

FIRST ANNUAL TOURNAMENT OF NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

PROF. BRUNO E. JACOB, Ripon College

There is usually a special interest in "first" things. We are glad to have the following report on the first national meeting of the N. F. L. by National Secretary Jacob. We like his suggestion that we of Pi Kappa Delta watch for the later forensic achievement of these high school winners. If any P. K. D. chapter school has one or more of these students this year let us have a news item on that fact.—The Editor.

THE first National Speech Tournament for High Schools, held May 7-9, at Ripon College, was proclaimed by everyone coming in contact with it a most remarkable achievement. Attendance far exceeded expectations. One hundred thirty-eight contestants and 53 coaches registered from 49 schools. The geographical distribution was amazing. Seventeen states were represented and they ranged from Maine to Oklahoma, from South Dakota to Alabama. It was really a national gathering and the winners were national champions.

The contest work was of a superior nature as might well be expected in competition among state champions. Long before the final contest several of the judges from other colleges remarked that the debates were as good as any college debates they had heard during the year and one even claimed they were better. In the other speech events the same superior work prevailed.

The plan of elimination in oratory and like contests described in the March Forensic proved eminently satisfactory. With so many superior contestants in competition, it was indeed fortunate that such a plan was provided by the tournament rules. Each contestant was permitted to be ranked in the lower half of the competing section twice before he was eliminated. The psychological effect on the contestants was clearly evident. They felt they had a chance. Everything did not depend on one particular group of judges. If one judge did rank them down or they didn't do their best in that round, they still had one more chance. When twice ranked third or lower among six contestants, even a state champion had to admit that there were probably others better than he.

The additional rounds did not prolong the tournament, but rather gave the orators and extempore speakers activity while the longer debate tournament ran its course.

The national debate championship was won by Miami, Oklahoma, represented by Jack Yancey, Clay DeFord, John Williams, and Ithamer Tuthill. They defeated Topeka, Kansas, in the ninth round. Wanda Perrin, Kathryn Burt, Bert Dumars, and Don Wallace comprised the Topeka team. Third place in debate went to Jean Smith and Wirt McMitchell of Fayette, Missouri; fourth place to Elbert Redmond and Paul Hergenroeder of Ravenna, Ohio. Is there any significance in the circumstance that the first two teams had two students for each side of the question, while the third and fourth place winners upheld both sides of the question throughout the tournament?

The winners in the other speech events follow. Perhaps members of Pi Kappa Delta are not interested in the names of place winners in a high school contest. Yet most of these same winners will be in college this year or next, many of them Pi Kappa Delta colleges. It should be interesting to preserve this list of high school champions and note how provincial tournaments in 1933 and 1935, and perhaps the national tournament in California (?) in 1934 may be affected by the forensic achievement of these same champions.

Oratory—1. Howard Wilson, Granite City, Ill.; 2. Donald Verhulst, Sheboygan, Wis.; 3. Spencer Johnson, Mayville, Wis.; Kathryn Harney, Peoria (Manual), Ill.

Extempore Speaking—1. Edward Manthei, West Bend, Wis.; 2. Wirt Mitchell, Fayette, Mo.; 3. Robert Sheran, Minneapolis (Roosevelet) Minn.; Martha Odell, Passaic, N. J.; Sam Edlavitch, Ft. Wayne (Central) Indiana; Helen Hiett, Pekin, Ill.; Joseph Sudow, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

Oratorical Declamation—1. Howard Wilson, Granite City, Illinois; 2. Audley Wolfe, Clarksburg, West Virginia; 3. Frank Pucci, Kenosha, Wisconsin; Eugene Gillaspay, Muskegon Heights, Mich.; Rex Chaney, Sulphur, Oklahoma; Sheldon Johnson, Stillwater, Minnesota.

Dramatic Declamation—1. Kathryn Harney, Peoria (Manual), Illinois; 2. Harold Stark, Granite City, Illinois; 3. Esther Zion, Sheboygan, Wisconsin; Kathryn Harney, Peoria (Manual), Illinois; Sarah Cocke, Clarksville, Tenn.; Jeanne Bishop, Elkader, Iowa.

