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FOREWORD

The debate which appears in these pages is the first contest of the kind ever held between representatives of Kansas and English educational institutions. It was held in Manhattan, Kansas, on the evening of October 18th, 1924, between teams representing Oxford University, of England, and the Kansas State Agricultural College.

The question discussed was, “Resolved, that this house upholds America’s refusal to enter the League of Nations.” The proposition was upheld by the team representing Kansas State, and opposed by the debaters from Oxford University.

Debaters representing Oxford were M. C. Hollis, graduate from Oxford in 1924, and a former president of the Oxford Union; J. D. Woodruff, graduated from Oxford in 1923, and also a former president of the Oxford Union; and M. C. MacDonald, graduate from Oxford in 1923, son of Prime Minister Ramsey MacDonald of Great Britain, and labor candidate for a seat in Parliament in the elections of 1923 and 1924. Mr. Hollis was a member of the Oxford debate team which came to this country in 1922; while Mr. Woodruff was a member of that which debated several Eastern universities in 1923.

Representing Kansas State were Kingsley W. Given, of Chicago, a member of the junior class in the division of General Science, and former interstate orator representing Park College, Parkville, Missouri; James F. Price, of Manhattan, a member of the sophomore class in the division of General Science, and former intercollegiate debater at Swarthmore College, of Swarthmore, Pennsylvania; and Robert E. Hedberg, of
Oklahoma City, member of the sophomore class in the division of General Science, and former intercollegiate debater at Park College, of Parkville, Missouri.

The debate was one of about thirty in which the Oxford team participated with representative schools in the United States and Canada. Several questions were used by the Oxford men in their various debates, particularly those of the American policy of Prohibition, American entry into the League of Nations, and the French policy since the Armistice. The debate between Kansas State and Oxford was arranged only six days before the date when it was held; the Kansas debaters were consequently placed at some disadvantage in being forced to make their entire preparation in less than a week.

An audience of more than sixteen hundred persons heard the debate. The decision was left to a vote of the audience. Of the sixteen hundred present, only six hundred twenty-nine cast ballots indicating a change in attitude as a result of the debate; in deciding the argument, therefore, only six hundred and twenty-nine votes were counted.

In taking the audience vote, it was not primarily desired to get a pro-League and anti-League division at the close of the debate. Instead, the ballot was designed in an attempt to secure an expression of the change of view produced in the audience as a result of the discussion. Each member of the audience voting was asked to check one of four statements—the one most accurately indicating his position after hearing the debate. The statements follow:

"1. My general attitude has been favorable to the League, and has been strengthened by the evening's discussion.

"2. My general attitude has been favorable to the League, but the discussion has lessened my desire for American entrance.

"3. My general attitude has been in opposition to the League, but the discussion has lessened my opposition.

"4. My general attitude has been in opposition to the League, and the discussion has strengthened my opposition."

Of the 629 persons voting, 118 checked the first statement given above; 171 checked the second statement; 62 checked the third statement; and 278 checked the fourth. Consequently, the result of the ballot would indicate that the audience before the debate stood 289 for the League, and 340 against. The result of the debate was to influence 180 to a position more favorable to the League, while 449 were influenced to a position more opposed to the League than at the beginning of the argument. Since the Kansas State debaters opposed the League in the discussion the audience vote may be considered favorable to the Kansans by a division of 449 to 180.

The Oxford debaters made use of a very informal type of speech, which was at the same time very direct and effective. Of course no memorized speeches were used; in fact, the Oxonians go to the other extreme so completely that there is not even a division of points among the three speakers composing the team before the debate begins. No effort was made at consecutive argument; no attempt to secure team-work; each speaker presented whatever argument seemed good to him without consideration for the attitude taken by his predecessors. There was a strong appeal to the sympathy and good nature of the audience; humor, judicious flattery, sparkling wit, pointed satire and even mild ridicule are weapons of which the English speakers are masters, and which were used to excellent advantage by each of the three speakers who represented Oxford in the debate. The interest of the audience was held throughout; laughter and applause were evoked by the English far more frequently than by the Kansans.

The speaking style of the Kansas representatives was more nearly that characteristic of American debaters. No effort was made to meet
the visitors on their own ground, and with their own tactics. It is
doubtful whether any American team could be successful in such an
attempt; American debaters have been trained along other lines, for
the most part. At the same time, the Kansans attempted to depart from
the traditional formalism which in the past, at least, has characterized
American debating. While the constructive case was prepared before
the debate as thoroughly as the short time permitted, the Kansas de-
baters used that case only as a basis about which to build speeches
largely extemporaneous. The Americans were probably smoother speak-
ers than were the English; however, they lacked the close “contact” with
the audience, the ability to play upon the feelings of the audience, which
is the strongest asset of the Oxford speakers. The Americans relied on
presentation of facts rather than wit, and upon appeal to intelligence
rather than feelings; with this particular audience, the American style
was successful. It is to be questioned, however, whether the same
would be true of an audience wholly free from prejudice both with respect
to the teams and with respect to the question.

A better idea of the debate may be had from the speeches, a steno-
graphic report of which may be found on the following pages.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER

MR. KINGSLEY W. GIVEN
K. S. A. C.

Mr. Chairman, our friends from England, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We most heartily welcome to the Kansas State Agricultural College,
here in the very heart of America, our visitors from across the Atlantic.
It is indeed a privilege for us to have them with us, to discuss from this
platform one of America’s most important international questions. The
men who have for the past four years come each fall from Oxford Uni-
versity to discuss before college audiences in various sections of the
United States the problems which concern the leading English-speaking
nations of the world, are having no small part in bringing Britain and
America together in a firm and lasting friendship. We welcome our
friends from Oxford; and we hope that we shall have the privilege of
entertaining them again, upon the occasion of their future visits to the
United States.

Upon the subject of discussion this evening, America’s refusal to
enter the League of Nations, the gentlemen from England hold views
somewhat at variance from our own. We look upon the League of Nations
as an organization primarily affecting Europe. European conditions,
European affairs, have been the objects of League consideration in the
past; and will in the future. Americans are less vitally concerned in the
affairs of Europe than are our friends from Great Britain. America
views European affairs from across the broad Atlantic; England must
view them from across the Channel. It is but natural that the English
point of view on that essentially European institution, the League of
Nations, must be somewhat different from our own.

When the League of Nations was brought into being, Britain was
among the first to enter. The United States, alone of the major powers
of the world, held back. Not because of any inherent opposition to the
idea of world organization; a brotherhood of nations has been and is
one of our outstanding national ideals. Not because of any lack of a
strong desire for peace; America wants peace for herself and for all
the world no less than any other nation. Not because of any lack of
idealism; America's ideals are certainly as high and fine as may be found with any people of the whole world. No such motives were responsible for our holding aloof. America failed to join the League at the time of its inception, and refuses to enter the organization today, because we had and still have every reason to believe that the fine phases of the covenant did not represent the real spirit of the participating members; because we learned that the nations most active in the League were entering primarily out of a desire to gain some advantage by so doing; because we knew that the nations which today dominate the League of Nations have not adopted any real spirit of international brotherhood and good will, but are governed by the same selfish, intriguing, nationalistic spirit that controlled their acts before the league was brought into being.

For centuries past, the people of the civilized world have been divided into national groups. Each group built up within itself a moral code that held as right and good, every action of whatever nature that promoted the welfare and interests of the nation. The welfare of others was secondary, if indeed it was considered at all. So the morality of nations was no morality at all, when judged by the standards of individuals. Nations expanded their territories by conquest; nations entered into solemn treaties, and broke them as soon as it was to their advantage to do so; nations practiced fraud, deceit, trickery, every form of deception in their dealings with one another. America was no exception; nor was that nation which our friends from Oxford represent.

But when the proposal for a League of Nation came, the people of America expected a changed attitude from the nations of the world. They hoped that the plan for international brotherhood would be met by a general renunciation of the selfish nationalism of the past. But their hopes proved vain. Nations came to Versailles to pursue the same tactics which had characterized their actions in the past; to bend every effort to secure some national advantage from the organization being created. The great powers refused to enter unless the plan to be followed gave them control of the organization. France demanded from the members of the league, a military barrier against Germany. Italy demanded Austrian territory. Japan bent every effort to maintain and solidify her hold on Eastern Asia. And even Britain insisted on seats in the assembly for each of her dominions; insisted on the creation of a system of mandates which would greatly enlarge the British empire; insisted that no provision should be included in the covenant which would in the least endanger British control over the seas. Every nation save America came to the conference at Versailles demanding some concession, some advantage, as the price of entrance into the league.

America, disillusioned by the attitude of the nations, lost faith in the league. Instead of a brotherhood of nations, ruled by a spirit of peace and international good-will, she saw the league an organization of nations as greedy, as selfish, as greatly inspired by nationalistic ambition as before. And America, realizing the futility of the organization as a means of bringing about permanent peace, refused to enter the league.

Events which have followed the formation of the League of Nations have more than justified America's distrust of the sincerity of the nations which form the organization. The league was in principle an agency of peace; a means of maintaining international justice. If the nations which entered the league had really been sincere, some evidence of sincerity should have been found in their actions since the league was organized. They would have made every effort to maintain international peace and good-feelings; they would have carried out to the letter the terms of the league covenant to which they had pledged their honor. But what has happened? In the five years since the league came into existence,
the idealism which it represents has been forgotten; the covenant has been violated again and again by its members; its articles have become mere scraps of paper.

Let us consider some of the instances in which the lack of good faith of league members has made itself known.

In the first place, Article Eight of the covenant pledges the members of the league to take immediate steps toward the reduction of armaments. Five years have passed; today, the stronger nations of Europe are more heavily armed than they were in 1914. France has increased her standing army and organized reserve until it totals five million men; Italy has an organized force of three and a half million; Poland, Czechoslovakia, Jugo-Slavia, Spain, and Roumania have more than a million fighting men each. Certainly, the nations have ignored their pledge to bring about disarmament.

Again, Article Ten pledges the members of the League to refrain from territorial aggression against other states, and to protect the territory of nations whose territory was encroached upon. But how have the nations carried out their pledge? Since the summer of 1920, there have been in Europe alone, no less than eight cases of territorial aggression. In the summer of 1920, the Poles invaded Russia; in October 1920, the Poles seized Vilna, historic capital of Lithuania; a year later, Serbian forces from Jugo-Slavia invaded Albania; in March, 1922, Italy seized Fiume for the second time; in September, 1922, Turkish armies drove the Greeks out of Thrace, and destroyed the city of Smyrna; in January, 1923, French troops occupied the Ruhr valley in Germany; at the same time Lithuanian forces seized the German city Memel, and annexed it to Lithuania; and finally, in August, 1923, Italy bombarded and seized the island of Corfu, the property of Greece. Here we have eight cases of territorial violation, every one in direct opposition to the pledge of the League members in Article Ten and in seven cases out of eight, the violation was committed by a member of the league; a state which had solemnly pledged itself to respect the territory of other nations. What stronger evidence of bad faith on the part of the nations which today control the league could be demanded?

But that is not all. In the invasions themselves, only a small group of nations were guilty. But every nation adhering to the League, every nation which signed the covenant, rendered itself equally guilty of abandoning the principles of the league and the pledges of the league covenant when they took no steps to prevent these violations. Article Ten provides that the nations adhering to the league, pledge themselves to protect other nations from invasion. But did the nations protect Russia from Polish invasion? Did they defend Vilna, when the Poles seized that city from Lithuania? Did they come to the assistance of Albania, when that nation was invaded by Jugo-Slavia? Did they force Italy to surrender Fiume? Did they punish the Turks for their war against the Greeks? Did they prevent France from occupying the Ruhr? Did they require Lithuania to surrender Memel, when that city was taken from Germany? Did they punish Italy for the unprovoked Italian attack on Corfu? Did a single nation even make an effort to prevent a single one of these illegal assaults on unprotected territory? Not in a single instance. Nor did the Council of the League take action; though the Covenant specifically obligates its members to take action in the event of violation of the covenant. The nations, large and small, disregarded their pledges in permitting the repeated violations of the covenant without even an attempt to protect the injured states.

But let us go on. Article Twelve provides that when a quarrel arises, it shall be submitted to the council for peaceful settlement. Of the eleven conspicuous quarrels which have arisen in Europe since 1920, eleven likely to lead to war, three have been submitted to the council; eight
have resulted in war or armed aggression. Again the bad faith of nations
composing the league is clearly demonstrated.

Article Sixteen provides that the league shall enforce an economic
boycott against any nation which commits an act of aggression against
another. But in the eight cases of armed invasion which I have already
referred to, the economic boycott was not used in a single instance, nor
was any step taken toward its use by any member of the league or by
the league council itself. Again the failure to live up to the principles
of the league in good faith is established beyond contradiction.

I could go on, and mention the violations of Article Eighteen pro-
viding that nations will not enter into secret agreements with one an-
other; or Article Seventeen which provides for inviting non-members to
use the machinery of the league to settle disputes; or Article Thirteen
which provides that awards of the league will be carried out in good
faith; of Article Twenty-two which provides that mandates of the first
class shall be awarded in accord with the wishes of the inhabitants
of the mandatory state. But time will not permit. Enough evidence has
already been presented to show beyond a possibility of doubt that many
if not all of the nations which subscribed to the league covenant did
not do so in good faith; that the spirit of international cooperation and
good-will upon which must rest any success a league of nations might
attain, is wholly lacking; that the nations of Europe are still conducting
their affairs on the same basis of national selfishness, trickery and in-
trigue.

A league of Nations based upon an honest desire for a better inter-
national understanding, upon a genuine will for world peace; upon a
sincere willingness to surrender national advantage for the welfare of
the whole world, would be a wonderful thing. In such a league, we of
the Affirmative sincerely believe. But the existing League of Nations,
found on the same chauvinistic and selfish attitude on the part of
nations which has characterized Europe for centuries past; a league
whose members have not entered in good faith; a league which is re-
garded simply as a means of securing some advantage over other nations,
such a league is an entirely different thing from the league of idealism
for which America hoped; and we of the Affirmative believe that we
speak for the American people when we maintain that America should
not enter it.

FIRST NEGATIVE SPEAKER
MR. M. C. HOLLIS
OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

After the splendid game* I had the great pleasure to witness this
afternoon, I think I would be churlish indeed if I did not thank you for
your great courtesy in coming to listen to our poor remarks on the
League of Nations this evening. I wish to offer you my sincerest con-
gratulations on your victory over Kansas University.

I will admit that most people in Europe, when they come to discuss
the attitude of this country toward the League of Nations, are apt to
find themselves in certain difficulties because, to some extent, the League
of Nations does not seem to be a success; and evidently because the pre-
war system has proven inadequate to guarantee the world’s peace; but
that there is no chance of guaranteeing that peace save in some sort of

*Referring to football game between Kansas University and Kansas State
Agricultural College, which the Oxford debaters attended before the
debate.
a world-organization, seems a conclusion which follows equally. I will admit that most Englishmen who come to America find it difficult to understand, and some Englishmen who know something of America have difficulty in understanding the attitude of your citizens, who, united in States, should find it anathema that nations should be associated. The difference seems a small one—a matter of words—and for my part I should say that the objection to America's entry into the League being on the ground that it should be an association of nations, I should not hesitate to make the change. But this objection to the League of Nations is not an objection—I understand from the speaker who just sat down—is not an objection to the League of Nations idea, but to this particular League of Nations, and we have to find out wherein lies this objection which is so strongly felt in America to this particular League of Nations. Is it to this particular League of Nations? and if so, I would say that all these objections can be met; that the details of the League's organization can be changed without difficulty; that the constitution of the League of Nations is not written imperishably, and no jot or tittle lacking. All parties to the League of Nations would be willing to amend it and come to some agreement to meet the objections of this country, if only by meeting these objections she can see her way clear to join; and naturally if America fairly tries to see if her objections can be met, it seems that these objections are irrelevant.

