

A large part of the value of debating comes from the mental stimulus and training derived from searching after evidence and preparing the logical development of a debate case. The purchase of these "canned debates" deprives the students of this valuable training and relegates debating to a mere recital of memorized speeches and makes a mockery of the true function of the greatest of all competitive forensic practices. By refusing to buy these "mail order debates" and by stressing the importance of extempore speaking, debate coaches and their debaters can do much to curb this growing evil of providing made-to-order debates at so much per word.—Karl Mundt in The National Forensic League Bulletin.



THE WETS GIVE ME A PAIN

(Continued from page 207)

Well, What Have You?

The greatest ache in my jugular region that I get from wet talk is the lack of any suggestion of a sensible substitute for prohibition. True, government control and dispensaries are working, after a fashion, in other countries. But they didn't work here—in South Carolina—and they're not working to exactly universal satisfaction in Norway, Sweden, or Canada.

These noble experiments in other countries are, granting every wet claim, not so brilliantly successful as to warrant substituting them for our own system. If after ten years the machinery of prohibition enforcement is still missing on three cylinders, how long might we expect it to be before government control would be even fifty per cent efficient? Why substitute the complexities of regulation, which failed for more than a hundred years, for the comparative simplicity of a policy that has had only ten years trial and is by no means—again granting every wet claim—a total flop?

The most naive confession of wet futility that I have run across appeared in the editorial columns of a New York wet paper of the highest respectability. I haven't the actual clipping before me, but this is the outline. A reader wrote as follows:

"I note that your paper smites the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act hip and thigh at every opportunity. But what have you to suggest as a workable substitute?"

To which the editor appended this reply:

"It is, perhaps, a weakness in the anti-prohibition movement that it has no reasonably satisfactory policy to substitute."

Probably that editor was fired for that confession, but for once a wet had inadvertently admitted the truth.

AMONG THE CHAPTERS

"CHARLEY" MARSH HAS MEN AND TO SPARE

We have heard of no school with a larger turn-out for forensics than U. C. L. A. where at the call of Prof. Chas. Marsh at the beginning of the season sixty-five men reported. In addition to this number eligible for varsity debating, there were many interested in freshman debates. As usual Prof. Marsh is not limiting participation to a chosen few.

* * * * *

In a debate with Gustavus-Adolphus, Ripon College was given the decision by a three-to-one vote. This is the first debate Gustavus has lost in twenty.

Ripon's debate with Milwaukee State Teachers initiated a new method. Only main speeches were given. The purpose was to give the audience information. In this way a direct clash was avoided. This seemed to be desirable from the audience's view point.

* * * * *

DRAKE SEEKS REAL AUDIENCE SITUATIONS

Of the debates held at Drake University recently, some have served as programs for the Junior Chamber of Commerce, for church audiences, for the East Des Moines Club, the Kiwanis Club, and Cosmopolitan Club.

* * * * *

WESLEYAN AND AUGUSTANA WIN IN S. D. MEET

The South Dakota Intercollegiate Forensic Association held their annual contests at South Dakota State College on February 20th. The events of participation were extempore speaking, peace oratory, women's oratory and old line oratory. First place honors went to Dakota Wesleyan, second to Augustana.

OUR INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATERS

Intercollegiate debating season was launched successfully last Thursday before a fairly large audience. The support given to our debaters must have been gratifying to them. But they deserved it. If you consider the work Intercollegiate debating entails, you will see that you owe them no less.

For the past three months our debating team has spent long hours at work. They spent tedious hours on research work. Long after the campus is deserted you find them bending over books in the library. All unselfishly you find them devoting their every spare moment to a study of the subject. The personal glory they obtain is incidental to their true purpose: the bringing of glory to Southwestern. It is their duty to represent as capably as possible our institution in a battle of wits. It is an assignment, and they deserve the utmost support of which we are capable.—From an editorial appearing in the campus paper of Southwestern College, Lafayette, Louisiana.

* * * * *

MICHIGAN ZETA BROADCASTS

The speech department of the College of the City of Detroit broadcasts weekly from 7:00 to 7:30 eastern standard time, over Station WEXL at Royal Oak, Michigan. The programs have featured talks by the department members, readings by students in interpretation, men's and women's debate teams, and last year's orators who hold the state and interstate oratory titles for 1931. This year's orators are to be heard soon.