Humorous Declamation—1. Ramsey Wieland, Virginia, Minnesota; 2. Eva Nannie, Peoria (Manual), Illinois; 3. Neva Keir, Youngstown (Chaney), Ohio; Eunice Pollock, Manitowoc, Wisconsin; Elizabeth Weems, Dickson, Tennessee.

Following the enthusiastic approval accorded the first national speech tournament the executive council of the National Forensic League is planning to make it an annual event. The 1932 tournament will again be held in May, probably a little later than this year to permit winners of later state contests to compete.

The place for the 1932 tournament has not been chosen and if some Pi Kappa Delta chapter wishes to secure a really fine and worth while gathering for its college and community, there is a real opportunity. Invitations to hold the tournament will be received by the League officers up to December 1.

Pi Kappa Delta took a prominent part in the tournament. The Wisconsin Alpha chapter of course was host to the tournament. The chapters at Oshkosh Teachers College and Carroll College assisted nobly in supplying judges. Vice-President Tous-saint was right-hand man and carried an indispensable service in finding, assigning, and drafting judges for the score of contests going on every hour. Prof. Mundt of Dakota Theta chapter as vice-president of N. F. L. was toastmaster. Editor McCarty was the principal speaker at the tournament banquet.



DATE KERNELS

(Continued from page 85)

the fruit of trees planted by my forefathers who thought of those to come, and shall I not do likewise for those yet to be?"

Friends, I invite you to share in the two-fold task. Let us be weed-pullers, and above all let us be sowers of date kernels. Then with the passing of the years those to come after us having squared their thinking with world conditions as they are and living in peace and equity with their neighbors may look back to us and say, "Blessed be those who planted the date trees, the golden fruit of which we are today partaking."



WHO IS TO BE YOUR CHAPTER CORRESPONDENT

Please appoint one whose ambition is to make The Forensic a real medium for the exchange of news among Pi Kappa Delta schools.

PRESIDENT PFLAUM URGES MEMBERSHIP IN N. A. T. S.

STUDENTS as well as teachers of speech, and especially Pi Kappa Delta people, ought to avail themselves of the privilege of having membership in the National Association of Teachers of Speech. There is no other speech organization that grants such an opportunity of fellowship and association as does the National Association of Teachers of Speech. From a professional viewpoint, affiliation with this organization has many outstanding advantages. The National Association of Teachers of Speech meets annually in convention, and speech individuals are privileged to enjoy discussions on some of the most recent and outstanding problems of research in the field. Aside from membership in the organization, another outstanding value is the privilege of subscription to the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. This magazine is available to non-members as well as members. The subscription price is small, \$2.50 per year. Also sustaining memberships are available at \$10 a year which entitle the holder of such to monographs, bulletins, and research publications put out by the association which deal directly with speech. This printed matter keeps students and teachers of speech aware of the happenings and research activities that are done in this field, enabling them to keep up to date and modern with the work in speech.

Pi Kappa Deltans will be privileged to assemble at a Pi Kappa Delta dinner at the next national convention of the National Association of Teachers of Speech which will be held in Detroit, December 28, 29 and 30.

All Pi Kappa Deltans, students as well as teachers, interested in membership or subscription to the Quarterly Journal, should make their applications to Prof. G. Densmore, Department of Speech, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

As first vice-president of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, I have taken the liberty of presenting the above information to you. I was not solicited or authorized to do this but realizing the contribution and value of the Association, I want to highly recommend it to Pi Kappa Delta.

Very truly yours,

GEO. R. R. PFLAUM,
First Vice President of National Association
of Teachers of Speech.



"Believe it or not"—This is a debate audience. The Eastern State Teachers College debate team of Commerce, Texas, staged a battle of wits with a team from Washburn College of Topeka, Kansas, before this enthusiastic audience. (See opposite page.)

EAST TEXAS TEACHERS CHEER DEBATE TEAMS

Ripley should have been present at the debate occasion pictured opposite. This occasion featured a debate between Eastern State Teachers College and Washburn College at Commerce, Texas, the home city of E. S. T. C. Had Ripley been present he could have added another "Believe It or Not" in the following statement of fact: "More than a thousand students and faculty attended a college debate." He could have gleaned the further information that cheer leaders actually led cheers for the debaters.