Now, what are these objections? I have heard objections raised of one sort and another, sometimes inconsistent. Sometimes that the League is nothing more than a pro-German organization, and nothing but a Machiavellian effort; sometimes it was apparently such a strong thing that if America joined it would mean that her sons would be sent miles from home to lay down their lives in a controversy in which they had no interest; and sometimes because it was such a weak thing that it was not worth while for America to come in and join it. It is too important a subject for us to merely contend about and make a debating point. These objections are directed to one thing and another. What are these objections more in detail? What is this feeling which we hear so much of regarding Article Ten, upon which, more than any other, America grounds her refusal to join? There is a feeling that if Article Ten was in, America would lose her independence, and that she would have to send her sons over the seas. But what is Article Ten? It says that the members of the League of Nations undertake to protect and preserve the territorial integrity of other members, and the Council shall advise upon the means by which this shall be done; and Article Five says that the recommendations of the Council must be made unanimously; and so such arguments that are used in America against Article Ten that the United States loses her integrity, are not true. During the time in which the League of Nations has been in existence, peace, as the last speaker has pointed out, has been far from adequately preserved. And yet, take such a country as Canada. How many Canadian soldiers have been sent overseas to preserve the peace of some alien country? Not one. America would not be called on to preserve peace in Europe any more than Canada has; soldiers have so far not been found necessary by the League to secure peace.

We have the complaint that the League of Nations is intertwined with the Treaty of Versailles. It is hardly a fair objection to make against an Englishman, or against Europe as a whole, for if the League of Nations was intertwined more than it should have been with the Treaty of Versailles, was it not at the instigation of the United States that it was done? However, if it is imagined that these two documents happened to be within the covers of the same volume, and that we are out to enforce every item in that Treaty, it is a mistake.
is a document full of many vices, and it will soon be one of the problems of statesmanship to remove and revise them. It is a hard thing to do, anyhow. When Senator La Follette announces that he will revise the Treaty of Versailles, we wonder how he is going to do it. The Treaty must be revised in many important features, and I say there is but one hope of that being revised, and that is through the League of Nations.

You have heard of one of the Articles of the League—Article Nineteen, which provides that treaties shall, from time to time, be revised. I will admit that the Article leaves a lot to be done, and with that Article there it will be difficult to ever revise the Treaty of Versailles; but without the League of Nations, it will be impossible.

The League of Nations does not solve everything, but it is a beginning point. The gentleman on the other side of the house said that chauvinistic factions are still ruining nations. Well, I don’t think as much so as he would have you believe. I think he has fallen into the error that nations are like individuals, which have one character. But there is a small amount of truth in his charge that the League of Nations has been far from what it ought to be. If that is true, what is the reason for it? What reason for it is there, except the reason that the United States of America, the one country which could prevent that, is not represented in the League of Nations—the only country that could have stood for those things and said, “This shall not be!”

He says, “We will not go into the League of Nations because there are a lot of nations in Europe that do not obey the law.” We may as well say, “We will not have any criminal laws because there are lots of murderers.” If the lion and the lamb were still lying down together the League of Nations would not be necessary; but because this spirit of war has brought the world to the brink of destruction, it is necessary that we do have a League of Nations to bring about peace and see that there shall be no more world wars, and that civilization shall be preserved.

It is said that my country—England—inserted a clause by which six votes were given to the British Empire; and that is used as an example of the imperialism of my country. Now, first, the actual fact is, it is true that in the Assembly of the League of Nations every one of the self-governing Dominions are represented. It is also true that the decisions of the Council, except the pure matters of routine, have to be unanimous decisions. So the six votes of the British Empire enabling it to defeat the United States of America six to one, is a misrepresentation of facts. I would use the fact of the six representatives of the British Empire just the opposite. Suppose the League of Nation’s constitution had been drawn up and it was found that all parts of the British Empire should be represented by one delegate, and that Canada, New Zealand, Australia had no representation. But the English government does not appoint the delegates from Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Ireland. They come there as separate delegates. Suppose the United States would join the League of Nations; the delegates from Canada would come a good deal freer from the British government than your delegates from Panama would be free from the United States government.

Now, you say that in asking America to come into it, we are seeking to drag you into the Old World disputes. It is not the League of Nations that is dragging the United States into disputes in the Old World; but it is the economic values that have done it already. What is the good of saying that now? What is the good of saying that you have no interest in the League of Nations? The Old World is not concerned whether we have a League of Nations or not, but it is concerned whether the world is to be convulsed by four or five years of bloody fighting, or that we have a swift guarantee of peace.

You say that the proposal of arbitration has been so unfortunate as to fail, and that the United States would suffer a hard blow if she were
ever to submit to some neutral arbitration. This seems a peculiar argument for any American statesman to make, for America was the first country to propose, and led the world in this arbitration feature; and already in Bolivia, Chile, Brazil, Columbia, Guatemala and about fifteen other countries she is practicing arbitration, and this is no more than she would do if a member of the League of Nations. The only difference in America’s position if in the League, would be a very admirable theory carried out on one piece of paper instead of seventeen.

Our friend says that the League of Nations has done nothing towards the reduction of armaments. There are more soldiers in Europe than we would like to see; but after the last meeting of the League of Nations at Geneva, with a prospect of a second conference on world disarmament, it behooves us to wait until we have the result of that conference before we say that it has done nothing.

Now, all these wars that have been going on in Europe—there have been wars that we have stopped, and wars that we have failed to stop. We did nothing in the trouble between Jugo-Slavia and Albania. The truth is that there was a suggestion at the time of that dispute from the League of Nations that an economic boycott should be applied against Jugo-Slavia, and the next day her troops were in fact, withdrawn. There was another dispute in Europe between Sweden and Finland in which war was actually averted. But everyone who speaks of the League of Nations tells of the wars that do happen, and no one tells us of the wars that don’t happen.

I remember hearing the statement that in the crisis in Russia, the League of Nations did nothing. Why not? Behind Poland stood Germany, which was not in the League and whom England was not going to fight, and America, which did not belong. The League could not prevent it. No one will give the League of Nations a square deal. We do not claim that the League of Nations is some mystic formula which we can repeat. We say that it is the only practical scheme that can offer any hope. Europe, in her agony, appeals to the United States to come and save her at this moment when she is in a position that her survival is a matter of doubt. I appeal in the name of that other country Spring-Rice spoke of when he said, “Her ways are ways of gentleness, and all her paths are peace.”

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER

MR. JAMES F. PRICE

K. S. A. C.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Negative, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The United States is often criticized for her failure to join the League; and we ourselves are sometimes left in momentary doubt as to the wisdom of our policy, when the case for the League has been so ably presented as it has been by our friend who has just left the floor.

But he says that the Covenant is not perfect, and that it can be changed and revised. Our fight is not against the Covenant, but the fact that the nations do not live up to the Covenant as it is. I rather believe that our friend is appealing to the emotions of the audience, while we are going to try to give you the facts as they are, and let you draw your own conclusions.

Our argument of the affirmative, thus far, has been to the effect that the nations of Europe did not enter the League in good faith, or with any intention of living up to the ideals of the Covenant of the League. We have called to your attention repeated violations of the Covenant unmistakable evidence of a lack of peaceable intent on the part of those nations that compose the League.
We have shown that the European members of the League today do not direct their foreign policy from the standpoint of a world will for peace, but rather are seeking world conquest, selfish expansion and national interests at the expense of their neighbors.

Scarcely had the nations affixed their signatures to the covenant of the League of Nations when we find a certain group joining together in an attempt to secure control over the League machinery.

Frank H. Simonds, probably America's keenest observer of European political affairs, refers in the Review of Reviews for February, 1924, to a series of interlocking alliances which bind together no less than nine European members of the League. According to Mr. Simonds, France has since the establishment of the League, concluded formal military alliance with Belgium, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, and Roumania. Italy has entered into alliances of more or less formal nature with Spain, Roumania and Jugo-Slavia; and has a treaty of guarantee with Albania. Spain, the ally of Italy, is also allied with Brazil. Other treaties of alliance bind together Czecho-Slavia, Jugo-Slavia and Roumania; also Roumania and Poland are allied.

The existence of these alliances is confirmed by Sir Philip Gibbs the noted British war correspondent, in his series of articles, in the January issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

So we find that no less than ten powerful members of the league are bound together in a series of interlocking alliances, in which the position of leadership is held by France.

In addition, many other states, not directly or openly allied by treaty, must in reality be included in the coalition. Finland created by the powers and financed by French gold; Lithuania, which has been given heavy credits by France; Turkey, not a member of the league but a traditional ally of France; and even Japan, which while not a formal member of the group, still holds militaristic views that correspond exactly with those of the allied nations, and has from the first upheld French policy in all League affairs. All these nations must be considered as being at least closely involved in the alliance.

This gives a total of no less than fourteen nations, some bound together by alliances, all pursuing similar policies, all working together in close harmony for their own selfish interests, under the aggressive leadership of France.

It is true that these nations may occasionally differ among themselves; but in every case of any importance which involves one or more members of the alliance as against a state not a member of the coalition the allied nations have pursued a policy of complete unity of action. Consequently it may be safely asserted that, in spite of minor disagreements, the nations composing the inner alliance act as a unit in their dealings within the League.

Now it is an obvious fact that these allied nations control the actions of the League of Nations. The Covenant of the League provides for two governing agencies for that organization—the Assembly and the Council. The Assembly is the larger organization. It meets once each year, and includes representatives from each member of the League. It has very limited powers, chiefly that of debating and recommending, and, save for the election of new members of the Council, the Assembly can do absolutely nothing without the concurrence of the Council. This latter body is the real power of the League of Nations. In it are vested powers legislative, executive and judicial. It determines the policies of the League, it makes all decisions of the League; it controls the military forces of the League. In the words of Arthur Sweetster, British member of the Secretariat, "The Council is a small body of ten members, focusing the moral power of the world about one small table." The council is the actual governing body of the League.
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Now this Council is controlled by the inter-allied powers. It consists of ten members, of which four are the permanent representatives of the four great powers—France, Britain, Italy, and Japan—and six are non-permanent, elected by the Assembly. Of the four great powers, three are involved in the coalition—Great Britain alone may be regarded as entirely free from French influence. The six non-permanent seats on the Council are today held by Belgium, Czecho-Slovakia, Spain and Brazil, (all members of the interlocking alliance) and Sweden and Uruguay, independent states. Thus seven of the ten seats of the Council are today held by members of the interlocking alliance within the League.

Now we understand that the Council cannot act save by the unanimous vote of its members; but weak, independent members of the Council, such as Uruguay and Sweden, cannot hope to hold out against the combined moral force of the powerful members of the alliance. Greece and China, when members of the Council, refused to co-operate; they were replaced by nations who could be counted on to offer no resistance to the allied plans. Great Britain herself, the only independent nation of consequence holding a seat in the Council, has not once seen fit to resist these Allied Powers in any matter of importance. Consequently, the policies of the Council have invariably been determined by the members of the interlocking alliance, and the Council has, from the first, been entirely dominated by the allied group.

Now, controlling the Council, the real governing body of the League of Nations, the inter-allied powers unquestionably govern the League. The council dominated by the alliance acts for the league exactly as the allied nations direct. The league today is governed absolutely by the powerful members of the interlocking alliance.

Moreover, the members of this alliance are making use of the league to advance their own selfish interests. Consider, for instance, the matter of territorial aggressions. Your attention has been called by the first speaker for the affirmative, to the eight outstanding cases of territorial aggression, invasion and war—the Polish invasion of Russia; the Serbian occupation of Albania; the Italian seizure of Fiume; the Polish seizure of Vilna; the Turkish war in Greece; the French occupation of the Ruhr; the Lithuanian seizure of Memel; and finally the Italian bombardment of Corfu.

It is interesting to note that of the eight cases of invasion six were committed by definite members of the inter-alliance which controls the League, Italy having been twice the aggressor, Poland twice and France and Jugo-Slavia once each. In the seventh case of aggression, the offending state was Lithuania, not a direct member of the alliance, but bound to France by debts. And in the eighth case of aggression, Turkey, the offending state, was not a formal member of the coalition but was the traditional ally of France. So in every one of the eight outstanding cases of covenant violation, the aggressor state was directly or indirectly involved in the alliance. Now did the League fulfill its obligation to prevent the aggression, and punish the invading states? Not in a single instance. The Council, controlled by the inner alliance, refused to take action against members of that alliance in any one of the eight cases of aggression. The League refused to act, for by this refusal, the interests of the inter-allied powers within the League were advanced.

Now let us consider those cases in which the League has acted. In every single case of league action, the same thing is true—the action in some manner or other directly benefitted the great powers which control the League, or injured the foes of these powers. In the Aaland Island settlement, the League awarded the disputed islands to Finland as against the claims of Sweden. It is interesting to note that Sweden was not connected with any of the great powers of the alliance in any way—while Finland was created by the powers, and has been from the begin-
ning financed by French capital. Again, in the dispute over Vilna, involving Poland and Lithuania, Poland, a member of the inner alliance, was awarded the city, though it was the ancient capital of Lithuania, at that time a non-participant in the alliance. Lithuania, however, was later involved in the group by means of a loan from the French government.

In the third case of League adjustment, Upper Silicia was awarded to Poland, a member of the inner alliance, though a plebiscite was actually taken by the League, and resulted in an overwhelming vote in favor of Germany. In the fourth instance, that of the Greek-Albanian boundary dispute, Northern Epirus was awarded to Albania, another member of the interlocking alliance, though the inhabitants are Greek in both language and sentiment. Again, the Council permitted and ratified the seizure by Lithuania of the German city of Memel. Lithuania at that time being bound up in the interests of the alliance by a French loan. Again, when the Poles invaded Russia, the Council was urged to interfere; but refused to take action—Poland was a member of the alliance.

And finally, in the Corfu incident, Italy, the aggressor state, but one of the members of the inner alliance, received practically every demand made against Greece; and in spite of the fact that it was Italy, not Greece, which had violated the League Covenant, the League confirmed the settlement. In the light of these facts, there can be no doubt whatever but that the League has always acted when it has been to the interests of the inner alliance of powers to act—but has remained passive when such inaction was desired by the powers.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the light of these facts, there can certainly be no question but that the League of Nations is today controlled by a combination of countries, who have not accepted in the slightest degree the League's principles of idealism, but are governed by selfishness, greed and nationalistic ambition; and who have repeatedly used the league machinery to aid in the attainment of their own selfish desires. Such a league, ladies and gentlemen, the United States should not enter.

