THE BUSINESS SIDE OF FORENSICS

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

TABLE I.

MEN'S Debates

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

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

TABLE II.

Most Men's debates reported by one institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Men's debates reported</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cotner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cotner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cotner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cotner and Ripon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cotner and Ripon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cotner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cotner, Simpson, and Bethany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Colorado Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Park and Southwestern (Kansas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Washburn and Intermountain Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Southwestern (Kansas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While in the first few years especially, these tables may include under debates for men, debates open to both men and women, for women's forensics were not then well established, the table below has reference to debates for women only. Nothing is more illuminating than the rapid progress in women's debating as revealed in this table, particularly in the increasing number of institutions participating each year. This year, for example, witnessed the beginning of women's debating in Arkansas. There is yet room for expansion.

**TABLE III.**

**Women's Debates**

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

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

**TABLE IV.**

Most women's debates reported by any one institution

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

While the reports on oratory do not indicate such rapid growth, they do show that each year more of our institutions are engaging in oratory and that they are engaging in more oratorical contests.
These 104 chapters report that their institutions have 66,352 students attending, or an average of 638 students per institution.

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

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

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

1. Iowa Wesleyan
2. Kansas State Agricultural College
3. Redlands
4. Colorado Agricultural College
5. Oklahoma Agricultural College
6. Morningside
7. Huron
8. Colorado Teachers College
9. Parsons
10. South Dakota State College
11. Sioux Falls
12. Hastings
13. Grand Island
14. South Dakota Northern State Teachers
15. Upper Iowa
16. Sterling
17. University of California, Southern Branch
18. Augustana
19. Buena Vista
The following have scheduled contests in these three lines for men, but not in all of them for women. It should be observed that some of them do not have women attending.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Eight other institutions offer debating and oratory for women:

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

Carthage and Nebraska State Normal have debating and extemporaneous for both men and women, but no oratory. These institutions offer debating and extemporaneous for men or for women as indicated.
For Men:
1. College of the Pacific
2. Coe
3. Western Union
4. Lombard

Doane reports extemporaneous oratory for women but no debating.

Debating is the only forensic activity in the following institutions:
There are schedules for both men and women.

1. Michigan State
2. Tusculum
3. University of Akron
4. Northwestern State Teachers of Oklahoma

5. Connecticut Agricultural College
6. Central Missouri State Teachers
7. Howard Payne

Debating for men is the only forensic activity at Colby.

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

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

Women's forensics at Ottawa are limited to oratory.

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

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

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

**TABLE VI.**

Methods of assigning forensic budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thru the faculty, usually by the executive committee</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru the board of trustees</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thru the student body, by a council, often on the recommendation of the coach</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method not given</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These budgets vary between wide extremes. The smallest budget reported was $84. Upon this slender income the chapter was planning to engage in 11 debates, 4 oratorical and 1 extemporaneous contest, an average of $5.25 per contest. It should be explained that this institution is situated in Southern California where it does not have to travel any distance to speak of to carry...
through its forensic program. Another institution with a budget of $150, scheduled 20 debates, a debate for every $7.50 to be expended. With only $175 available, a third institution plans to engage in 7 debates and 2 oratorical contests. There are other examples of highly efficient expenditures of funds.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$.01 - $.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.25 - $1.49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.25 - $.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1.50 - $1.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.50 - $.74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1.75 - $1.99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.75 - $.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2.00 - $2.24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.00 - $1.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2.25 - $2.49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.50 - $2.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition 19 chapters raised $2,459 thru some form of activities, an average of $131 per chapter. The following activities were mentioned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dramatics, plays, movies, and vaudeville</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission to debates, mainly from those not students</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support thru literary societies ........................................ 1
Lyceum course ........................................ 1
Selling refreshments ........................................ 1
Selling books ........................................ 1

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

**TABLE X.**
Methods of expending the forensic budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the coach</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the college treasurer on presentation of properly authorized bills</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the chapter of ΠΚΔ</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By a forensic committee and the coach</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the administration of the college</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the college treasurer and debate coach</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the treasurer of the student body</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the activity manager and faculty committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By a faculty member not the coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the literary society board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the place of ΠΚΔ in this financial situation?

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

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

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

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

**TABLE XI.**
Activities Number of times mentioned

Promote forensics ........................................ 46
This includes interesting the student body
entertaining visiting teams, conducting forensic banquets and social entertainments, looking after the business end of forensics

Advance high school forensics, entertaining high school debaters, furnishing judges for high school debates and other contests .......................................................... 6

Conduct inter-society, inter-class, and other local contests to create greater interest in forensics .......................................................... 6

Conduct plays and other activities to raise funds for forensics .......................................................... 5

There is a great deal of variation in the methods of meeting.
TABLE XII.
Times of meeting for chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of chapters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every two weeks</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When business requires, but not at any regular interval</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or four times a year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or seven times a year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the call of the president</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

And now read this indictment of our society. We asked each of our chapters whether or not it had permitted the local organization to become merely an agency which conferred the right to wear an emblem. Fifty-four replied no and were able to point to some worth-while results which had followed from the presence of ΠΚΔ in their institution. Twenty-six others, however, were not able to show that their chapter had accomplished anything worth while. In these days when many students are struggling thru
college on slender means, it is hard to justify an organization which collects a four dollar initiation fee and the price of a key and contributes nothing to the individual or the institution. Why wear a key unless that key means something? What that key shall mean depends upon what you as an individual and your chapter as a chapter are willing to make it mean.

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

THE FINANCING OF FORENSICS

W. H. Veatch, National First Vice-President
California Epsilon, University of California, Southern Branch

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

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

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

The most outstanding example of outside aid has been at the University of Southern California, where there is an endowment of over fifty thousand dollars devoted to inter-collegiate forensics. This is not the sole support either, for the student association gives forensics about as much as does the
average school of the same size. This enables U. S. C. to support what is probably the most extensive forensic schedule of any college in the country. And, “To them that hath shall be given,” is well illustrated here for the gate receipts of the U. S. C.-Oxford debate were announced as over fifteen hundred dollars. Oratory, particularly, has always been aided by gifts from the outside. It has been fairly easy to get alumni to give a prize for the annual oratorical contest, and to get business men of the college town to contribute funds to send the orator to distant contests. Notice also the ease with which Bates College raised sufficient funds to send its debating team to England. Today, the best method of gaining such outside assistance seems to be the commercial and service clubs of the college town and nearby cities. One commercial club contributed four hundred dollars to assist a nearby college debating team to make a transcontinental trip.

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

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

The fourth method of having the forensic activities supported in any way by the coach or the students engaged in the activity should never have to be used. And yet it surely does show an immense enthusiasm for forensics, and yes, for an ungrateful school, when they do contribute. The appropriations for forensics should be enough to pay all expenses of contestants and coaches to events. If cars are used, enough should be paid the owner to compensate for the use of the car and not merely enough to pay for the gas and oil, the car owner contributing the rest. When teams go on trips they
should be given good hotel accommodations and not given second rate accommodations or lodged in the dormitories of the school visited. The appropriations should be sufficient to cover these points and a failure to cover them means that the students involved are paying in decreased comfort or in actual money part of the expense involved. When no fees are paid for judges, it means either that second rate judges are being used or that the judges are asked to pay part of the legitimate expense of running the contest. Unfortunately there are a large number of schools that are forced to use such methods of financing a forensic schedule that corresponds with the size and status of the institution.

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

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

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

ALBERT KEISER, Ph. D.

Forensic Coach, South Dakota Eta
Augustana College

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The men’s oratorical resulted as follows:
First, “In Contempt of Court,” Kingsley Given, Kansas Aggies.
MEN'S EXTTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING CONTEST
General Subject......................Our Constitution.
Subject prepared by Professor L. K. Horner, Oklahoma University.
First, "Marshall and the Constitution," Andrew Coleman, Tulsa.
Third, "Jefferson and the Constitution," Don Ketch, Southwestern.
Also speaking:
"Our Constitution in providing checks and balances has failed to provide a check on the Supreme Court." Edward Potts, Oklahoma City.
One of the pleasant features of the convention was the banquet Friday evening given by the Oklahoma Alpha chapter. There was a program of after dinner speeches that were entertaining and pleasing to all. National President Westfall issued a glowing invitation to all chapters to be present at the national convention in Colorado next year. Every chapter present is planning to send a delegation.

NORTHERN PROVINCIAL CONVENTION
Ten colleges from 3 different states were represented by the 40 delegates at the Northern Provincial Convention at South Dakota Alpha, Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, April 8-10. They were: North Dakota Alpha, Jamestown; Iowa Iota and Kappa at Western Union and Buena Vista; and South Dakota Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, Zeta, and Eta, at Dakota Wesleyan, Huron, Yankton, State College, Sioux Falls, Northern State Teachers, and Augustana. National President Alfred Westfall, Colorado Alpha, was present representing the National Council.
The Convention opened Wednesday evening with a reception by the members of the Alpha chapter and an initiation at which 21 members were taken in, 14 from Wesleyan, 3 from Yankton, and 4 from Augustana. The initiation was in charge of President Westfall.
The debating tournament opened Thursday morning.
The program of the women's tournament follows. All of the debates were on the question of Japanese Exclusion.
Wesleyan, affirmative, won from Huron, negative.
Wesleyan, negative, won from Northern Teachers, affirmative.
Northern Teachers, negative, won from Huron, affirmative.
This left two Wesleyan and one Northern Teachers teams in the field.
The Teachers defeated first the Wesleyan affirmative and then, changing side, the Wesleyan negative, winning the tournament.
The men debated the Capital Punishment question. The results follow:
Huron, negative, won from Yankton, affirmative.
Augustana, affirmative, won from Northern Teachers, negative.
Northern Teachers, negative, won from Wesleyan, affirmative.
State College, negative, won from Sioux Falls, affirmative.
Huron, affirmative, won from Wesleyan, negative.
Northern Teachers, affirmative, won from Sioux Falls, negative.
Augustana, negative, won from State College, affirmative.
Yankton, negative, won from Jamestown, affirmative.

SECOND ROUND
Augustana, affirmative, won from Northern Teachers, negative.
Augustana, negative, won from Northern Teachers, affirmative.
Yankton, affirmative, won from Huron, negative.
Huron, affirmative, won from State College, negative.
Third Round.

Augustana, negative, won from Huron, affirmative.
Augustana, affirmative, won from Yankton, negative.
This left two Augustana teams undefeated.

One of the most hotly contested events was the extemporaneous speaking contest. The subjects were selected from the leading articles in the January, February and March issues of three prominent magazines. Each contestant drew three topics and had fifteen minutes to select the one he was to use finally. The subjects were drawn one hour before the contest. The program follows:

Second, “American Relations with Japan,” Gruhn, Northern Teachers.