Garnet Garrison, president of Michigan Zeta chapter, is a regular announcer at the station. Prof. P. H. Scott is head of the department.

Oratory at the College of the City of Detroit, according to the Collegian, campus paper, was, at the time of its beginning five or six years ago, a small affair indeed, with only a handful of listeners. The audience which gathered to hear the oratorical contest recently was one of the largest ever to attend a college function, the judges were men of city-wide renown . . . the oratorical contests have become an event. Also the scope of the contests, were are told, has greatly widened, students outside of speech classes now being eligible. Also women now have a contest all their own and prizes of \$75 are available for women, as well as a like amount for the men.

Henrik Ibsen's "Peer Gynt" is the unusual theatrical offering to be staged at Yankton College this year. Yankton, the home of South Dakota Gamma, is known in the state not only for its forensic excellence but also for superior dramatic achievement. "Peer Gynt," a drama in five acts and a cast of 75, has been in preparation for four months to perfect it for what is said to be its first production in South Dakota.

* * * * *

ARTHUR LARSON IS RHODES SCHOLAR

L. Arthur Larson '31 of Augustana College, S. D., winner of second place in oratory at the Wichita tournament, who tied for second honors in the finals of the 1930 National Intercollegiate Oratorical contest, and winner of many forensic honors in high school and college, is now winner of that much coveted honor, the Rhodes scholarship, which will provide the privilege of study at Oxford University the next three years. The scholarship carries a stipend of \$2,000.00 per year. Mr. Larson will leave for England next summer. He will specialize in law.

* * * * *

BEWARE OF THESE AT TULSA

Reports are not available on many of the state contest winners as this issue of the Forensic goes to press. Here are a few. Better beware of these at Tulsa.

Harold LeVander of Gustavus, first place in the fortieth annual State Intercollegiate contest of Minnesota. His oration, "Date Kernels," won third place in our national essay-oratorical contest, reported in the October, 1931 Forensic.

Margaret Patterson, representing Michigan State College, took first in a nine-college statewide extempore contest in which seven men and two women participated. Homer Yinger of Albion, non-P. K. D. school, won second.

Gordon Fischer, also of Michigan State, won first place and the prize of \$60 in the State Peace Oratorical contest. And again, an Albion representative, Merrill Wahls, took second honors with its accompanying \$40 honorarium.

Lowell Ditzen, representing William Jewell in the Missouri Intercollegiate Peace Oratorical, won first honors and the \$60 award. We do not have the information on second place winner.

In the Southern California Debate League tournament held in Los Angeles February 19 and 20, Whittier and California Christian tied for first in the men's contests. Redlands and La Verne tied for second. In women's debate U. C. L. A. won first, Redlands second.

The invitational speech tournament held at Linfield College resulted in a most interesting meet in which thirteen colleges of Oregon, Washington, Idaho and California participated. Various delegations report a great time and compliment Linfield on the success of the tournament. The forensic department at Linfield now anticipates such a contest annually. Linfield, with Willamette College, carried off the lion's share of honors. Minnie Hese-man and Dorothy Dirks took a 2 to 1 decision in the finals of the women's debate, in competition with Eunice Ewer and Margaret Griffin representing the College of Idaho. Lucile Beswick of Linfield placed first in women's oratory, and Minnie Hese-man was given second in women's extempore.

John Shultz and Carroll Arnold, representing Siouz Falls College, won the state debate tournament held in connection with the South Dakota Intercollegiate Forensic Association held at State College February 19 and 20. They will see you at Tulsa.

May we digress to comment that we expected nothing less than this achievement from the S. F. C. boys, for note that Sioux Falls College is the Alma Mater of J. D. Coon, national counsel of Pi Kappa Delta.

* * * * *

TULSA TEAM MAY MAKE TROUBLE

It looks like the Tulsa chapter of P. K. D. may do more than provide us with a forensic battle ground. Sam Brodsky and Carl Wiedman as freshman and sophomore, respectively, won second in men's debate in their province a year ago. These local warriors may make trouble for the "foreign" invaders.