SECOND NEGATIVE SPEAKER

MR. J. D. WOODRUFF
OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have had to admire the variety with which the American audience passes a pleasing evening. Particularly in connection with another subject, prohibition—we were told if we wished to see variety, to wait until we got to Kansas. I assure you that we have this evening a very different atmosphere than one which might be expected in a university whose football team has just won a crucial battle.

Generally, as I have said, we are talking on more intimate subjects, and we have had it flung in our faces that we are a wicked, selfish people. That is the charge against which we have to defend. And that is the very charge which we are able to bring tonight against the American nation; that the policy which the American people have followed has been a policy which rather lets down the other countries of the world.

Thus far tonight I expect you have noticed that all of the speeches have been very eloquently designed to bring out the idea that things in Europe are in an exceedingly bad way; that the statesmen and people of Europe are exceedingly given to selfish ends, and I think any idea that the Americans are simpletons can be safely banished by the calculating suspicion and convert way in which the cards are stacked against us. And before leaving that subject I will say that I am exceedingly embarrassed as a result of seven days' labor*—only one day longer than it took

*Referring to time available for preparation to Kansas debaters.
to make the world, and I now know what is meant by "American hustle."

While I am the last person to come to this continent and say that America is to blame, it is perfectly true that for some reason or other, international politics is more or less of a jumble. I think that my friends are perfectly right in suspecting all the nations of the world, for when a man comes and says that he wants to bury the hatchet, it probably means that he has an axe to grind. Such a natural handicap is intensified in the case of my own country by the fact that Lloyd George who has directed our policies, had a large part in it; but if it is true that things were done in the making of peace which were to all fair minded people reprehensible, we think we should forget them. They say that it is a wise child that knows its own father, but the Lloyd George gentleman has disappeared, and Mr. George may take rank as a man of mystery; and when we talk of the League of Nations in the future we will hope it may lead a very useful life, although at the time it must be admitted that it betrays certain weaknesses—that is to say, all these weaknesses have been very prominent in the past and probably will be in the future. All these governments, however, will have their statesmen, and maybe you had better deal with them openly in Geneva than in conferences behind closed doors.

Rather more criticism is directed against the determined attitude of the French. Well, the French are suffering from a very severe attack of nerves. Their population is getting smaller and smaller, while that of their hereditary enemies is getting larger and larger, and they hope to make up by an abundance of caution their lack of men.

That is the very thing we tried to get the Americans to say with us. We wanted a grand consolidation of the nations of Europe, but we got a few gentle digs in the ribs as a reminder that there were certain sums of money still outstanding.

After all, the League of Nations is what it calls itself—a League of Nations. That is to say, it is nothing new. It is just a way of behaving which is only valuable as it is used, and is only valuable in proportion as it is used by those nations which can speak with authority. It is an idle dream to think that Europe is a place where you can visit, whose incompetent, inefficient people cannot make their own lives worth living. I should be the last to destroy the case that the other side has built up, but there is not much more basis to the argument than the fact that Europeans are an unhappy people, unable to get on with the main business of life and the protection and enjoyment of wealth. All that is upheld by their failure to get straight politically. It is the mere poverty that is produced by a failure to do business. Although we were not thinking of pity when we came here, we think there is need for pity on your side for the conditions which will continue from generation to generation unless some solution is discovered for the political ills of Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, after the Chairman had made what I thought was a rather unfortunate remark that the speakers here were not content to speak for a lesser period than an hour each, I want to keep check on myself. (Speaker consults his watch). I neglected to look at this when I began. In the course of my remarks I am only going to make one last point, and that is this: We could spend this evening quibbling over the particular decisions which the League has made; many of them, as we think, extremely valuable; others doubtful. We could follow that, but it would not be of very much benefit without a map of Europe, and this (referring to back-drop) is a rather idealized picture of the map of Europe at this time. I will admit that things are in a terrible condition, and there is a great deal of chicanery and greed going on in Europe; but the reason for this trouble is that Europe is largely an armed camp
because the peace was largely a failure, and for that failure the American people cannot escape a large portion of the responsibility.

You abandoned the Monroe Doctrine when you came into the War, and your present attitude is to drop out of European affairs when it is impossible for your idealistic impressions to take sovereign sway.

The oldest trouble in Europe is the trouble between France and Germany, and that will be only settled in proportion as the new spirit, that of the League of Nations comes to prevail over the old spirit. Half of the trouble is that the old spirit has prevailed over the new spirit of publicity and open-handed talk at Geneva. Publicity is a great thing; but they simply haven’t got the faith to come open handed into a full assembly of all nations of the world. The third speaker on our side will go into these details, but I will repeat that the main reason is a change, and a simple one.

America’s responsibility is being enforced by its interests. Mr. Borah makes this point when he states that American industries are looking more and more to Europe for their markets. You are producing more and more goods, and for those goods you need a market, and when you think you are injuring strangers, they often prove to be your children. There were a people to whom a stranger came and made advances towards them. They came at night into his room and fell upon him in the dark; but in the daylight they discovered he was their own child, returned. The moral is, that you think your interests can be separated from those of the European people, while reason says they cannot. I thank you for your attention.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKER

MR. ROBERT E. HEDBERG
K. S. A. C.

Gentlemen of the Negative, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

So far in the debate this evening, the gentlemen from Oxford have done a great deal of jesting at the expense of our arguments against the League of Nations. We realize that America’s entrance into the League is not a matter of tremendous importance to the rest of the world; but to us in America, it involves our future welfare as one of the leading powers of the world; and while our arguments seem to merit only humor from the gentlemen of the Negative, we are presenting and will continue to present the facts which we have collected, which we believe will portray the League in its true light.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, let us consider, just for a few moments, some of the arguments which have been advanced by the gentlemen from Oxford. The first speaker, Mr. Hollis, told you something of Article Five of the Covenant, which provides that in order to take any action, the League must have the unanimous assent of all its members. Now we are not basing our argument primarily on the Covenant and its weaknesses; we are basing our argument on the lack of good faith of the nations adhering to the League; but at the same time, this very clause in the League covenant which the gentleman has mentioned is a striking evidence of the League’s inability to do anything that is contrary to the interests of the members of this inner alliance which we have mentioned. If the alliance can get that unanimity which is necessary for the League to take action, then the influence of the alliance is far too strong within the League for us to safely enter it; while on the other hand the necessity for unanimity on the part of the League before action can be taken would make it absolutely impossible for the League to take action against this inner alliance for
its violations of the spirit which the League is supposed at least, to represent.

The gentlemen have stated that the United States is selfish, because it has not joined the League. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that you will approve of my statements when I say that the United States has not been guilty of selfishness in international affairs; but has done her part on every occasion and in every action that helped promote the betterment of the world. Perhaps, as the gentlemen infer, we stayed out of the League in 1919 for reasons that were wholly political; but in the light of the present-day development of the League, it seems quite evident that we took the course that was best; and I believe that you will agree with me that we are glad that today we stand outside the League, and not inside.

The gentlemen have questioned the accuracy of our arguments with respect to the Serbian invasion of Albania, stating that the mere threat of League action brought about the immediate evacuation of Albanian territory by the Serbs. Possibly the gentlemen are right; but permit me to call to your attention the account of the same incident given in the League of Nations Handbook, issued by the League of Nations Non Partisan Association last year. The Association is strongly in favor of American entrance into the League, and can hardly be expected to represent the actions of the League in a light any more unfavorable than necessary. But their publication states that the Prime Minister of Albania informed the League on March 5th, 1921, that Serbian troops had occupied Albanian territory, and asked for League action. None was forthcoming. So on April 29th, Albania again notified the League that their territory was occupied by Serbian troops, and requested the League to take some action. Again, the League ignored the plea, not even replying. So for the third time, on June 15th, Albania again appealed to the League. This time the League Council notified Albania that they considered it inadvisable for the League to consider the case, but that the Council of Ambassadors might act upon it. Meantime, the Serbian troops were still occupying the Albanian territory. So after waiting for three months longer, Albania appealed to the Assembly of the League, upon its meeting in September. Remember, this was six months after the affair was first reported to the League, and the fourth time that the League had been notified. So this time, the League acted. The Assembly requested the Council to appoint a Commission; the Council appointed the Commission, on October 6th—and the following April, the commission made its report—thirteen months after Albania had first complained to the League. Ladies and gentlemen, these are the facts in the case; instead of the Serbian troops being withdrawn the next day, as the gentleman from Oxford has stated, they remained in Albanian territory for more than a year. And my statement is based on pro-League authority, hardly capable of any accusation of prejudice against the League.

Now, from the arguments so far presented, it is evident that the League of Nations is not the idealistic organization that it is represented as being. The gentlemen from Oxford have not for a minute contended that the nations of Europe which compose and control the League are not selfish and nationalistic—they admit by inference at least, the truth of our contentions. We have told you how the nations are banded together in alliances for the realization of their selfish ends; that the League is hardly an organization of nations that are seeking to benefit the world, but a group of selfish, greedy powers. And the gentlemen have not dared to state that the nations are not selfish.

Should the United States enter the League, it is clear that we would be obliged to surrender a considerable portion of our national sovereignty; that we would be compelled to accept the dictation of a group
that we know to be controlled by an interlocking alliance of selfish
countries that would discriminate against America if justice to this nation
conflicted with their own selfish interests. Let us consider just how
great would be this surrender of American sovereignty, should America
enter the League.

Five years ago, when the League was first established, a permanent
commission on disarmament was formed for the purpose of outlining
a plan for the general reduction of arms. At the fifth assembly of the
League on September 24, of this year, this commission submitted a report
in the form of a protocol, the purpose of which was to employ the ele-
ment of compulsory arbitration in all international controversies. Article
Three of this protocol declares that the signators are committed to the
 compulsory arbitration clause of the World Court. Either party may
submit the dispute and compel the other to arbitrate. Once an award is
made it is binding to both parties and in case it is not accepted the of-
fending state is declared an aggressor and by Article Seven “sanctions
provided for by the Covenant are applicable against it.” Article Sixteen
of the Covenant defines these sanctions as “the prohibition of all inter-
course between the nationals of the League and the nationals of the
League-breaking state.” Furthermore, “that it shall be the duty of the
Council to recommend what military, naval, or air force, the members
of the League shall contribute toward the enforcement of these sanc-
tions.”

Now, at the very time the League was considering the adoption of
this protocol, Japanese feeling was at its height toward America’s new
immigration bill. Seeing her opportunity to incorporate into the protocol
a measure that would possibly defeat America’s purpose, Japan pro-
posed an amendment to Article Eight. This measure states that “should
one of the parties contend that the dispute arises out of a matter which
by International Law is solely within the jurisdiction of the party, the
arbitrators shall take the advice of the Permanent Court of International
Justice.” Moreover, “that the opinion of the court shall be binding
upon the arbitrators.” This simply means that any nation that could
convince the Council that her grievance against another nation was justi-
fied, could force the offending nation to accept any terms the Court
stipulated.

The amendment and the protocol were signed by forty-seven of the
fifty-four League members, a majority that includes every one of the
members of the alliances that control the League. As soon as the pro-
tocol is ratified it will be applicable to all members.

It naturally follows then, that any nation participating in the League
today, must surrender to the League, not only those questions arising
over international affairs, but the control of domestic questions as well.
In other words, the proposed protocol will give to a body of scheming
selfish nations power to override the provisions of international law
itself.

Now let us consider the position of America, were she to enter the
League, assume its responsibilities and support its protocol. Probably
our most important current consideration is that raised by the provision
of the Johnson Immigration Bill which excludes the Japanese from the
United States. When this measure was discussed in Congress and finally
passed, Japanese feeling was raised to a white heat against us as we
have already stated. Japanese cities were alive with posters of denuncia-
tion. Oriental merchants boycotted American goods. Some sections
even prohibited the reading of American newspapers. This feeling was
shared by the Japanese government, which, while not daring to make
a direct objection, carried the matter to the League in the form of their
amendment. Now, if America entered the League, this amendment would
make it possible for the Court to review her domestic affairs and at the
suggestion of Japan, pass judgment upon her immigration policy. Now with European states none too friendly as a result of their heavy debts to the United States, and especially with the nations of Europe closely joined to Japan in this interlocking alliance, we could hardly hope for the Council of the League to find any justification in our policy; and America would be confronted by the choice of being thrown open to a great influx of Oriental immigration, or going to war against the entire League, including every other nation in the world.

Not only would the League have power to determine our immigration policy, but its jurisdiction would extend over other domestic questions as well. The League could easily decide that our tariff system needed revision and take action that would seriously effect American Industry. International shipping could be controlled by the League if any nation wished to bring the matter up for consideration. Alien rights could be dictated and our entire domestic regulations would no longer be ours to determine.

Now with it entirely possible for the League to have such an enormous power over American domestic affairs, we must remember that the Council is controlled by selfish, ambitious alliances and that the powers that control the Council rule the League. We can only conclude that we can hope for little understanding or approval from Europe. Yet the gentlemen from England would have us enter a League which they themselves do not deny to be composed of selfish, scheming nations, and surrender our sovereignty to such an organization.

We would naturally suppose that the gentlemen of the opposition would possibly represent unofficially, the attitude of Great Britain, even as we believe we are expressing the general sentiment of the United States. It is with some surprise that we read in the current issue of the Review of Reviews that “the address of the British Premier at the opening session of the fifth Assembly of the League is especially significant in that it discloses with crystal like accuracy, the break between the British and the Continental point of view.” This article was written by Frank H. Simonds who goes on to say, “Premier MacDonald’s speech is little more than a restatement of the very reasons for which the American people refused to enter the League in 1919, a vigorous objection to the use of the military sanctions provided for in the protocol sanctions which must lead to war. Apparently Britain and America stand together in their views of the League of Nations. Now if this is the attitude of Great Britain, we can hardly see how the gentlemen of the opposition can advocate American entrance into a League that their own country is on the verge of denouncing.

In the face of Premier MacDonald’s denunciation of the League’s present policy, can the gentlemen from England possibly contend that America’s place is in the League? Can they show us wherein Britain, for centuries the strongest nation in the world, has been able to turn the League from its unreasonable purpose? Can the gentlemen convince us that the states of Europe have departed from their paths of greed and nationalism? Can they explain any worthy objective of the alliances within the League? Can they deny the existence of these alliances? Can they justify the element of force in the protocol of the attitude of Japan in amending it? If the protocol is defeated is there even then any hope for any different course from that followed for the last five years? Do the gentlemen dare advocate the entrance of America into a League that their own country cannot approve of?

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a great need today for some organization that can answer the world cry for peace but the League of Nations is not that organization. We have offered it to you we believe, in its true light. We have traced from the very beginning, the elements of greed and nationalism that dominate it. We have pointed out inner
alliances whose existence cannot be denied and we have enumerated forty-seven instances of the League deciding in their favor. We have explained the proposed protocol which would take from us even the right to define our own domestic affairs and would involve a surrender of our national sovereignty. If America must unite with someone for world peace, we had better consider some super alliance with Great Britain, a kindred nation who can no more approve of the League's policies than can we. But certainly these facts are sufficient to convince you that this house should approve America's refusal to join the League of Nations.