In response to our request for information on this debate, Miss Maud Webster, debate coach at E. S. T., explains that it is not uncommon to have debate audiences of 200 to 1000. She goes on to say, "We make no special effort to attract them,—just try to show that the same brand of school spirit which helps a ball team will encourage a debate team. The great problem in teachers colleges is keeping the same people for two consecutive years. All my men debaters will be out teaching next year. This means I start from the bottom again."

If your college debate audiences show more interest or larger attendance than the one pictured here, we would like to have your story.



PI KAPPA DELTA PUBLICITY

From the Oklahoma Delta Campus

A copy of the March issue of "The Forensic", national publication of Pi Kappa Delta fraternity, is on file in the journalism office. Issued four times a year at Fort Collins, Colorado, the publication carries some very interesting accounts of work carried on by the various chapters.

Pi Kappa Delta is represented at Northwestern by the Oklahoma Delta Chapter. It is a national honorary forensic fraternity, open to men and women who have represented the college in debate or oratory. There are sixteen active members in Northwestern now and many members are away engaged in other work.

Pi Kappa Delta is one of the largest forensic fraternities in the world. Its chapter roll contains the names of one hundred twenty-nine first-class universities and colleges. Oklahoma has five chapters of this organization. The aim of the fraternity is the promotion of forensic activities in inter-collegiate relations.

REFUTATION IN TEAM DEBATING

SYLVESTER R. TOUSSAINT

Professor of Speech, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.

A TEAM debate is a formal platform practice in which opposing groups of speakers advance arguments to support their stand on a stated resolution. These arguments are used in an attempt to bring the listeners to accept the particular beliefs which the speakers hold. If there were no opposition this would be relatively easy to do. The opposing team, however, seeks to win the listener to an opposite belief and advances arguments to that end. Since these must, in a measure, take issue with what their adversaries say, all arguments so called constructive are to a degree refutation of the opposing stand.

Direct refutation has for its aim the destroying of the opposition arguments and the preventing of the opponents from achievement of their goal; namely, the winning over of their hearers. Let us suppose that I proposed to board a train in Monmouth to ride to Burlington, Iowa. You do not want me to reach Burlington. There are two ways to prevent me: you could keep me from getting on the train and starting the journey, or if I did succeed in leaving the station, you might wreck the train somewhere between Monmouth and Burlington. Just so may a debater be kept from reaching his goal.

Argument is based on two factors: evidence and reasoning to your conclusion from that evidence. As evidence we have all sorts of actual occurrences and happenings, statements and opinions of men, statistics, compiled reports and surveys, evidence of real property, etc. They are the instances which lie at the bottom of all conclusions and are responsible for our beliefs. We reason from these items of evidence to our conclusions; the debater uses this evidence to support an assertion which he wants his audience to accept as true. To carry out our comparison with the train: in order to keep his opponent from reaching his goal, a debater either attempts to keep him from getting started—that is, he attacks the evidence—or to wreck the train along the way—that is, he breaks down the chain of reasoning from the evidence to the primary contention.

Attack on Evidence

Let us consider first the method which is employed more frequently, attack on evidence. There are two general ways of refuting evidence: first, you may destroy the particular items presented by your opponents by showing that they are untrue, that they are exaggerated instances, that they are irrelevant, that there are extenuating circumstances which are responsible for the condition found to be true, that the source is not authentic, or for some other reason the material advanced by the opposition is not to be accepted as supporting or proving the contention they assert.

This is an especially effective type of refutation since it sweeps the ground from under your opponent's feet. Unless they can re-establish their contention with new and better evidence their cause is shaky; the foundation is gone. A debater must be careful in using this method of rebuttal and must be certain that what he says about the evidence attacked is true.

An example of this kind of refutation was shown in a debate on the public development of hydro-electric projects. The negative argued that such public plants were impracticable and cited the instance of the Pittsburgh municipal plant. The affirmative destroyed the force of the evidence by pointing out that the Pittsburgh plant was a steam project and consequently irrelevant to the argument. In the same debate the negative argued the failure of the Muscle Shoals project under government operation. The affirmative refutation of the contention admitted the statistical correctness of the negative figures but pointed out that such returns were the result of a temporary contract based on the partial operation of the plant. Here the affirmative showed that there were extenuating circumstances responsible for the evidence presented by the negative. The force of the figures is thus weakened if not spent altogether.

