

YOUNG AND ACTIVE

Ohio Eta chapter, of Bowling Green State College, which was admitted to membership at the national convention at Wichita, will be host to the convention of the Province of the Lakes, April 16, 17. Plans are being perfected to make this meeting one of the best of the thirteen provinces.

This college is one of four established for the training of teachers in 1910. It opened in 1915, and has had a remarkable growth. Its combined student body now numbers over 1000. The physical equipment consists of a campus of over 42 acres, seven buildings in use, and another under construction, the value of which is about two and a half million dollars. The library and gymnasium are among the finest in the state.

Preparations are being made to accommodate about one hundred delegates in the Province convention. Contests in oratory, extempore speaking and debate for men and women will be held. There are sixteen colleges in the Province.

Ohio Eta chapter is completing its biggest year in debate. By the time the convention begins, the men's squad of eighteen shall have held thirty-nine debates with twenty-two different colleges and universities. The women's teams shall have held nine intercollegiate debates. The chapter will also be represented in various oratorical contests in the state, and will be fully represented in the provincial contests. Plans are already in the making looking forward to a good representation at the next national convention. In all, thirty-two men and women shall have had training in various forms of public speaking during the year. During the Christmas vacation, a men's debate team debated their way to and from Winter Park, Florida, where they engaged in a series of debates with Rollins College. These men are holders of the degree of special distinction in debate.

LIFE IS NOT A STATE; IT IS A PROCESS

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

At every step along the road which men have trod, the hill which they have climbed, there has been conflict. Always the man of active type, the man of "common sense," believes that he has reached the goal. This is the place, he thinks, where men should live, where they should settle down, master the coun-

try, reap its fruits, and live their lives in peace. But always men have found that in the spirit of man there is no peace in this inactive sense. The man who does not climb slips back. Nothing can be more clear than that a thought accepted, put in action, and kept free from criticism, becomes with every day less true, less vital—becomes more false. A thought believed and only that, becomes unworthy of belief. And so man ever goads himself again to travel the unending road. His life is not a state; it is a process.



ILLINOIS HAS OLDEST INTERCOLLEGIATE
ORATORICAL CONTEST

The Oracle, student publication of Monmouth College, claims that Illinois has the oldest intercollegiate oratorical contest in the United States. It was organized in the '70's by Knox College and Monmouth College.

"During the past half century," states *The Oracle*, "William Jennings Bryan, Jane Addams, Charles Wishart, John H. Findley and other speakers of note, have taken part in the contest. In his only appearance in it Wm. J. Bryan won second place, losing first to a Monmouth College representative."

At present the Association has ten member schools, seven of which belong to Pi Kappa Delta.



OSHKOSH STATE TEACHERS HOSTS TO
PI KAPPA DELTA CONVENTION

(Continued from page 211)

Wisconsin

- Alpha-----Ripon College, Ripon, Prof. H. B. Boody.
- Beta-----Carroll College, Waukesha, Prof. V. A. Utzinger.
- Gamma---Oshkosh State Teachers College, Oshkosh, Prof. N. S. James.

IN CHARGE OF THE VARIOUS CONTESTS

- Men's Debating-----B. E. Jacobs, Ripon
- Women's Debating-----G. E. Oliver, North Central College
- Oratory-----V. A. Utzinger, Carroll
- Extempore-----H. B. Allen, Shurtleff College

SOCIAL PROGRAM

Besides the full schedule of contests the Illinois Province will feature three evenings of entertainment consisting of one general social gathering, a "party" or something; a humorous debate; and a banquet program.

H. L. Ewbank of the speech department of the U. of W., will be the principal speaker at the convention. His subject will be "Speech Contests as Educational Techniques." He will also judge the Eau Claire-Oshkosh debate March 6.

SHOULD THE NATIONS ADOPT A POLICY OF FREE TRADE?

Both sides of the case as presented in the Southwestern College Debate Tournament by Albert Tener and Theron Ashley of Park College.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

MR. TENER

Mr. Chairman:

The question for debate is, Resolved: That the nations should adopt a policy of free trade. Perhaps two terms in this question need clarification. We take "nations" to mean the major nations or major economic units, and the term "free trade" to mean, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, the abolition of all duties except those for purposes of revenue only.