THIRD NEGATIVE SPEAKER

MR. MALCOLM MACDONALD
OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, my Friends of the Opposition, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

I confess that I hardly would have dared to come before you this evening, had you lost this afternoon's game. Before I went on the field I began to wonder what on earth I could tell you about the League of Nations that would console you under those distressing circumstances; but I assure you that my cares were lifted from my shoulders when I got up in the high seat. There was no doubt from the first minute who was going to win in the end.

It is very pleasant indeed to come to Manhattan personally and debate, and to see a fine game like that—and I also congratulate you on the extraordinary subsequent procedure, for had we had a victory like that at Oxford, we could not hold a debate within a week, a fortnight, or a month. I think you have shown a great deal of restraint. I wish we could have some of those cheer leaders and those two rival bands, but I would like to have seen some bagpipes, as well. I think that is a little clan of Scots over there. Under such circumstances I believe we might be able to make speeches on this side which would bring you a little more to our point of view, and the point of view of our friends and your friends in Europe.

My friend from the other side of the house has told you a great deal about the selfishness of the countries which went into the League of Nations. That is partly true; but the only thing I can say in reply is, that the greater part of the accusation is unfounded. The last speaker talked of the selfishness of the nations going into the League, and then went on to make one of the most selfish speeches on behalf of America to which it has been my privilege to listen. "We must not enter the League of Nations because the whole spirit of the League is on the side of the Japanese." That is purely a selfish construction. I am afraid my good friends have lost a little of the idealism and the faith which people in Britain and France and Germany and Italy and Belgium believed they had. These nations have not lost their faith in that idealism, or I assure you there would be no League of Nations today.

It is a little difficult, after traveling in America and receiving the whole-hearted and spontaneous hospitality that has been accorded us, not to wish that that friendly hospitality could not be interpreted along a larger way of helping us in the League of Nations.

My friend spent a great deal of time telling you how the League had been defied in the bombardment of Corfu, and other instances of that kind. I can tell you quite frankly that the greatest blow that it ever received was when the United States refused to enter it. I can assure you, as one who was in Europe at that time, that Europe was never in
such depths of despair during the War as they were when they learned
that the United States was not to join.

But we are not here to reprimand you for your actions. The League
of Nations was certainly an ideal, and it was perfectly plain from the
beginning that there would be mistakes, and mistakes and mistakes.
That doesn’t mean, however, that the people who are concerned should
shed their responsibility. The speaker has said that America has done
a great deal since the War to help the world. I agree. America has
been generous and high-minded in relief work; but those things are
outside of the main issue which we are discussing,—they want to know
about the bombardment of Corfu. Why didn’t Britain make a protest
against that? She had a seat on the Council. Was not America’s atti-
dude in staying out of the League of Nations of greater influence in
not stopping the bombardment of Corfu, than Great Britain’s was? Has
America’s staying out of the League had any effect in making possible
these eight or nine instances for which the gentlemen blame the League?
America’s attitude has been just as vital as any action of the League
of Nations.

The speeches which my friends delivered, described with a great
deal of accuracy the selfishness, a certain amount of militarism and
a good deal of hatred among the European nations. That is one of
the great arguments for a strengthened League of Nations. The object
of the League and the view in which it was received was this; that
it was going to be a kind of world-organization for the maintenance
of peace. My friend said it was strictly a European affair. I would
remind him that its greatest strength came from American capitalists.
We know quite well that the old methods of preserving peace have
failed utterly. Having no world-understanding, no world machinery
to which world difficulties could be brought, and as a result of that
absence the allowing of the world to be ruled by alliances here and there
—one military camp opposed to another military camp—resulted in the
state of finances in my country today. The nation’s budget comes to
about eight hundred million pounds, and of that, six hundred millions
go to pay for the last war and to prepare for the next one. This large
expenditure for war material and war debts is a very shocking waste of
human energy and activity and should make people consider seriously
an unselfish League of Nations.

We are told that it has failed again and again; but no one has
referred to its successes. In the first place, we are told that the League
had nothing to say when Poland marched into Vilna. If the League
hadn’t very effectively intervened, the Poles would have marched very
much further. The Poles were stopped from going further than Vilna,
and finally retreated from Vilna altogether. We are told that the League
was ineffective in stopping Jugo-Slavia’s invasion of Albania. Mr. Lloyd
George sent a telegram to the League of Nations saying, “Jugo-Slavia
has invaded Albania,” and calling for the use of the economic forces of
the League; and within a few hours afterwards, the Jugo Slavian army
was withdrawn back within its boundaries. A very good example of
the prevention of war, which could not have been had there been no
League of Nations, was in the question between Finland and Sweden
over the Aaland Islands. In the question of Silesia, we admit that
this settlement was very bad. It left dissatisfaction; and yet it was far
better than the best that could have been effected by any other means.
It prevented a war; it got the difficulty over with peace, and it left the
people for a certain period, at any rate, during which they cooled down.
You have international accord set up at a later date by the League of
Nations in the settlement of a very nasty difference of opinion when the
French tried to conscript British subjects in the Moorish provinces, and
it averted a possible war between Great Britain and France. Those two
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selfish nations said, "We will leave it to the League of Nations," and the League made a decision which Great Britain and France both accepted. There are examples of the successful work created by the League of Nations.

We are again told that the League of Nations is made up of nations who are selfish. I had the privilege of meeting many statesmen at the London Conference. I had the pleasure of meeting His Excellency, the American Ambassador. He would not tell you that his colleagues during that critical month were selfish people, and that France was the head of this great selfish alliance. Somewhat selfish they may be. I do not know what my people at home would say to me if I made that concession in the interests of European interests. France, whom we have heard belabored this evening, has made many sacrifices during the last six months, and if my friend will stop reading the articles of Mr. Simonds, which were quite true of conditions in the early part of 1924, he will find out that the spirit of Europe has changed very much in the last six months, and that those nations need America to come in and help them.

They are making mistakes. They are groping their way. They are trying, against the very greatest difficulties, to make this machine a success. France is coming into the Disarmament Conference next July, and I wish the American people would keep their faith and say, "All hope is not dead, nor does it sleep; wrong does fail, right prevails, peace on earth, good-will towards men."

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL
MR. MALCOLM MAC DONALD
OXFORD

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am afraid this is a rather sudden re-appearance; but I thought I would give you just a look at something you don't see in America, and that is "a double shot of Scotch." I should like to express again my delight in coming to Manhattan this evening and meeting in debate the Manhattan students. We have been here about three weeks, and have debated a great many of your domestic and international problems, and whatever the results may have been, we have been very far from losers by reason of these discussions. We have had most interesting discussion all the way between New York and Manhattan. Our understanding has been increased tremendously, our friendship has been added to considerably, and it is a great pleasure to add to our list of American friends some people in Manhattan and in the Kansas State Agricultural College. We have enjoyed very much the kindly hospitality which has been extended to us here.

Our friends, in their speeches, have limited their criticism of the League of Nations to matters that have to do with international affairs. That kind of activity by no means exhausts the activities of the League of Nations. The League of Nations, through effective organization in Geneva, has been able to do a great deal of humane work. It has been able to bring relief to war ravages; to relieve famine in Russia. It has carried on very good work in connection with the White Slave traffic. It has done a great deal in rescuing European citizens in trouble in Eastern countries. Every day, the League of Nations has been carrying on useful work in many directions. You cannot ignore that good work which is done quietly and unpretentiously every day.

My friend suggests that America's entrance means the surrender of her sovereignty. I do not think that, when I find that Chief Justice
Taft, Ex-Senator Wright and every judge and solicitor in the country disagrees with that argument. Mr. Chief Justice Taft says that by entering the League we would not surrender one iota of our sovereignty. We don’t have to go to Mr. Taft to find that out. They say America would lose her sovereignty by being compelled to take military action in matters in which she had no interest. Military action cannot be authorized by the Council until it comes by unanimous decision of the members of that Council. America’s seat at the Council table is empty. You will find an empty seat at Geneva which is ready whenever America wishes to come in. Therefore, America is standing alone against economic progress. Economic progress is held up by America. It would give America increased power over that which she has wielded in the affairs of the world.

My friend says that Britain has introduced six members into the League of Nations, and that the British Empire is seeking to turn the League of Nations into an instrument for her own good. They have that argument both ways. One said that the real part of the League of Nations was the Council, and the Assembly had no power at all. I answer him with his own argument, and say that these six members are on the Assembly, which has nothing to do with it on his own statement; and that Canada has no more authority in the League of Nations than would Panama, Cuba, and so on, and the British Empire has but one representative on a par with other nations.

I still want to know, after listening for three quarters of an hour to descriptive speeches of the terrible conditions in Europe which have been continually raised in argument—and now, getting back to another World War—I want to know from the people who described that deplorable condition, what are you going to do about it unless you can get all nations to make an agreement for a machine of peace? That machine of peace cannot be effective unless it has the power and authority of the greatest nations in the world; and all we wish is that one of the greatest nations of the world would add its authority to that of the other nations—to that machine of peace, imperfect as it may be, but which is, notwithstanding, just beginning to prove its worth. To use an old English motto: “Half a loaf is better than no bread.” No nation is able to shed its responsibility because its ideals are touched at the first start. We knew that the League of Nations would fail again and again unless it has the backing of the great moral powers of the world behind it. Our plea is that the League of Nations should be supported by America. The League would gain only by the adherence to it of that nation which today probably carries the greatest moral authority in the affairs of the world.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

MR. ROBERT E. HEDBERG
K. S. A. C.

During the course of the debate, our opponents have very frequently accused us of making statements that we did not make. For instance, they stated that we objected to England and her dominions having six votes in the League assembly. Our argument was not in opposition to the British possessions having six votes—it was simply that England would not enter unless that concession were made here. Again, the gentlemen persist in answering objections that we are supposed to have made to the Covenant of the League. Our argument is not against the Covenant, but against the things that the League has done and those it has failed to do; and against the spirit which is controlling the nations which compose and control the League.
Now, the gentlemen tell us that many authorities on international affairs, say that America could enter the League without any surrender of sovereignty. They quote Mr. Taft to that effect. But the gentlemen are basing their statement upon the Covenant of the League alone; they are not considering the proposed protocol which was signed only last month by forty-eight members of the League—the protocol which would give the League jurisdiction over American domestic policies, should we enter the organization. Now, what is sovereignty—would entrance into the League really be possible without surrender of sovereignty? Arthur Sweetser, British member of the Secretariat of the League, says that the “control of armament and munitions is one of the essential attributes of sovereignty.” Our late President, Woodrow Wilson, states that “joining the League is a recognition and surrender of self-sovereignty;” and goes on to say, concerning the League, “It abrogates the Monroe Doctrine. You have established a governmental body, and are bound to abide by its decisions.” Can the gentlemen still tell us that entrance into the League does not involve a surrender of sovereignty?

The gentlemen from Oxford told you in their concluding speech that the nations of Europe are ready to co-operate for world peace. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we offer you in refutation of that statement, the actions of these same nations for the last five years. Poland, Italy, France, and the rest of them have acted on principles that are militaristic. They have built up powerful armies. They have banded together in alliances. They have violated the League covenant repeatedly, when it was to their interest to do so. These nations are not for peace, but for self-government; they wish to realize their selfish aims through their control of the League of Nations—the same League which the gentlemen ask us to join, though they are able to offer us no guarantee of good faith on the part of the nations of Europe when they ask us to do so.

The gentlemen from Oxford have referred to the London Conference, and to the fine spirit which characterized the representatives of the nations at that conference. Gentlemen, the London Conference was called to prepare and agree upon some plan for the re-establishment of German financial stability. It was General Dawes who originated this plan. It was an American mind which brought this council together; and now the League of Nations says, “Yes, America, we will follow your leadership.” That is an example of American influence outside of the League of Nations. But had she been a member of the League, her influence would have been very much less—she would either have been aligned with the alliance controlling the league, and forced to follow its policies, or would have been opposed to the alliance, and consequently powerless.

There has been mention, also, of the economic and social agencies of the League—the crusade against narcotics, and the work against the international white slave traffic. But gentlemen, is this work really the work of the League? Hardly; these agencies were in existence, and working with all effectiveness years and years before the League was ever dreamed of. The League simply took them over; permitted the organizations to function as before; and assumes the credit. Do you know that the League of Nations takes credit today, for the work of the Red Cross? The League can hardly claim responsibility for the fine work of these organizations—America, a non-member of the League, is an active participant in every one of them, and is doing as much as any other nation in furthering the work of these commissions for which the League is assuming the credit.

The gentlemen of the opposition assure us that the League is not wholly lifeless—that in a number of cases, it has taken action; that it
settled the dispute between Finland and Sweden; that it averted war in Upper Silicia; that it settled the boundary dispute between Albania and Greece; that it acted in the incident of Corfu. But, ladies and gentlemen, the advocates of the League seem strongly at a loss for instances of success on the part of the League; for every one of the instances they have cited have been cases which we had already called to your attention as establishing the power and control of the interlocking alliance over the League; for in every one of these cases which the gentlemen mention, the decision and action of the League was directly in behalf of the interests of one or more of the members of the interlocking alliance. And the gentlemen from England have not ventured to contradict our statements to that effect; by their silence they have indeed admitted it.

The gentlemen from Oxford have very cleverly appealed to your sentiment; they have told you that if the League has been a failure it is because of America's failure to enter it; if the nations that compose the League are governed by selfish ambition, the cause is America's selfishness in remaining without; in other words, they blame the entire condition of Europe today upon America. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I feel reasonably certain that the nations of Europe are greedy, and selfish, and nationalistic, without any help or encouragement whatever from the United States; and I believe that you will agree with me that the cause of their selfishness is not America's refusal to enter, but the traditional nationalism, greed and self-seeking policies of Europe, which existed long before the League came into existence, which exist today, and which would continue to exist even were the United States so unwise as to join the League.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, throughout this entire debate, we have endeavored to impress upon you the fact that the nations which entered the League did not, upon so doing, lay aside their desire for national advancement—their selfishness and greed. The gentlemen from England make no attempt to deny this fact; they admit again and again that selfishness dominates Europe. We have offered for your consideration the network of alliances established since the formation of the League, binding together practically all of the powerful nations of Europe, and a few from other parts of the world—and the gentlemen from Oxford have not ventured to deny the existence of these alliances. We have pointed out the actions of the League, and the League's failures to act; and have called to your attention the fact that every decision of the League has benefitted one or more of these allied nations; every action of the League seems to have been in their interests; every failure to act on the part of the League was a failure which benefitted one of these allied nations. The gentlemen from England have again made no effort to deny the implication that the League is controlled by members of the alliance; that it acts in the interests of this alliance. We have pointed out the protocol, signed by forty-eight League members only last month; no reference whatever has been made to it by the Negative, though they have had ample time to do so. And finally, in my own constructive speech, I specifically called attention to the denunciation of the very idea contained in this protocol—that of the use of military sanctions—by none other than Premier MacDonald of Great Britain, himself; a denunciation which puts Great Britain officially in virtually the same position that we are in here in the United States. But the gentlemen from Oxford have studiously avoided any mention whatever of this attitude.