The second way to refute evidence, and that most commonly employed in team debates is to counter the evidence of your opponents with other, incompatible data which is more likely to be accepted because it is superior to what the opposition has used. In this way you do not leave your opponent's arguments unsupported but you overbalance his argument by outweighing it.

Evidence presented to counteract other evidence will be superior to it if it comes from a more reliable source, if it is of better type, if it is more recent, if the examples are more typical and universal, and, in some cases, if there is a greater quantity. Generally speaking, evidence which is statistical or compiled

from instances is of better type than statement of authority opinion. Consequently the testimony of men or organizations as to matters of fact is outweighed by a mass of definite data, the result of research.

To illustrate: In a debate on the policy of the United States in the Caribbean region an affirmative advanced the argument that our present policy was undesirable because our export trade with these countries was falling off as a result of the animosity of those peoples. As evidence of this fact the affirmative presented two statements by well-known historians and a resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor. In refutation of this argument the negative presented evidence to the contrary. They quoted the figures of the report of the Federal Trade Commission and supplemented them with data from the Babson organization to show that year by year in respect to each individual country concerned, our export trade had increased materially. The affirmative gave no new material to support their stand and to my mind the point was clearly won by the negative because the evidence used in refutation was more convincing than that supplied by the affirmative.

Again, in the aforementioned debate on the hydro-electric proposition, in the same question of feasibility of operating Muscle Shoals it was customary for the negative to introduce the statement of then-President Coolidge to the effect that Muscle Shoals was a government white elephant and we had better dispose of it to private interest. An affirmative team presented in contrast to this general statement by an executive who was known to be opposed to public operation in principle, the testimony of government engineers who proceeded to show how the plant under discussion could be made a paying proposition to the government and was not necessarily a burden which ought to be released as soon as possible. Here one would be more inclined to accept the evidence of a specific nature presented by the engineers rather than the remark of the president no matter how much we might respect his judgment.

Attack on Reasoning

You need not, however, always disagree with the facts presented by the opposition. It may be that the data is very true and is also very good. But you may not accept the conclusions which they draw from the data and which they want their listeners to accept. Herein lies the real test of debating skill. The preparation for the refutation discussed above is done in the library or study. Its effectiveness depends almost entirely upon

what you have been able to find as fact. The brunt of the second type of refutation must be done on the platform or after the debate has opened. The debater needs the ability to reason clearly, to attend closely to the argument, and to see the fallacies of mistaken causal relationship, of poor analogies, of hasty generalization, and the numerous other weak links in the chain of reasoning from the data to the ultimate contention of the speakers. It is in this respect that the experienced team usually has the advantage over one less experienced. This method of refuting is effective because in addition to destroying the argument, when it is well done it creates an impression of superior reasoning and debating skill—as indeed it is.

To illustrate: In the previously mentioned debate on the condemnation of the present policy of the United States government in its affairs in Central America, the negative presented very convincing evidence to the effect that our policy of armed protection of American property was justified, it was highly desirable that we retain it as our national policy. An affirmative speaker replied by saying that they were willing to accept the evidence presented and the contention that according to international law, the United States was justified in armed protection. But he did not accept the reasoning that because it was justifiable, therefore it was desirable. Said he, "A man may be justified in going to a law-suit with his neighbor over some dispute, but that does not signify that such action would be the desirable one. In some cases a citizen may be justified in an assault on the person of another man, but it probably would not be the desirable or advisable thing to do." Here the contention of desirability, which was one of the three main arguments advanced by the negative for the retention of the policy was not a reasonable conclusion from the evidence advanced to sustain it. Do you note the effective appeal of the affirmative refutation?