Obviously tariffs not for purposes of revenue are for the purpose of protecting home industry. So this question might just as well be restated, Resolved: That the nations should abolish those tariffs designed for the protection of home industry.

We wish you to note that tariffs are not the only means of protecting the industries of a nation; there are other means. To quote Salvadore de Madariaga from his article "Our Muddling World" in the *Forum*, February 1929, "Tariffs are only one form of protection." As a matter of fact, the natural inequalities of the nations themselves is a means of protection. Geographical advantage, natural resources, inventive genius, mass production, and cultural advantages are all means of protecting home industry.

Now in the light of this fact that there are means of protecting home industry other than by protective tariff barriers, the real issue in this debate is not whether home industries should be protected, but rather to what extent home industries should be protected.

We believe that the home industries of the major nations should not be protected by a tariff system for six very definite reasons.

In the first place, the tariff system is inefficient. Take, for example, the situation in Europe which has arisen since the World War. The new boundaries which were set up were racial

and political rather than commercial and economic boundaries. Each new nation wanted to be self-sufficient, so each erected high tariff barriers, and the result was that Europe's economic system stagnated. According to Alfred P. Dennis, vice chairman of the U. S. Tariff Commission in his article in the *Saturday Evening Post*, December 13, 1926, "Tariff Walls in Europe": ". . . Austria Hungary was an economic whole before the war, now she is a commercial islet in central Europe. Italy prevents her from forming customs unions with her former states, and France prevents her from forming customs unions with Germany. Custom duties separate materials from workers, ores from factories, agricultural lands from industrial centers, producers from markets, and customers from purveyors." Mr. Dennis further points out that, ". . . In a meeting of the International Chamber of Commerce, in Stockholm, a bill of lading was displayed on a carload of coal shipped from Poland to Austria, some 200 miles, which was larger than the parchment upon which was inscribed the Declaration of Independence, and was frescoed over with stamps and certificates of 15 inspections estimated at 3 hours each. Under these conditions the Austrian consumer cannot purchase Polish coal and yet Austria needs coal, and Poland has coal to sell. . . ." so both Austria and Poland would benefit by a removal of the impediments on coal. But Austria and Poland are not the only countries which suffer. The German economic system is cut in two by the Dantzie Corridor and is mutilated by the loss of Lorraine iron ore, Alsacian potash, Silesian coal, and Posnan beet sugar. The Esthonian-Latvian frontier is divided in half by tariff walls, the city of Teschen is divided into three distinct commercial units by tariff walls, and so the story of Europe goes, much too long for me to give completely, but certainly you grasp the significant truth; tariffs are an inefficient means of protecting home industry, and in the light of this evidence you can easily see why the Britannica gives this general conclusion, Vol. 9, page 755 in its article "Free Trade," ". . . Governments are unsuited to regulate industry because of pressure from interests and influence from statesmen, they discriminate between industries; they discriminate by political boundaries and not by economic and commercial relations."

After noting the glaring inefficiency of the tariff system our second contention almost presents itself. A policy of free trade has the sanction of economists and financiers the world over. It is a generally recognized fact that the leading economists almost unanimously favor free trade. Of course, the

mere fact that so many of the world's thinkers favor free trade does not prove that the nations of the world should adopt a policy of free trade, but it does indicate that there must be something decidedly wrong with the present system and it does tend to show that free trade has a practical basis and is not a mere speculative theory.

Still another fact gives free trade an even more practical aspect. That is the Banker's Manifesto issued in 1926 by 15 of the leading bankers in Europe and America declaring themselves in favor of the removal of tariff barriers. They contend that since the war these barriers have been allowed to interfere with international trade and have prevented it from flowing in its natural channels. They declare that there can be no recovery in Europe until politicians in all territories, old and new, realize that trade is not war, but a process of exchange, and that in times of peace our neighbors are our customers and that their prosperity is the condition of our own well-being.