Ladies and gentlemen, our friends from England dare not deny the facts that we have presented. They dare not deny the spirit of selfishness which dominates Europe; the existence of the inner alliance, the control of the League by this alliance; the repeated actions of the
League in the interests of this alliance; the surrender of sovereignty that would be entailed by American entrance into the League. The facts speak for themselves. America dare not jeopardize her future by entering the League of Nations.

COE MEETS OXFORD

Coe won its first international debate last night when the Crimson arguers defeated Oxford University, England, by a 437 to 95 decision. A rising vote was taken.

M. C. Hollis opened the debate for the affirmative, with J. D. Woodruff and Malcolm MacDonald following in that order. Vernon C. McIraith '26, Warren C. Kehn '27, and George E. Simpson '26 spoke in that order for the Coe team.

The question for discussion was, "Resolved: That this house is opposed to the principles of prohibition." The speeches throughout the debate were tempered with caustic remarks and much humor, especially from the visiting trio.

The negative took the stand for the praise of strong drink and the praise of personal liberty, while the Coe team came back in its contentions that prohibition is absolutely essential to the public, that it gives a legitimate limitation to personal liberty and that it is economically sound.

Keep Hearers Chuckling

The members of the visiting trio spoke extemporaneously, touched on points of American life as if they had lived here, and kept the audience chuckling at their stories and comments.

Abraham Lincoln, for instance, was invoked by MacDonald in proving to his hearers that the nation's great leaders were not in favor of sacrificing human liberty for the sake of prohibition. The premier's son read from a letter Lincoln once wrote in which he took occasion to pay his respects to those who issued tirades against beer drinking.

"Alcohol is a poison; it lessens the span of life," the Coe team told its hearers.

"That may be," Woodruff rejoined, "but alcohol has been used for some 7,000 years and if it is a poison you must admit it is a mighty slow one.

"Anyway it is better to live only half as long and see twice as much. Would you trade your birthright for a mess of dotage?" he jokingly taunted.

"We would do away with many of the social reformers of the day who take the joy out of life," Hollis said, in stating the position of his team.

"Give us wine which makes man just a bit more genial and friendly and happy. Sweep away these reformers who wish to make the world go round but who only give it a turn and give us liquor which literally does make the world go round," he said.

MacDonald took a rap at those who say that poverty and prohibition go hand in hand.

"You might truthfully say that wealth and liquor drinking go hand in hand, but to say that poverty and prohibition go together shows lack of moral courage to attack industrial institutions which permit poverty."

The question of where medicine stands on prohibition provoked a discussion.
"The king's physician prescribes liquor for our king," MacDonald told his audience, "while the physicians for various cabinet ministers have advised moderate use of alcohol because of their increased worries," MacDonald argued.—The Coe College Cosmos.

WESTMINSTER BESTS OXFORD IN DEBATE

A highly interesting debate was held between teams representing Oxford University and Westminster College in the auditorium of Westport High School at Kansas City, Missouri, the evening of October 17. About 2000 people were present, the auditorium being crowded to capacity. Many stood throughout the two hours of the debate.

The audience manifested the most intense interest, frequently breaking into cheering as English or American speaker would make apt thrust or parry. The motion debated was: That this house is opposed to the principle of prohibition. The English debaters defended the motion while the Westminster men opposed it.

The Oxford team was composed of J. D. Woodruff, M. C. Hollis, and Malcolm MacDonald. Woodruff was born in Kent in 1897, and was educated under the Benedictine monks at Downside in Bath. He served under the foreign office and admiralty in Holland in the latter part of the world war, won an exhibition at New College, the Lothian prize in 1921, and a first class in the final History School in 1923. His father's mother's family, the Winthrops, were prominent among the early settlers of New England in the seventeenth century. Woodruff is also a former president of the Oxford University Liberal Club.

Hollis was born at Asebridge, Somerset, England, on March 29, 1901. He was educated at Eaton and Balliol College, Oxford, entering the latter in 1920. He was president of the Union in 1923. Hollis has written for several English papers and contributed to the Outlook.

MacDonald is the son of the present prime minister of Great Britain and was educated in Dedales school in Hampshire, a co-educational institution. He was awarded a scholarship in history to Oxford, where at Queen's college he studied history and economics. In 1923 he was a candidate for parliament from the Bassetlaw division of Nottinghamshire in the general election, and is standing for parliament in his absence in the present election.

Westminster was represented by three members of the Missouri Alpha chapter of Pi Kappa Delta; Kenneth Lineberry, Raymond Kroggel, and Albert Kissling. Each of these men holds the degree of special distinction in debate. Lineberry is an honor man in oratory, having placed second in a Missouri State Oratorical contest last spring, while Kissling is a special distinction man in oratory, having won the state contest in 1923. Lineberry and Kroggel are juniors; Kissling is a senior.

The English speakers were more suave and humorous, while the Americans were the more earnest and convincing. The most effective of the English speakers was Mr. MacDonald, the most sober, while the most effective American was Mr. Kissling, the most humorous. Keen and sharp thrusts and humorous parries were sprinkled through each of the speeches and enlivened the argument. Fine sportsmanship prevailed throughout, the speakers occasionally paying tribute to their opponents from the floor. MacDonald declared the American team the best the Oxford men had met thus far in their trip around the world.

Certain differences in the style of the two teams may be traced to the differences in debating in England and America. If one were to
summarize these differences it is most easy to do, by saying that, whereas all American debating is an imitation of the law courts, all English debating is a parody of Parliament. How does this basic difference show itself in practice? The whole emphasis of an American debate is on the contest between two teams. ‘Who has won?’ is the natural and always asked question. In England the emphasis is upon the discussion in question. The debaters are regarded as leaders of a discussion in which all present may participate, and decisions are rendered upon the motion by a vote of those present. Each speaker is therefore an individual’s expression of opinion. There is no attempt to present a coordinate case. Those who speak for the same side need not by any means do so for the same reasons. Mr. Hollis, for example, argued that the drinking of alcoholic beverage did a great deal more good than harm, while Mr. MacDonald argued that drinking was harmful, but that prohibition was not a successful method of stopping it. The Americans presented, however, a sharp contrast to this in their team work.

Mr. Woodruff opened the debate in defense of the motion “that this house is opposed to the principle of prohibition.” He argued that alcoholic beverage had proved of great benefit to man and that even if abstinence did lengthen life, one should not surrender his personal liberty for a “mess of dotage.” Lineberry challenged the alleged beneficial results of even temperate use of alcoholic beverage and insisted that the alcohol traffic threatened the safety and well-being of society. Charged with picturing extreme cases, he asked if, when one is about to drop a stick of dynamite, he should be warned that it would “make an unpleasant noise.”

Malcolm MacDonald, son of the present British premier, made the second speech for the Englishmen. MacDonald, who was by far the most brilliant of the Oxford debaters, agreed with the Americans that even moderate drinking is bad, but argued that prohibition is not removing the evil of alcohol, for arrests for drunkenness are increasing. Raymond Kroggel, of Westminster, replied that the increasing number of arrests for drunkenness argued increasing effectiveness in enforcement of the law. He brought out the fact that all other methods of dealing with intemperance have failed, and that absolute prohibition is the only remedy. M. C. Hollis, for the British, argued that consumption of wine was more of a blessing than a curse and that self-control, not prohibition, will prevent its evil effects.

The last speaker was Albert J. Kissling of Westminster. He spent the first eight minutes of his speech in tearing to pieces the argument offered by Oxford, and concluded by saying that prohibition is a new achievement of human liberty. His brilliant and deft rebuttal and his clear explanation of the principles of government involved won him a five minute ovation when he had concluded his argument. Though the debate had been a splendid struggle with little to choose between opponents, this speech gave a decided advantage to the Americans.

The rebuttals found each of the speakers at his best and they held the audience to the very last. Westminster won further advantage in these rebuttal clashes, and when the ballots were counted there were 976 votes for prohibition to 246 against.
(NOTE—The following itinerary of the Oxford Debate team is neither complete nor correct. It is the one supplied by the Institute of International Education under whose direction the itinerary was originally planned. After the team left New York, it found it necessary to make certain changes. Several debates not on this schedule were added. It has been impossible to get the complete and accurate list of debates.—Editor.)

October 3.—University of Pittsburgh. Subject: Resolved that the extension of state interference with the individual is a chief evil of the times.

October 8.—University of Michigan. Subject: Prohibition.

October 10.—Ohio State University. Subject: That this House condemns the policy of France towards Germany since the War.

October 13.—University of Cincinnati. Subject: That this House is opposed to the principle of prohibition.

October 15.—Washington University.

October 17.—Westminster College. ( Debate to be held Kansas City). Subject: Prohibition.

October 18.—Kansas State Agricultural College. Subject: League of Nations.

October 20.—University of Kansas. Subject: Prohibition.

October 22.—Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Subject: Prohibition.

October 24.—Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa. Subject: That this House condemns the policy of France toward Germany since the War.

October 27.—Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. Subject: Prohibition.

October 29.—Grinnell College. Subject: Prohibition.

October 30.—State University of Iowa.

November 3.—University of Chicago. Subject: Prohibition.

November 10.—University of Minnesota. Subject: Prohibition.

November 11.—Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. Subject: Resolved: That in a democracy ministers should be directly responsible to a popularly elected assembly.

November 14.—University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

November 18.—Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada.

November 21.—Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

November 24.—University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B. C.

December 1.—University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Subject: Resolved that in a democracy ministers should be directly responsible to a popularly elected assembly.

December 3.—University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. Resolved: that a referendum is a necessary part of representative government.

December 8.—Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington. Subject: That the extension of state interference with the individual is a chief evil of the times.

December 10.—Univ. of Montana, Missoula, Montana. Resolved: that a referendum is a necessary part of representative government.

December 13.—University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. Subject: French policy towards Germany.

December 17.—University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada. Subject: Prohibition.

January 5.—University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma. Subject: That in a democracy ministers should be directly responsible to a popularly elected assembly.
January 7.—Pomona College, Claremont, California. Prohibition.
January 8.—University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California. Subject: Prohibition.
January 12.—University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona. Subject: Prohibition.
January 15.—Stanford University, Stanford University, California.
January 16.—Mills College, California. Subject: Resolved that in a democracy ministers should be directly responsible to a popularly elected assembly.
January 19.—University of California, Berkeley, California.
January 20.—Sail for New Zealand.

TRUTH OR VICTORY?
GEORGE R. R. PFLAUM
Instructor in Debate
Kansas Zeta, Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas

It is with much concern that the writer has observed the decrease in attendance at College debates. A number of years ago the auditoriums were packed with people but gradually the attendance has decreased and interest has waned. Again it has been noticed that where debates with Oxford have been held the auditoriums have been crowded. This without a doubt is due to curiosity, the desire to hear and see the men from England. On the other hand the Oxford debates present a possible solution.

The comment is frequently made that debates are too dry and it seems that in the past entirely too much emphasis has been placed on the desire to win. The winning of a debate in many instances was a prerequisite for the coach’s advancement, and consequently the debaters were trained to handle a dry, technical, hackneyed question not for the education of the audience but to influence the judge or judges. The six men on the platform are well versed in the question, the judges are supposed to be individuals better informed than the average audience, and the subject matter shaped to win the debate, is not to enlighten the audience and ascertain the truth concerning the question. The great drawing card for the audience is the decision. The Oxford system has in part done away with this, yet the audience has not become educated to the system and still votes for the support of the home school. The audience should be the first consideration. A discussion of the proposition to enlighten, and an endeavor to arrive at the truth should be the paramount issues and not the winning of the debate. This win idea has brought about severe criticism and decreased the attendance at the contests.

It is interesting to notice that at the Illinois Debate Conference, held at Bradley Polytechnic, Peoria, Ill., with the following colleges present, Bradley, Eureka, Lombard, Normal of Illinois, Illinois College, Illinois Wesleyan, Monmouth and Northwestern, a very satisfying action was taken in reference to having decisionless debates; doing away with the problem of securing judges and also introducing the idea of debating for the purpose of gaining and giving knowledge instead of debating for a decision only. The following resolution was passed, “All colleges represented at the conference are in favor of decisionless debates.”

Iowa State College has gone on record as conducting only debates at which the audience will vote on the question or decisionless debates. Kansas State Teachers College with the cooperation of the College of Emporia will conduct one ladies’ and one men’s debate with audience
decisions. Each team will consist of two speakers, one from each college. This is an endeavor to remove from the vote all possibilities of favoritism, and allow for a discussion of the question for the purpose of ascertaining the truth and educating the audience. With the audience as the first consideration it is hoped that the attendance will be increased.

To further accomplish these objectives in debate it is possible that dialectic method, a neglected form of argument, may be used. The term originally meant, "The art of rational conversation." Professor Creighton has defined it as the art of separating a subject into its parts by discussion. It includes both reason and speech and is the process of defining an idea or principle and testing that definition by showing all the consequences, both positive and negative, that it involves. Dialectic application is advocated in some of our current literature. Mary Follet in her book, "The New State," suggests group discussion as the only remedy for modern political wrong doing. She says, "We all need not merely opportunities to exercise democracy, but opportunities for training in democracy, which means the upbuilding of neighborhood consciousness. A mass meeting will never do this, but group discussion will." By discussion, she means the kind that is developed by a genuine group. The group idea—not the crowd idea—is to come from discussion. She continues, "When we advocate discussion as a political method we are not advocating the extension of a method already in use. There is very little discussion today. Talk to air our grievances is not discussion nor is the present method of debate discussion. Their influence is pernicious and they should be abolished in colleges, schools, settlements, Y. M. C. A., or wherever they are found. In these societies the object is to win but not to discover truth. This is excellent training for present day politics, but wretched training for the kind of politics we wish to see in America. In debate we are always trying to find ideas and facts that will support our side, but we do not look for truth. The first advantage of discussion is that it tends to make us think, but its greater advantage is that it overcomes misunderstandings and conquers prejudice."

In an article in the New Republic, H. A. Doverstreet discusses the relative merits of debate and discussion. In debate, "there is a case to defend at all costs and the outcome is never an adjustment, never an incorporation of the truth that is on both sides; never a reciprocal elimination of error; never the evolving of a conclusion that is neither one side or the other. It is always this side or that side. Apparently debate has no proper place in a civilization dedicated to the careful search for truth. It is narrow, stationary and antagonistic but discussion is liberating, evolving and co-operative.

"The schools and colleges would be far more in line with the spirit of the day if they developed the type of mind apt for the handling of many-sided, growing problems, the type of mind skilled not in bilateral antagonism but in alert meeting of mind with mind to the end of co-operatively evolving out of difficult complex situations the judgments necessary for sane and successful living."

These are worthwhile goals to strive toward and in the future the first consideration in debate should be the audience, and not the win or lose idea. What could be better than a discussion of the question by the audience, under the leadership of debate teams who are endeavoring to find and explain the truth of a proposition. I believe the interest would be great enough to again fill our auditoriums.