Again, in a debate on the proposed child labor amendment, the affirmative argued that the amendment would do away with migration of child laborers from one state to another because it would produce standard and uniform limits and restrictions on such labor. The negative refuted the argument by saying that it was true that we had migrations but it was not true that migrations were caused by differing standards in different states since labor migrated from a state with low standards to one with high restrictions. They maintained that it was due to available seasonal employment, which could not be regulated by law. Consequently we would have migratory child labor with a federal amendment as well as without. Without passing on the merits

of the evidence or argument, here is an example of refutation by showing a mistaken causal relationship. The affirmative attempted to show that an evil would be eliminated by doing away with the alleged cause. The negative sought to destroy the force of the argument by showing that the evil did not grow out of the alleged cause, and therefore it would do no good in that respect to do away with migrations by instituting uniform regulations for child labor.

What to Refute

Debaters often ask the question, "What should one attempt to refute, everything or just a few important points?" This is a legitimate and vital question because proper selection is as necessary as good material. My observation in coaching and particularly in judging is that the chief weakness of much of our refutation is that it is scattered, unorganized, and "pecky."

If a team's constructive case is logically developed, all evidence and steps in reasoning will be related to the larger contentions. Scattered and ineffective refutation results when a debater strikes at an item of evidence or a sub-topic in one major contention and then jumps to another entirely unrelated to the first, without showing the relationship of either to the primary considerations of the proposition. When he sits down at the end of five minutes the impression he has left is that he has said something about what the opposition has advanced but just what he has refuted or what damage has been done to the case is left to vague conjecture. The judge has a memory of nothing but "they said." The remedy lies in striking at the vulnerable point, whatever it may be, and then following through to show the result on the issue at stake. Of what particular concern is it that some evidence is destroyed? The important thing to point out is that since the evidence or chain in reasoning has fallen, the main proposal totters. In that way a debater relates his refutation to the case.

It is my personal opinion that something should be said about the whole case presented by the opposing team. Refutation should not be, as is so often the case, an attack on the other side of the question—on stock arguments advocated by prepared briefs but should be a thrust at the way the opposing team has presented the other side of the question. In general, a team does not present more than three or four main arguments. These four arguments are the reasons why listeners should accept the debaters' stand on the resolution. Through those four arguments you strike at that stand or objective, which is the ultimate goal of

your fire. A team ought to say something about the main contentions and its rebuttal should be centered about them. You may admit one, or show it irrelevant, or attack it as unimportant and not vital, or refute it directly, but you should do something about it. A wide-awake team will force its opposition to some reaction in the hope of making progress at their expense and also of getting to the chief issues early in the debate.

Refutation should be organized not only in respect to the opposing case, but within itself. It should make clear to the audience just what is being refuted, its relationship to the argument, how you are refuting it, and the effect. A joy forever is the rebuttal speech which takes one central argument and proceeds to demolish it in an orderly, systematic arrangement of numerous good items of different types of evidence you have and clearness in presenting it will often make up for a handicap you may have with regard to side of question. If you have a poor side to defend and a strong side to attack it is not your fault, but an aimless, unorganized five minutes of quoting various "authorities"—one to each point—which results in the general effect that other equally renowned men are all liars is the result of cloudy thinking, poor instruction, and lack of experience.

When to Refute

Good debate strategy says to refute as soon as practicable. Not only is it better debating to relate your material to what the opposition is doing and thus begin the debate before the first rebuttal speech, but it gives the attacking side a distinct rebuttal advantage. In the first place, it shows that the debaters are alert and are prepared; that they can depart from their somewhat memorized material without being upset. Second, it puts the team originally presenting the argument on the defensive. Suppose that the first affirmative speaker presents an argument which is refuted successfully by the first speaker for the negative. The second affirmative speaker must rebuild the argument or allow it to lie refuted. If he does not rebuild it with new evidence or some refutation of the negative attack, the affirmative has lost the effect of the whole first speech—one-third of the constructive case. If he does re-establish the point he cannot spend that time in an attack on the negative contentions. In debate, as in physical contests, oftentimes the best strategy is to keep the opponent on the defensive. If you have him mending his own fences he will not be pulling up yours.