Now it appears to us that if fifteen world bankers, experts in commerce and finance, declare themselves in favor of a policy of free trade that policy must be a practical, workable, proposition, and we believe that this evidence establishes for us our second contention, that economists and financiers the world over favor free trade.

A third and most important reason why the nations should adopt a policy of free trade is that that policy would be economically desirable because it would conform to a fundamental economic law. Consider the fundamental economic law which would be operative were free trade adopted. Quoting Fairchild, an eminent economist: ". . . In the absence of restrictions upon foreign trade the people of each nation tend to buy goods in the cheapest market and sell them in the dearest which leads them to devote their energies in those lines in which the nation has comparative advantages as evidenced by their ability to produce at a comparatively low cost."

In other words, if one nation could produce a commodity more cheaply than other countries, it would devote its energies to the production of that commodity and would trade with other countries which would produce other commodities cheaply. Thus international trade is mutually beneficial, and each country derives specific benefits from the exchange. For example, the United States can produce wheat more cheaply than Japan, and Japan can produce rice more cheaply than the United States. An exchange of these commodities would benefit both the United

States and Japan. We, therefore, maintain that a policy of free trade would be in complete accordance with this fundamental economic principle which Fairchild has so splendidly set forth.

Because of the fact that the tariff system is inefficient, because economists and financiers the world over favor a policy of free trade, and because such a policy is economically desirable, we maintain that the nations of the world should adopt a policy of free trade.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

MR. ASHLEY

Mr. Chairman: Thus far the affirmative has argued that the tariff should no longer be used as a means of protecting home industry because it is inefficient, because economists and financiers favor resorting to a policy of free trade, and because free trade is economically desirable.

I wish to point out to you further that if the tariff for protection were abolished, it would make it possible for the European nations to pay their war debts. Now in order for a nation to pay an obligation to another, the debtor country must export to the creditor country more than it imports. Before the world war, the United States was the great debtor nation of the world. The development of the vast resources within this country, the railroads and major industries were financed largely by European capital. It was necessary for us to export enormous sums to Europe annually in order to meet the ever rising indebtedness. We had to ship goods to pay our debts; it wasn't a question of maintaining a favorable balance of trade as protectionists might maintain; it was either export or go bankrupt. The world war changed the situation almost to the opposite. Today we are the creditor nation, and in order for other nations to pay their obligations to us, they must export to us more than they import from us. However, the United States sets up tariff barriers for the purpose of keeping down imports so that our exports can still be more than our imports. And we submit to you that these enormous foreign debts can never be paid to us as long as the United States maintains its system of high protective tariffs. The payment of these debts is the status-quo of the nations and as such must be dealt with by the gentlemen of the negative. Either they must advocate a departure from the present situation which would be accepting a burden of proof, in that they

would be compelled to prove that these debts should not be paid, or they must show how these debts can be paid under a plan of protective tariffs.

In addition to the points already enumerated, we wish to further point out as another contention closely allied with the preceding, that high tariffs hamper a nation's export markets. Tariff is of two kinds, for revenue purposes and for the protection of home industries. Now this evening we are discussing only the latter and in order for a tariff to protect home industries it must impose a duty that will equalize the cost of production and transportation of the home product and the foreign product. Thus the high protective tariff serves its purpose, the keeping out of foreign goods and keeping our home products free from competition. In fact, the cry of politicians has been for years, the maintenance of a favorable balance of trade, the selling of our goods abroad and the keeping down of the imports into this country. At the present time America is very desirous of building up her export market. Our mass production is putting more goods on the market each year, more than we can absorb, and in order to keep our factories in operation, and our men employed, we must find foreign markets for our products. At the present we export over five billions of dollars worth of products yearly and are trying to find a market for the 20 percent surplus that accumulates each year. But we forget that in order for nations to be able to buy from us, they must sell their goods to us in order to have any buying power. Thus when a nation sets up tariff barriers to keep out foreign products, then other nations cannot adequately sell to that nation; neither can they buy adequately from her; they have no adequate buying power. At present, we import about four billions worth of products yearly, and if the new tariff bill reduces that to three billions, as many have predicted it will, it will automatically slash our exports below three billions. We cannot reduce imports without reducing exports.

