.
2. Colorado Teachers.

Third choice of: Center (Kentucky).

7. Ten points: RESOLVED: That the jury system should be abolished.

First choice of: Kansas Wesleyan.

Second choice of:

1. Hope.
2. Carthage.

3. Oklahoma Baptist.

Third choice of: Huron.

8. Ten points: RESOLVED: That the interallied war debts should be cancelled.

First choice of Kansas Wesleyan.

Second choice of:

1. Colorado Aggies.
2. Simpson.

3. Newberry.
4. South Dakota State.

Third choice of:

1. Tusculum.
2. Yankton.

9. Eight points: RESOLVED: That the United States should abandon the policy of protective tariff.

First choice of: Gustavus Adolphus.

Second choice of: Redlands.

Third choice of:

1. Culver-Stockton.
2. Westminster.

3. Sterling.

10. Seven points: RESOLVED: That the United States should change its constitution so as to give to the states the delegated powers and the federal government the residuary powers.

First choice of Central (Iowa).

Second choice of: Grove City.

Third choice of:

1. Nebraska Wesleyan.

2. Colorado Aggies.

11. Seven points: RESOLVED: That the Ku Klux Klan in the United States should be abolished.

First choice of:

1. Kansas Teachers of Pittsburgh.

2. Hope.

Third choice of: Newberry.

12. Seven points: RESOLVED: That the United States government should recognize the present Russian government.

First choice of: Culver-Stockton.

Second choice of: Kansas Teachers of Pittsburgh.

Third choice of:

1. Simpson.

2. Hope.

13. Six points: RESOLVED: That the Japanese should be excluded from the United States by law.

First choice of:

1. Westminster.

2. Northern Normal & Industrial.

14. Five points: RESOLVED: That there should be compulsory Federal arbitration in labor disputes on railways and in the coal industry.

Second choice of:

1. Central (Iowa).

2. Macalester.

Third choice of: Franklin.

15. Four points: RESOLVED: That the principles of the Huber Unemployment Insurance Bill (Wis.) should be embodied in national legislation.

Second choice of:

1. Olivet.

2. Kansas Wesleyan.

16. Three points: RESOLVED: That the President of the United States be elected by a direct vote of the people.

First choice of: Northwestern Teachers (Okla.).

Several other questions received some scattered second and third choices. At the present time Secretary Westfall is sending out a questionnaire to ascertain what subjects the various colleges are using this year. The result will be announced in the next issue.

The California Gamma chapter and the Alpha chapter may unite in sending a Woman's debate team to the convention, if satisfactory financial arrangements can be negotiated and a convenient schedule arranged.
(271)

BAIRD'S MANUAL

This summer the tenth edition of Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities and Honorary Societies made its appearance. It is three years since the ninth edition appeared and in consequence it is exceedingly interesting to note the growth of the various societies which recognize forensic merit. The three older societies, Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, and Tau Kappa Alpha have grown, especially Pi Kappa Delta which has trebled its chapter roll since 1920.

The most noteworthy recent addition to the ranks of the honorary forensic societies is Alpha Phi Epsilon, which was founded April 29, 1918, at Atlanta, Georgia, by representatives from nine southern colleges. Originally the membership was drawn from one literary or debating society in each institution having a chapter, and all members of that society were members of the intercollegiate society. It was found that this arrangement would not work so the organization went on a regular fraternity basis. It now has chapters in the following institutions: University of Alabama, Alabama Polytechnic, Emory University, Howard College, University of Mississippi, University of Richmond, Southwestern Presbyterian University, John B. Stetson University, University of Tennessee, Centre College, Maryville College, Millsaps College, University of Arkansas, University of Florida, University of Texas, Bethany College, University of Southern California, Rollins College, Colorado Agricultural College.

This organization admits to membership not only debaters but members of literary societies.

Zeta Kappa Psi, women's honorary forensic fraternity has chapters in the Kansas State Agricultural College, Oregon University, Minnesota University, Iowa State Teachers' College, Kansas State Normal, and Oregon Agricultural College.