An excellent illustration of the effective placing of refutation was evidenced in a debate on the question of giving Congress

power to declare on the constitutionality of laws after a disagreement of the Supreme Court. The affirmative speakers based their case on five instances of split decisions of the Court and the need for allowing Congress to review such decisions. The first speaker for the negative took each case separately and succeeded in showing that a need based on these five cases was very weak indeed. The second affirmative speaker did not rebuild the argument and the result was that the negative had the affirmative in a bad way all through the debate because the foundation speech and argument was kept down. All other contentions sounded hollow because the affirmative could not get the upper hand on this fundamental and basic point which they were defending all evening.

Not only should refutation be swift but it should be continuous and cumulative. In the illustration given above, whenever the affirmative did try to set up their first argument, the negative made another vigorous attack with *added new evidence*, not just a repetition of what was used before. It is good policy not to use all your shot in one first charge but to save a few rounds of good ammunition with which to clinch the matter when it comes up again. With the continual introduction of new vital refutation the team builds up a powerful case which is hard to deny. Of course, the majority of the time and energy should be spent upon the strategic and important issues underlying the accepting or rejecting of the proposition. This following of the central issue or the tide of the debate is an evidence or real debate knowledge.

Two examples of cumulative refutation came to my attention in different debates on the curtailment of installment buying. In one case the affirmative argued that installment buying was making poor people poorer and creating a great debtor class who were living way beyond their incomes, that it was responsible for poverty and the farm depression. The negative reply was that increased savings in all walks of life seemed to indicate that the affirmative contention was not true. Throughout the debate the argument arose and the negative made its attack each time with new figures and new sources of evidence. They seemed to have an endless supply and by the close of the debate the affirmative claim that people were not saving money was literally snowed under the mass evidence to the contrary. Another time an affirmative team contended that this increased credit was going to cause a depression in business which would have serious consequences. The negative, through successive speeches as the argument was reiterated, built up a cumulative refuta-

tion of the point by showing that there were twenty-eight causes of depressions of which inflated credit was only one, that out of a total credit of 202 billion dollars, installment credit amounted to only four and one-half billion, that there was a great saving reserve upon which people could draw, that economists and statisticians were able now to forecast and regulate production with fair accuracy and very probable success—and other arguments each supported by convincing evidence to destroy the affirmative contention that the continued practice of installment buying was going to cause a depression. When the final speaker summed up their refutation of the argument, the contention itself was lost in the varied and powerful material directed against it.

One last but extremely important word about refutation. All material used in attack should be apt and related to the point under discussion. So many times the rebuttal does not strike specifically; it may be related to the contention but it slides off without being precise and consequently does little effective damage. A carpenter strikes one or two effective blows and drives the nail straight into the wood, burying the head flat along the level of the board; an inexperienced worker slashes several times with poorly directed strokes and succeeds only in bending the nail back along the grain and the two pieces of wood are barely held together. A debater who is not listening closely to the discussion may hear his opponent use a word which is related to a refutation note lying in wait in the card file. Out comes the card and the subsequent speech whether the evidence strikes at the argument or not. Another very common fault is to misunderstand or misinterpret the use which the speaker makes of the argument or evidence. The remedy for both fallacies is to listen to what the speaker is saying in order to get the whole argument. Any writing should be done while a colleague is talking. When the opposition has the floor a debater should be listening and *thinking*.

Effective refutation, like many other things connected with debating and argumentation, depends largely and finally on sound preparation; clear, logical thinking; and a wide-awake attentiveness.



“Man’s greatest and most distinctive gift: the power of communication through articulate speech; a power without which his other achievements, even the power of thought, would be impossible.”

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF PI KAPPA DELTA

July 1, 1930 - June 30, 1931

Cash Receipts

Cash in Bank June 30, 1930.....		\$6,028.70
Interest on Savings	\$ 155.90	
Certificates	1.50	
Conventions and Provinces	62.51	
Membership Fees	3,987.00	
Fines	13.00	
The Forensic	91.50	
Keys	3,403.60	
Total Receipts from all sources		\$7,715.01
		\$13,743.71

Cash Disbursements

Conventions and Provincials	\$1,115.59	
The Forensic	1,638.42	
Keys ..	2,834.75	
Office Expenses	1,560.78	
Postage ..	101.71	
Printing ..	204.56	
Refunds and Short Checks	215.35	
Total Expenses		\$ 7,671.16
Balance in Banks June 30, 1931		6,072.55
		\$13,743.71

Accounted for as follows:

Weld County Savings Bank checking account.....	\$3,152.64
Invested in 6 percent Bonds	2,537.50
Weld County Savings Bank Savings Account	382.41
	\$6,072.55

AUDITOR'S REPORT

August 15, 1931.