"Dialectics," an article by Professor E. L. Hunt, Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, June 1921, pp. 221-232, shows how this method of discussion or cross examination may be used in the class room. I have seen the method used and am using it at the present time with marked results.
A CODE OF ETHICS FOR DEBATE

H. B. SUMMERS
Coach of Debate

Kansas Gamma, Kansas State Agricultural College
Manhattan, Kansas

Of all the types of intercollegiate competition, debating alone lacks a universal code of rules and principles under which contests should be held. To be sure, debaters throughout the country agree on a few general rules—that the two sides should have equal time allowance, that the affirmative should open and close the debate, and the like; but concerning the underlying principles which should govern the attitude of competing teams, no such agreement exists. That which is considered right and proper in one institution, or in one section of the country, is frowned upon as unethical and unsportsmanlike elsewhere.

The continuous increase in intercollegian debating makes it extremely desirable that some general understanding should be reached as to just what shall be considered ethical and proper with respect to debating, and what practices shall be condemned. With the idea of ultimately developing a code that might be considered really representative of the opinions of the collegiate debate coaches of the nation, there has been prepared a temporary recommended code, which it is hoped, will serve the purpose at least of affording a basis for discussion and criticism. The recommended code is outlined in the following pages.

The method by which the recommended code was developed was the same method by which it is hoped to ultimately produce an authoritative code, but on a smaller scale. A tentative code was prepared, representing the combined ideas of a number of middle western coaches, and in many cases intentionally more extreme than a final code could be expected to be, with the idea of insuring criticism. This tentative code was sent to a representative group of forty-eight men, including outstanding coaches of debate, judges, and others known to be interested in the cause of intercollegiate debating, for criticism. Of the forty-eight, thirty-six replied, and offered suggestions and objections. Four of the number expressed some doubt as to the desirability of attempting to secure a written code, but co-operated by offering criticisms of specific sections, and suggesting changes which should be made. The remaining thirty-one men indicated their approval of the idea, and also offered criticisms and suggestions where they believed changes to be desirable.

From the criticisms so made, the following code was developed, which conforms as closely as is possible to the suggestions of the invited critics. It is not offered as a final document, but as a basis, primarily, upon which coaches generally are invited to offer criticism, and from which it is hoped eventually to develop a code that can be considered as authoritative, and truly representative of the opinions of the coaches of the nation as a body. The recommended code follows:

A RECOMMENDED CODE OF ETHICS FOR DEBATE

Debating

1. Debating is a friendly form of contest. No act should be committed by a debater or by any person connected with the debate, which might in any way disrupt the friendly feeling existing between competing institutions. Relations between debaters and between schools should be maintained on a high plane of courtesy, sportsmanship and good feeling.
Courtesies to Visitors

2. Visiting teams should be accorded every hospitality due honored guests. Unless local conditions make such courtesies impossible or unnecessary, the meeting of the visitors upon their arrival, and their escort to and from the contest and to the train upon their departure, are especially recommended.

Securing Judges

3. No judge should be invited to act who has not been fully approved by representatives of both competing teams, unless by special agreement of the two institutions concerned.

4. No judge should be nominated or approved who is suspected of prejudice with respect to the question or the competing schools, sufficient to influence his decision. No judge should accept an invitation to serve if conscious of any prejudice with respect to the question of the competing institutions which might influence his vote in a close debate.

5. Should any judge fail to appear, the privilege of nominating his substitute should be extended to the visitors.

6. No entertainment should be extended to judges other than that which is also given visiting debaters. (This does not, of course, refer to lodging and meals).

7. In inviting a judge to serve, the invitation should include the names of the competing schools, the statement of the question, and a statement that the invitation is extended by the competing institutions jointly.

8. The invitation should also state whether the judge’s expenses will be paid, and what fee the judge may expect, if any is given. Such expenses and fees should be paid the judge either before, or immediately after, the debate.

The Audience

9. The audience should take, during the debate, a position of sportsmanlike impartiality, showing no undue favoritism to either side. Every effort should be made by those in charge of debate contests to secure such an attitude of impartiality.

10. No announcement or introduction should be made from the platform which might tend to influence either audience or judges, for or against either team.

The Contest

11. The attitude of debaters toward their opponents on the platform, should be characterized by a spirit of friendly courtesy. Sarcasm, ridicule, or malicious humor directed at an opponent personally, are to be condemned. This does not preclude, however, the use of humor in debate when directed at the arguments, rather than the personality, of an opponent.

12. No argument should be based wholly upon a technicality arising from the form in which the question is stated. The general sense of the question, rather than the form, should be the subject debated.

13. When extracts from personal letters or telegrams are introduced as evidence in debate, the letters or telegrams quoted should be submitted to the opponents for verification at the conclusion of the speech.

14. When charts are used as a means of presenting evidence to the audience, opponents as well as the side preparing the charts, should have the privilege of using the charts or material contained on them. It is recommended that either at the beginning of the debate, or at latest at the beginning of the speech in which the charts are used, an exact copy of all material contained on the charts be provided the opposing team.
15. Deliberate misquotation or garbling of statements of an opponent, or misrepresentation of the attitude of an opponent with respect to any phase of the debate, are to be condemned as unsportsmanlike.

16. Debaters should have the privilege of receiving time warnings of whatever nature they wish, from the official timer or timers of the contest. Time lost through interruptions should not be charged against the speaker.

17. Failure on the part of the debater to end his speech when his time has expired, or abuse of the privilege of completing a sentence begun before time his expired, by the undue prolongation of that sentence, should be considered unethical.

18. Debaters should be protected as far as is possible, from the annoyance of entrance or exit of members of the audience, during the course of a speech.

19. Interruption of a speaker should be permitted only during the final rebuttal speech of the affirmative; and then only in case of misquotation or misrepresentation of negative argument. Such interruption should be made in parliamentary form, the interrupter rising to a point of personal privilege.

20. Introduction of new argument in rebuttal is contrary to the rules of debate. It should be so considered by the judges without the necessity of interruptions by opposing speakers.

Judging

21. Judges should severely penalize, in their decisions, violations of the ethics of debate on the part of either team.

22. Judges should base their decisions entirely upon the comparative debating ability of the two teams, as evidenced in the debate, and not upon their personal attitude toward the question.

23. No judge should, under any circumstances, cast a "sympathy" vote.

Audience Decisions

24. Frequently, when the audience decision is used, the debate is not intended as a contest between teams, but primarily as a discussion of the question. In such cases, the audience vote should be taken for or against the proposition for debate. When a vote of this kind is taken, it should be considered unsportsmanlike and unethical for the team upholding the side which receives the greater number of votes to lay claim to a victory as a result of the vote, since the decision given is on the question and not on the debate.

25. If an audience decision is to be taken on the debate, rather than on the question, it is recommended that ballots be so prepared that they do not call for a vote for or against either team or for or against the question; but should rather indicate any changes in attitude toward the question on the part of the audience, which have been brought about by the discussion.

Scouting

26. Scouting of the debates of a future opponent on the same question to be debated later, or the use of other means of securing information as to the arguments to be used by opponents in future debates, is to be considered unsportsmanlike, unless permitted by express agreement between the schools concerned.

Sportsmanship

27. Whether victory or defeat, the outcome of the debate should be accepted with the highest type of sportsmanship by the debaters and all others concerned. Recriminations, excuses, arguments with opponents or judges after the debate, claims of unfairness or of incompetence
against judges, or sullen evidences of dissatisfaction on the part of the defeated side, as well as an unsportsmanlike "crowding" attitude on the part of the victors, should be considered as a flagrant violation of the ethics of debate.

DEBATING IN CALIFORNIA

Debating is under way in California with University of Redlands off in the lead. The women's league has been discussing the following question: "Resolved, That the observance of Defense Day should be discontinued." On December 4, Misses Esther Hopper, Helen Irwin, and Elsie Hanson, upholding the negative, defeated Occidental. December 5 at Los Angeles Misses Virginia Reid, Doris Smith, and Amelia Gray, on the affirmative, won a unanimous decision from Mabel Keefaucer, Griselda Kuhlman, and Louise Murdock who represented the University of California, Southern Branch.

The Southern Branch women, consisting of Alice Kramer, Mabel Keefaucer, and Louise Murdock won unanimously from La Verne College December 17. The same night Virginia Shaw, Griselda Kuhlman, and Helen Jackson lost a two to one decision to Evelyn Graves, Ruby McDonald, and Frances Ryan. The Defense Day question was used, with La Verne upholding the negative and Occidental the affirmative.

The Redlands negative also won a two to one decision from Pomona. The results of the Redlands-La Verne debate are not available. As the debates stand now, Redlands, with three victories and no defeats, stands at the head of the league.

The College of the Pacific won and lost in the first debates of the season. Its affirmative, consisting of Harry O'Kane and Roy Wilson, lost to Fresno State College, while the negative, consisting of George Burcham and Harold Milnes, won from Santa Clara. The question was: "Resolved, that three-fourths of a jury should be competent to render a verdict in criminal cases in California."—The Pacific Weekly.

The Agora Club of the Southern Branch and the Aristoleen Literary Society of the University of Southern California debated the Ku Klux Klan. While this was an inter-society debate, it was an inter-collegiate contest.—The California Grizzly.

OUR MOST PREVALENT IMMORALITY

If it is immoral to needlessly impair the body's vitality, then lack of sleep is Colby's most prevalent immorality. Students who ought to be firm-nerved, straight-thinking, and clear-eyed go through their college course with a perpetual tired feeling, irritable, sluggish-eyed, and languid-brained. They sit torpidly through classes and wonder why the professors are so boresome. They slump dismally into a chair and feed their minds on whatever takes the least mental effort. They wish that something would happen and wonder why they do not have enough "pep" to start anything. Fatigue poison has lost far more athletic contests for Colby than nicotine or alcohol.

A few men seem to be able to operate indefinitely on a very little sleep. . . . But the chances are a hundred to one that you can not. You can get along on five or six hours a night for a long time, but the accumulated fatigue will eventually take its toll. Nature always collects her bills.

Colby would be a better place to live in if the nerves of all the men were kept toned and sweet by a generous measure of sleep. Let us pray with “Robert Louis the Beloved”: “Give us to go blithely about our business all this day and bring us to our resting bed weary, content, and undishonored, and grant us in the end the gift of sleep.—The Colby Echo.
We take pleasure in designating this the Oxford Debate number of the Forensic. The Oxford men have been in this country since September debating institutions in a number of states. Four Pi Kappa Delta colleges have had the pleasure and profit of meeting the English team, Coe, Westminster, Kansas State Agricultural College, and Tulsa. We are glad to be able to publish one of these debates supplied us thru the courtesy of Professor H. B. Summers, debate coach of the Kansas team.

It is interesting to note the English style. As has been said many times it is modelled on parliamentary practice while the American institutions follow the practice of the law courts. There are other essential differences. The English system recognizes the importance of an audience if the presentation of truth is to have any effect on human conduct, and shapes the whole debate to interest and profit the hearers. Where the American interest lies is shown by accounts of the debates in the college papers. The headline over almost every story is—“.... Defeats Oxford.”

There is another essential difference, and that is in the use of evidence. The Oxford discussion is carried on on a more mature level. There is a more tolerant attitude, less dogmatic assertion, no high-reared structure founded on the thin basis of the opinion of some one authority. In short, the Oxford men speak as tho they were talking to mature, reasoning beings, who must be persuaded by due process of reason and who can not be suddenly cudgeled into a hasty opinion by a mass of extreme evidence and repeated assertion.

This is not a criticism of the American debates published here. It is the opinion of the author after following the accounts of American-British debates ever since Bates went to England and from having read some summary of almost all the debates of the Oxford team now in this country. Of course it is only fair to add that the three very able Britishers who have been meeting our own debaters are all graduates of Oxford and are men of some public experience and maturity of judgment. Still the differences remain.
THE ATHLETIC INTEREST

The faculty of a western college was considering methods of disciplining some students, who, under the excitement of an approaching football game, had been guilty of some rather serious offenses. "Dismissal is the only fit punishment," exclaimed one member of the faculty. "Unless the athletic spirit is curbed it is going to destroy the college."

"It isn't athletics," replied another member who was an alumnus of the institution. "I remember about twenty years ago when I was in school we had more excitement over a debate than there has been over this football game. We destroyed more property and broke up more classes." The other members of the faculty were dazed for an instant as they tried to comprehend his statement.

This is an athletic age. The athlete is the hero of the day both on and off the campus. Two-thirds of the student fees usually go to athletics. Most of the college paper is devoted to accounts of football games and pictures of the players. Special wires report the game play by play when the team is away from home. The one subject of student discussion is the prospects of the team. And the public supports this attitude. Our newspapers devote column after column to intercollegiate sports. How "Red" Grange does it or the performances of "the Four Horsemen" are safe topics to open the conversation with any stranger on the street car or at the restaurant. At a single game during the past season, somewhat less than 100,000 people paid more than a quarter of a million dollars to see two teams perform. But say, have you attended an intercollegiate debate?

It is hard for the forensic interests to look on and not feel jealous. No one knows the names of our leading college debaters and orators. Who were the men on the first team that Bates sent to England? How much space does forensics receive in the college paper? While athletics is wallowing in money, debating receives usually about five per cent of the student fees. And the debaters themselves, after weeks of hard, unnoticed toil, must speak to empty chairs.

Forensics, however, has no quarrel with athletics and should not begrudge it one bit of its popularity and support. There should be room for both lines of interest. While the man on the street will freely admit that it is much more important for us to settle our international problems than it is for the "Wildcats" to push a leather covered ball across a chalk line defended by the "Bisons," still he is much more apt to pay four dollars to watch the second performance and to cheer until his throat is sore than he is to sit thru an able discussion of the other problem. We shall probably never have to ask all alumni to contribute fifty dollars apiece for a new stadium to handle the crowds at our debates, but there is no reason why we can't see that forensics remains a vital part of college life. It isn't the athletic spirit that prevents it from exciting more interest. Already certain supporters of athletics are bemoaning the lack of support for athletics and pointing to the bogy of the social ideal with the "lounge lizard" and "campus sheik." Perhaps it is athletics which overshadows forensics now, but if athletics were banned there is no proof that student interest would come back to oratory and debating.

Forensics has a big task ahead of it. The few who are devoted to it, must influence the whole student body. They must see that the student of today learns something about the excitement and interest of a vigorous intellectual contest, of the immediate interest of our great problems of politics and economics, education and sociology, and of the power training in these contests brings. Our college debaters and orators must prove to their fellow students that the athletic ideal and
the social can not monopolize student interest and effort, but must yield to the intellectual its rightful place.

It is easy enough to say that forensics has a big task ahead of it. The question is what can it do to accomplish this task. First, let it begin at home. It should correct the common campus error that debating is all drudgery. Debating is hard work, as is training for a football team or practicing for a play. But debating is pleasant work when rightfully conducted with a congenial bunch of students. Those who are working on debating and oratory should speak more of the good time and fun that they have. They should have some social times together, be active, have a good time. They should see that plenty of news is furnished the college paper regularly. There should be something in each issue about forensics as there is in each issue about athletics.

Above all, the supporters of forensics must conduct their activities on such a high level that they attract rather than repel attention. A poor debate between ill-prepared teams is a dull, stupid affair. One such debate will set back debating further than almost anything else. Tricky debating which now and then wins a decision, but which leaves the audience unconvinced, but suspicious, baffled and confused, leads people to the conclusion that they gain no reliable knowledge at a debate. A debate should above everything else be sincere. It should attempt to simplify and make clear. To help an audience to understand some great question, to present only the best and most reliable information, is not only serving the public, but it is also good debating. After all, what we need is not more decisions and victories, but better support from campus and town alike. We can get more of this by taking the emphasis off of winning and putting it more on interesting and benefitting the audience.