* * * * *

The College of Emporia conducted an invitation junior college debate tournament February 19 and 20. Nine colleges were represented with one or more teams. Hutchinson Junior College took first honors.

WHY DEBATE IS WORTH WHILE

Is debate worth while? What part does debate play in the development of the student's capabilities? Is the value equal to the sacrifice of time from regular studies? Is one justified in taking time from studies for debate?

These questions arise in the minds of many students, and perhaps a discussion of or enumeration of values to the student would prove helpful in the search for a solution to them. Debate requires time, study, and thought, but its returns are large.

Do you, who wish these questions answered, remember the enumerated requirements of a scholar as given by a noted psychologist, published in the October 3 issue of the *Highland Echo*? They were:

1. Understanding and appreciation of other races and cultures contemporary or remote.
2. Ability and disposition to weigh evidence in controversial matters.
3. Ability and disposition to mentally project an undertaking through its successive steps before undertaking it.
4. Skill in explanation and prediction.
5. Ability and disposition to look beneath the surface of things before passing judgment.
6. Ability to do reflective thinking.
7. Disposition toward continued study and intellectual cultivation.
8. Critical and questioning attitude toward traditional sanctions.
9. Clarity in definition.
10. Discrimination in values in reacting to environment, social and physical.
11. Analytical approach to propositions leading to the detection of fallacies and contradictions.
12. Ability and disposition to observe accurately and systematically.
13. Understanding and skill in the use of processes of induction, deduction, and generalization.

(Continued on next page)

TULSA UNIVERSITY WELCOMES PI KAPPA DELTA

*To the Officers and Members of
Pi Kappa Delta:*

The University of Tulsa wishes most heartily to welcome the officers and members of Pi Kappa Delta to the campus of the university and the city of Tulsa. We hope that your visit will prove to be most enjoyable and profitable, and that you will carry away most kindly impressions gained through your sojourn among us.

Cordially yours,

JOHN D. FINLAYSON,
Chancellor.



JOHN D. FINLAYSON, Chancellor
University of Tulsa

WHY DEBATE IS WORTH WHILE

(Continued from page 214)

14. The ability to see relationships, and accuracy in their interpretation.

15. A freshness of interest with respect to the developments of knowledge.

All the requirements, with the possible exception of the first, eighth, and tenth, are the characteristics of the sincere debater. In the consideration of particular questions of debate, the remaining three points could also be acquired characteristics. If one phase of the intellectual development of college life can give such reward as this, is not debate worth while? What do you think of it?—Tenn. Alpha.

WAS "THE NEW SOUTH" IMPROMPTU?

GEORGE McCARTY

IT is believed to be typically American to want our heroes to be self-made; to want them to arrive at heroic esteem through personal effort. The idea that anyone can become president of the nation fits in with the democratic ideal. In contrast with this idea and quite as often, apparently, we like to think that the heroic attain their heroism, their greatness, through no effort of their own; the smaller the effort the greater the credit for achievement. Perhaps this is a sort of hang-over from our pre-American ancestral days of the monarchical ideal, under which the menial slaved for the kingly. At any rate the idea is extant. For the propagation of this latter conception, biographers have sometimes been responsible. Biography relates many instances of those, who quite unexpectedly, even to themselves, have attained great distinction.

In oratory as in other arts, according to biography, success just came, descending like a magic mantle upon the surprised shoulders of its elect. We read from one of Lincoln's biographers of how he delivered his Gettysburg Address with practically no preparation, having jotted down a few hasty notes on an old envelope that forenoon as he travelled to Gettysburg. Imagine Lincoln, who all his life had followed the path of effort, on this great occasion, one of the most significant of his career, trusting to the hands of chance the possibility of making a bad impression, at a time when a good impression on the part of an already misunderstood president, would mean so much. Lincoln's whole life is an argument against any such belief. As a bit of meagre evidence that the president prepared very seriously for the occasion we have the word of Mr. Hay, his secretary, that "Mr. Lincoln remained up until a late hour, probably preparing his speech."

