

THE FORENSIC

SERIES 11

MAY, 1925

NUMBER 1

THE BUSINESS SIDE OF FORENSICS

Since the war closed in 1918, there has been a steady increase in forensic activities. This is shown by the following tables based on reports received from 104 of the 108 institutions having chapters of Pi Kappa Delta.

TABLE I.

MEN'S DEBATES

Year	Number of institutions reporting.	Number of debates reported	Average number of debates per institution
1915	48	136	2.83
1916	59	174	2.94
1917	62	183	2.95
1918	55	160	2.90
1919	57	182	3.19
1920	67	229	3.41
1921	81	323	3.98
1922	90	458	5.08
1923	92	545	5.16
1924	99	621	6.27
1925	102	749	7.33

This table shows that many more institutions are engaging in debating now than there were a few years ago and that they are constantly expanding their program. The average number of debates per institution has increased from 3.41 in 1920 to 7.33 in 1925, or .78 debates per year for the past five years. The highest number of debates reported by any one institution each year is shown in Table 2.

TABLE II.

Most Men's debates reported by one institution:

Year	Number of Men's debates reported	Institution
1915	8	Cotner
1916	8	Cotner
1917	8	Cotner
1918	8	Cotner and Ripon
1919	8	Cotner and Ripon
1920	12	Cotner
1921	12	Cotner, Simpson, and Bethany
1922	20	Colorado Agricultural College
1923	18	Park and Southwestern (Kansas)
1924	20	Washburn and Intermountain Union
1925	23	Southwestern (Kansas)

While in the first few years especially, these tables may include under debates for men, debates open to both men and women, for women's forensics were not then well established, the table below has reference to debates for women only. Nothing is more illuminating than the rapid progress in women's debating as revealed in this table, particularly in the increasing number of institutions participating each year. This year, for example, witnessed the beginning of women's debating in Arkansas. There is yet room for expansion.

TABLE III.

WOMEN'S DEBATES

Year	Number of institutions reporting	Number of debates for women reported	Average number of debates per institution
1915	9	18	2
1916	13	22	1.69
1917	18	38	2.11
1918	9	20	2.22
1919	14	28	2
1920	23	49	2.13
1921	31	73	2.35
1922	44	115	2.61
1923	52	134	2.57
1924	54	184	3.40
1925	79	325	4.12

The following table, showing the highest number of women's debates for any one college reported each year, gives some indication of what ambitious programs some of our institutions are carrying.

TABLE IV.

Most women's debates reported by any one institution

Year	Number of Women's debates reported	Institution
1915	4	Hastings
1916	2	Washburn, Kansas State Agricultural College, Redlands, Occidental, Colorado Agricultural College, Fairmount, Morningside, Colorado Teachers College, Kansas Wesleyan, Central Missouri State Teachers College.
1917	6	Hastings
1918	4	Colorado Teachers College
1919	6	Hastings
1920	8	Hastings
1921	8	Hastings
1922	12	Hastings
1923	9	Hastings
1924	12	Colorado Agricultural College
1925	14	Southwestern (Kansas)

While the reports on oratory do not indicate such rapid growth, they do show that each year more of our institutions are engaging in oratory and that they are engaging in more oratorical contests.

TABLE V.

MEN'S ORATORY

WOMEN'S ORATORY

Year	Number of institutions reporting	Number of contests reported	Average per institution	Number of institutions reporting	Number of contests reported	Average per institution
1915	44	65	1.47	9	14	1.55
1916	46	85	1.84	9	12	1.25
1917	52	80	1.53	9	15	1.66
1918	45	62	1.37	10	13	1.30
1919	46	61	1.32	8	11	1.37
1920	54	77	1.42	14	16	1.14
1921	57	84	1.41	11	17	1.54
1922	65	101	1.55	22	28	1.27
1923	75	122	1.62	28	38	1.35
1924	80	145	1.81	31	49	1.57
1925	84	155	1.84	34	55	1.62

These 104 chapters report that their institutions have 66,352 students attending, or an average of 638 students per institution.