Also speaking:
“Edison—The Industrial Genius,” Lawrence, Augustana.
“Recent Religious Controversies,” Farn.
“The Problem of the Child Labor Amendment.”

It is significant to note that the one girl in this contest carried off the honors.

Six orators appeared in the oratorical contest. The results follow:
First, “The Threatening Tide,” Milton Rogers, Sioux Falls.

Also speaking:
“The Man Without a Price,” Clarence Westphal, Western Union.

Miss Green from Buena Vista also gave the oration on which she won first in the Iowa Women’s contest. She was barred from the contest however.

National President Westfall gave a program concerning the coming national convention. He showed slides of Estes Park, Colorado, where the convention will be held, and a reel of motion pictures showing winter sports.

Part of one afternoon was devoted to a round table discussion. “When is an oration,” as presented by Professor Gilkinson of Yankton proved to be a very helpful definition of that form of speech. Professor McCarty spoke on “Humor in debate.” Professor Huffman of Sioux Falls, the president of the province, gave an interesting discussion of “The Art of Refutation,” Professor Garrett of Huron, a former student of Professor Shaw of Knox, gave a most interesting talk on “Strategy in Debate,” as presented by Professor Shaw in his recent book on debating. President Westfall spoke on judging debates.

The final event of the convention was a 24 hour debate between Wesleyan and State on the uniform marriage and divorce question. Contrary to what might be expected, the four who spoke presented a well organized debate with lots of good material in it. Taking his cue from some suggestions made at one of the discussions earlier in the convention, President Westfall, the single critic judge, called the debate a tie. It was a very even contest and the tie decision, while unusual, was undoubtedly the fairest.

All the delegates left full of enthusiasm and pledging each other, as many of them as will be in college next year, to meet again at the Sixth National Convention in Colorado.
CALIFORNIA PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

The California Province of Pi Kappa Delta held its 1925 Convention at Bridges Hall, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, on April 11. There were 45 delegates. California Alpha of Redlands was represented by 8 members; California Beta, Occidental, by 5; California Gamma, California Institute of Technology, by 14; California Delta, College of the Pacific, by 1; California Epsilon, University of California, Southern Branch, by 13; Kansas Gamma, Kansas State Agricultural College by 3 members, guests at the Province; and Professor Scott, formerly of Nebraska Alpha, Nebraska Wesleyan, was present.

After roll-call the first round of debates was held. The question used was: Resolved, that except in case of invasion or rebellion, war should be declared by a vote of the people. The question was selected Wednesday and the debates held Saturday. The teams took the platform, tossed for sides and began to debate in five minutes. Occidental forfeited to U. of C. S. B. Redlands, affirmative, composed of Margaret White and Dale Wood, lost 1 to 0 to Edward Gilmore and Robert Ross of Cal. Tech. Occidental lost on the affirmative (Frances Ryan and Ruby MacDonald) to the Cal. Tech. negative (Robert Fulwider and Joe Walker). Redlands affirmative (Helen Irwin and Lawrence Dunn) lost to U. of C. S. B., negative (Virginia Shaw and Charles Schottland). Since U. of C. S. B. and Cal. Tech. each had two teams in the semi-finals, it was agreed to eliminate the semi-finals and hold just one more debate. The first round of debates were judged by Professor Summers of Kansas Agricultural College, Messrs. Walt and Hedberg of the Kansas Aggie debating team, and Professor Pergells of Cal. Tech. Lunch was held at noon at the Cal. Tech. Cafeteria.

In the afternoon the oratorical contest was held with the following contestants:

- Kansas State—Robert Hedberg, winner of first place
- Occidental — Euphratia Pashgin, winner of second place
- U. of Cal., S. B. — Arthur White, winner of third place
- College of the Pacific — Edgar Wilson
- Redlands — Elsie Hanson
- Cal. Tech. — Joe Walker

The Coach Judge system was used; Mrs. Peters, Occidental; Professor Scott, representing College of the Pacific; Mr. Walt of Kansas State; Professor Marsh of U. C. S. B.; Professor Nichols of Redlands; and Professor Macarthur of Cal. Tech.

Extempore Contest:
- Kansas State — Robert Hedberg, winner of first place
- Redlands — Russell Andrus, winner of second place
- Occidental — Mildred Zellhofer, winner of third place
- College of the Pacific — Edgar Wilson
- California Tech. — Ted Coleman
- U. of C., S. B. — Henry Murphy

The subjects selected for the extempore ranged from "Promoting interest in forensics" and "Coeducation" to the "Fall of the Herriot Government" and "Politicians, the enemies of Statesmanship," which was used by Mr. Hedberg, the winner.

The Coach Judge system was used; Mrs. Peters, Occidental; Professor Scott, representing College of the Pacific; Mr. Walt of Kansas State; Professor Marsh of U. C. S. B.; Professor Nichols of Redlands; and Professor Pergells of Cal. Tech.

upheld the negative. The judges were Messrs. Summers and Walt of Kansas Aggies and Scott of Pomona. The Decision was 2 to 1 for the affirmative. Dinner was held at six forty-five after which the business session was held. Professor Scott of Pomona College, a member at large, was elected Governor of the Province. The chief order of business was the National Convention at Estes Park and the chapters responded as follows: Cal. Tech. has over one hundred dollars in the fund for attending the convention and expects to send as many representatives as it can get money for. Occidental has raised no funds but intends to be there and hopes to have a debating team. U. of C. S. B. is planning on two debating teams and hopes to send from six to eight delegates. Redlands said that it had never missed having a debating team at a convention yet and was not going to break the precedent next year. College of the Pacific said that it had never attended a convention before but had enjoyed the provincial so much that it would be at Estes Park. Kansas Aggies said they had never missed a convention and expected to be at Estes Park in full force. Professor Scott said that he was going to try to save enough from his salary as Provincial Governor to enable him to attend.

**WESTERN PROVINCE**

The Western Province of ΠΚΔ, with Missouri Zeta, Culver-Stockton, as host, assembled at Canton, April 23-25. President Reeves of Westminster presided. The convention assembled at two o'clock, with the following chapters represented: Culver-Stockton, Carthage, Missouri Wesleyan, Central (Missouri), Central (Iowa), Westminster, William Jewell, Upper Iowa, Simpson, and Henderson-Brown, all the members of the province except Park and Central Missouri State Teachers.

The first thing on the program was the debating tournament, the results of which can best be shown by the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missouri Wesleyan, affirmative</th>
<th>versus</th>
<th>Missouri Wesleyan, affirmative versus</th>
<th>William Jewell, affirmative</th>
<th>Central (Missouri), negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simpson negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Jewell, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jewell, affirmative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthage, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver-Stockton, affirmative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central (Missouri), negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central (Iowa), affirmative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Iowa, negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were but two entries in the women's extempore. The results were as follows:

First—Edith Friedon, Upper Iowa. Subject: Should the United States cancel her inter-allied war debts?

Second—Frances Neilsen, Carthage. Subject: Should the Philippines be granted immediate independence?
There were more speakers in the men's extempore. The results were:

First—Roberts of William Jewell. Subject: Can legislation help the farmer?
Second—Tenscher of Westminster. Does the United States need a protective tariff?
Third—Crawford, Missouri Wesleyan. Should the government own the coal mines?
Fourth—Brooks, Carthage. Should tax exempt securities be done away with?
Fifth—Tie between Heddington and Tate both of Upper Iowa.

Subjects:
(a) To what extent should education be made compulsory?
(b) The railroads and the motor bus.
Sixth—Cunningham, Culver-Stockton. Cooperative marketing and the farmer.
Seventh—Mudd, Culver-Stockton. The League of Nations as an instrument for world peace.

This contest was followed by the women's oratorical which resulted as follows:

First—Doris Hatch, Simpson. The Call to Service.
Second—Nadine Nichols, Missouri Wesleyan. The Dragnet.
Third—Maurine Miller, Culver-Stockton. The King of the Electron.

Six orators competed in the men's oratorical.
Second—Lloyd Sutton, Simpson. The Pathway to Peace.
Third—Boswell Burns, Culver-Stockton. The Modern Martyr.
Fifth—Robert Smith, Upper Iowa. The Ploughshare of Revolution.
Sixth—Osro Cobb, Henderson-Brown. Let America Find Her Soul.

Some of the best oratory of the convention was produced at the banquet Friday evening, May 23. Here under the exhilarating influence of water, women, and song, the following program was "rendered:"

Toastmaster ....................... Dr. Schultz, Culver-Stockton
Progress of Forensics ..................... President Wood, Culver-Stockton
In the Mountains ..................... G. W. Finley, National Secretary, Colorado Teachers
Some Standards for Judging Contests ........................

......................... W. C. Dennis, National Vice-President, Simpson
Pi Kappa Delta and Public Speaking .... Professor Reeves, Westminster
When Good Fellows Get Together ... Professor Graham, Culver-Stockton
Osro Cobb issued such an enthusiastic invitation from the whole state of Arkansas, that it was voted to hold the next convention at Henderson-Brown.

The following officers were elected for the coming term:
President, Professor Graham, Culver-Stockton.
Vice-President, Debate coach at Henderson-Brown.
Secretary-Treasurer, Crawford, Missouri Wesleyan.

National Secretary-Treasurer G. W. Finley of Colorado Teachers was present representing the national council. He acted as debate judge several times and filled in otherwise wherever he was needed. His willingness to assist, and his broad minded view of things and analytical and constructive criticism of the contests were much appreciated. In behalf of the national council he issued a general invitation to all the chapters present to have a full delegation in Colorado next year. Each chapter left the convention resolved to let the whole society hear from it at the national convention in March.
KANSAS PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

A sectional Pi Kappa Delta tournament was held at Emporia the 4th and 5th of May, in which eight colleges participated. Competition in all forensic events was offered. In debate, the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, women's team was successful, the College of Emporia's men team winning in the men's debate. The Kansas State Agricultural College took first place in both men's and women's extemporaneous contests. Sterling college won the women's oratorical contest. The Kansas State Teachers College woman orator, who won the women's State Oratorical contest, did not compete in this event. The College of Emporia won the men's oratorical contest.

The last evening of the convention, a joint initiation into Pi Kappa Delta was held. The floor work was in charge of the college of Emporia, and the Kansas State Teachers College. Fifty individuals were initiated.

Note: The Kansas Provincial was organized late and on short notice. This is the best report the editor could get on it.

KANSAS THETA

The following is a resume of the forensic season of the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Kansas, Theta. Fourteen men's debates, competing with such schools at Iowa State College, Utah Agricultural College, Drake University, Bethany College, Pittsburg Teachers College, Washburn College, College of Emporia, Friends University, and the Kansas City Law School.