This naturally leads me to my concluding point. Free trade would encourage good will among the nations. For years the peoples of Europe have lived in fear of American dominance of the world, economically and politically. Always present among peoples are those petty jealousies and grievances that often lead to greater grievances. The complex working of prohibitive tariffs is the most important of these. One country sets up a high protective tariff seriously affecting imports from other countries. These in turn retaliate in kind, erecting tariff walls so high as

to stop the natural flow of trade, and thus international antagonisms are aroused. This is readily seen in the increased resentment felt all over the world at the passage of the new tariff bill in the United States. It was no small matter that exporters from thirty nations registered formal protests against its passage. It was no small matter that our export market should suddenly drop 20 percent, principally because of this feeling of animosity, according to Mr. Paul Mazur, in the *Outlook*. It was no small matter that France should place a crushing tariff on American automobiles as retaliation, that Canada has increased her duties on many American products, that Argentina and many of the other South American countries are contemplating revision of the most favored nation agreements with the United States. It is no small matter that the leading industries of the United States are moving their factories to Europe, putting American laborers out of work, getting ready for the day of widespread tariff reprisal.

The protective tariff system is selfish in its very nature; it is a system that advocates taking everything that it can and giving nothing in return; it is in direct opposition to every natural, economic law. The United States calls herself the leading advocate of peace and friendly relations with other nations. We call peace conferences and make huge displays of our good intentions, and then, as if our right hand did not know what our left was doing, we build up tariff barriers against trade with other countries that more than nullify all that we can do in a peace conference. And we submit to you that if good will and trust among the nations is ever to be accomplished, the high protective tariff barriers must be removed.

FIRST NEGATIVE

MR. TENER

Mr. Chairman:

At the very outset of this debate we should like to make clear the position which the negative wishes to take. The generally accepted definition of "free trade" is the abolition of all duties except those for purposes of revenue only. Obviously then, tariffs not for the purpose of revenue are for the purpose of protecting home industry. So this question might just as well be restated, Resolved: That the nations should abolish those tariffs designed for the protection of home industry.

We wish you to note the fact that tariffs are not the only means of protecting home industry. There are other means. To quote De Madariga in the *Forum*, February, 1929, "... Tariffs are not the only means of protection. England protects her industries by maintaining a world-wide banking system, by an unrivaled net-work of merchant lines, by the restriction of immigration, by propaganda in favor of British goods such as the placing of the slogan 'British goods are best' on every postal cancelling machine." He further states that, ".... No free trade was ever better protected by other than tariff barriers than that of the British free trade ..."

And England is not the only country protecting her industries by means other than tariff barriers. As a matter of fact the natural inequalities of the nations themselves is a means of protecting home industry. Geographical advantage, natural resources, inventive genius, and mass production are all means of protecting home industry.

Therefore the real issue in this debate is not whether home industry should be protected, but whether or not tariffs should be employed as one means of protecting home industry.

Now we maintain that tariffs should be employed as a means of protecting home industry for five very definite reasons. In the first place, the protection of home industry by means of tariffs is sound in principle. Protection in the past has come in response to a need. In the early history of Venice, the Venetian merchants found that the only method by which they could compete with the Oriental merchants was by a method of protecting home industry. Under such a system Venice became a great commercial nation. Germany found that the only means by which she could advance commercially was to protect herself from rivalry with lower wage countries by means of tariff barriers. Our own nation has employed this same principle as a means of rising to commercial prominence.

Prof. Curtiss in his three volume work, "The Industrial Development of the Nations," says, "If the commercial and industrial history of the world teaches anything it is the advantages of domestic production and that the permanent prosperity of nations has always rested upon those pursuits which furnish employment for the people and the investment of capital at home..." Lewis F. Carr in an article in the *North American Review*, September, 1930, says, "The aim of protection is not high prices, but the growth and development of home industries to a

point where they can function profitably at low prices." Tariff is the most effective means to this end.