While, of course, not all of these are interested in forensics, yet if all should demand an opportunity for forensic experience, with a total of 1,381 contests (1,074 debates, 210 oratorical contests, and 97 extempore contests) scheduled for the year, we find one contest for every 48 students. As most of these contests are debates, and as most of them offer opportunity for three men on a side, it is probably fair to assume that each contest offers opportunity for at least two men, or that one in 24 of our students could have taken part in forensics. This says nothing about the students who compete in the local contests but do not win the right to represent their institutions. Admitting that many students appear several times during the season, it is still well within the facts to say that more opportunities for participation in forensics are being offered our students each year and that an ever growing number are taking advantage of the opportunities offered in debating and oratory. Forensics are on the up-grade, increasing in popularity and support.

What constitutes a full forensic program? In every institution there should be debating and oratory. The less formal and more ready discussion as developed around the extempore contest is a recent form of contest which is rapidly gaining favor. A co-educational institution should offer contests for women as well as men. The old idea of mixed teams does not seem to bring out the women, but where separate contests for them are scheduled, they exhibit a healthy interest.

The following institutions this year scheduled contests in debating, oratory, and extempore speaking for both men and women. This is what we might call a full program.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Iowa Wesleyan | 11. Sioux Falls |
| 2. Kansas State Agricultural College | 12. Hastings |
| 3. Redlands | 13. Grand Island |
| 4. Colorado Agricultural College | 14. South Dakota Northern State Teachers |
| 5. Oklahoma Agricultural College | 15. Upper Iowa |
| 6. Morningside | 16. Sterling |
| 7. Huron | 17. University of California, Southern Branch |
| 8. Colorado Teachers College | 18. Augustana |
| 9. Parsons | 19. Buena Vista |
| 10. South Dakota State College | |

The following have scheduled contests in these three lines for men, but not in all of them for women. It should be observed that some of them do not have women attending.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Washburn | 13. Kansas State Teachers of |
| 2. Nebraska Wesleyan | Pittsburg |
| 3. Southwestern (Kansas) | 14. California Institute of |
| 4. Dakota Wesleyan | Technology |
| 5. Kansas State Teachers of | 15. Maryville |
| Emporia | 16. William Jewell |
| 6. Simpson | 17. Missouri Wesleyan |
| 7. Yankton | 18. Culver-Stockton |
| 8. Westminster | 19. Illinois State Normal |
| 9. Park | 20. Henderson-Brown |
| 10. University of Tulsa | 21. Bethany |
| 11. Cotner | 22. McKendree |
| 12. Doane | |

There are no institutions reporting a full line of contests for women which do not also have a full line for men.

The following report that they engage in both debate and oratory for both men and women.

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Illinois Wesleyan | 9. Hope |
| 2. Central (Iowa) | 10. Franklin |
| 3. Des Moines | 11. Michigan State Normal |
| 4. Fairmount | 12. Puget Sound |
| 5. Kalamazoo | 13. Jamestown |
| 6. Heidelberg | 14. Linfield |
| 7. Olivet | 15. Kansas State Teachers of Hays |
| 8. Bradley | 16. North-Western |

Debating and oratory for men are scheduled in the following other institutions:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Ottawa | 15. Oklahoma Baptist |
| 2. Ripon | 16. Presbyterian |
| 3. Eureka | 17. Saint Olaf |
| 4. Kansas Wesleyan | 18. Centre |
| 5. Intermountain Union | 19. Gustavus Adolphus |
| 6. Central (Missouri) | 20. Newberry |
| 7. Montana State | 21. Hamline |
| 8. Baldwin-Wallace | 22. Oklahoma City |
| 9. Macalester | 23. Bethany |
| 10. Wofford | 24. Ouachita |
| 11. Georgetown | 25. Kentucky Wesleyan |
| 12. Southwestern (Texas) | 26. Carroll |
| 13. Hiram | 27. East Texas State Teachers |
| 14. Baker | 28. North Carolina State |

Eight other institutions offer debating and oratory for women:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Occidental | 5. Kansas State Teachers of |
| 2. Southwestern (Kansas) | Pittsburg |
| 3. Kansas State Teachers of | 6. Missouri Wesleyan |
| Emporia | 7. Culver-Stockton |
| 4. University of Tulsa | 8. McKendree |

Carthage and Nebraska State Normal have debating and extempore for both men and women, but no oratory. These institutions offer debating and extempore for men or for women as indicated.