Nine women's debates, competing with the following schools: Colorado Agricultural College, Hays Kansas Teachers College, Ottawa University, Washburn College, Kansas Agricultural College, Bethany College, Southwestern College, and the College of Emporia.

Two extemporaneous speaking teams, one men's and one women's, one woman orator.

Kansas Zeta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, has this year taken in twenty-three new members; these with the original eight members, make at present an active membership of thirty-nine. There are nine members on the faculty.

The large number of new members taken in shows that the forensic work was widely distributed, giving practical training to a large number, rather than using the same individuals over and over in the different contests. The year has been a successful one, and we trust that the future may see forensics continue to grow.—Contributed.

NORTHERN ORATORICAL LEAGUE.

The finals in the Northern Oratorical League were held at Northwestern May 1. The results follow:

First, "The Challenge," Miss Frances Killefer, University of Illinois.
Second, "Natural and Human," Walter Lundgren, University of Minnesota.
Third, "The Twentieth Century Slave," Phillip N. Krasne, University of Michigan.

Also speaking:
"Shackles of Freedom," Howard Becker, Northwestern University.
"The Other half of Leadership," Miss Carol Hubbard, University of Wisconsin.
"The Permanent Court of International Justice," Arnold A. Lassen, The University of Iowa.
SHALL WE ADMIT NEW ARGUMENT IN REFUTATION?
A DEBATE ON A MUCH DISPUTED POINT

The Affirmative

The Editor of the Forensic:

I wish to congratulate ΠΚΔ on the splendid work it has done in formulating the "Code of Ethics for Debate" published in the January Forensic. It was a fine piece of work. The code is comprehensive and moderate.

Will you permit me thru your columns to question the wisdom of including one article, number 20. "The 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."

This has long been one of the traditions of debating. Sixteen years ago when I took part in my first college debate it was an unwritten law, for we had no code of ethics then. One of the most painful situations of my forensic experiences came in connection with it. Our coach had drilled into us the idea that refutation should be something more than a repetition of what we had said in our first speeches. I was second speaker on a team which was having a hard fight with a neighboring institution. When I was about half-way thru my refutation, I was bluntly interrupted by a loud voice from the opposing table. "Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order," I heard. "My opponent is introducing new argument." I shall never forget my sensations. I was presenting new evidence. While I had never thought of it as a violation of ethics, as soon as my opponent spoke, I realized my guilt. If any criminal caught red handed in the very act ever felt more aghast, I pity him. Here I was exposed in dishonorable conduct on the platform of my own chapel and before my own friends. I can remember yet how the row of electric lights around the gallery blurred and danced.

I don't know how I ever got to my seat. I had no idea of fighting back. I was convicted in my own mind although I had had no intention of doing anything wrong. I was completely floored and helpless. The leader of our team replied to the charge. I don't remember anything about his defense. My accuser was not to be lightly turned aside however. He insisted that the debate should be forfeited. Finally he said something about cancelling further contracts. The word contract set my mind to going again. I had acted as debate manager and had signed the contract between the two institutions. I knew that there wasn't one word in that contract about the introduction of new argument in refutation. I struggled to my feet and pulled our copy of the contract from my breast pocket. "Here is the contract," I gasped with a faint hope in my heart of redeeming my shattered reputation. "There is nothing in it forbidding the introduction of new argument."

Victory was not to be so easily won. I shall never forget the fine scorn with which my opponent replied. "Why that doesn't have to be in the contract. Everybody knows that." I sank back in my seat again, convicted by my own conscience.

An able chairman settled the point and saved the day. After fifteen minutes of quibbling, I was called back to the platform, informed that I had over two minutes left, and ordered to proceed. I still had that gone feeling in the pit of my stomach, but I shuffled my cards, finally caught a few words on one and started. I had not said two words before I realized that I was again introducing new evidence. I couldn't see anything to do but to give additional evidence or repeat. I don't
know what I did. If I did any debating it was purely automatic, for my mind was engrossed in my preplexing situation. After the debate the quibbling was renewed. Our opponents objected to any new statement. Coaches and friends joined in. It seemed impossible to draw any dividing line between new argument and new evidence.

Years later while I was acting as a judge a hot headed coach interrupted a debate to hurl the same charge. Again it was the same narrow interpretation of new argument. Again this past week the question arose during a debate which I was judging. If Congress can reenact legislation declared unconstitutional by the supreme court, it is correcting the faults of our constitution, argued the affirmative. In refutation the negative contended that if that was the case, we had a violation of state rights, for we should have Congress amending the constitution without giving the states an opportunity to vote on the amendment as was provided in the constitution. "You are introducing the question of state rights," interrupted the affirmative, "and that is new argument."

Where are you going to draw the line? It was new evidence and new argument, but it was called forth very naturally during the process of the debate. To deny the negative the right to present it would be unduly limiting it. This is almost always true. I listened to a negative introducing an alternative plan in a last refutation speech. It was new argument, but the speaker was careful to show that he was presenting it in reply to a statement by the affirmative that compulsory arbitration in labor disputes was the only way in which we could protect the interests of the public.

I question the whole proposition. When and where did it ever start, and why? Can it be enforced? Is it not more liable to lead to trouble than to good? I have never known the side which raised the question to win. Of course the idea is to prevent the introduction of some fallacious proposition at a time when the other side can not attack it, but isn’t the cure worse than the disease? What would happen if the rule were dropped? The gateway is not let down to any evil practices, for even now the most foreign material may be introduced under the guise of refutation of some opposing statement. Any sensible debater who has a good argument to advance will want to inject it into the debate at the earliest possible moment. Any judge will be suspicious of argument that is introduced when the opposition has no opportunity to reply to it. Hard feelings and unprofitable quibbling would be eliminated.

I am not well enough versed in the history of intercollegiate forensics to know what authority stands back of this more or less universally accepted but poorly understood principle. I don’t see how it can be fairly enforced. It is often abused. Wouldn’t debaters and coaches alike do better to drop it? Perhaps there are good arguments for its retention which I do not now see. I shall look forward to seeing them presented by its friends.

In the interests of more harmony in debating,

I remain,

A FORMER DEBATER.

The Negative

(When the editor received the letter printed above, he sent it to F. B. Ross, Professor of Social Sciences, Kansas Zeta, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, with the request that he reply to it. The reply is printed below.)

On several occasions during the past debate season the negative has not been entirely satisfied with the tactics employed by the last affirmative rebuttal speaker and has not hesitated to interrupt to make
the fact known. These actions have caused considerable controversy in forensic circles and in it all, Article twenty of the “Code of Ethics for Debate,” published in the January, 1925, Forensic, has been under fire. The first part of the controversy resolves itself into this question: What really is refutation? Is it a mere summing up of the debate? Is it a repetition of what has been said in the main speeches? Is it a battering down of the opponents arguments with evidence, whether or not it has been used earlier in the debate? Or, does it include the introduction of new argument as well as new evidence? Each of these positions is taken by men in the forensic field today.

I do not pretend to be an authority, but I wish to add a word in defense of the first part of Article twenty of the Code of Ethics mentioned above.—“The introduction of new argument in rebuttal is contrary to the rules of debate.” Before going farther we must distinguish between “argument” and “evidence.” Argument is a reason for or against a proposition, an advantage or disadvantage; while evidence is material offered in support of the above contentions. For example: In a recent debate on the Supreme Court question, a final affirmative rebuttal speaker cited ten Supreme Court decisions in an attempt to defeat three weaknesses in their proposition as pointed out by the negative. These decisions had not been mentioned prior to this time in the debate by either side, but my contention is that they constituted legitimate evidence at that particular juncture in the debate. The speaker committed a gross error, however, in his closing statement when he said, “Finally, ladies and gentlemen, the plan advocated by the affirmative will foster a more friendly feeling between the United States and England as the two systems of legislation will be similar.” This is an argument, but neither side had hinted at it previously in the debate, consequently it was NEW and entirely out of place in the last rebuttal speech.

The second part of the controversy centers around this question: Should a speaker be interrupted? Here is where I differ with the second part of Article twenty.—“It should be so considered by the judges without the necessity of interruption by opposing speakers.” My position is that the last affirmative rebuttal speaker should be interrupted in case he violates the first part of this rule. There is a question, however, as to whether or not there should be interruptions at other times as there is a chance for a comeback, but the negative is not through debating until the affirmative is through. To me it is a sign of splendid work to see the negative hold the affirmative in final rebuttal to the question and to the arguments already advanced. There is nothing that gives me a hollow feeling at the pit of my stomach quite so much as to listen to a negative team do splendid work until its last rebuttal speaker has finished, then slump down in its seats with a sigh as much as to say, “Thank God we are through,” and thereafter pay no attention to their opponent who is closing the debate. One coach has stated that he has never seen a team win whose members had interrupted the opposition. Let me ask, Is the purpose of debate to win a decision or is it the honest, conscientious, fair presentation of facts? If we leave it to the judges to penalize the speaker who has violated this rule, we have made no headway, for we are still entrusting the idea of winning. Furthermore, the majority of the judges we get these days are not capable of distinguishing between “argument” and “evidence”; while others consider it a point in favor of the team that has resorted to a “trick” if they can “get away” with it without being challenged by the opposition. But the greatest reason for allowing the interruption is that otherwise the audience would be left out of consideration. Efficient as a
judge may be in detecting "tricks," the average audience is still in the
dark as to the reasons for his decision, unless the critic system is used.

I would go farther and say it is the duty of the chairman to hold
the affirmative to the question and already advanced argument in the
final speech, in case the opposition does not do so; but at the same time
it is also his duty to protect this speaker from unfair attacks by the
opposition. The object of a debate should not be to please a judge,
but to inspire the listeners by truth honestly presented. Hence it is my
belief that it is not only a right but a duty of the negative to hold the
affirmative strictly to the rule even though it must be done by interrup-
tion. To do so is a sign of good debating, while to fail in this point is
a sign of poor work.

CLEVER INITIATION FOR PI KAPPA DELTA GIVEN

Last Friday some of the new pledged members of the ΠΚΔ were initi-
ated into that organization. The initiation deal out by the committee this
year consisted of five minute chapel talks for some, and three minutes of
street talks, in front of the post office, for others. The subjects for the talks
were also given out to the new members of the committee.

Edith Frieden started the ball rolling by giving her talk in chapel last
Friday. Miss Frieden’s topic was Labor Problems, about which she gave
a very interesting discussion.

In the afternoon of the same day, at four-thirty, six of the new mem-
biers gave their “Soap Box Orations” in front of the postoffice. The speakers
and their topic were as follows:

Mr. John Lyford—Robert LaFollette.
Mr. Kenneth Rawson—Senator Brookhart.
Miss Vera Decker—Pi Kappa Delta.
Miss Eleanor Parker—Bolshevism.
Miss Agnes Corbitt—Coolidge.
Mr. Veylerd Humeence—Woman’s Rights.