A new women's oratorical fraternity is Sigma Delta Phi, founded at the University of Michigan in 1918. It has four chapters: University of Michigan, University of Illinois, Ohio State University, University of Indiana.

For the information of members of Pi Kappa Delta we are printing the most recent chapter rolls of Delta Sigma Rho and Tau Kappa Alpha, both of which have made additions in the past three years.

The chapter roll of Delta Sigma Rho is as follows: Chicago, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Northwestern, Wisconsin, Ohio Wesleyan, George Washington, Indiana, Virginia, Missouri, Beloit, Brown, Harvard, Iowa State, Pennsylvania, Texas, Yale, Colorado, Columbia, Dartmouth, Kansas, Ohio State, Syracuse, Wesleyan, Williams, Albion, Carleton, Cornell, Knox, North Dakota, Princeton, Stanford, Swarthmore, Western Reserve, Allegheny, Amherst, Iowa State Teacher's, Oklahoma, Colgate, Washington and Lee, Bates, De Pauw, Southern California, Vassar, Mount Holyoke, Pennsylvania State, Washington State, Washington and Jefferson, Wyoming State, Whitman, Pittsburg, Arizona, Washington, Oregon Agricultural, Wooster, Hamilton, and California.

The chapter roll of Tau Kappa Alpha is as follows: Butler, Cincinnati, Miami, Vanderbilt, North Carolina, Denver, Utah, Muskingum, Richmond, Louisiana State, Lawrence, Vermont, Kentucky, Randolph-Macon, Wabash, Trinity, Washington, Southern California, Oregon, Indiana, Arkansas, Alabama, Dickinson, Clark, Colorado, Ohio, Purdue, St. Lawrence, South Dakota, Tennessee, Westminster, Bethany, Emory and Henry, Mississippi, Monmouth, Occidental, Pennsylvania, Southern Methodist, Lafayette, Rhode Island, Illinois, Middlebury, Augustana, Bucknell, Union, Utah Agricultural, William and Mary, Wittenberg, Roanoke, Young and Emory.

Baird's Manual should be found in every college library as there is vast amount of information contained in it. Even though many of our chapters may not be interested in the records of social fraternities, they will surely wish to see the accounts of the honorary societies. Ask your librarian to procure, or procure it yourself and present it to the library. It is published by James T. Brown, 363 West 20th Street, New York City. The cost is \$4, prepaid.

DEBATING ASSOCIATION OF THE COLLEGES OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Recommendations concerning the list of judges for use throughout the whole State.

It is recommended that a committee of one be selected to compile a list of judges that will be available for use as individual colleges or groups of colleges may desire them. Each college is requested and urged to provide a carefully selected list of names of judges they know to be available. This list should include names of men whom the college has used as judges and found to be satisfactory. It should also include names of alumni and members of the faculty whose training and interests make them particularly valuable as judges. Each college must be certain that the men it recommends are able and willing to serve as judges.

As far as possible each name should be accompanied by the information designated as follows:

College or university; political and religious affiliations; occupations and professions; well known opinions of the proposed judge, his reputation for fairness, etc.

The committee of one shall make any further investigations necessary to secure important information concerning each man named.

The complete list should be representative of the whole State.

Whenever it is requested, the committee of one can select and secure the judges for a particular debate.

It is further suggested that the following regulations govern the judges at debates.

"In rendering his decision each judge shall vote either for the Affirmative or Negative side. In no case shall he declare the debate to be a tie.

"During the debate the judges shall sit apart from one another. Each judge, at the conclusion of the contest, shall, without consultation with any one, register his decision upon the ballot provided, seal it in an envelope, and hand it to the teller who is appointed to receive it."

THE OPEN FORUM OR JUDGELESS DEBATE

After several years trial in local contests, the Debate Board of Swarthmore College, with the general approval of the Faculty and students, has decided to substitute the Open Forum or Parliamentary or Judgeless Debate, as it is variously called, for the familiar method of conducting these inter-collegiate events.