For Men:

1. College of the Pacific
2. Coe
3. Western Union
4. Lombard

For Women:

1. Dakota Wesleyan
2. Maryville
3. Bethany

Doane reports extempore and oratory for women but no debating. Debating is the only forensic activity in the following institutions: There are schedules for both men and women.

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Michigan State | 5. Connecticut Agricultural College |
| 2. Tusculum | 6. Central Missouri State Teachers |
| 3. University of Akron | 7. Howard Payne |
| 4. Northwestern State Teachers of Oklahoma | |

Debating for men is the only forensic activity at Colby.

Debating is the only forensic activity open to women in the following institutions:

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Ottawa | 13. Baldwin-Wallace |
| 2. Washburn | 14. Macalester |
| 3. Nebraska Wesleyan | 15. Monmouth |
| 4. Eureka | 16. College of Emporia |
| 5. Simpson | 17. College of the Pacific |
| 6. Yankton | 18. Oklahoma City |
| 7. Park | 19. Illinois State Normal |
| 8. Cotner | 20. Henderson-Brown |
| 9. Kansas Wesleyan | 21. Otterbein |
| 10. Intermountain Union | 22. Carroll |
| 11. Central (Missouri) | 23. Western Union |
| 12. Montana State | 24. Lombard |

Women's forensics at Ottawa are limited to oratory.

Every institution is interested in keeping pace with the forward march in forensics. But there must be funds to carry on the forensic program. Each institution should begin efforts to put its forensics upon a sure financial foundation. In an effort to get information which would assist in this, Π K Δ has collected certain data from its chapters during the year. This information discloses some interesting things.

Eighty-eight institutions have a definite forensic budget from year to year which they know in advance; 14 do not.

This budget is usually assigned by the faculty, the board of trustees or similar governing agency, or thru some organization of the student body. The following table shows how these budgets are assigned.

TABLE VI.

Methods of assigning forensic budgets

	Number
1. Thru the faculty, usually by the executive committee.....	28
2. Thru the board of trustees	12
3. Thru the student body, by a council, often on the recommendation of the coach	29
4. Method not given	19

These budgets vary between wide extremes. The smallest budget reported was \$84. Upon this slender income the chapter was planning to engage in 11 debates, 4 oratorical and 1 extempore contest, an average of \$5.25 per contest. It should be explained that this institution is situated in Southern California where it does not have to travel any distance to speak of to carry

thru its forensic program. Another institution with a budget of \$150, scheduled 20 debates, a debate for every \$7.50 to be expended. With only \$175 available, a third institution plans to engage in 7 debates and 2 oratorical contests. There are other examples of highly efficient expenditures of funds.

The largest budget reported was one which included \$582 for oratory and \$1,523 for debating, a total of \$2,105. With this large bank account supporting it, this institution has scheduled 28 debates, and 4 oratorical and 2 extempore contests. This would mean an expenditure of \$61.91 per contest. While this cost is perhaps a bit high, it can be explained, partially at least, by the fact that the institution is situated where it must travel a good deal to carry on its forensic program, and because it follows the extensive system of giving training to as many students as possible rather than intensive training to a few.

The average budget for the 90 schools reporting budgets was \$501.33. The average number of contests engaged in was 15.86. The average cost per contest was \$32.31. As a matter of fact, I believe the average was even lower than this, because these figures are based on the proposed schedules of many of these institutions as they were reported early in the forensic season. I know that many of them added to them materially without receiving additional funds.

Where the budget is raised by student fees, the institutions reported forensic fees per student as follows:

TABLE VII.
Student fees for forensics

Amount	Number of institutions	Amount	Number of institutions
\$.01 - \$.24	3	\$1.25 - \$1.49	4
\$.25 - \$.49	7	\$1.50 - \$1.74	3
\$.50 - \$.74	15	\$1.75 - \$1.99	2
\$.75 - \$.99	10	\$2.00 - \$2.24	10
\$1.00 - \$1.24	12	\$2.25 - \$2.49	1
		\$2.50 - \$2.74	3

The smallest fee was \$.13 while the largest was \$2.60. The average was \$1.09.

These fees represent varying percentages of the total student activity fee as shown below. The smallest was 1% and the largest, 50%, depending, of course, upon what activities and how many were carried on the activity fee. The average was 11.82%

TABLE VIII.
Proportion of the activity fee assigned to forensics.