There was considerable humor mixed in with the interesting facts that
were given. A good-sized crowd was present which seemed to enjoy the
program that was rendered.—Upper Iowa Collegian.

ALABAMA BOY, 15, WINS FIRST PLACE IN HIGH SCHOOL CONSTITU-
TION AND ORATORICAL CONTEST

Washington, May 8.—(By Associated Press.)—Robert Sessions of Bir-
mingham, Ala., tonight won the national oratorical contest over six competi-
tors chosen in regional contests from among 1,400,000 starters.

The finals, which were held in Washington’s new auditorium with an
opening address by President Coolidge, were judged by Chief Justice Taft,
Justices Van Devanter, Butler and Sanford of the Supreme court, and At-
torney General Sargent. All of the orations dealt with the federal consti-
tution.

The winner was 15 years old and the youngest of the seven contestants.
Eugene F. McElmeel of Los Angeles, aged 16, rated second; Max N. Kroloff
of Sioux City, Iowa, third; Miss Flora Longenecker of Iliam, N. Y., fourth;
Miss Azenath Graves of Washington, D. C., fifth; George Stansell of Chicago
sixth, and Philip Glatfelter of Columbia, Penn., seventh. Both of the girls
are 16 years old and all of the boys except Sessions and McElmeel, are 17.

The Washington Alpha women at Puget Sound won a popular de-
cision from the Willamette ladies on the affirmative of the Japanese
question. The men lost twice to Willamette and to Lawrence once on
the Supreme Court question.—The Trail.
"The National Catalog of Debate Judges," edited by Professor H. B. Summers, Kansas State Agricultural College, and published by ΠΚΔ has evidently filled a long felt need. Scores of enthusiastic letters have been received from all parts of the country.

In publishing this catalog ΠΚΔ was frankly experimenting. It has asked for criticisms of its work. Almost all of those who have written about it, even some of the judges who received "M" and "X" ratings, have thanked the society for accomplishing a beneficial piece of work.

It was inevitable that some would not approve. The society expected this. It has been surprised that not more objections were received. What criticisms and objections have come in, have been helpful for the most part and will aid the society in its future work.

The one violent objection appeared in the April, 1925, number of "The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education," over the signature of F. M. Perry, Wellesley College.

He objects, first, to the fact that we do not give the names of those who give the "A", "X" and other ratings. This is undoubtedly one of the weaknesses of our rating system, but it is simply impossible to get signed ratings to be published. Mr. Perry himself, while he probably will give an estimate of the capabilities of a man as debate judge to some one asking him for it, would be unwilling to have this inquirer present that opinion to the proposed judge with his name back of it. It would probably do more harm than good to do it anyway. The opinions privately expressed are probably more honest. Teachers who recommend students for positions usually do so with the understanding that their recommendations are not to fall into the hands of the students.

It does not follow that because a man is a debate coach that he is also a good judge. Mr. Perry assumes that any one who is coaching debating must by that very fact be an excellent judge. It will not be hard to supply ample evidence to prove that this is an unwarranted assumption, even tho the debate coach himself may not relish the fact.

Perhaps also Mr. Perry does not understand that the people whose names appeared in the book did not have to have them appear. Each one was asked to supply certain information about himself and understood what this information was to be used for. If he requested that his name not appear in the list, his request was respected. Perhaps some of those who received an adverse rating regretted after the rating appeared that they had not withheld their names. Undoubtedly some feelings have been hurt. ΠΚΔ sincerely regrets this. However, it is perhaps best to discourage these unsatisfactory judges from continuing to serve. Their unsatisfactory decisions but stir up unpleasantness. The state finds it necessary to prohibit those unqualified from practicing medicine, no matter what their feelings.

The objection to the fact that the society disclaims responsibility for the ratings published is an objection to the only possible plan and the common practice. Even the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education in publishing Mr. Perry's letter does not assume responsibility for his opinions. The ratings are only what they profess to be, the opinions of debate coaches who have had opportunity to see the work of these judges.

These objections from Mr. Perry seem to be well made. They will help ΠΚΔ to publish a more useful list another time. However there are other assertions in the article which probably do not help any one to arrive at the truth concerning the matter. "At any rate I should like to attribute to well meaning but thoughtless youth and inexperience such violation of
academic decorum as the National Catalog of Debate Judges recently issued by the Pi Kappa Delta Honorary Forensic Fraternity."

“But for an organization while disclaiming responsibility for its ratings, to publish and distribute them gratis through the country in the name of public service, suggests the bounder's obliviousness to the full effect of his cheerful impertinences.”

Neither of these statements has any value in a sincere effort to arrive at the truth in a courteous discussion, but suggest more the individual who lacks the culture which enables him to differ from another without attempting to insult him. There is room for two opinions on most questions without those holding either forfeiting their right to be considered sincere gentlemen. While the society does not question Mr. Perry's right to object to its publication, it does not accept his authority for awarding it the social classification he does not hesitate to award. “The crass insensitiveness” which he freely bestows upon ΠΚΔ does not prove the catalog a fiasco.

Mr. Perry's objection to the use of the term “Professor,” grows, undoubtedly, out of his failure to read correctly the statement in the catalog. Instead of trying to maintain the distinction between “Professor,” “Associate Professor,” and “Assistant Professor,” ΠΚΔ used the more generic and inclusive term. Here it is following a widely accepted practice, both in and outside of educational circles. The title “Professor” was not inaccurately used nor improperly conferred upon those not entitled to it. Undoubtedly this objection on the part of Mr. Perry was due to a hasty assumption.

When the inventor Olds drove the first automobile upon the streets of Chicago, many people objected on the grounds that it would frighten the horses. They were right. But if progress in rapid transportation had been halted by this objection, Detroit would not now be the city it is. Mr. Perry tells us what kind of a list would meet with his approval, but that does not produce a list of judges. The “National Catalog” at least marks a beginning. It has frightened the horses. It is undoubtedly as far from satisfactory and from what will finally be achieved, as Mr. Olds first automobile is from a modern high priced car. However, if Mr. Olds had not driven that first noisy, smoking, rattling contraption, we should today be saying “Get up,” and “Whoa,” instead of “Step on the gas.”

But what about the system Mr. Perry proposes? “Of even greater value to those who would rather know something about a judge before opening correspondence with him, would be a list of established and recognized professors in different sections willing to name men fitted to act as judges of debate on specific subjects.” Such a system would do some of the very things Mr. Perry objects to. Here we should have men secretly passing judgment on proposed judges. Again there might be “slugging in the dark.” Such a proposal does not convince us that we have yet found the Moses who will lead us out of our wilderness.

David Shepard, who became a member of the Colorado Alpha during his freshman year, is now president of the senior class at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.—The Rocky Mountain News.

Paul Bemenderfer won the local Peace contest at Heidelberg with the oration “The Last Strand.”—The Kilikilik.
DEBATE QUESTIONS SUGGESTED FOR 1926

The following questions were suggested for the 1926 official question in response to a questionnaire sent out by the national secretary.

1. That a federal child labor constitutional amendment should be ratified.
   1. Otterbein
   2. Transylvania
   3. Redlands
   4. Intermountain Union

2. That the United States should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law.
   1. Tulsa
   2. Gustavus Adolphus
   3. Baker

3. That the Philippine Islands should be granted their immediate independence.
   1. Akron
   2. Lombard
   3. Central (Iowa)

4. That there should be no discrimination against the Japanese in our immigration laws.
   1. Otterbein
   2. Intermountain Union

5. That there should be a federal department of education with a secretary in the president's cabinet.
   1. Southwestern (Texas)
   2. Henderson-Brown

6. That American foreign debts contracted between April, 1917 and November, 1918, for war purposes should be cancelled.
   1. Emporia
   2. Intermountain Union

7. That tax exempt securities should no longer be issued.
   1. Baker
   2. Colorado Agricultural College

8. That the United States should recognize the Soviet government.
   1. Akron
   2. Bethany

9. That the system of direct primaries should be abolished.
   1. Coe
   2. Colorado Teachers

10. That each state should adopt a system of compulsory voting.
    1. Tulsa
    2. Baker

11. That capital punishment should be abolished in all states.
    1. Simpson
    2. Washburn

12. That capital as well as men should be conscripted during war.
    1. Redlands
    2. Sioux Falls

13. That the people of the United States should have the power to declare war by a direct vote except in cases of insurrection or foreign invasion.
    1. Redlands
    2. Univ. of Calif., S. B.

14. That the Senate rules should be amended as suggested by Mr. Dawes.
    1. McKendree
    2. Fairmount

15. That the delegated powers should be the state powers and the residuary powers the federal powers.
    1. William Jewell
    2. Central (Iowa)

16. That Senate Rule 20 (?) should be repealed.
    1. Bradley
    2. Centre

17. That the United States should withdraw troops from Latin-American countries.
1. Kalamazoo
18. That the president should be elected by direct vote.
   1. Southwestern (Texas)
19. That the president and vice-president should be nominated by a direct
    preferential primary.
   1. Bethany
20. That each state should adopt the single tax as the basis of its taxing
    system.
   1. Emporia
21. That the federal government should discontinue the policy of leasing
    to private individuals and corporations the natural resources over
    which it has control.
   1. North Carolina State
22. That a national referendum should be taken on all decisions of the
    Supreme court which declare acts of Congress unconstitutional.
   1. Intermountain Union
23. That the United States should adopt the cabinet-parliamentary form of
    government.
   1. Northern Normal and Industrial School.
24. That the Volstead act should be amended so as to permit the manufac-
    ture and sale of light wines and beer.
   1. Coe
25. That the 18th amendment should be repealed.
   1. Coe
26. That the United States should join the World Court.
   1. Howard Payne
27. That higher education should be subsidized by the federal government.
   1. Bethany
28. That the restrictions of the tariff preferential regulation should be
    delegated to the Tariff Commission.
   1. Akron
29. That the United States coastwise vessels should be exempted from
    Panama Canal tolls.
   1. Linfield.
30. That the pardoning power should be taken from the governor's hands
    and given to a board of 12 men.
   1. Kentucky Wesleyan.
32. That women should receive the same wages as men for the same work.
   1. Fairmount
33. That the Towne-Reed bill should be passed by Congress.
   1. Montana State
34. That Congress should be given power to pass uniform social legislation
    in the United States.
   1. Montana State
35. That the United States should adopt the essentials of the Canadian
    system for immigration control.
   1. Montana State
36. That Congress should be empowered to enact a national uniform criminal
    court procedure act.
   1. Illinois Wesleyan
37. That the principle of the closed shop is justifiable.
   1. Upper Iowa
38. That the United States should own and operate the coal mines.
   1. Upper Iowa
39. That the United States should own and operate the railroads.
   1. Upper Iowa
II KΔ is proud to present in this issue the pictures of 14 of the presidents of the colleges in which we have chapters who are members of the society.