The first step in this direction was made in 1917, when a vote of the audience was substituted for the decision of the usual board of judges, in the Extemporaneous Speaking Contest. This worked so well, both in the results obtained and in the effect upon the interest of the audience, that the practice has been extended to cover all local contests. In 1920, in a local debate, one round of speeches was substituted for the usual plan of division between constructive and rebuttal speeches. This also was approved and adopted in other local contests.

The chance to apply the plan to intercollegiate events was offered by the (273)

request of the Oxford Debating Union for a debate of this type. This debate took place at Swarthmore on October 2, 1922, and won the approval of the largest audience that ever heard a forensic event in Swarthmore. The obvious difficulty of nullifying whatever prejudice the audience might be supposed to feel for the home team was met by splitting the teams, placing two speakers from one college and one from the other upon either side of the question, and by asking the audience to vote, not on the skill of the debaters, but upon their convictions upon the question after hearing the debate, as they would in any deliberative assembly. At the close of the assigned speeches the question was thrown open for discussion from the floor, which continued until the presiding officer called for a division of the House.

It will be seen that this method involves an entire shifting of the emphasis of debate with, as it seems to those interested in debating at Swarthmore, the following definite advantages:

1. It lifts debate from the field of sport into the plane of sincere discussion of public questions. Each speaker is independent of the others, and there is no necessity for sacrificing or suppressing personal convictions in the interest of team play to win a technical decision.

2. It directs the attention of the speaker to the proper end of all public speaking, that of interesting and convincing the audience as a whole rather than three supposed experts in the technique of debating.

3. It eliminates the difficulty of securing judges who are experts in the field, a source of friction between institutions too well known to require comment.

4. It results, despite the removal of elements of sport and partisanship, in a more interesting and valuable discussion from the standpoint of the audience. This fact was brought out by votes taken in various classes following the Oxford debate, as well as by the unanimous approval of the students who actually participate in debates.

These advantages can be obtained, moreover, without the necessary sacrifice of the real benefits of the usual plan. Thorough knowledge of the question, careful analysis and sound evidence, skillfully presented are required in even greater degree of the speaker who must win the audience to his viewpoint in a single speech, without reliance upon the ability of his teammates, and who must pick up the discussion wherever he finds it and carry it on.

Swarthmore believes that the introduction of this system would greatly increase the value of debating in American colleges.

PROFESSOR PHILIP M. HICKS, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

Michigan Alpha.—Coach Elmer C. Griffith makes the following announcement and call for debaters at Kalamazoo:

The Pi Kappa Delta Convention will be held this college year at Peoria, Illinois, about the last of March. Our budget provides for two debaters to attend the Convention taking on such contests in going and returning as may be available. The Pi Kappa Delta question is the World Court.

Freshman Debate—Question: Resolved, That the United States should enter the World Court. It will be used in tryouts and in final debates. Time of tryout to be announced later. You can begin work now. Final debate, Friday evening, January 11th, 1924.

Varsity Men's—The question proposes Federal enactment providing for unemployment insurance similar to the provisions in the Huber legislative bill of Wisconsin. Time of tryouts will be announced in ample time. Final debates in the Michigan Debating League are to be held with Albion and Hope Colleges on the week end of February 15, and with Olivet and Alma two weeks later. A cup is to be presented the winning teams in the League.

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

Series 9

November 1923

Number 2

A MESSAGE FROM THE NATIONAL PRESIDENT

The Fifth Biennial National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta will be held at Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Illinois, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 1, 2, and 3, 1924 with the Illinois Delta Chapter as hosts. This will be the greatest forensic gathering ever held, and an occasion never to be forgotten by those who are privileged to attend. It will be a great forensic carnival. It is the plan of the National Council to transact the necessary business of the convention in the least possible time, thus affording ample opportunity for the several contests and for the discussion of subjects of special interest to the delegates.