To Whom This May Concern:

This is to certify that I have inspected the books and records of the Secretary of Pi Kappa Delta, and that I believe the following report to be a true and accurate record of the financial condition of the society.

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) A. O. COLVIN, Auditor.

PI KAPPA DELTA CHAPTER REPORTS

1930-1931

Chapters	Fees	Keys	Total	Short Checks Ref'ds
Arkansas:				
Henderson Teachers	\$ 15.00	\$ ———	\$ 15.00	
Ouachita College		5.00	5.00	
California:				
Univ. of Redlands	50.00	42.50	92.50	\$ 11.25
Inst. of Tech.	35.00	30.75	65.75	
Col. of the Pacific	25.00	16.75	41.75	
Univ. of Calif. L. A.	25.00	20.75	45.75	
Colorado:				
Agri. College	50.00	35.75	85.75	4.25
Teachers College	45.00	55.75	100.75	
Western State	5.00	———	5.00	
Connecticut:				
State College	———	———	———	
General Chapter	340.00	235.50	575.50	24.25
College of Idaho	40.00	25.25	65.25	4.25
Illinois:				
Wesleyan Univ.	50.00	34.50	84.50	
Eureka College.....	40.00	13.50	53.50	5.00
Carthage College	5.00	———	5.00	
Bradley Tech.	———	———	———	
Monmouth College	55.00	66.00	121.00	
Ill. State Normal U.	50.00	54.00	104.00	8.25
McKendree College	1.00	19.10	20.10	1.35
North Central College	40.00	46.00	86.00	1.00
Lombard College	45.00	18.25	62.25	
Shurtleff College	30.00	34.75	64.75	.50
Wheaton College	70.00	87.50	157.50	
Iowa:				
Wesleyan Univ.	40.00	16.25	56.25	.50
Central College	30.00	37.25	67.25	
Morningside College	60.00	16.50	76.50	1.25
Simpson College	45.00	44.25	89.25	1.50
Parsons College	20.00	34.00	54.00	
Upper Iowa Univ.	25.00	18.25	43.25	
Coe College	20.00	32.75	52.75	9.25
Western Union	———	5.00	5.00	
Buena Vista	10.00	2.00	12.00	
Dubuque Univ.	———	4.00	4.00	
Drake University	25.00	21.00	46.00	9.25
Penn College	70.00	48.50	118.50	
Indiana:				
Franklin College	———	5.00	5.00	
Kansas:				
Ottawa Univ.	15.00	12.75	27.75	
Washburn College	30.00	5.75	35.75	
State College	15.00	18.50	33.50	
Southwestern College	20.00	5.75	25.75	
Univ. of Wichita	20.00	31.75	51.75	
Emporia Teachers	60.00	52.25	112.25	5.00
Wesleyan Univ.	35.00	17.00	52.00	
Pittsburg Teachers	25.00	20.25	45.25	