Five of them have been elected to honorary membership because of their interest in forensics. The other nine in addition to their interest had a right to join upon their own forensic record. Three of them, Presidents John L. Hillman of Simpson, George S. McCune of Huron, and B. H. Kroeze of Jamestown, were college orators. Four were debaters, Presidents George W. Frasier of Colorado Teachers College, Frank E. Mossman of Morningside, H. W. Foght of Northern Normal and Industrial School, and George S. McCune of Huron. Four have coached debating and oratory, Presidents A. Ames Montgomery of Centre, Ross Turner Campbell of Sterling, Howard McDonald of Parsons, and George S. McCune of Huron.


There are many interesting things connected with the forensic experiences of these men. President Mossman of Morningside was a member of the first debating team ever put out by Morningside. Former Governor Harding of Iowa was a member of the same team.

In 1886 President John L. Hillman of Simpson represented Ohio Wesleyan in the state contest. The subject of his oration was “Dangerous Tendencies in Modern Commercial Life.” One of the judges was William Howard Taft. The contest was won by Dr. Howard H. Russell, the organizer of the Anti-Saloon League, who represented Ohio in the interstate contest at Leavenworth, Kansas. Oratory certainly brings one in contact with people of distinction. What a rich heritage of pleasant memories must be President Hillman’s from the acquaintance his efforts in oratory brought him. Some day the Forensic hopes to be able to persuade him to write the interesting story of these experiences. Who knows where our orators of today will be 20, 30, or 40 years from now?

President Harold W. Foght represented the University of Nebraska in debating in 1893 and 1894 against Doane College and the University of Kansas. We wonder what he debated so many years ago.

President George S. McCune was both a debater and an orator. He won his debates in 1899 and 1900 when he represented Park against William Jewell and Missouri Valley. He ranked second among the 8 speakers in the Missouri state contest.

President Kroeze of Jamestown represented the University of Michigan in oratory in 1894.

One of the youngest college presidents of the country is President George W. Frasier of Colorado Teachers College who represented Michigan State Normal College against Michigan Aggies in 1911 and against Ferris Institute in 1916.

Those chapters who can list their college presidents among their members are fortunate. If the president debated during his college days, he will understand the problems of financial support. He will have an understanding and sympathy which will mean much to the struggling debaters and orators. Whether or not he participated in forensics during his college days, he now is charged with directing the many activities of the college and moulding them all into one unified program. If he understands what efforts the debaters are making and, even more important, if the II KΔ people understand where he is directing the course of the college, better cooperation will result. If he is interested in forensics, the president of the college makes a valuable member of the chapter.
ORATORY

THE OLD LINE INTERSTATE

There are fourteen states in the Old Line Interstate Oratorical association. The contests in seven states were won by ΠΚΔ men. Two of these were in the east. Fagan Dixon, Georgetown, won the Kentucky contest. Willard Reeves, Carroll, was Wisconsin's representative. Both lost out in the divisional contest.

Five of the seven states in the Western division were represented by ΠΚΔ schools. Joseph T. Owen, a seventeen year old freshman from Wesleyan, won the Kansas contest. Robert Bartlett of Parsons represented Iowa. Missouri was represented by Kenford R. Nelson of Park; Nebraska by Emilio M. del Rosario of Wesleyan; and South Dakota by another freshman, Marcus Houge of Augustana. The last three won the right to speak in the finals at Northwestern. Thus half of the state contests were won by ΠΚΔ orators and half of the speakers in the final contest were members of our society. Here our luck seemed to end.

The final contest was held May 2. The results follow:
Also speaking:
"America's Palabra de Honor," Emilio M. del Rosario, Nebraska Wesleyan.
"Our Common Heritage," Marcus Houge, Augustana.

The judges were Professors James M. O'Neill, Wisconsin; Frank Rarig, Minnesota; B. C. Nelson, Chicago; Charles H. Wollbert, Illinois; Thomas C. Trueblood, Michigan; Ralph B. Dennis and Lawrence Hall, Northwestern.

The Interstate Association was reorganized. West Virginia was admitted, making 15 states. Hereafter instead of two, there will be three divisions. Professor G. E. Fisher, Georgetown, Kentucky Alpha, is manager of the Eastern division consisting of Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. The Central division consists of Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and Kansas, with Professor Bost of Carroll, Wisconsin Beta, as manager. Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, North, and South Dakota constitute the Western division with Dr. Albert Keiser of Augustana, South Dakota Eta, manager. In the future two orators from each division will appear in the finals.
MISSOURI VALLEY ORATORICAL

Kingsley W. Given, Kansas State Agricultural College, won second in the Missouri Valley contest. First place went to the University of Texas and third to Drake. Other schools in the association are: Washington University, and the universities of Kansas, Colorado, Missouri and South Dakota.—The Kansas State Collegian.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN ORATORICAL LEAGUE

The first contest of the Rocky Mountain Oratorical League was held at the University of Colorado, May 8. Six orators spoke. At the end of the contest three of them were tied for first place. The tie was broken by resorting to the grades. The final results follow.

First, "Enforcing the Law," Grace Johnson, University of Utah.
Second, "Human Engineers," Herbert Woodman, University of Wisconsin.

Also speaking:
"Our Hope of Peace," A. C. Lambert, Brigham Young University.
"The End of the Old Parties," Moses Lasky, University of Colorado.
"Conserving the Natural Resources of the Rocky Mountain States," Winton Weydemeyer, Montana State College.

PEACE CONTESTS

Bethel won first; Southwestern, second; McPherson, third; and Fairmount, fourth, in the Kansas Peace contest. Sterling, Kansas City, Ottawa, Friends, and Iowa College were also represented.—The Sunflower.

Earl Raitt won the local contest at Nebraska Wesleyan and will represent his school in the state Peace contest.—The Wesleyan.

CALIFORNIA

Ted Coleman of Cal. Tech., Clifton Winn of Pomona, and Dick Grey from Occidental tied for first in the ranking of the judges in the Peace Contest. The grades, however, gave first to Pomona, second to Occidental, and third to Cal. Tech. Southern Branch of the University of California was fourth.—The Grizzly.

ANTI-TOBACCO

"The Gold of Destruction," by George Whiteneck of McPherson, was awarded first place in the Kansas state Anti-Tobacco contest. Orville Holtz, Kansas Wesleyan, with "Safeguarding our Future" tied for second with Archer of Central College, who spoke on "The Dawn of a New Era." Sterling, Tabor, and Miltonvale Junior College were also represented.

CALIFORNIA OLD LINE

In the California State Oratorical contest "America First" delivered by Ellsworth Meyer of Pomona was awarded first, Roger Walsh won second for Redlands with the oration "The Unfulfilled Promise." "The Youth Movement" won third for Tom Cunningham of Southern Branch. The other speakers were ranked as follows: T. C. Coleman, Cal Tech; J. J. Mayo, Southern California; L. Studebaker, La Verne; and P. Carter of Occidental.

—The Grizzly.

THE COLORADO ALPHA AND BETA

To encourage a beginning in a state intercollegiate oratorical contest in oratory and extempore work, the Colorado Aggies and Teachers arranged a
dual between themselves. Each institution was represented by two speakers in the men's and women's contests in oratory and extemopore.


The general subject for the women's extempore was the problems of college education in Colorado. "What shall be done to develop higher standards of honesty in student obligations?" was the topic on which Miss Nelson of the Aggies won first. "What are the obligations of the staff of a college paper to the institution as a whole?" was developed for second place by Miss Chubb also of the Aggies. "Is the honor system in examinations as generally conducted desirable in Colorado institutions of higher learning, and can its requirements be enforced by student self-government?" as answered by Miss Edna Walters was awarded third for the Teachers.

The men's extempore was on the general subject of the Sugar Beet Industry in Colorado. W. O. Orr of the Aggies and Kenneth Perry of Teachers tied for first. Orr spoke on the comparative values of beets and alfalfa. The social problems arising from establishing permanent colonies for Mexican beet workers was Perry's subject. The sliding scale for beets versus a fixed scale was developed by John Gaul of Teachers for third.

First and third in the women's oratorical were awarded to the Teachers for the orations "They Know Not What They Do," and "Lest We Forget," delivered by Edna Walter and Jessie Morton. Frances Jones of the Aggies speaking on "Games versus Gangs" was awarded second.

ORATORICAL CONTEST ON THE CONSTITUTION

The Forensic has been unable so far to secure much information concerning the intercollegiate orations on the constitution. The whole United States has been divided into seven divisions and there are to be seven speakers at the contest in each division. The 7 are to be selected on their manuscripts.

One division will hold its contest in St. Louis. The colleges which will be represented there are: Iowa University and Penn. of Iowa; University of Colorado and Denver of Colorado; University of North Dakota; and two ΠΚΔ colleges, Hastings of Nebraska and Oklahoma Aggies.

Word has also been received that the new chapter at North Carolina state is the only ΠΚΔ institution which will be represented in the southern divisional.

WOMEN'S CONTESTS

IOWA

Eight colleges were represented in the Iowa Women's Forensic League. The results follow:

First, "The Great Crucifixion," Dorothy Green, Buena Vista.
Second, "Youth and War," Susan Fulton, Parsons.

Others speakers were:
"The Path to Peace," Jane Corbitt, Upper Iowa.
"Clean Politics," Vera Johnson, Penn.
"Physical Fitness," and Gilford, State Teachers.
"America and Peace," Alleen Blake, Morningside.
Professor Charles H. Woolbert of Illinois University was critic judge.
In the Extempore contest Mildred Hickman, Morningside, won first; Nelle Bass, Penn, second; and Margaret Lawson, Parsons, third. All the talks dealt with the Pan-American situation.

KANSAS

Nine colleges were represented in the Kansas Women's State Oratorical Contest at Emporia, April 22. The results were:
First, "Woodrow Wilson," Violet Hasslar, Kansas State Teachers of Emporia.
Second, "Christianity and War," Geraldine Reboul, Kansas State Agricultural College.
Third, Sterling College.
Fourth, Fairmount.
The other institutions represented were: Emporia, Ottawa, Friends, Southwestern and Washburn.—The Sunflower.

STERLING-FAIRMOUNT DUAL

"Society's Responsibility to the Criminal" given by Miss Mildred Clark representing Fairmount, was awarded first place in the dual contest with Sterling. Sterling was represented by Edith Stinson who spoke on "For Valuue Received."—The Sunflower.