There will be held four National Contests: A Men's Oratorical Contest, A Women's Oratorical Contest, A Men's Extempore Speaking Contest, and A Women's Extempore Speaking Contest. Every chapter is entitled to enter a contestant in each of these contests. Judging from the success of the contests held at the Fourth National Convention, we are confident that these intercollegiate oratorical battles will be the greatest ever fought in America, as many of the contestants will have previously won the highest honors in oratory in their own states.

It is our ambition to make the attendance at this convention one hundred per cent strong, that is, each chapter represented by at least one delegate. Colby College is already planning to send four delegates, and Redlands University will be represented by not less than four. Cannot the centrally located chapters do as well as these far-away chapters in Maine and California? Redlands has had four or more delegates present at every convention so far held. If your plans are not already well under way, begin at once. Arrange for some debates en route; give a play or some other entertainment to raise funds; send the largest delegation possible, and let us make the Fifth National Convention the biggest and best yet held.

Professor W. Ross Marvin and the other members of the Illinois Delta Chapter are preparing a royal welcome for us.

CHARLES A. MARSH.

GREETINGS

This time we have to welcome four new chapters to our circle. With these we enter two new states and two already occupied by us. It is with great pleasure we announce the granting of Connecticut Alpha to the Connecticut Agricultural College at Storrs. This chapter is to be installed soon by some of our alumni members at Harvard. We also have to greet Arkansas Alpha, granted to Henderson Brown College at Arkadelphia. Illinois Eta goes to the Illinois State Normal University at Normal. This is a fine institution with a strong forensic record. The list is completed by Oklahoma Epsilon granted to Oklahoma City College. This will strengthen our position in the state. As we go to press, the National Council has in its hand petitions from two excellent institutions recommended by the Charter Committee. These new chapters will be announced in our next issue.

 "THE PLAY'S THE THING"

How to raise money to send delegates to the National Convention next spring is the question that is uppermost in the minds of practically all our chapters at present. There are various means employed to do this. On the whole, however, it seems as though the giving of a play is by all odds the most successful method, provided that one is given which does not make heavy demands in the way of costume, scenery, or royalty. Our California Gamma chapter is planning to give a Greek play, Sophocles' "Philoctetes". C. I. T. is a technical school with only men students. It was hard to find a Greek play—or indeed any play for that matter—with only male characters. This play of Sophocles', however, satisfies the conditions. Such plays offer admirable opportunity for those trained in oratorical work and, paradoxical as it may sound, they are more or less of a novelty. Try one.

 TAKE TIME BY THE FORELOCK

If you have not yet begun to make your plans for sending a delegation or a delegate to Peoria, do it now. The experience of the past conventions leads us to state emphatically that in almost every case where a chapter makes up its mind to be represented, that chapter is represented. It depends almost entirely upon the leadership of the chapter. If your chapter leader is not taking this matter seriously or is delaying the consideration of it, bring at once the strongest pressure to bear upon him or her. Insist upon a strong committee being appointed whose special business shall be the raising of funds to have your chapter representation guaranteed. It is going to be a wonderful gathering and you cannot afford to miss it.

 OUR FOUNDER SPEAKS ON THE PI KAPPA DELTA CODE

My idea further is that we should write some articles for the Forensic on such matters as entertaining the visiting team, being entertained while on a trip, keeping debate agreements, absolute honesty and courtesy throughout the conduct of a debate, generosity and above board dealings in the matter of judges, abolishing the suspicious attitude toward rivals, cutting out the alibis for home consumption, also the brag about strings of victories. My idea is that a college that always wins is a mighty dubious customer—I don't say that those connected are crooks—also let us cultivate the art of losing gracefully. A sorehead attitude gets no one anywhere. These are some of my ideas on what we should embody in our code. I believe they need inculcating. We have chapters that do not understand these principles at all. Raising the ethics of debate is one of P. K. D.'s most eminent missions.—(From a letter written by Egbert Ray Nichols.)