We have the athletic interest. It is not a bad thing in itself. Forensics has no quarrel with sports. Our job is not to pull down athletics, but to lift up forensics. A survey of the last century of college history, with its changing interests and activities, must convince the student that things will not long remain as they are. We are moving rapidly to some other condition. It is the duty of forensics to help to determine what that condition shall be. Upon us rests the obligation to see that intellectual interests and activities as represented by debating and oratory maintain their rightful place in that new state and contribute their just share to the development of the college man and woman of the future.

The Forensic is pleased to be able to present the picture of our National Counsel to its readers. Mr. J. D. Coon is not only a member of P.K.D in his own right, both as a debater and a coach, but he is also the son of a member of P.K.D, for his father, while acting as debate coach at Grand Island, became a member of the Nebraska Epsilon chapter.

Mr. Coon is a prominent lawyer of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and has just recently assumed the duties of State's Attorney for his own county, to which office he was elected the past fall. It is hardly necessary to add that he is a Republican. While he has been a hard working public man, he has found time to further intercollegiate forensics in his own state. He has served as coach, debate judge, and general adviser and friend. No man not connected with one of the educational institutions has done as much for forensics in South Dakota.

He has served as national counsel for four years. His legal mind and mature judgment have been of inestimable value to the national council. His kindly nature, friendship, and enthusiasm have been potent influences. Those who met him at the Peoria convention and heard him speak will especially welcome this picture of him.
John M. Bull, Jr., Centre College, Kentucky Beta, has been elected Student Representative on the National Council, to succeed Paul M. Watson, also of Centre, whose graduation made it impossible for him to continue as student representative. In case of vacancy, the constitution provides, Article V., Division C, section 4, a, that the president shall appoint some one to fill the vacancy and submit his appointment to the chapters for confirmation. This has been done. Mr. Bull’s appointment met with almost unanimous approval.

Mr. Bull is a junior at Centre, a member of Phi Kappa Tau and the Deinologist Literary Society. As a high school debater at Frankfort, Kentucky, was a member of the team which went to the semi-finals in the Kentucky inter-scholastic contest. Mr. Bull has twice represented Centre on the platform.

The South Dakota Zeta Chapter at Northern State Teachers College is issuing an alumni news-letter twice a year to all alumni of the chapter. The letter gives all the forensic news and invites and returning alumni to attend the regular monthly luncheon meetings at the Dutch Coffee Shop. The chapter is sponsoring an intra-mural debating tournament for students not actively engaged in inter-collegiate debates. Individual cups will be given the members of the winning team and bronze shields to the best man and woman debater.

South Dakota Zeta is planning a forensic program which will include debates with a number of institution and participation in all of the contests of the Northwest Province P K D convention.

“Plans have already been laid for the great national convention in 1926 in Estes Park, Colorado. South Dakota Zeta will not lag.”

Miss Frances Tobey, Colorado Beta, has just returned from a year’s study at Oxford University. “Every student at Oxford must be inside the walls of the college at 9 o’clock at night when the historic old bell tolls its hundred and one traditional strokes; if he is late, he must pay a fine; if he is very late he will probably not be permitted to leave the college for perhaps a week,” she says.

“Since there are no classes, and attendance at lectures is voluntary, the students study for their examinations at their convenience. They do most of their studying during vacation, as their social and political life occupies their time during the regular term.”—The Teachers College Mirror.

* * *

The woodpecker pecks
The wood to mere specks
As he bores out a hole for his hut.
He works like a nigger
To make the hole bigger
As he proceeds with his cutter to cut.
He spurned every plan
Of the cheap artisan
Who advised him, for in answer he said:
“My whole excavation
Has this explanation,
I build it by using my head.”—Anonymous.

* * *

A quill, writes a sapient college student is the pinion of one goose used to express the opinion of another.
The Editor's Personal Page

Where inconsistencies cease from troubling and logic is at rest.

* * *

Myself when young did eagerly frequent
Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
About it and about; but evermore
Came out by the same door where in I went.
—Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.

* * *

Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge.—Job.

* * *

"I judge that our National Counsel, Coon, has received a commission in the Turkish army in addition to being elected State's Attorney by the sovereign people of Minnesota County, South Dakota. At least at the bottom of his last letter I find "JDC: BEY." The only definition that the cross word puzzle book gives for BEY is a Turkish chief. Congratulations."—From a letter by Vice-President Veatch.

* * *

"On the day of the Trinity next ensuing was a great debate, . . . . and in that murder there were slain . . . . fourscore," wrote Robert of Gloucester in the days when arguments were really settled and debates were debates. Spencer said, "Well could he tourney and in lists debate." Prescott related that "Volunteers . . . . thronged to serve under his banner, and the cause of religion was debated with the same ardor in Spain as on the plains of Palestine." More recently Sir Walter Scott added this:

* * *

"But question fierce and proud reply
Gave signal soon of dire debate."

* * *

The word "debate" comes from the old French word "debatre," which in turn was derived from two Latin words, "de-batuere," to beat. While we use our vocabulary quite figuratively today our ancient forbears were more literal. How effeminate we have become. We have no debates today where "there were slain fourscore." It is well. Better to hang a P K D key on the debater today than to pull out the spear and plant a rose on his grave.

* * *

Our National Counsel, who is pictured elsewhere in this number of the Forensic, according to an Associated Press dispatch under date of December 18 took President Coolidge out behind the White House and gave him a lesson in skiing. With Senator Norbeck of South Dakota, he was a member of a delegation representing the National Ski Association of America which called on the President and Mrs. Coolidge to present them with a pair of skis each and to invite them to attend the national ski tournament at Canton, South Dakota, in February. To show that he had skied in Vermont, President Coolidge went out behind the executive offices and donned his pair.

We presume that Mr. Coon also mentioned the 1926 Estes Park convention to President Coolidge and invited him and Mrs. Coolidge to bring their skis and attend.
ORATORY

Miss Reva Jarman with the oration, “The American Home,” and Mr. Paul Ward speaking on “The Enemy within our Gates,” won the local contests at Michigan State Normal. Over fifty candidates have appeared for debate and oratory this year.—College Paper.

Robert J. Clendenin, Monmouth, won the state oratorical contest. Miss Myrtle Horseman, Northwestern, won second, Louis McDonald, Bradley, third. The other institutions represented were: Augustana, Eureka, and Illinois.—Illinois Wesleyan Argus.

Otto Gruhn, a South Dakota Zeta, won the Lincoln gold medal at Northern State Teachers and will represent the school in the state oratorical. He speaks on “Greatness: Past or Present.”—The College Paper.

Ray Simpson will represent Simpson College in the state oratorical contest this year by virtue of having won the local contest. “The Menace of the Age” is the title of his oration.—The Simpsonian.

Miss Linda Trilk and Mr. Harold Bauer won the local oratorical contests at Central, Iowa Beta, and will represent their college in the state contests.—College Paper.

St. Olaf has dropped the Junior-Senior oratorical for women for an extempore contest.—The Manitou Messenger.

EXTEMPORE

Representatives of The University of Southern California, University of California, Southern Branch, Redlands, California Institute of Technology, Occidental, Pomona, and Whittier, met at Whittier College December 19 for the annual extempore contest. The judges gave first place to Roy Votaw of Whittier, second to Roger Walch of Redlands, and third to Ward D. Foster of Caltek. The general topic was “Regulation of Athletics in American Colleges.” Coach Glen Warner of Leland Stanford University divided the subject into the following sub-topics: “Should athletics be under faculty control?” “How should the business side of athletics be handled?” “Are intersectional games of benefit?” “What rules are most effective in preventing professionalism?” “Should coaches be regular members of the faculty?” “Effect of athletics on college spirit,” and “Is it a good thing for alumni to assist athletes thru school?”—The Redlands Campus.

Charles Carpenter, representing Washburn, Kansas Beta, won first place in the triangular extempore contest between that school, the Aggies and the Teachers from Emporia. Robert Hedberg of the Aggies won second. Lawrence Evans and Ferry Platt, also of the Beta chapter, won third and fourth. The present political situation was the topic under discussion.—The Washburn Review.
DEBATING

McKendree, Illinois Theta, opened its forensic season December 18 by participation in its first women's debates. It won both ends of a dual with Greenville. Immediate independence for the Philippines was the subject discussed. McKendree was represented by Helen Young, Emma Bergman, and Lela Smith on the affirmative, and Dorothy Harman, Delta Jessop, and Adelaide Graham on the negative.—McKendree Review.

Washington Alpha, the College of Puget Sound, has carried on two debates with clubs from the University of Washington. The freshman won from the Badgers Club. The chapter debate with the Stevens Club was a non-decision debate open only to Pi Kappa Delta members and invited friends.—The College Paper.

LOCALS

Sixteen colleges comprising the Mid-Western Debating League have agreed to use the decisionless debate this year followed by an open forum discussion. The institutions involved are: Beloit, Carroll, Cornell, Ham-line, Illinois Wesleyan, Kalamazoo, Knox, Lawrence, Milton, Monmouth, North-Western College, Olivet, Ripon, Rockford, St. Olaf, and Western State Normal. They are using the Pi Kappa Delta question.—Ripon College Days.

The women of Heidelberg, Ohio Beta, will debate the Japanese exclusion act and the men the St. Lawrence water-ways. The squad of fifteen men met with the American Society of Civil Engineers in Detroit to gather data on the subject. A heavy schedule is being drawn up. Professor H. D. Hopkins is coaching the men and Mr. Richard Palmer the women.—The Kilikilik.

Warren Van Camp and Donald Sham, representing the sophomore class of the University of Redlands, are scheduled to debate Fresno State College December 19. December 30 the same team is to meet the College of the Pacific. The question for debate is: “Resolved, That the 1924 Immigration Law should be so amended as to admit Japanese upon the same basis as Europeans.”

Some of the Wisconsin colleges are planning debates before the high schools of the state. Carroll, for example, will meet Beloit, Ripon, and Lawrence before the high schools at Rickland Center, Berlin, Romah, and Sheboygan. All who take debating are required to take the course in public speaking. A heavy schedule for both men and women is being planned.—The Carroll Echo.

Augustana, South Dakota Eta, our 100th chapter, has conducted an inter-society debate tournament. It was the Demosthenians versus the Websterians with honors in favor of the Greeks. There has been a remarkable growth in forensic work under Professor Kelser, the coach.—The College Paper.

The Juniors at Oregon Alpha, Linfield college, won the interclass debate series. Linfield has been very active in oratory during past years and has won the state oratorical a number of times.—The College Paper.
Kansas Aggies has joined a new debating league known as the Valley League. It is composed of the following institutions: Kansas Aggies, Washington, Drake, and the universities of Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas and South Dakota. The Pi Kappa Delta question is being used.

In addition the Aggies plan to send a women’s team thru Iowa, Illinois, and South Dakota. A men’s team will make a trip to the Pacific coast. The Kansas State Collegian.

The following debate teams have been picked at Ottawa: Men: Affirmative, Charles Trent, Lowell Bailey, and Carryl Church; negative: Ted Palquist, Wayne Love, and Edwin Lewis. Women: Affirmative, Emelie Hoornbeek, Hazel Griffeth, and Myrtle Jeager; negative, Lois Hogue, Maude Lynch, and Romola Ireland. Four of the girls and five of the men have had intercollegiate experience.—The Ottawa Campus.

Southwestern, Kansas Delta, using the squad system, has selected the following from its tryouts: Men: Cecil Headrick, Theodore Marvel, Donald Kitch, Glen Witherspoon, David Boyer, Alvin Allen, Reger Leidy, and C. L. Moody. Women: Alberta Haynes, Lucile Green, Edith Stewart, Catherine Schriver, Daisy Miller, Lucille Wright, Esther McMurray, and Eloise Hatteberg.—The Southwestern Collegian.

The Southern California Women Forensic league, consisting of Southern Branch, Redlands, Pomona, Occidental, and La Verne, will hold an extempore contest this year for the first time. The contest has been scheduled at Redlands for March 18. Disregard for law in the United States is the topic selected.

Two former East Texas, Texas Gamma, debaters have won fresh honors on other fields. Paul Bledsoe was one of the twelve selected for debating at Texas University from among seventy competitors. Mr. Arthur West won first place in one of the literary society tryouts at Vanderbilt.—The East Texan.

Two literary societies at Baylor University have agreed to hold a debate at four o’clock in the morning. Their difficulty is in securing judges. It has been suggested that they use the milk man for one.—The Howard Payne Yellow Jacket.

Trinity, Texas Beta, is planning a triangle with Southwestern Texas Alpha, and Texas Christian University. It will also probably meet the University of Tulsa.—The Trintioneer.

The University of Redlands, besides a large program of local contests, has debates scheduled with Washington State, Williamette, and the universities of Nevada and Arizona.—Redlands Campus.

W. O. Ross, a former debater from Oklahoma Baptist, was awarded first place in the debate tryouts at Missouri University where he is a senior this year.—The Bison.

George Ross and George Wise, former Central Missouri debaters, have made the University of Missouri debating teams this season.—Central Collegian.

Kansas Epsilon, Fairmount, has organized a series of inter-society contests. The oratorical contest for the men was won by Samuel Grimes while Miss Ruth Stevens won the women’s contest.—The Sunflower.
Iowa Alpha, Iowa Wesleyan, has been very active in creating forensics interest. It entertained all those interested in forensics at a six o’clock breakfast. The institution has agreed to award Pi Kappa Delta keys to all who earn them in forensics. Professor McReynolds, in his efforts to make the work interesting, created quite a bit of campus excitement over a debate on the superiority of the clinging vine type of girl over the super-intellectual for domestic happiness. The “high-brows” finally won the contest.

The debate teams have been selected. During Christmas vacation the members plan to visit the law library at the University of Iowa. “Racial conflicts in the United States” has been selected as the general subject for the extemopore contest.—Iowa Wesleyon News.

The Forensic league at Nebraska Teachers of Kearney is running motion pictures to raise funds to carry out its program. The debating teams selected consist of the following: Affirmative, Homer Morrow, Jack DeVoe, and Margaret Yoder; the negative, Homer McConnell, Kermit Jackson, and Matt Wigton.—The Antelope.

Simpson, Iowa Epsilon, with debates scheduled with the University of Southern California and the Chicago Kent school of law, besides state contests, is preparing for an active forensic season.—The Simpsonian.

Forensics were placed on a better financial footing at Kansas Aggies when the percentage of the student body fees allowed forensics was increased from 6.7 last year to 7.5 this year. It is estimated that this will give forensics about $2,100.—The Kansas State Collegian.

Walter Cerka, Harley Farnham, Rex Frolkey, Helen McCauley, Alfred Skogsberg, and Clarence Westphal were chosen in the debate tryouts at Wesleyan Union to represent Iowa Iota in a dual debate with Dakota Wesleyan on December 12.—The Gleam.

The Teachers of Pittsburg, Kansas, are planning to send a full delegation to the district Pi Kappa Delta contest which will be held in either Wichita or Stillwater, Oklahoma.—College Paper.