NEW MATERIAL IN THE FINAL REFUTATION

Dear Mr. Westfall,

I have a question which I wish to ask you. Suppose we are having a formal debate. All constructive speeches have been given. All of the rebuttal speeches have been given except the last affirmative and the affirmative speaker is in the midst of it. The affirmative speaker starts introducing new material. Has the captain or any other of the negative debaters a right to rise to a point of order and call to the affirmative speaker's attention that he is introducing new material?

My own personal views on this matter are as follows:
1st.—That a formal debate is different from a case at law or other strictly parliamentary procedure, hence certain phases of Robert's Rules of Order do not apply to a formal debate.
2nd.—That it is extremely discourteous.
3rd.—That it is the judges' business to discount a speaker for introducing new material.
4th.—That the condition is liable to lead to a wrangle which is not debating in any sense of the word.

I would like very much to have your views on the matter and also citation to written authority if there is any to be had.

Fraternally,
Mr. Cortie Ellis Stevens.
Kansas Theta

Charles Howard, a former student, won the annual interclass oratorical contest at Princeton this year. Last year as a freshman he was a member of the team which defeated Harvard and this year as a member of the regular team he repeated the trick.—(This information is taken from the Zeta News of Northern Teachers of South Dakota, an alumni letter issued three times a year by the chapter.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER—</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Keys</th>
<th>Fines</th>
<th>Refunds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—Henderson-Brown</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
<td>$35.69</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Ouchita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Univ. of Redlands</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Occidental</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—Calif, Inst. of Tech.</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6—College of Pacific</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7—Univ. of Calif. So.B</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8—Colo. Agric. Col.</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9—Colorado Teachers.</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>96.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10—Connecticut Agri. C.</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11—Illinois Wesleyan</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12—Eureka</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13—Carthage</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14—Bradley</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>67.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15—Monmouth</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>42.69</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16—Illinois State Nor.</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>85.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>109.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17—McKendree</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18—Northwestern</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19—Lombard</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20—Franklin</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21—Iowa Wesleyan</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>51.84</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22—Central Iowa</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>49.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23—Des Moines</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24—Morningside</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>73.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>98.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25—Simpson</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26—Parsons</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>103.64</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>131.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27—Upper Iowa</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>75.13</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>125.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28—Coe</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29—Western Union</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>144.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>226.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30—Buena Vista</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31—Coe</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>45.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32—Washburn</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33—Kansas State Ag. C.</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>58.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34—Southwest'n (Kan.)</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>134.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35—Fairmount</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>36.47</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36—K. S. T. C. Emporia</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37—Kansas Wesleyan</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38—K. S. T. C. Pittsb'g</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39—College of Emporia</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40—Baker</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41—Sterling</td>
<td>72.03</td>
<td>164.23</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>236.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42—Bethany</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43—K. S. T. C. Hays</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44—Georgetown</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45—Centre</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46—Kentucky Wesleyan</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>53.07</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47—Transylvania</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48—Colby</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49—Kalmazoo</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>142.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>218.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50—Olivet</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51—Hope</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>Endowment</td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Agri. Col.</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>33.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S. N. C. Ypsilanti</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>137.28</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. of City Detroit</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olaf</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>164.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamline</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central (Missouri)</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jewel</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>58.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Wesleyan</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver-Stockton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Missouri State Teachers</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-mountain Union</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>62.34</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>72.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotner</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doane</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>58.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Island</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska State Teachers</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balwin-Wallace</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>36.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>80.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otterbein</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>35.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Agri. Col.</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>59.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa U.</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Baptist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Teachers of Oklahoma</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wofford</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>50.92</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>100.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Wesleyan</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>61.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>119.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Teachers of South Dakota</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>71.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>117.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>78.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>126.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusculum</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern (Tex.)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>43.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>73.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Texas Teachers</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Howard-Payne</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>College of Puget Sound</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>78.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>45.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>69.82</td>
<td>153.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>General Chapter</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>44.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Delta Sigma Rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Forensic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,943.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,345.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$90.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Receipts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand April 1, 1924</td>
<td>$3,321.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from Dues</td>
<td>2,943.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from keys</td>
<td>4,345.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from fines</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from Delta Sigma Rho</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from Forensic</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,645.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. G. Balfour</td>
<td>$3,980.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Printing</td>
<td>1,386.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Newman</td>
<td>81.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. B. Summers</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds to Chapters</td>
<td>152.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. I. Ross</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Union</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. S. Seibert</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. Marsh</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. W. Finley</td>
<td>27.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. R. Nichols</td>
<td>149.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Coon</td>
<td>106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Westfall</td>
<td>366.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A. C. Multigraph Bureau</td>
<td>18.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Powell</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Prize</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Sigma Rho</td>
<td>32.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettering Charters</td>
<td>41.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>104.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Vann refund</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,351.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,645.82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,351.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash on hand, April 1, 1925                      | $3,294.32 |
THE SIXTH NATIONAL CONVENTION

The Sixth National Convention will be held next spring, probably during the week beginning March 29. A questionnaire recently sent to the chapters indicated that that date was the most acceptable.

As many inquiries have been received concerning the convention program and contests, the tentative plans are herein announced, subject, of course, to final revision by the National Council.

The convention will open, let us say, on Monday. The men will meet in Fort Collins with the Colorado Alpha chapter at the Agricultural College; the women in Greeley with the Beta chapter at the Teachers college. The preliminary contest will begin, say at one o'clock. It will be necessary to hold the preliminaries upon some college campus in order to insure plenty of auditoriums.

There will be three sets of preliminaries at each place. The debating teams will be composed of two members, each speaking 10 and 5 minutes. An institution may enter two teams, one on each side of the question, but each team entered must be prepared to debate on each side of the question and will be required to do so. The tournament will be arranged so that no team will be put out until it has been defeated twice. It will be possible to have four rounds of the debating tournament the first day, at one, three, seven and nine o'clock. This will be strenuous work, but it will be necessary to work fast to get thru. The final few rounds can be completed in Estes Park Tuesday and Wednesday.

The orations will be limited to 1,500 words. The preliminaries will be arranged so that not more than six will speak in any one contest. The winners in each contest will go to the finals. Those who rank second will go to a consolation contest and those who rank third will go to still another consolation. The winners of first and second in the first consolation, and the winner of first in the other consolation, will also go into the finals. Thus any one winning first is sure of a place in the finals. No one who wins as high as third will be out of the final until he has had a chance before another set of judges. In case of a tie probably both of those tying will be advanced as would the one have been, had he won alone. All the preliminaries will be held the first day.

The speakers in the extempore contest will know some time in advance what their subject is to be. They will have one or two hours after they draw their special topic to prepare for the contest. Each one will have eight minutes. The same plan of selection from the preliminaries for the finals that is used in the oratorial will be employed in this contest.

If the convention opens Monday, it will move to Estes Park by automobile Tuesday morning. There the convention proper and the final contests will be held. The convention should close with the final banquet Thursday evening if it opens on Monday. In Estes Park the program will be to have the convention meetings and contests early in the morning and in the evening in order to release the delegates during the best part of the day to enjoy the winter sports and other advantages of the mountain region.

A chapter may send as many delegates as it cares to. The more it sends the better. It should be represented in each of the contests if possible. It should send some students so that they may bring back to their campus the inspiration of the convention. The coach should be there to learn what is being done in forensics. We should like to have the college president present so that we may learn from him the place forensics should occupy in the general college program, and so that we may show him what plans we have for the future.

Now is the time for a chapter to be working on its plans for sending a delegation to the convention. A number of chapters already have both plans
and funds. No chapter but what can send as many delegates as it cares to. It is the old “where there is a will, there is a way.” It does mean effort, it may even mean sacrifice, but it is abundantly worth while. If the student body understood that the winning orators and the leading debaters and extemporaneous speakers were going to the national convention, there would be real competition for the places, the whole student body would become interested in the struggle, and would await with interest the report on the success of its representatives.

The expenses of sending a good delegation can be handled in a number of ways. First, the expenditures of the budget should be managed in such a manner as to leave as much as possible for the convention fund. Second, debates along the route should be scheduled. The early bird, in this case, gets the plums. Third, the chapter can well afford to undertake some activity which will raise funds. Many of the chapters have given plays, one ran a summer excursion, and others have resorted to various other activities. Fourth, perhaps the institution can be interested in sending the coach, as it sends representatives to other conventions. The president may be persuaded to attend. Fifth, interested friends in the community may be willing to provide part of the financial backing. A Rotary club sent a team to one convention.

There are many ways in which funds may be provided. The only trouble is in lack of foresight and planning. If a chapter spends all of its budget and makes no effort to provide a convention fund until just before the convention, it may find it difficult to meet the necessary expenses. If it starts now, works and economizes during the year, undertakes some activities which should provide financial support, it can send as many delegates as it cares to.

Is it worth the effort? Forensics are going forward as shown in the tables earlier in this number. A good deal of the impetus for this advance has come from the honorary forensic organizations, and most of it has been provided thru the national conventions. The problem for each institution next year is not how many debates it can carry nor how many oratorical contests it can enter, but what can it do to advance Forensics, create greater interest in its student body, produce better Forensics, get more people interested, and provide more opportunities for them. The presence of a good delegation especially of the students at this great convention where there will be hundreds of other students from more than half the states of the union in three days will give these representatives more ideas about better forensics locally and more inspiration to drive ahead than the average schedule of two or three years. If the proper delegation is sent, the dynamic forces of the convention will be carried back to each institution and set to work for forensic betterment.

Wisconsin Beta at Carroll has completed its most pretentious and most successful season. It inaugurated women’s debating, won the state oratorical for the first time, engaged in 11 decision debates, winning a majority of them, and in 6 decisionless contests. The affirmative was unusually successful on the ΠΚΔ question.—The Carroll College Echo.

Kenford Nelson, the Park orator who won third in the interstate, is the author of a volume of poems entitled "Guesses at the Truth." While the volume has received very pleasant recognition from literary critics, when the poems appeared while Nelson was a student at Asbury College, Kentucky, the dean asked Nelson to continue his conjectures at some other place. A limited number of copies have been put on sale at Park, but so far we have not heard any objection to Nelson’s guesses. —The Stylus.
VITALIZING THE PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTESTS

E. C. Buehler, Debate Coach
Kansas Beta, Washburn College

Do our public speaking contests deal with problems which are of vital interest to the speaker or the audience? This year at Washburn College we have tried to put a little "reality" into at least some of the speaking contests. We tried to do this in debating, extempore speaking and in special speaking contests dealing with student and campus problems.