Percentage	Number of institutions		
0 - 4%	16	20-24%	5
5 - 9%	22	25-29%	3
10-14%	13	30-34%	1
15-19%	10	50%-	1

In addition 19 chapters raised \$2,489 thru some form of activities, an average of \$131 per chapter. The following activities were mentioned:

TABLE IX
Activities for raising forensic funds.

Activity	Number of times mentioned
Dramatics, plays, movies, and vaudeville	12
Admission to debates, mainly from those not students	10

Support thru literary societies	1
Lyceum course	1
Selling refreshments	1
Selling books	1

In 78 institutions the forensic committee has complete charge of the expenditure of funds; in 17 it does not. Different methods of expending the funds are employed, as shown below:

TABLE X.

Methods of expending the forensic budget.

Method	Number of institutions
By the coach	24
By the college treasurer on presentation of properly authorized bills	21
By the chapter of Π K Δ	7
By a forensic committee and the coach	7
By the administration of the college	5
By the college treasurer and debate coach	2
By the treasurer of the student body	2
By the activity manager and faculty committee	1
By a faculty member not the coach	1
By the literary society board	1

What is the place of Π K Δ in this financial situation?

The only excuse for the presence of a chapter of Π K Δ in an institution is its ability to help advance forensics. It is of interest to note what the chapters are doing.

In 48 institutions Π K Δ has charge of administering the forensic program. In 6 more it acts in an advisory capacity, and has joint control in 4 others. In 38 it does not have control of the forensic program.

In 44 institutions there is a separate forensic committee from the student body. In 40 there is not. Where there is a separate committee the chapter has something to do with selecting it in 11 institutions. In 43 it does not.

The chapters list various activities. Table 11 indicates something of these.

TABLE XI.

Activities	Number of times mentioned
Promote forensics	46
This includes interesting the student body entertaining visiting teams, conducting forensic banquets and social entertainments, looking after the business end of forensics	
Advance high school forensics, entertaining high school debaters, furnishing judges for high school debates and other contests	6
Conduct inter-society, inter-class, and other local contests to create greater interest in forensics	6
Conduct plays and other activities to raise funds for forensics	5
There is a great deal of variation in the methods of meeting.	

TABLE XII.

Time	Times of meeting for chapters	Number of chapters
Weekly		2
Every two weeks		15
Monthly		40
When business requires, but not at any regular interval		24
Three or four times a year		3
Six or seven times a year		2
Twice a year.....		1
At the call of the president		12

One desirable form of publicity that any chapter may obtain is in connection with its new members. If those who make the forensic teams are publicly pledged, or if their election to membership is publicly announced, some fitting notice of the honor of winning membership in an honorary organization is given. The existence and importance of $\Pi K \Delta$ is thus brought to the attention of the whole student body.

Eighty-seven chapters publicly announce in the college assembly or thru the college paper those who are elected to membership in $\Pi K \Delta$. Twelve do not. Only 27, however, publicly pledge their members while 70 do not.

What is $\Pi K \Delta$? There are many honorary organizations in every institution now which grant membership for one thing or another and confer on their members the right to wear a key or special insignia of some sort. That is all some of them do. The value of such an organization to the institution where its chapter is located can well be questioned. It is receiving funds from the members of the student body without returning value received. A recent college graduate stated in a letter of application that he belonged to eleven honorary organizations, not knowing that the prospective employer, who was also a college man and who belonged to some dead-head honorary organizations, would not be favorably impressed, and in fact was influenced against the applicant. The employer put him down as an activity "fan" whose college ambition was to accumulate a string of keys to decorate his breast. No college student could have time to belong to eleven honorary organizations which were actually doing anything.

$\Pi K \Delta$ has no ambition to be an organization whose sole function is to confer the right to wear a key. There is too much to be done. Forensics do not occupy the position of influence and attention they are entitled to by virtue of their importance and value. It is the business and duty of the organization as a whole to advance forensics by every laudable means within its power and each chapter is especially charged with the obligation of creating more interest in forensics on its own campus, of obtaining better support for the various forms of this activity, and of elevating the standards. Unless each chapter is actively engaged in this great task, it is doubtful whether or not it is justifying its existence. It should be able to point to definite, specific tasks it has undertaken and to measure tangible achievements. Then and only then will it become the power for good that it should be. Worth while students will eagerly work for the distinction of wearing the emblem of such an organization and cherish its membership as one of the prized distinctions of a college course.