Free trade has been the policy of England since 1848. But during the past few years England has been tending toward the abandonment of this policy as shown by the Imperial Conference of October, 1930, when her colonies declared themselves in favor of protective tariff. According to an Associated Press article of November 25, 1930, former Prime Minister Baldwin declared that protective tariffs would be put on as soon as his party returned to power. England, the only commercial power of Europe to experiment with free trade, will, on the downfall of the Labor Party, build more tariff walls in addition to those erected since the war.

Therefore we maintain that the commercial history of the world establishes for us our first contention, that the principle of protection of home industry by tariffs is sound.

Mr. Carr's statement in the *Review* suggests our second contention: Tariffs stabilize industry. In this same article he states, "Under free trade fluctuations are much more violent because of dumping of imports; and because middlemen and gamblers are placed on margins." He cites wheat as an example because long trends in the wheat market cannot be altered but fluctuations can be decreased. This is also true of cotton, livestock, and all the major farm products. Production is so dependent upon climatic conditions that there is apt to be overproduction in one section or one country and underproduction, of the same commodity, in another country. With so much variation in agriculture and those industries dependent upon agriculture to a large extent, it is absolutely necessary that there be some sort of a stabilizing influence. The only means of effective stabilization is a protective tariff. We maintain that the effect of tariffs in stabilization alone is enough to warrant its retention.

A third and most important reason for tariffs is that tariffs protect undeveloped industries. Now if we can point to one thriving industry whose development was not possible without tariff protection, we shall have established our contention. But we can point to many industries which owe their existence to tariffs. Professor Taussig, an ardent free trade economist, admits that the American silk manufacturing industry is the child of protection. In addition to this very significant admission he gives much space in his recent book to showing how the growth of the iron and steel industry, the woolen industry, the cotton industry, and practically every industry in the United States, which

had any foreign competition, owes its growth in part at least to protective tariff.

Now we believe that Professor Taussig's conclusions are correct and that tariffs have aided in the growth of undeveloped industries. Infant industries in a country naturally cannot be expected to compete with the more perfectly organized and developed industries of the older nations. A very modern example is the chemical industry. Only since the war has America taken an active part in the manufacture of chemicals. The importance of this industry from the standpoint of national defense and from the standpoint of medical economy cannot be overemphasized. Here is certainly one industry that should be encouraged within our borders.

Says Professor Taussig, " If it were not for a protective tariff on chemicals, we would have to abandon their manufacture because of foreign competition."

Roland Ringwalt says in an article "Saving the American Chemical Industry," " The unity that prevails in both parties in regard to the protection of American chemical industries built up during the war is striking. It is not even a political issue." The importance of the chemical industry in the modern world made former President Wilson an advocate of protection on chemicals.

We have dealt with the chemical industry because it is the most recent example. In modern commercial complexity it is a self-evident fact that new industries, and new aspects of old industries will continue to arise. Consequently the principle of protection of undeveloped industries remains as a sound basis for the retention of protective tariffs.

Therefore since the principle of protection is sound, since tariffs stabilize industry, and since they enable undeveloped industries to develop, we believe that the nations of the world should not adopt a policy of free trade.

SECOND NEGATIVE

MR. ASHLEY

Mr. Chairman: So far we have contended that the principle of protection by tariffs is sound, that the tariff protects undeveloped industries, and that the tariff stabilizes industry.

We further maintain that the tariff tends to make a nation economically independent, and that free trade destroys the principle of individualism.

Obviously no nation can be absolutely independent of any other. Perhaps United States and Russia approximate that independence, but we hold that the tariff aids in making both countries more independent. Now, in the first place, unless the gentlemen of the affirmative can show that there will be no more war, it would be highly desirable, in time of war, for a nation to be economically independent, or as nearly independent as possible. The United States learned this lesson during the world war. At the outset of the war we were dependent almost entirely upon Germany for our chemicals and dyes. It took nearly two years to adjust ourselves to a new order of things. Seaver Wood, editor of the *Literary Digest*, said that the unpreparedness of the United States was as great a catastrophe as the war itself. Now had the United States been independent of Germany at the outset of the war these commodities would have been supplied in ample quantity and at reasonable cost. Understand that the negative is not in favor of war, we merely say that we must face conditions as they are, and unless there are to be no more wars, it would be better for a nation to be as nearly economically independent as possible.