Last fall when the presidential campaign was reaching its climax an extemporaneous speaking contest was conducted. This contest was open to both men and women, the speeches to be eight minutes in length, the speakers drawing three sub-topics an hour before the contest, the general topic being "The National Political Situation." As a result there was a large audience with more interest and enthusiasm for this one contest than for ten formal intercollegiate debates.

Then at various times during the year speaking contests were conducted at the regular chapel sessions. In these contests students discussed campus problems. Usually there were five speakers, selected by the students or the faculty, each speaker having seven minutes to present an original, thoroughly prepared speech. The topics always dealt in a vital way with student life. In two contests the topics were limited to a special problem. In one case it was student honor in the other it was student government. The decision was rendered in these cases by the student body and the winning speech printed in the college paper. In another case the students were free to choose their own topics. In this contest three members of the faculty and two students acted as judges. A senior, Mr. Herman Johnson, was the winner, his topic being, "Do College Fraternities Justify their Existence?" He was a barb.

In debate, we had one unique and spectacular event. The Washburn negative team met the affirmative team of the University of West Virginia in the House of Representatives in the State Capitol with Governor Ben S. Paulen presiding, with judges of the Supreme Court acting as judges, with an audience which packed the floor and the galleries at the time the state legislature was in session and the question was the regular official Pi Kappa Delta question for 1925. Yes, the affirmative won, 2-1. We see that judges do decide upon the merits of debating and not upon the merits of the question.

Another speaking event which had a flavor of reality was conducted before the student body at the regular chapel hour when Miss Helen Correll, of Kansas State Agricultural college, clashed with Miss Lorraine Bates of Washburn on the topic of state control of higher education versus that of private control. Miss Correll of the state school spoke in behalf of the state control, Miss Bates spoke in the interest of private control. Each speaker had 15 minutes, Miss Correll having 6-6- and 3 minutes alternating with Miss Bates' 8 and 7 minutes.

Why not aim to put into practice, in some measure at least, some of the theory and principles which we have in such great abundance in our class room, in our text books and in our collateral readings?

Texas Gamma at East Texas retained her championship of the Texas normal schools by winning on both sides of the resolution that it would be to the best interests of the state to have a state board of equalization to relieve the present county systems of the burden of determining tax valuations.—The East Texan.
Editor's Personal Page

Where inconsistencies cease from troubling and logic is at rest.

** **

Minnehaha was kneading the dough
Unexpectant of sorrow or woe;
The pappoose began bawling,
And the bread pan in fawling
Crushed the Indian corn on her tough.

** **

One of the Oxford debater opened his speech in the debate with Harvard by stating that altho the lord had created monkeys with tails, he had left man to draw his own conclusions.

** **

"Professor McCarty reports that the squad has run out of the best questions on which good arguments can be based, and in order to get new material, he has asked for some questions on which the student body would like to hear arguments presented. We offer the following:
1. Would a locomotive last longer if it did not smoke so much?
2. Why does water freeze with the slippery side up?
3. Do trains whistle at night to keep up their courage?
4. Why is it that no matter how far a fish swims it never perspires?
5. Why do all animals wear their clothes the fur side out, when practice has proven that the garment is warmer when turned fur side in?
6. Why do cows refuse to use cuspidors even tho they chew their cud more than the average nicotine mangler?
7. Why are blueberries red when they are green?—The Industrial Collegian of South Dakota State College.

To the above list we might add Mr. Bryan's famous argument against evolution that no scientist can explain why a red cow can eat green grass and give white milk. We answer because the milk is yellow.

** **

The debater who becomes discouraged in his efforts to work up some glow of enthusiasm as he presents his carefully prepared arguments on one of the important national questions to a room of empty seats, sometimes looks with envy upon the grandstand full of cheering people who become hysterical over the valiant efforts of an athlete to carry an inflated pig skin across a chalk line. But the fame of the athlete is temporary. Every one knows of Cicero and Demosthenes, but who can name the Olympic heroes of ancient Greece? Luther's debate with the established church is one of the high points of history, but outside of Ivanhoe, who is a creature of fiction, I have never even read the name of the winner of one of those great tournaments of chivalry. Burke left a speech on conciliation that thousands of high school students have struggled over but very few can even name the popular sport of his day. The Lincoln-Douglass debates must sooner or later attract the attention of any one who reads American history, but where will you turn to find the names of the leading athletes of the period prior to the Civil war? Sampson, the greatest athlete of ancient history, and his greatest athletic achievement, the slaying of the Phillistines, is best known. I verily believe, not because he slew two thousand, but because he used an instrument that has been confused with speaking, the jaw bone of an ass. This deadly weapon is still being employed, usually by the owner, both for purposes of destruction and to lessen interest in worth while forensics.
THE END OF THE YEAR

Another forensic season is closed. As the final "I have now proved" echoes thru the auditorium, it is time for each \( \Pi K \Delta \) chapter to take an inventory of what has been accomplished during the season and to place its orders for what it will need to accomplish next year.

Real forensic achievements cannot be measured in contests won and lost alone. It is worth while to win. In our effort to get away from the "win-at-any-cost" methods, let us not forget that usually the better class of forensics meet with the approval of the judges.

However, the real purpose of forensics is not to win contests, but to develop individuals, the men and women who are students in our colleges. We can not measure the progress of a chapter by the victories alone, for many factors enter into a winning season, but each chapter can measure itself more or less accurately. Each chapter should measure itself.

First, has the season improved those who took part in forensics? Have they a greater love of truth, a truer appreciation of some of the problems of the day, and a better understanding of the factors which influence human actions? If they are dissatisfied, suspicious of their fellow students, cynical, prejudiced, narrow, it is doubtful whether or not they have profited by their year's work. That season has been successful which has trained men and women to be more tolerant of the opinions of others, to seek ample evidence for their own beliefs and assertions, and to be able to live with their fellow students with less friction and greater friendship. The search for truth should teach men to value it more highly and to live in accordance with it.

Second, there should be greater respect for forensics in the college and community and more interest in them. The season should have been so conducted that the institution as a whole has been bettered by it. Old misunderstandings should have been cleared away, greater confidence and friendship built up between institutions. The president of the college and the faculty as well as the students should feel that the forensic endeavors of the debaters and orators have accomplished something worth while.

Third, there should be a growing enthusiasm among the members of the
chapter for better forensics next year. The presence of the spirit of youth is proof that growth is still taking place. The spirit of youth is the desire to do something bigger, better than has been done before. Unless a chapter has this spirit, it is in a dangerous condition.

If it has this spirit of youth, it is already planning for next year. This is a good time to plan for next year, while the lessons of this year are fresh in mind. Tasks of ample magnitude must have sufficient time for their execution. A worth-while forensic program cannot be conceived in the middle of the season and carried to completion before spring vacation.

What have been the deficiencies in our forensic program this year? Have we devoted our energies to too few people? Have we narrowed our efforts too much? Have we scattered? Have our debates been hastily and illy prepared? Have we been weak in analysis and logical arrangement? Has our evidence been scanty and from too few sources? Do we measure up in delivery? Have we developed our men to speak effectively without reciting a memorized manuscript? Do we weaken or advance in refutation? There are some of the questions each chapter should ask itself. Once it has agreed upon its chief weakness, it can devise measures to overcome the fault.

If it does not have sufficient funds to carry out a good forensic program, it should seek means of obtaining financial support. If it does not have a debate coach whose teaching schedule permits him to devote sufficient time to forensics, it should attempt to convince the president of the college that it would be wise for him to make better arrangements for next year. If it has been engaging in too many expensive contests, traveling too far from home or giving too many guarantees to visiting teams, it should adopt a new plan. We do not get to any place worth while by accident. Good forensics are almost always the result of intelligent planning and consistent effort.

LIGHTER QUESTIONS.

Have you ever heard a group of people discussing the question of whether or not Congress should be empowered to reenact legislation declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court? How many citizens know enough about forms of government to discuss the relative values of executive-legislative-judicial and the cabinet-parliamentary systems? Mr. Average Citizen is quite willing to condemn or approve the league of nations vehemently, but painfully grieved if you ask him to support his opinion with any evidence. "The Harding reservations" is a term he uses glibly but with little idea of what these reservations are supposed to do or why we are supposed to need them. Yet these are the questions which intercollegiate debaters ask the public to listen to.

One reason people do not find intercollegiate debates very interesting is because they deal with questions that require a great deal of the hardest kind of study and concerning which the average man knows nothing. The person who listens to them feel helpless. He hears a lot of figures and arguments which are beyond his immediate comprehension, and he is unable to deal with the mass of strange knowledge. Very little of it does he retain. He feels that he has wandered out of his realm. The next day he argues heatedly with his neighbor over the prohibition question or whether we should have Sunday movies. He knows some things about these questions and does not feel his feet slipping when he ventures to discuss them.

Of course the idealist is right in insisting that people should know something about governmental forms and international movements. He visions the intercollegiate debater as an educator who is enlightening the public on some of the grave questions of the hour (He should attend a debate at which there are about fifteen bored listeners and talk with them afterwards). The mission of the debater thus conceived is an inspiring
one. There is nothing wrong with the vision, the question is whether or not it works out. Would it not be better to discuss Bryan’s theory about teaching evolution in the colleges of the country before a full auditorium than to debate the Supreme Court question before fifteen or twenty fond parents and loyal roommates who already know part of the debate by heart? One question is more or less debatable in the sense of having two well-balanced sides. The other is not, but is less apt to go to the heads of the audience. If there were more personal feeling and less cold impersonal logic, there would be more appeal to the audience. We like the thrill of feeling as well as the appeal to reason.

I am not sure that we should do well to change. There are many things to be considered. As now conducted our debates have much in their favor, but we must admit they do lack a personal appeal. It is the same question the churches are facing. Is it better to have a church full to see a moving picture or a vaudeville or to preach the real gospel to a few? We don’t know. The good citizen should be anxious to wait upon religion and to receive enlightenment on the important problems of his government. He does not seem to be. What shall we do, go to him or wait for him to come to us?

CHAPTER 109

Chapter 109, to be known as the Iowa Lambda chapter, has just been granted by the National Council to the University of Dubuque, Dubuque. This university and ΠΚΔ have been interested in each other for some time. We shall have more to say about it in the next Forensic. It is planned to have the installation this spring.

On behalf of the whole organization, all the members, and the other 106 active chapters, the National Council extends a full welcome and the most cordial greetings to the Iowa Lambda chapter, its members, and the institution as a whole. May the relations be at all times pleasant and mutually beneficial.

WATCH US GROW

As the Forensic went to press, the editor received word from the national secretary that he had just ordered key number 3003 and had issued membership card 4832. The key went to Evelyn Newman, Dean of Women, Colorado Teachers College, and the membership card to John Brewster, College of Emporia.