And now read this indictment of our society. We asked each of our chapters whether or not it had permitted the local organization to become merely an agency which conferred the right to wear an emblem. Sixty-four replied no and were able to point to some worth-while results which had followed from the presence of $\Pi K \Delta$ in their institution. Twenty-six others, however, were not able to show that their chapter had accomplished anything worth while. In these days when many students are struggling thru

college on slender means, it is hard to justify an organization which collects a four dollar initiation fee and the price of a key and contributes nothing to the individual or the institution. Why wear a key unless that key means something? What that key shall mean depends upon what you as an individual and your chapter as a chapter are willing to make it mean,

There is no place that a $\Pi K \Delta$ chapter can function more efficiently than in putting forensics on the right financial foundation. First, it should see that the very best possible type of forensics is produced in the institution, keen, interesting debates, strong, forceful orations. It should keep in touch with every development and forward step. Second, with such a program behind it, it can win the interest and support of the students. If the student body is once convinced that forensics are amounting to something and bringing the college some returns, it will give generous financial backing. To win this confidence is peculiarly the work of the $\Pi K \Delta$ chapter. Third, the chapter should have a good organization, meet regularly, set itself some definite and specific tasks, and be able to point at the end of each year to some tangible achievements.

THE FINANCING OF FORENSICS

W. H. VEATCH, *National First Vice-President*

California Epsilon, University of California, Southern Branch

There is no question that the financing of inter-collegiate forensic events is one of the most troublesome problems of the faculty member in charge of forensics and of the students vested with this responsibility. Oratory and debate cannot be carried on without money and with very few exceptions, forensic events do not pay for the expenses that they pile up. Of course the amount of expense that forensics in an institution costs, varies from school to school. A transcontinental debating trip can scarcely be undertaken with less than two thousand dollars, thus making the budget of some schools run close to three thousand dollars, while I was informed by a student manager a few weeks ago that his school had financed sixteen debates and three oratorical contests and one extempore contest on eighty dollars. When asked how he did it he stated that they paid nothing for transportation, getting some student to use his car, that they paid no fees to judges, consequently having a hard time to land them, and that about the only expenses that they did not force some one else to pay were the fees to the various debate and oratory associations to which they belonged.

Again, schools vary as to the ease with which they can obtain funds. One coach in an eastern state asserts that he estimates the cost of the forensic season and goes in and tells his president, who opens a check book and writes a check to the coach for the amount. In another school on the Pacific Coast, the Head of the Public Speaking work personally financed the whole debating schedule of thirteen debates. It is needless to state that both these cases are uncommon. I never met such a college president and I didn't think there was a college faculty member who could do it.

There are on the whole, four methods used to support intercollegiate forensics. Assistance by gift from either inside or outside the school, support by the administration, support by student association funds, and, fourth, support by the students engaged in the activity.

The most outstanding example of outside aid has been at the University of Southern California, where there is an endowment of over fifty thousand dollars devoted to inter-collegiate forensics. This is not the sole support either, for the student association gives forensics about as much as does the

average school of the same size. This enables U. S. C. to support what is probably the most extensive forensic schedule of any college in the country. And, "To them that hath shall be given," is well illustrated here for the gate receipts of the U. S. C.-Oxford debate were announced as over fifteen hundred dollars. Oratory, particularly, has always been aided by gifts from the outside. It has been fairly easy to get alumni to give a prize for the annual oratorical contest, and to get business men of the college town to contribute funds to send the orator to distant contests. Notice also the ease with which Bates College raised sufficient funds to send its debating team to England. Today, the best method of gaining such outside assistance seems to be the commercial and service clubs of the college town and nearby cities. One commercial club contributed four hundred dollars to assist a nearby college debating team to make a transcontinental trip.

Support or partial support of intercollegiate forensics by the college administration is very good when it can be gained. The main difficulties are that the average college administration has so many calls for financial aid from various departments that the amount available to be contributed is generally not very large. It is more liable to be able to contribute scholarships to winners of local contests than to give real financial aid. And yet, if he is at all sympathetic, practically every college president can aid in long forensic trips from college funds.