The gentlemen of the affirmative would have us adopt a policy whereby the nations would become mutually dependent upon each other or at least more dependent than they are at the present. In that event economic rivalry would exist to an even greater extent than it does at the present, and we know that economic rivalry has been the most persistent cause of war. So the affirmative would have us adopt a policy that would tend to aggravate the chief cause of war. Then if a war should come, the nations would have to wreck their whole economic and industrial plan in order to wage war most effectively. And so for this reason we believe that a nation should maintain its economic independence as completely as possible. Therefore, tariffs, which develop the home industries of a nation and aid in giving it its economic independence, should be maintained.

In conclusion, we contend that the whole plan of free trade is impracticable because it is opposed to individualism. In a highly specialized world brought about by free trade a nation would of necessity produce only those things in which it had the most comparative advantage. A Utopia, each country taking advantage of its own climate, geographical position, racial aptitudes, and contributing to the paper plan of economists and theorists the world over. The words of Mr. C. Pearce Dennis most aptly describe the ensuing result. "Let the peasant stick to his

field, shoemaker to his last and boatman to his barge—each community serving according to its natural bent. . . . There is only one thing against it, human nature. Man simply does not act that way. It is to deny the forces working in humanity. Man is ever pushing, stumbling, trampling forward with life, fermenting, boiling over, and progressing. The dictator of Bulgaria was the son of a hired sheep herder; the prime minister of Poland was a peasant." All nations are nationalistic in their attitudes; this does not need proof. The history of the world since the beginning of recorded time makes it the most evident factor in history. It is the psychological principle of self-preservation being illustrated in national scope. Nations are ever striving to better their situation; they want higher standards of living, less work, more relaxation. No society is willing to accept a servile state. Nations will never allow themselves to become dependent upon other nations but will ever strive to keep their own national identities. And we submit to you that so long as human nature is what it is, so long as people act as individuals, and so long as nations follow nationalistic lines, a policy of free trade could never be made practicable, in that it destroys the most necessary asset to progress—individualism.



THE SPEECH ORGANIZATIONS

(Continued from page 197)

There are three dramatic honor societies (coeducational):

Name	No. Chapters	Publication
Theta Alpha Phi—founded at National Association Speech Teachers, 1919	65	The Cue
National Collegiate Players, 1922, merger of Pi Epsilon Delta, 1919, and Association of University Players, 1913	22	Players Magazine
Alpha Psi Omega—founded at Fairmont State College, 1925	84	The Playbill

A merging of the chapter rolls of these organizations gives an idea of how extensively these societies have penetrated the American colleges and universities. In addition to these societies there are two junior college organizations—one for dramatics and one for forensics—both national in scope—and there are two high school forensic organizations national in scope.

THE FORENSIC OF

THE NATION'S NEED OF MEN

By DAVID STARR JORDAN

The best work of a Republic is to save its children. The one great duty of a free nation is education, wise, thorough, universal. Reforms in education are the greatest of all reforms. The ideal education must meet two demands: it must be personal, fitting man or woman for success in life; it must be broad, giving man or woman such an outlook on the world as that this success may be worthy. It should give a man that reserve strength without which no man can face difficulties because the victor in any struggle is the one who has the most staying powers.

A man should have reserve of skill. If he can do well something which needs doing his place in the world will always be ready for him.



NOISY DRESSES AID PUBLIC SPEAKERS

There are various aids to public speakers. There should be more than there are. We feel sure that there can never be an aid that will cure or correct some. However, defective and scarce as necessary aids may be, there is one recently noted of which we confess we had little knowledge. We are indebted to the *California Daily Bruin* for the following item, under the heading given above:

Women's dresses are getting louder and louder is the recent statement made by the United States Bureau of Standards. This does not refer to their color scheme but to their actual ability to absorb or reflect sound waves.

The fact that women's dresses absorb sound is important to the theater builder, because the auditorium must be designed so that the audience's clothes will not muffle the voices of the actors. The bureau has made measurements of the ability of clothes to deaden the sound of voices. The woolen clothes that were worn by our grandmothers absorb about twice as much sound as the silken dresses of the present age.