Webster's "Reply to Hayne" is another classic example of great effectiveness in address which came "on the spur of the moment," as if the speaker merely opened his mouth and somehow the colorful, meaningful, words came of their own volition. On the matter of such spontaneity Webster himself said: "There is no such thing, as extemporaneous acquisition." Mr. Winans

states, ⁽¹⁾ "When great speeches have been made with apparently little preparation (as in Webster's Reply to Hayne) they have really sprung from years of study, discussion and experience in which materials have been amassed. . Not only have materials been amassed, but, they have been formulated over and over again, and in different ways."

The case of Henry W. Grady provides another example for our purpose here. Clark Howell says of his address, "The New South," delivered before the New England Society, in 1886, "I believe he prepared an outline for that speech before he left for New York, but it was entirely different from the speech as he delivered it." ⁽²⁾

Mr. Howell generalizes, furthermore, by stating that Grady's speeches were all spontaneous, that the same sort of preparation, or lack of it, characterized his Dallas speech on the race question. This speech was written and in type before Grady left Atlanta. When delivered it was so different that Mr. Grady wired back "Suppress speech it has been entirely changed." The same is true of the Boston address according to this biographer, who states further, ⁽³⁾ "Magnificent as were his prepared speeches, the 'impromptu' speech stood out by comparison, for the fire of the genius of oratory was in them."

Nevertheless would we not be more accurate to say that both his Dallas and Boston speeches were extemporaneous rather than impromptu since he prepared for both, regardless of his holding strictly to his outline. On both occasions he used the same subject, that of the race question. He had doubtless spoken and written much on these subjects before either occasion.

Joel Chandler Harris in his "Life of Grady" states that Grady's address on "The New South" was "an impromptu effort from beginning to end,—a creature of the imagination." Does Mr. Harris mean extemporaneous or does he really mean impromptu? While we perhaps cannot disprove Mr. Harris' statement, one cannot on any ground reasonably accept it.

First of all, Henry W. Grady was not like that, if we are to believe his biographers, for all seem to agree that "he possessed a brilliant mind and best of all a firm and resolute determination to acquire knowledge." ⁽⁴⁾

(1) Winans Public Speaking, p. 90.

(2) Henry W. Grady; Clark Howell; The Chautauquan, Vol. 21, p. 703.

(3) Henry W. Grady; Clark Howell; The Chautauquan, Vol. 21, p. 705.

(4) T. R. Crawford, "Early Home of Henry Grady," New England Magazine, Vol. II, P. 428.

Furthermore, at least two years prior to this time, with the election of Cleveland in 1884, he must have felt his responsibility as a possible spokesman for the South. Before 1884 he was keenly interested in the reconciliation of North and South, bitterly estranged by the Civil War. The privilege of speaking before this northern organization,—an important occasion at any time, especially so, for him a young man, and a guest in the North's greatest metropolis, the first Southerner since the Civil War to be given that honor,—presented an unusual opportunity for him to appeal for greater understanding between the two sections of his country. The role of peace-maker was not a new one to him and obviously he would not go into the experience unprepared.

We are not sure of the time elapsing between the invitation to address the occasion and the occasion itself. One authority, at least, states that it was six months. The New England Society of New York had for many years made their annual banquet a notable occasion. Says Lee, "A company of higher character or broader intelligence, does not meet in this country—To touch the body of gentlemen composing that club was to touch American thought." (1)

Among the notables present on this occasion were William Tecumseh Sherman and other national figures. Such a group might be expected to invite as their speakers only those of some considerable renown, and it is only reasonable to suppose that they would, both as a matter of courtesy to the guest speaker as well as a safeguard to the success of their program, inform the speaker of the occasion in time for his adequate preparation. Certainly no one would suppose that Henry Grady under such circumstances would wait, depending upon an impromptu effort.

Even though he had no more time for preparation than the time required for his trip from Atlanta—his home at this time—to New York City, his effort could hardly be called impromptu. For ten or more years before this date, his interest, and his work as editor and writer, had prepared him in a general way for his address at this time. He had written much along the same line before. It is entirely possible that some of his exact phraseology had been previously used. It is reasonable to believe that would be true. Furthermore, in the matter of effective self-expression, it should be remembered that his success on this occasion was not due to impromptu efforts. Eighteen

(1) Henry W. Grady, *Editor, Orator and Man*; Arena, June, 1890, Vol. 2. p. 9-23.

years before "The New South" was delivered Grady had won a local reputation as a brilliant orator and debater. Later he pursued graduate study at the University of Virginia in journalism and oratory. Doubtless throughout all the intervening years he was developing his ability in simple, clear and effective expression. This, by way of further evidence that he would not go carelessly unprepared.