Chapters	Fees	Keys	Total	Short Checks Ref'ds
College of Emporia	15.00	18.00	33.00	
Baker Univ.	30.00	5.00	35.00	10.00
Sterling College	45.00	41.75	86.75	
Bethany College	40.00	34.25	74.25	5.00
Hays Teachers	20.00	18.00	38.00	
Kentucky:				
Centre College	5.00	10.50	15.50	
Georgetown College	—	6.75	6.75	
Wesleyan College	—	—	—	
Transylvania	25.00	5.00	30.00	
Louisiana:				
Louisiana College	20.00	12.50	32.50	.75
Centenary College	25.00	27.75	52.75	
La. Institute	20.00	43.25	63.25	
Maine:				
Colby College	—	5.00	5.00	
Michigan:				
Kalamazoo College	65.00	35.50	100.50	3.00
Olivet College	30.00	64.50	154.50	
Hope College	55.00	46.00	101.00	18.50
State College	45.00	60.75	105.75	1.00
State Normal	30.00	96.75	176.75	3.25
Col. of Detroit	40.00	34.75	74.75	
Minnesota:				
Macalester College	—	5.00	5.00	
St. Olaf. College	65.00	67.25	132.25	13.50
Gustavus Adolphus	95.00	69.75	134.75	
Hamline Univ.	20.00	8.50	28.50	
College of St. Thomas	10.00	—	10.00	
Mississippi:				
Millsaps College	14.00	—	14.00	9.00
Missouri:				
Westminster	40.00	26.25	66.25	6.75
Central College	45.00	46.25	91.25	.75
Park College	40.00	82.50	122.50	12.00
William Jewell	30.00	49.75	79.75	
Culver-Stockton	10.00	8.50	18.50	
Warrensburg Teachers	15.00	21.75	36.75	
Kirksville Teachers	30.00	32.50	62.50	
Montana:				
Intermountain Union	45.00	18.00	63.00	5.00
State College	55.00	20.00	75.00	
Nebraska:				
Wesleyan Univ.	—	10.50	10.50	
Cotner College	—	—	—	
Doane College	30.00	4.25	34.25	
Hastings College	45.00	38.75	83.75	
Kearney Teachers	35.00	—	35.00	
North Carolina:				
State College	—	5.00	5.00	
Wake Forest	—	—	—	
North Dakota:				
Jamestown College	20.00	—	20.00	
Ohio:				
Baldwin-Wallace	—	10.00	10.00	1.00
Hiram	35.00	24.25	59.25	

Chapters	Fees	Keys	Total	Short Checks Ref'ds
Heidelberg College	45.00	31.00	76.00	
Akron Univ.	25.00	6.50	31.50	
Otterbein	25.00	30.00	55.00	
Marietta				
Bowling Green	50.00	47.00	97.00	.75
Oklahoma:				
Agr. College	15.00	9.25	24.25	1.00
Univ. of Tulsa	15.00	10.00	25.00	
Baptist Univ.	20.00	5.50	25.50	
Alva Teachers	25.00	37.50	62.50	
Okla. City Univ.	15.00	26.00	41.00	.75
College for Women	35.00		35.00	
Ada Teachers College	30.00	63.75	93.75	10.00
Oregon:				
Linfield College	30.00	24.50	54.50	.75
Pennsylvania:				
Grove City College	30.00	9.50	39.50	9.00
South Carolina:				
Wofford	20.00	12.75	32.75	
Presbyterian	3.00	15.00	18.00	
Newberry	5.00	10.00	15.00	
South Dakota:				
Wesleyan College	60.00	54.00	114.00	
Huron College	30.00	1.00	31.00	5.00
State College	50.00	41.50	91.50	
Sioux Falls College	45.00	31.75	76.75	
Aberdeen Teachers	24.00	50.50	74.50	1.00
Yankton College	40.00	21.50	61.50	.75
Augustana College	15.00	11.25	26.25	
Madison Teachers	45.00	29.00	74.00	
Tennessee:				
Maryville College	40.00	39.00	79.00	
Tusculum College	15.00	13.50	28.50	
Texas:				
Southwestern Univ.	10.00		10.00	
Trinity Univ.	20.00	14.75	34.75	
East T. Teachers	45.00	46.25	91.25	
Howard Payne	10.00	13.50	23.50	
Baylor College	25.00	22.00	47.00	.75
Christian Univ.	45.00	48.75	93.75	
Denton Teachers	30.00	44.50	74.50	2.25
Simmons Univ.	25.00	17.00	42.00	
Baylor Univ.	20.00	26.75	46.75	
Sam Houston	15.00	4.25	19.25	
Virginia:				
Farmville Teachers	15.00	8.00	23.00	
Washington:				
College of Puget Sound.....				
West Virginia:				
Wesleyan College	5.00	8.25	13.25	
Wisconsin:				
Ripon College	55.00	56.25	111.25	
Carroll College	35.00	49.00	84.00	
Oshkosh Teachers	30.00	8.00	38.00	
	<u>\$3987.00</u>	<u>\$3403.60</u>	<u>\$7390.60</u>	<u>\$215.35</u>

Missing