College of Emporia plans to send a debate team into Oklahoma and Arkansas. It will also meet the University of Southern California on its own floor.—College Life.

With two members of the state championship team back, Bethany is preparing for the heaviest schedule it has ever undertaken.—The Bethany Messenger.

Kansas Wesleyan debaters are at work. They plan to end the season at the provincial convention at Wichita.—The Kansas Wesleyan Advocate.

Leland Tallman, formerly of Parsons, is reported to have won first place in the debate tryouts at the University of Southern California.

Washburn conducts a series of inter-society debates as a means of bringing out promising debate material.—The Washburn Review.

The Sophomores won the inter-class debate at Sioux Falls College.—The Sioux Falls Stylus.
Here is another correction concerning the attendance at Peoria. Harlowne Bowes and Paul V. Betters represented Hamline. Mr. Betters is now president of the Minnesota Gamma Chapter and is trying to raise funds to send a large delegation to the Estes Park convention. Mr. Paul Hanna, last year’s president, is now doing graduate work at Columbia. Professor Merle L. Wright, the debate coach, was elected president of the Mid-West debate conference.

Sixteen entered the freshman extempore contest at Culver-Stockton. Much interest is being shown in oratory. A member of the faculty, Professor Nelson, is a former winner of the inter-state oratorical contest. —Culver-Stockton Megaphone.

The following students will represent Grand Island in debate this year: Margaret Rice, C. E. Strong, and Earl Hayter on the affirmative, and Richard Johnson, Paul Newell, and Mary Goldenstein on the negative. —College Paper.

The Olivet debate squad attended the Hillsdale-Oxford debate. A debate on allowing the members of the three upper classes to attend class at their own discretion aroused a good deal of campus interest. —The Olivet College Echo.

Fourteen men were selected on the debate squad at Kalamazoo. Cash prizes aggregating $165 were offered last year. The Michigan state league is using the Pi Kappa Delta question. —The Kalamazoo College Index.

The following men have been picked by Coach Sawyer for the debate teams this year at Oklahoma Baptist: Jent, White, Compere, and Yarbrough, and Wilson, Marshall, Hank, and Walker. —The Bison.

The Freshmen won the inter-class debate at Otterbein on the St. Lawrence deep-sea-water-way question. The debaters were banqueted by the Ohio Epsilon chapter after the debate. —College Paper.

Debating has been placed on a new footing at Hope college this year by the securing of Professor Lubbers to act as coach. Before this the college has had no real coach. —The Hope Anchor.

Donald Leonard was awarded the Davidow prize of $25 for having shown the greatest proficiency in forensics last year and for having done the most to advance the art. —Detroit Collegian.

Kansas Theta and Iota, located in the same town of Emporia, have arranged for a split-team debate after the Oxford plan. The Teachers have nine debates scheduled. —College Paper.

George B. Wolstenholme who represented Colby in the oratorical contest at the Fourth National Convention is now pastor at Bath, Maine. —The Colby Oracle.

The squad system is being used at Oklahoma Aggies this year. The men’s squad is selected but the women’s squad had not held its tryouts. —The O’Collegian.

The Kentucky Intercollegiate Debating Association selected the Supreme Court question for its debates this year. —The Crimson Rambler of Transylvania.
The College of the Pacific has debates scheduled with University of West Virginia and Willamette. It will engage in seven debates in its own league, besides sending a team to southern California to meet Redlands and Pomona. Its debate society, the Forum, will debate similar organizations in Stanford, Santa Clara, St. Mary's, St. Ignatius, and several other institutions.—The Pacific Weekly.

A very extensive program of inter-society debates was conducted at St. Olaf this year. Almost one hundred men and women took part in these contests. An extensive debate program will be carried out, with the men discussing the Pi Kappa Delta question, and the women government ownership and operation of the railroads.—The Manitou Messenger.

Women's inter-society debates were undertaken at Park this year for the first time. They were very successful. The debate squads picked are as follows: Men: Bail Bradley, Robert Chaffin, Wallace Filson, Glenn Ginn, Arthur Harris, James Hays, and Kenford Nelson. The women: Katherine Blair, Gertrude Graham, Jeanette Peery, Florence Winter, Margaret Moore, and Marion Sternberg.—The Stylus.

William Jewell will meet the University of Southern California in debate this year. The Missouri Delta chapter has had the most successful tryout in its history. The squad system will be used from now on.—College Paper.

Edgar Wilson, Frank Lelarmarter, Howard Derby, and Gerald Wallace were recently initiated in the California Delta chapter at the College of the Pacific. Mr. Wallace is the debate coach.—The Pacific Weekly.

The University of Akron will debate the St. Lawrence water-ways question with a number of other Ohio institutions. Pearl Vanica, president of the chapter there, is pushing local interest.—The Bucktetite.

Pi Kappa Delta at Gustavus Adolphus is this year sponsoring a freshmen debate clash. The debate season is under way. The squad system is being used to pick the debaters.—The Gustavian Weekly.

The Pi Kappa Delta chapter at Redlands took a number of prospective debaters to a retreat at Kamp Kold Brook in the mountains for a forensic conference.—Redlands Campus.

The freshmen of Caltek have a debate scheduled with Fullerton Junior College for December 12. The League of Nations is the question.—The California Teck.

Minnesota Alpha put on a special chapel program to attract interest in forensics. Mr. Gray, the new coach, was presented to the students.—The Mac Weekly.

Huron men are debating the recognition of Russia, and the women the abolition of capital punishment.—The Huron Alphomega.

Kenneth Shaw is now president of the Maine Alpha chapter and is planning a very busy forensic season.—The Colby Oracle.

Inter-society debates for women were inaugurated at Kentucky Wesleyan this year.—College Paper.
The Southern Branch of the University of California was to meet the University of California in debate some time during December. Dorothy Freeland, Eleanor Chace, and Helen Jackson were to go to Berkeley for this first forensic contest between the two branches of the same institution. They were to have debated Defense Day observance.—California Grizzly.

The Southern California conference has adopted a new plan in forensics. Four men may sit on the platform. Any of them may speak, none more than twice, altho one man may be used in the constructive speech and another in refutation. This plan, it is hoped, will make it possible for more men to take part in debating.—Redlands Campus.

Roger Walch won the Fowler Extempore contest at the University of Redlands, and with it the prize of $25 and the right to represent Redlands in the annual contest. Mr. Walch represented Redlands in the oratorical contest at Peoria during the last national convention.—Redlands Campus.

Mr. Guy S. Allison, a Los Angeles business man, has donated a beautiful loving cup to the Southern California debating conference. It is very attractively engraved and stands three feet high. It will come into permanent possession of the school winning it seven times.—The California Teck.

Miss Helen Jackson of Southern Branch was elected president of the Women’s Forensic League of Southern California. Elsie Thompson of Occidental was elected secretary.—The California Grizzly.

The Gamma chapter at the California Institute of Technology is working on a Roman Comedy to be presented early the second term. It also plans to give a formal dance.—The California Teck.

W. D. Foster won first place among nine speakers in the local extempore contest at Caltek and represented his college in the state contest, winning third place.—The California Teck.

Professor F. S. Siebert, Bradley, Illinois Delta, was elected president of the Illinois Debate league. Durward V. Sandifer, Eureka, Illinois Beta, was elected secretary.—The Bradley Tech.

The Southern Branch had an interclass debate tournament. Each class supported one of the presidential candidates. The freshman supporting La Follette won.—California Grizzly.

Arthur White won the extempore contest at Southern Branch of the University of California and with it the right to represent his institution in the state meet.—California Grizzly.

Milton Badger, of Colorado Alpha, was awarded the Alpha Zeta cup for the best work done by any freshman in the Agricultural Division.—The Rocky Mountain Collegian.

Nineteen men tried out for places on the debate teams at Caltek. They were all so good that all of them were kept on the squad.—The California Teck.

The Freshman won the inter-class debate at Montana Aggies.—The Weekly Exponent.

The debaters at Illinois Delta, Bradley, are planning to hold dual debates before the clubs of the city as part of their preparation for the coming forensic season. They are debating the Supreme Court and the Japanese Immigration questions which should prove interesting to the lunchon clubs and other organizations of Peoria.—The Bradley Tech.

McKendree, Illinois Theta, is leading in the organization of a southern Illinois oratorical league. When the league is completed it will consist of Greenville, Blackburn, Lincoln, Ewing, and McKendree. Central Wesleyan and Cape Girardeau of Missouri will also be invited to join the league.—The McKendree Review.

Dean Agnes E. Wells of Indiana University has prohibited the women of the University from owning automobiles. She announced that fifty per cent of the co-eds who were forced to leave school at the beginning of the fall term because of poor scholarship spent much of their time in automobiles.—The Franklin.

Indiana Alpha, Franklin College, held a reunion for forensic graduates on Home Coming Day. Elba Branigin, a member of the board of trustees, who represented the college in the state oratorical contest of 1892, gave the history of forensics at Franklin.—The Franklin.

The following girls have been selected for the debate teams at Colorado Beta: Zelma Baker, Muriel Bennett, Bernice Burns, Fern Fender, Lorena Mason, Jessie Morton, Anna Olin, Margaret Taylor, Bernice Udick, Christine Vaughn, and Edna Walters.—The Mirror.

Hedging College, Illinois Epsilon, has reopened its doors after a close of two years. It is now a freshman paradise as there are no upper classmen. The college paper is edited by freshmen and all the positions on the campus are held by first year men.—The Rocky Mountain Collegian.

Miss Myrtle Horseman won the local oratorical contest at Northwestern College, Illinois Iota, and with it the Miller prize of $25 and the right to represent North-Western in the state contest.—Chronicle (North-Western).

Morningside, Iowa Delta, is conducting a series of inter-society debates that are attracting a good deal of interest. These contests will bring out the college forensic material.—College Paper.

Warren Bentzinger won the Econstmore contest at Iowa Wesleyan and will represent that institution in the state contest.—Iowa Wesleyan News.

The Kansas debate league will use critic judges this year.—Ye Sterling Stir.
Colorado Alpha at the Colorado Agricultural College engaged in a split team debate with the University of Denver on November 3. The question was the endorsement of the third party. The debate was held before the labor college and the question was thrown open for discussion after the formal debate. Milton Badger and Wm. T. Nettles of the Aggies and Mr. Holland of Denver defended La Follette, while Charles Haines aided the two Denver speakers in condemning him. The audience decision was in favor of the third party.

Douglas V. Steere, Michigan Agricultural College, 1923, was one of the 32 youths representing 32 states selected out of 507 candidates for Rhodes scholarships. He had graduated in Agriculture and was studying Economics at Harvard. While at Michigan Delta, he was named the most popular student on the campus in a general election conducted by the college annual, the Wolverine. He was a member of Pi Kappa Delta and of the debating team that took an extended western trip.—The Holcad.


Colorado Beta at the Teachers College presented “Adam and Eva” to raise funds for their forensic budget, particularly to send all members of the chapter to the 1926 Convention. Two performances were given. Miss Casey directed the production and National Secretary-Treasurer Finley played one of the leading roles. The play won much praise and was a financial success.—The Mirror.

Illinois Beta at Eureka is working for the Estes Park Convention. At the recent Hallowe’en party given by Y. W. and Y. M. C. A., it conducted a contest to select the handsomest man and most beautiful girl in the school. They charged for the privilege of voting. Eureka has scheduled six debates for men and two for women.—The Eureka Pegasus.

Professor J. J. Fiderlick, debate coach at Illinois Wesleyan announced after the tryouts November 25, that the following ladies’ had been selected for the debate teams: Affirmative, Lillian Green, Lois Rudasill, and Gertrude Davis; Negative, Gladys Hoffman, Kathryn Moore, and Frances Hatfield.—College Paper.

Professor F. S. Siebert, Bradley, Illinois Delta, installed the Theta chapter at McKendree October 4. The officers of the new chapter are A. B. Zimmerman, President, and M. P. Akers, Secretary.—The Bradley Tech.

Des Moines, Iowa Gamma, has received over twenty-five debate challenges this year. It is planning a full program.—The Highlander.

Carthage College is using the squad system this year in selecting its debate teams.
Northwestern is conducting inter-sorority debates on the Japanese exclusion act.—Chronicle (Northwestern).

Franklin College is holding a series of class debates on the question: “Resolved that Indiana should adopt, in principle, the Wisconsin plan of unemployment insurance.”—The Franklin.
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SUBJECTS CHOSEN FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE

The most popular subjects for debate this season are those arising out of the recent presidential campaign. The proposed power of congress to override the supreme court is the favorite question. “Resolved, that the formation of a third major political party will advance the cause of representative government in the United States.” is the subject chosen by the Eastern Intercollegiate Debating League, which is composed of Amherst, Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Pennsylvania, Wesleyan, Williams, Yale and Harvard, which has recently been admitted in place of Cornell.

Special location seems to influence the choice of debate topics. The Rocky Mountain Conference, composed of the far western states, will debate the Japanese Exclusion Bill. In Ohio, where citizens dream of inland ocean ports, the State Debating Conference will argue the Deep Sea Waterway measure; in the South, where child labor is an issue the University of North Carolina and North Carolina State debate the Child labor amendment, and in New York City, the College of the City of New York and New York University debate the light wine and beer amendment of the Volstead Act.—Hedding College Paper.

The Forensic welcomes to the fraternity field the Theta News of Theta Kappa Nu, the “No. 1 of Vol. 1” of which has just been received. Theta Kappa Nu is a new fraternity with high standards, both in conduct and scholarship. It has eleven chapters, four of them in institutions in which Pi Kappa Delta also has chapters, Oklahoma City University, Iowa Wesleyan, Simpson, and Baker.

Pi Kappa Delta is also interested in Theta Kappa Nu because its Grand Oracle and Editor of the Theta News is J. H. Kenmyre, one of the founders of Pi Kappa Delta. The following paragraph is quoted from the biographical material in the Theta News:

“The year 1912 saw him interested, with several other men from different schools, in the organization of a new forensic fraternity. In 1913 he installed at his Alma Mater, Iowa Wesleyan, the Iowa Alpha chapter of Pi Kappa Delta. For four years he served as a national officer of the fraternity and had much to do with shaping its policies. In 1920 he was elected to membership in Delta Sigma Rho by the Grand Council.”

Montana Alpha, Intermountain Union College, under the direction of Dean Lemon, is planning a very heavy season of forensic work. A boy’s team, four debaters and the coach, will take a trip thru Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming. The team will have about ten debates, leaving February 27 and returning March 15.

A girls’ team of three members with the coach will travel west, debating in Montana, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. This trip will last from January 30 to February 10.

In addition to the debates on these trips, the college will debate a number of institutions on its home floor, including the University of West Virginia. The Pi Kappa Delta question will be the one most frequently used.—Capital City Collegian.

George Simpson and Vernon McIlraith tied for first place in the debate tryouts at Coe. They will divide the first and second prizes, amounting to $25, equally between them. The tryouts were so close that the points produced a three cornered tie, with Reno Silliman as the third contestant. The percentages given eliminated Silliman by one point, leaving the other two still tied.

Coe is planning a heavy schedule which calls for fourteen contests.—The Coe College Cosmos.
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