Perhaps Mr. Harris was misled by Mr. Grady's own comment concerning the occasion. He is said to have remarked, "When I found myself on my feet, every nerve in my body was strung as tight as a fiddle string, and all tingling. I knew then that I had a message for that assemblage, and as soon as I opened my mouth it came rushing out." Are we to understand from this remark that the speaker had no thought to express until he arose to speak?

Let us examine the speech itself. There are only four or five sentences—those referring to Dr. Talmage's speech and those referring to his toast—that give any reasonable excuse for the statement that the speech was impromptu. He begins with a quotation which there is no reason to assume grew out of the immediate occasion. The reference to Mr. Hill and his speech delivered in Tammany Hall in 1866, in the same city, looks like a sensible well-thought-out beginning. His address deals with the subject which doubtless the New England Society would expect him to discuss, and he could have been in no doubt on this point from the time he first received the invitation to speak. Knowing of his work as an outstanding southern editor, they selected him as a truly southern representative who would in his address do what he had been doing already in the South—make a plea for a broader brotherhood, for mutual understanding and a united country. His "New South" therefore was very reasonably not impromptu, and more the honor to him for his preparation for an occasion which demanded his best.



A CORRECTION

We are sorry for our failure to report in the January For-
ensic the winners of the Southwestern Debate tournament. Page 148 of that issue should have carried the additional information that first in men's debate was won by the Southwestern College team composed of Blake Cochran and Wayne Henderson. Second honors went to McPherson College. In women's debate Hastings College won first, and Northwest State Teachers (Okla.) won second.

MICHIGAN EPSILON PREPARES DIRECTORY FOR "TIN" ANNIVERSARY

We have before us a copy of the Pi Kappa Delta directory as prepared by the Michigan Epsilon chapter and sent to their various members last May. In a chapter letter, which accompanies the directory, the information is carried that the directory was prepared as a means of "helping us all to appreciate our ten years of history." The letter and directory were sent out to their entire membership, past and present, as a reminder of their forth-coming annual banquet.

The directory includes the names of all members of this chapter, from the charter member list of 1921 by years to the present time. The membership roll contains 166 names.

This chapter reminds their members of their interest in securing a good representation of all classes and particularly the "21'ers" at their annual banquet. A roll call for the various years was to be a feature of the banquet. National President Pflaum was to be their guest speaker.

We have had no later report on the banquet referred to but we are impressed with the thought that the activity of this chapter in gathering the necessary data for and printing of the directory is a very necessary and valuable piece of work. We wonder if other chapters may not want to follow the lead of Michigan Epsilon in order that local chapter history may be thus preserved? Why not try this as an impetus toward stimulating interest in your next annual banquet, whether it is your "tin" anniversary or not?



—LOCAL OBJECTIVES—

As suggested by Tau Kappa Alpha.

1. Adequate entertainment for visiting teams by a general "get together."
2. Intramural debates between schools, colleges, fraternities, literary societies, or other parts of a college or university.
3. Carrying the forensic program into the high schools by sponsoring contests, acting as judges, and counseling students.
4. Maintaining a speakers' bureau to give members additional experience in appearing before off-campus groups.
5. Sponsoring intersectional and international debates, providing addresses by individuals, and entertainment of other forms.

THE OREGON PLAN OF DEBATE

We were interested in the use of the Oregon plan of debate as revised at the Miami University. On inquiry, Prof. H. H. Higgins, of Miami's Department of Speech, gives us the following information:

"The original Oregon plan called for only two speakers and with the cross-examination period hedged about with all sorts of rules and regulations. We have hit upon a three speaker plan with all rules and regulations thrown to the winds, in an attempt to make debating in school the same type of thing that one gets into elsewhere. Under our plan the second speaker on each team may ask all the questions or as few questions as he wishes. To state our plan in another way, it is simply this: That the purpose of each speaker is to get as many people as possible to agree with him on the subject under discussion. He is at liberty to use any method he desires in order to get people to believe him, just as is true of any speaker in the situations of daily life.