The third and most frequently as well as most successfully used form of support is that of sharing with athletics and other activities the fees collected by the student association of the college. The danger here lies in the fact that the apportionment of these student funds being made by student officers, and these student officers being elected many times on a basis of personal popularity thru prominent in athletics, tend to contribute very extensively to athletics which has a great source of income thru the gate receipts and to refuse needed support to forensics which has practically no other means of support. In fact, I know of one institution where the student officers came to the coach of debating shortly after Thanksgiving and informed him that football had spent two thousand dollars more from the student association treasury than they had authorized it to, consequently all forensics for the year would have to be abandoned because if they didn't abandon forensics, basketball, track, or baseball would have to be curtailed in some way. There should be a definite sum, or better yet a definite percentage of the student fees allotted to intercollegiate forensics, in order that as the school grows the forensic development may keep pace with it. A second danger in regard to this form of support lies in the fact that there has been a great growth in the extent of intercollegiate forensics in recent years and that some times it is hard to make officers of student associations see that a larger sum is needed than in the day when the state oratorical contest and possibly one debate with the nearest school constituted a forensic season. Personally, I have never found such student officials difficult to handle when there is a real case for a larger apportionment. At Dakota Wesleyan University, when we found our forensic apportionment of one dollar and five cents per student per year too little to run forensics on, a short educational campaign succeeded in raising it to one dollar and thirty-five cents per student per year.

The fourth method of having the forensic activities supported in any way by the coach or the students engaged in the activity should never have to be used. And yet it surely does show an immense enthusiasm for forensics, and yes, for an ungrateful school, when they do contribute. The appropriations for forensics should be enough to pay all expenses of contestants and coaches to events. If cars are used, enough should be paid the owner to compensate for the use of the car and not merely enough to pay for the gas and oil, the car owner contributing the rest. When teams go on trips they

should be given good hotel accommodations and not given second rate accommodations or lodged in the dormitories of the school visited. The appropriations should be sufficient to cover these points and a failure to cover them means that the students involved are paying in decreased comfort or in actual money part of the expense involved. When no fees are paid for judges, it means either that second rate judges are being used or that the judges are asked to pay part of the legitimate expense of running the contest. Unfortunately there are a large number of schools that are forced to use such methods of financing a forensic schedule that corresponds with the size and status of the institution.

I do not believe that the average college can support an average forensic schedule on less than five hundred dollars per year without using this fourth method of supporting these activities. Look your own forensic budget over and see whether you are paying all of the legitimate expenses of your forensic program or whether your coaches, your debaters and orators, yes and the judges of your contests, are paying part of the expenses of carrying on your schedule. The thing that every chapter of $\Pi K \Delta$ should work for should be a forensic schedule that corresponds to the status of the college in which it is located, and this should include the trip to the National Convention every two years, and that all of the expenses of this schedule should be paid from the forensic funds. If this schedule cannot be carried out without appealing to the loyalty of those participating, allow them to contribute but as rapidly as possible extend your forensic funds so that such contributions will not be needed.

As a remedy for any lack in your forensic funds, first try to get your forensic apportionment increased to the place where it will carry out the ideal, a forensic schedule commensurate with the standing of your school, and all of the expenses of this schedule paid from forensic funds. There is no reason why this should not be granted by whatever source forensic funds are derived from. Present the case in its proper light and you ought to get results. Then when you have special trips on hand, your college ought to be able to assist you from its publicity funds. I know of no better publicity than may be gained by the sending of a debating team if it is accompanied by the proper amount of attempt to secure the publicity, and if a college fails to make use of such means that is the fault of its publicity workers and not of its forensic activities. The local commercial and service clubs are usually quite generous. Do not try to have them aid you in making up a deficit or in financing your regular schedule, but when you are planning a trip or something out of the ordinary, don't forget to call them in, because if your trip will aid the community in any way, they will be glad to aid. Then on the matter of outside gifts. Alumni who have engaged in oratory or debate themselves will often be very glad to contribute cash prizes or medals as prizes for contests. ExGovernor Lowden of Illinois, a graduate of the University of Iowa, has endowed the Northern Oratorical Leagues prizes, and many others have done the same thing to a greater or lesser extent. Many schools have these prizes already provided for. If this is true in your case, why not try to create an endowment for your chapter of $\Pi K \Delta$. Place a restriction upon it so that the principal of it could not be spent and restrict the use of the income to intercollegiate forensics. It wouldn't make any difference if it were small. It would help.