"All of our intercollegiate debates are upon this plan this year and most of them have been for some two or three years. Certainly it affords an opportunity for training in the technique of effective persuasion which was not possible under the old type of debate, with its many traditions and rules of procedure which were supposed to be rules of effective speaking but which as a matter of fact, were really rules for ineffective speaking."

The Miami Revision of the Oregon Plan

The Oregon plan of debate is a thoroughly practical type of debate. The conditions surrounding this type of debate are those which surround discussions in the workaday world.

It differs radically in purpose from the old, formal type of scholastic debates. Instead of trying to convince three judges (or a single, critic judge) that they have piled up more evidence on their side and have destroyed more of their opponents' arguments than opponents have of theirs, the speakers in the revised Oregon plan attempt to get the people in their audiences to believe on the question under discussion as the debaters believe. For this reason there are no "official judges" who determine who "wins" or "loses" the debate. Neither side "loses" under the revised Oregon plan; neither side is concerned about "winning" or "losing." The debaters are interested only in affecting

their hearers' beliefs on the question rather than their beliefs "regarding the comparative ability in debate shown by the contestants."

In all of our debates we should like to have an expression of the opinions of the members of the audience on the question both before and after the debate. The ballot which we like to have used if agreeable with our opponents also provides spaces for the criticism of the individual speakers. We have found these ballots¹ to be of great value in helping debaters to become more effective speakers. The results of the votes on these ballots do not constitute decisions on the debates; the results are not made public. They are for the use of the debaters and the department of public speaking.

In the revised Oregon plan the first speaker has an allotted time in which to attempt to get his hearers to agree with him on the question under discussion. This first speaker on each side of the question should introduce all arguments which his team expects to use in the discussion; in other words, the first speaker on each team "presents the entire case" upon his side of the question.

The second speaker on each team then cross examines his opponents. He stands wherever he prefers to stand and directs questions at his opponents which they answer immediately. The one who does the questioning is in complete charge of the discussion during the time which he is allowed; he may interrupt or stop any other speaker. He may direct his questions at the opposing team or at individual members of the team. An individual who is asked a question may indicate another member of his team as the one to answer the question. In other words, during the cross examination period anything is fair that anyone can "get away with"—just as is true in such situations in real life.

The third speaker on each team has a limited time in which to make a final plea or to "summarize the debate."

This type of debate is much more interesting to both the debaters and to the hearers. It gives much better training for speaking under conditions which prevail after college debate days are over. It makes necessary a straight-forward, honest discussion of the topic under consideration.

1. The ballot referred to is that devised by Prof. H. S. Woodward, of Western Reserve University, Cleveland Ohio.

The order of speaking and suggested time limits are:

First affirmative, 12 minutes; first negative, 12 minutes;
second negative, 12 minutes; second affirmative, 12 minutes;
third negative, 8 minutes; third affirmative, 8 minutes.

The Woodward Ballot

TO THE AUDIENCE:

The speakers will appreciate your interest and help if you will, both before and after the debate, indicate on this sheet your personal opinion on the topic of the debate. Kindly mark the ballot in accordance with your attitude on the relative merits of the two teams. This ballot has nothing to do with determining which team has done the better debating.

When the debate is finished, opportunity will be given you to question the debaters on any question that pertains to the topic under discussion.

BEFORE THE DEBATE

- ☐ I believe in the affirmative of the resolution to be debated.
☐ I am undecided.
☐ I believe in the negative of the resolution to be debated.

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

Date -----

Place -----

This blank is filled by a

(---) man (---) woman, whose age is -----

AFTER THE DEBATE

I have heard the entire discussion, and now

- ☐ I believe much more strongly in the affirmative of the resolution than I did.
☐ I believe in the affirmative of the resolution.
☐ I am undecided.
☐ I believe in the negative of the resolution.
☐ I believe much more strongly in the negative of the resolution than I did.

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

(If you wish to vote on the merits of the debating, indicate your vote here)

When I disregard my attitude upon the topic under discussion, I believe that the better debating has been done by the

THE CRITIC-JUDGE SYSTEM OF DECIDING DEBATES

PROF. MARTIN J. HOLCOMB, Bethany College

IN the first place, the writer desires to express his sincere appreciation to the directors of debate at the institutions having chapters of Pi Kappa Delta for their splendid cooperation in this investigation of the critic-judge system of deciding debates. This article will contain only a brief summary of the conclusions reached concerning the several phases of the critic-judge system that were investigated. A more detailed discussion of this investigation will appear in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

The method used in this investigation was suggested by Professor C. C. Cunningham, Director of Debate, Northwestern University. The writer wishes to give him due recognition for his many helpful suggestions. In order to make this investigation as comprehensive as possible, a detailed questionnaire was sent to three hundred and twelve directors of debate, including the directors at the universities of the Western Conference Debating League and all universities and colleges having chapters of Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, and Tau Kappa Alpha. Replies were received from thirty-nine different states, and included one hundred and forty-nine questionnaires that had been filled out and seventeen replies to the effect that the critic-judge system is not used in their institutions.

The questionnaire used in this investigation was formulated in such a manner as to secure information concerning the following phases of the critic-judge system: the present extent of use of the critic-judge system; who the critic-judge should be; how the critic-judge decision is received; and how the critic-judge system compares with other methods. This article will include a short summary of the conclusions reached relative to each of these phases.

As regards the present extent of use of the critic-judge system, the investigation made evident that the strength of the critic-judge system is found in the states of the Middle West;

that it has some supporters in the Far West; and that other systems of judging are used more extensively in the South and East. In fact, the critic-judge system is seldom used in the East.

In order to have some basis for definite conclusions concerning who the critic-judge should be, each director of debate to whom a questionnaire was sent was asked to submit his definition of a critic-judge. Most of the definitions submitted had a number of characteristics in common. For instance, ninety-nine of those submitting definitions pointed out that the critic-judge should be an individual who knows debate theory and practice thoroughly and who can evaluate skill in debating; fifty-six stated that he should be an individual who has had considerable experience in debate work; and a considerable number mentioned that the critic-judge should have the ability to give an effective oral criticism of the debate and should be capable of giving constructive criticism. The writer wishes to submit the following definition of the critic-judge, based upon the definitions submitted in the questionnaire investigation: "An efficient critic-judge is an impartial individual who knows theory and practice thoroughly, who has analytical ability, who has had considerable experience in debate work, and who has the ability to give an effective oral constructive criticism of the debate." In connection with this matter of who the critic-judge should be, an investigation was also made as to which profession furnishes the most efficient critic-judge. Undoubtedly the debate coach is the most efficient critic-judge as is evidenced by the fact that he received first rank from one hundred and nine while the total number of first places to all others was only twenty-four.

The investigation of how the critic-judge reaches his decision revealed, in the first place, that a large majority of the critic-judges take rather detailed notes during the debate and that many judges make it a practice to follow through the arguments as far as possible during the debate. This investigation further showed that a considerable number of the critic-judges employ somewhat definite standards as the basis for their decisions but that there is considerable difference of opinion as regards the practical standards that should be used in evaluating debate teams. Especially do critic-judges differ much in regard to the approximate weight that should be given to the various factors that might be considered in a critic-decision. The investigation also indicated, to a certain extent, the prevailing opinion among critic-judges concerning some of the matters that

arise during the progress of the debate. In some instances, there is a fair agreement among the critic-judges concerning those matters; in other instances, there is considerable divergence of opinion in regard to some of the problems that arise during the debate.

Since a criticism of the debate by the judge is an integral part of the critic-judge system, a detailed investigation was made of how the critic-judge gives his decision. Concerning this matter, the following facts became evident: first, it is almost a universal practice among critic-judges to give a criticism of the debate and a large number of the judges give a general criticism before the audience, and later, a more specific criticism before the debaters; second, practically all of the critic-judges announce the decision at the close of the criticism, but a considerable majority of the judges make no special effort to conceal the outcome of the debate until the announcement of the decision; third, a large majority of the critic-judges have rather a systematic plan for the public criticism, and this plan usually includes the standards that were used as the basis for the decision; fourth, critic-judges do not consistently use any particular type of introduction for their public criticism; fifth, the large majority of critic-judges do not make a special effort to use humor in their criticism; sixth, as regards the plan of the public criticism, a statement of the system or points considered is usually presented first; seventh, it is almost a universal practice among critic-judges to indicate the merits and weaknesses of each team; eighth, a considerable majority of the critic-judges analyze the specific arguments presented in the debate, and an even larger majority render the decision on the relative advantage of the respective teams on the arguments presented, and most of the critic-judges show how specific arguments may be strengthened; and ninth, most of the critic-judges also give criticisms of the individual speaker, but the more personal matters are not mentioned in public but are reserved for private conference.