The big thing is to try to do something. Practically everyone connected with forensics realizes that his school cannot come up to the ideal set, and all have known this for a long time, but the most that they have done is to sit around and "moan" about it. Get busy and try to remedy the situation in your own school and you will find some answer to the problem. The first move is to "get busy."

FINANCING FORENSICS IN THE SMALL COLLEGE**ALBERT KEISER, Ph. D.****Forensic Coach, South Dakota Eta
Augustana College**

The financing of forensics at a small college, such as Augustana with a student body closely approaching 400, is an important matter, since it must share substantially in the student's privilege fee and cannot exist or flourish as university forensics might do on the crumbs of a sumptuous banquet. We in South Dakota feel that extemporaneous speaking, oratory, and debate concern the whole school community, and are wide in their appeal, giving practically an equal opportunity to women who are often condemned to be onlookers in the sports which the great bulk of the privilege fee supports. At Augustana a representative committee of students and faculty members assigns to each activity its equitable share. Twenty to twenty-five per cent of a privilege fee of ten dollars a year seems to be a fair amount for an activity which develops in the best possible manner a relatively large number of students, especially if those trying out for positions are counted. It is true not all, in particular our 150 academy people, share directly in an equal manner the benefits of personal developments as the upper classes, but nevertheless, by hearing good speaking and observing correct methods, they learn to equip themselves more fully for the responsibilities and privileges that await them. A judicious and democratic system of rewards, as for instance the presentation of Pi Kappa Delta keys, is like bread thrown upon waters, which will return manifold in good will and increased support.

Our Forensic Board, composed of faculty and student members, manages to balance the budget; in fact has a good surplus in the treasury at the end of the season. Now we are looking forward to the Pi Kappa Delta National Convention at Estes Park next year, to which we expect to send a good delegation, at least as to numbers. It is likely that our portion of the privilege fee will not support adequately such an expanded forensic program, and in view of that fact our chapter is planning to present a worth while play next year—not the thin light stuff and silly slush so often seen now-a-days, but something both interesting and really good.

It is hard to determine what the ration should be of money spent for extempore speaking, oratory, and debating, as so much depends upon the circumstances of a particular year. But it would seem, taking also the number of participants into consideration, that to debate should go from three-fourths to four-fifths of the whole sum. Equally uncertain is the amount to be expended for a debate. We figure that on the average two debates cost from \$60 to \$80. The distance to be covered and the system of judging used are of course the determining factors which might make the range even greater.

If the money assigned to forensics is thus judiciously expended on worth while public speaking, increased support with the development of a greater number of able and aspiring students will result, which greater interest will in turn lead to better financial backing of a noble art. When real and wide-spread interest is once aroused, the financing of forensics ceases to be a problem.

SOUTHWESTERN PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

The delegates for the Southwestern Provincial Convention assembled at Oklahoma Alpha, the Agricultural College, Stillwater, April 2, 3, and 4. Professor George D. Wilmer, of Kansas Epsilon at Fairmount, presided. The following chapters were represented: Oklahoma Alpha, 14 delegates; Tulsa, Oklahoma Beta, 7; Oklahoma Baptist, Gamma, 1; Oklahoma City, Epsilon, 4; Washburn, Kansas Beta, 2; Kansas Aggies, Gamma, 2; Fairmount, Epsilon, 6; Kansas Teachers of Pittsburg, Theta, 5. There were present also 2 visitors from Harding College, Arkansas; 3 from Phillips University, Oklahoma; and 2 from Texas A. and M. National President Alfred Westfall, Colorado Alpha, was present representing the national council.

The debating tournament opened Thursday afternoon and finished Friday evening. The results are shown below;

FIRST ROUND

Washburn, negative, won over Tulsa, affirmative.
 Kansas Teachers, negative, won from Oklahoma Aggies, affirmative.
 Fairmount, negative, won from Kansas Teachers, affirmative.
 Southwestern, negative, won from Fairmount, affirmative.
 Southwestern, affirmative, won from Tulsa, negative.

Because the negative was winning all of the time and it was impossible for some of the schools to debate both sides of the question, special arrangements were used to continue the tournament.

SECOND ROUND.

Kansas Teachers, negative, won from Tulsa, affirmative.
 Oklahoma Aggies, affirmative, won from Fairmount, negative.
 Washburn, negative, won from Kansas Teachers, affirmative.
 Fairmount, affirmative, won from Tulsa, negative.
 Oklahoma Aggies, negative, won from Southwestern, affirmative.

THIRD ROUND

Southwestern, negative, won from Washburn, affirmative.
 Oklahoma Aggies, negative, won from Kansas Teachers, affirmative.
 Fairmount drew a bye in this round.

SEMI-FINALS.

Oklahoma, negative, won over Fairmount, affirmative.
 Southwestern drew a bye.

FINALS.

Southwestern, negative, won from Oklahoma Aggies, affirmative.
 The women's extempore was awarded to Miss Elizabeth Boyd, Oklahoma Aggies, the only entrant.

There were but two entrants in the women's oratorical.
 Helen Boyle representing Oklahoma Aggies spoke on "World Safety."
 Beth Hackendorf representing Tulsa spoke on "The Open Road."
 The six judges made the contest a tie. In the draw to settle it, first place went to Miss Hackendorf.

The men's oratorical resulted as follows:
 First, "In Contempt of Court," Kingsley Given, Kansas Aggies.
 Second, "The Monument of the Mountain," Cecil Headrick, Southwestern.
 Third, "Fruits of Conquest," Archie Booth, Fairmount.
 Fourth, "The New American," Lawrence Evans, Washburn.

MEN'S EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING CONTEST

General Subject.....Our Constitution.

Subject prepared by Professor L. K. Horner, Oklahoma University.

First, "Marshall and the Constitution," Andrew Coleman, Tulsa.

Second, "The Constitution and its Amendments," Theodore Metz, Washburn.

Third, "Jefferson and the Constitution," Don Ketch, Southwestern.

Also speaking:

"Judicial Expansion of the Constitution," S. O. Jones, Kansas Teachers.

"Congressional Expansion of the Constitution," James Williams, Oklahoma Aggies.

"Our Constitution in providing checks and balances has failed to provide a check on the Supreme Court." Edward Potts, Oklahoma City.

One of the pleasant features of the convention was the banquet Friday evening given by the Oklahoma Alpha chapter. There was a program of after dinner speeches that were entertaining and pleasing to all. National President Westfall issued a glowing invitation to all chapters to be present at the national convention in Colorado next year. Every chapter present is planning to send a delegation.

NORTHERN PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

Ten colleges from 3 different states were represented by the 40 delegates at the Northern Provincial Convention at South Dakota Alpha, Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, April 8-10. They were: North Dakota Alpha, Jamestown; Iowa Iota and Kappa at Western Union and Buena Vista; and South Dakota Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, and Eta, at Dakota Wesleyan, Huron, Yankton, State College, Sioux Falls, Northern State Teachers, and Augustana. National President Alfred Westfall, Colorado Alpha, was present representing the National Council.

The Convention opened Wednesday evening with a reception by the members of the Alpha chapter and an initiation at which 21 members were taken in, 14 from Wesleyan, 3 from Yankton, and 4 from Augustana. The initiation was in charge of President Westfall.

The debating tournament opened Thursday morning.

The program of the women's tournament follows. All of the debates were on the question of Japanese Exclusion.

Wesleyan, affirmative, won from Huron, negative.

Wesleyan, negative, won from Northern Teachers, affirmative.

Northern Teachers, negative, won from Huron, affirmative.

This left two Wesleyan and one Northern Teachers teams in the field. The Teachers defeated first the Wesleyan affirmative and then, changing side, the Wesleyan negative, winning the tournament.

The men debated the Capital Punishment question. The results follow:

Huron, negative, won from Yankton, affirmative.

Augustana, affirmative, won from Northern Teachers, negative.

Northern Teachers, negative, won from Wesleyan, affirmative.

State College, negative, won from Sioux Falls, affirmative.

Huron, affirmative, won from Wesleyan, negative.

Northern Teachers, affirmative, won from Sioux Falls, negative.

Augustana, negative, won from State College, affirmative.

Yankton, negative, won from Jamestown, affirmative.

SECOND ROUND

Augustana, affirmative, won from Northern Teachers, negative.

Augustana, negative, won from Northern Teachers, affirmative.

Yankton, affirmative, won from Huron, negative.

Huron, affirmative, won from State College, negative.