Naturally the final test of any system of judging debates is the manner in which it works. Therefore the writer attempted to obtain the available facts relative to how the critic-judge decision is received. The facts obtained in the investigation concerning this matter might be summarized as follows: first, it has been observed that the critic-judge gives evidence of rather a systematic method in reaching his decision; second, a considerable majority of the debate coaches believe that critic-judges

are not influenced in their decisions by their personal convictions on the question; third, a large majority of debate coaches, debaters and audiences are satisfied with most of the decisions rendered by critic-judges; fourth, a large majority of the debate coaches believe that critic-judges attempt to conceal the outcome of the debate until the conclusion of the criticism, which is contrary to their expressed opinions relative to their own practice; fifth, it has been observed that most of the critic-judges have a definite plan for their public criticism; sixth, likewise it has been observed that most of the critic-judges justify their decisions; seventh, a strong majority of the debate coaches believe that the critic-judges usually give individual criticisms and constructive criticisms; eighth, a large majority of the debate coaches believe that their debaters are benefited by the criticisms of the critic-judge, and that the public criticism of the debate by the critic-judge is of special interest or of benefit to the audience; and ninth, a large number of those who filled out questionnaires personally favor the critic-judge system.

The final matter that was given consideration in this questionnaire survey was how the critic-judge system compares with other methods of judging debates. The facts obtained from the questionnaires indicate quite conclusively that the critic-judge system is used more extensively than any other method of judging debates and that this system is more satisfactory to a larger number of those having a personal interest in the decision as is indicated by the statement of preference as regards debate coaches, the debaters and the audience.

Even though the facts obtained from the questionnaire survey indicate that the success of the critic-judge system is commensurate with its extensive use, the conclusion is not warranted that the critic-judge system is entirely satisfactory as it functions today. Considerable dissatisfaction with the system was expressed in the replies to the questionnaires by several coaches. Even though these men belong to the minority group, their statements, which are the result of several years' experience with the system, tend to indicate that there are some major criticisms that might be directed against the critic-judge system. From a careful reading of the replies to the questionnaires, the writer gleaned at least two major criticisms of the critic-judge system as it functions today.

In the first place, it is evident that there are a considerable number of almost inexplicable decisions rendered by critic-judges that tend to cast a reflection upon the system. Perhaps

the solution to this problem, as suggested by several of the coaches, is to insist upon a more careful selection of critic-judges and to refuse to use such judges as have indicated by their previous decisions that they are not qualified to serve as critic-judges.

This investigation revealed another major criticism against the critic-judge system as it functions today—namely, that there is no general understanding among the critic-judges as regards the factors that should be considered as the basis for the decisions, and especially no agreement as regards the approximate value that should be given to each of those factors. Perhaps this matter also would be improved through a more careful selection of the critic-judges, especially since several coaches indicated in their replies to the questionnaire that there is considerably more uniformity in the relative weight given to the factors considered in the decision by those judges who are qualified to serve as critic-judges. It is natural that should be the case as those who are more thoroughly trained and experienced in debate have become familiar with those factors that should serve as a satisfactory basis in evaluating debating skill.

The final conclusion of the writer in regard to this investigation of the critic-judge system of deciding debates is that the system undoubtedly justified itself, but that it also has certain weaknesses that perhaps would be diminished through a more careful selection of the individuals who are asked to serve as critic-judges.



VOLUMES I, II and III, P. K. D. DEBATE ANNUAL

Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations, volumes I, II and III are now on sale. Vol. III was published during the summer. In it appears the debates, orations, and extempore speeches which won the national contests at Wichita. Every chapter of P. K. D. and every library in a P. K. D. institution should have a copy. Each chapter should ask its library to order one or more. Individuals will want copies. Order now. The price is one dollar. All orders should be addressed to Noble & Noble, 76 Fifth Ave., New York City.