Some idea of size of the society may be gathered from the following figures. April 1, 1924, the first membership card of the fiscal year was issued to George F. Wise of Central College, Missouri. It was number 3629. The last card issued March 31, 1925, went to Paul E. Schweik of McKendree. 1001 memberships were issued, the largest number ever issued any one year.

Raymond Schutz of Otterbein purchased key number 2088, the first issued during the same fiscal year. The last one went to Bernice Burns of Colorado Teachers College. It was number 2864, making 781 keys for the year.

POSITION OPEN

The Forensic has been informed of five very good college positions open only to experienced instructors who have at least a master’s degree.

The Forensic has received a number of inquiries concerning positions from people seeking locations. Most of them are from students who are just graduating. They desire high school positions for the most part where they can teach and coach debating. Any one who can help us to locate these people, should write at once.
COLORADO ALPHA NEEDS A NEW COACH

Last year Colorado Alpha advertised for a debate coach thru the Forensic. It secured the services of Don C. Lewis who was then graduating from Parsons College. Mr. Lewis has just accepted a new position at a substantial increase in salary. Colorado Alpha is in the market for another debate coach, preferably a member of ΠΚΔ.

California Alpha at Redlands has won the debating conference championship for both men and women. The men, debated the question of Japanese immigration. On the affirmative, Redlands won from La Verne, Pacific, Calif. Teck, and Southern Branch. On the negative, she defeated Pomona and Occidental, but lost to La Verne. In addition she won against Willamette of Oregon on the affirmative of the ΠΚΔ question. One interesting feature of the season was the debate with University of Southern California. Only two judges arrived and the decision resulted in a tie. That the work of Professor Nichols and his squad has been appreciated is shown by the following letter sent by the Trustee:

Dr. Victor L. Duke,
President of the University,
Redlands, California.
Dear Doctor Duke:

At the last meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University of Redlands, a resolution was unanimously passed directing its secretary to write you and to express to you, and through you to Professor Nichols and the members of the two debating teams of the University, the thanks and appreciation of the members of the Committee for the splendid work done by these two teams during the debating season just closed. The news that both the men's team and the women's team had won the championship in the respective contests over all other competing colleges of Southern California, was indeed pleasant news to all the members of the Committee, and we are sure that their feelings were shared in by each and every number of the Board of Trustees. Victories like these are of the highest value, and give to the University a standing among its constituency and among those interested in educational matters that nothing else can do.

Will you please convey to Professor Nichols and to each member of the debating teams our most sincere and hearty congratulations?

Cordially yours,

J. W. CURTIS,
Secretary of the Executive Committee.
—U. of Redlands Campus.

California Gamma at Calif. Tech has been debating the Japanese immigration question. The affirmative won from La Verne and lost to Whittier and Pomona, while the negative won from Pasadena College and lost to LaVerne, Southern California, and Redlands.—The California Tech.

Simpson has had a good forensic year. The negative team on the Japanese question, among other things, defeated Kent School of Law of Chicago. The freshmen closed their season with a victory over the William Jewell freshmen on the supreme court question.—Ths Simpsonian.
North-Western has completed a busy season. On the ΠΚΔ question the men lost to Augustana and Olivet, and to Ripon and Monmouth on the affirmative. The negative won from Illinois College. The girls debated the repeal of the Japanese exclusion clause, winning on the affirmative from Bradley and Augustana, and from Monmouth on the negative but losing to Illinois Wesleyan. In an audience decision they defeated Beloit proving that the United States should not interfere in the internal affairs of Latin American countries by force of arms.—*The College Chronicle*

Parsons, Iowa Zeta, won 9 of its 11 debates. The women defeated Michigan Aggies, Central of Iowa twice, Iowa State Teachers twice, and split with Penn. The men won two from Central of Iowa, one from Simpson, but lost one to State Teachers. Wayne Neely won the state extempore and Robert Bartlett the oratorical. Susan Fulton won second in the women's extempore. The pledges are now wearing large wooden keys preparatory to initiation.—*The Portfolio.*

Des Moines, Iowa Gamma, did much traveling this year. A girls' team took a ten day trip, debating Missouri Wesleyan, the University of the South, Tennessee; Elkins, and Bridgewater, North Carolina. They lost to Missouri Wesleyan but won from the others. The men met Nebraska Wesleyan, Grand Island, Cotner; Brigham Young, and Westminster in Utah, Western State of Colorado, Washburn, and Kansas City University in Kansas; and William Jewell in Missouri. The official question was used in all of these debates.

In addition Des Moines broke even with Coe in a dual, but lost to Creighton and William Jewell on the negative and to Washburn on the affirmative of the same question.

One big achievement of the year is the prize contests in debating and oratory which the chapter is fostering. These contests will be held May 25. The first and second prizes in each contest are fifty and twenty-five dollars.—*The Highlander.*

The first co-ed debate in Arkansas was held February 26 between Henderson-Brown and Conway on the question of uniform marriage and divorce laws. The negative upheld by Conway won the decision. The Arkansas State Teachers College defeated the men of Henderson-Brown, upholding the affirmative of the recognition of Soviet Russia.—*Henderson-Brown Star.*

Colorado Beta at Teachers College took part in the state tournament using the split team system. In addition the negative lost to Western State while the affirmative won. The affirmative lost to Intermountain Union, but won from Aggies in a debate before one of the high schools. In all Beta has won eight out of fifteen debates, the women winning five out of the eight they entered.—*The Mirror.*

Ouachita, Arkansas Beat, lost to Utah Aggies on the negative of the ΠΚΔ question and to Oklahoma Baptists on the affirmative.—*Ouachita Signal.*
Iowa Alpha, Iowa Wesleyan, won three of its four women's debates, defeating Upper Iowa and John Fletcher on the affirmative of the IIKΔ question, and winning from Upper Iowa on the negative but losing to Central. On the same question the men broke even, losing to Central and Carthage on the affirmative, but winning from Penn and Carthage on the negative. Miss Lucille Beer won third in the women's state oratorical. Coe forfeited a debate. At a four course banquet at the end of the season, thirteen new members were initiated.—The Iowa Wesleyan News.

McKendree dropped both ends of its men's dual with Greenville on the IIKΔ question. Using the same question McKendree met Southwestern Missouri teachers in a no-decision debate. The girls won from Greenville on the Philippine question but lost to Central Wesleyan of Missouri on the affirmative of the IIKΔ question.—The McKendree College Review.

Lombard won from Monmouth on the affirmative and lost to Eureka on the negative of the Japanese immigration question. The tie in the Illinois intercollegiate debate league between Eureka and Augustana was settled at Lombard as a neutral point. Augustana's string of 13 victories running thru two years was broken by Eureka.—The Lombard Review.

To show its appreciation of the successful debating season, the faculty of Franklin, Indiana Alpha, voted a half holiday. On the Japanese question, the Franklin women won from Kalamazoo on the negative but lost to Denison on the affirmative. The men's teams won three and lost one debate.—The Franklin.

The recently organized Mississippi Valley Oratorical association held its first contests at McKendree April 17. In oratory Blackburn placed first; McKendree, second; and Will Mayfield College, third. In Ectempore Will Mayfield was first and McKendree, second.—The McKendree Review.

Illinois Wesleyan entered women's debating this year. The Alpha affirmative team won from North-Western on the Japanese question. On the IIKΔ question the men on the negative lost to Eureka and won on the affirmative from Bradley.—The Argus.

Eureka made a good start in the Illinois Intercollegiate Debate League by winning on the affirmative from Wesleyan and losing to Augustana while the negative won from Bradley and Normal University.—The Pegasus.

Central, Iowa Beta, lost both ends of a dual with Parsons in the men's debates. The women won both ends of their dual with Simpson, but lost to Parsons. The official question was used in all these debates.—The Central Ray.

The local oratorical contest to select Monmouth's representative for the state contest next year will be held this year. This will give the winning orator the summer to work on his oration.—The Monmouth College Oracle.
One of the features of the forensic season at Iowa Theta, Coe, was the broadcasting of the debate on the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question over the WJAM station. The "Kohawk" teams have engaged in eleven debates. The affirmative defeated Oskaloosa, Dubuque, and Cornell, but lost to Des Moines and Upper Iowa. The negative won over Des Moines, but lost to Dubuque, Cornell, and Monmouth. Another negative team had the unique experience of debating a tie with Cornell due to the failure of one of the judges to arrive. The dual with Iowa Wesleyan was forfeited.—Coe College Cosmos.

Upper Iowa, the Eta Chapter, has been very successful in forensics this year and at the same time has been training up a group of underclass men who will be able to continue the forward march of the institution. While both ends of the dual with Iowa Alpha were lost on the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question, Coe was defeated by the negative. The winning of first in the women's extemporaneous Provincial contest at Canton and the success in other contests there promises much for next year.—Upper Iowa Collegian.

California Delta at Pacific is carrying on a vigorous forensic program. Their frosh defeated San Mateo on the affirmative of subsidizing the aircraft industry. On the affirmative of the Japanese question the men lost to Brigham Young and to Redlands on the negative, while the girls won from Nevada. A no-decision debate with Southern California was also part of the program. On the affirmative of the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question Pacific was defeated by Williamette. On the affirmative of the question that the tariff was harmful to California farmers the men lost to Santa Clara.—The Pacific Weekly.

The Bradley women debated the Japanese immigration question. They won from Wesleyan and Normal but lost to North-Western on the negative. The men won on the negative of the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question from Lombard while the affirmative was losing to Monmouth. The affirmative also won from Millikin.—The Bradley Tech.

Carthage, Illinois Gamma, won on the negative of the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question from Gettysburg and Iowa Wesleyan but lost to Western Teachers. The affirmative won from Western Teachers, but lost to Iowa Wesleyan. In the freshman debate with Hedding, the affirmative lost both places.—Chronicle.

Harold Whitman was awarded the fifteen dollar Bullman prize in the debate contest at Lombard, Illinois Kappa. The second prize of ten dollars was won by Dorothy Tilden.—The Lombard Review.

Redlands and the University of Southern California are to engage in an open forum debate before a large labor union in Los Angeles, using the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question.—Redlands Campus.

The Monmouth girls won from Illinois Normal University on the negative side of the Japanese question. They lost on both sides to Lombard and Eureka.—The Monmouth College Oracle.

Dr. E. M. Erickson, a member of \( \Pi K \Delta \) and head of the Department of History at Lombard, has been elected to the same position at Coe.—Coe College Cosmos.
Washburn, Kansas Beta, won fifteen and lost ten debates on the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question in the most strenuous debating season it has ever known. The girls won six out of seven, losing only to Park. The men won nine and lost the same number. The most spectacular event of the season was the debate with West Virginia is the state Capitol with Governor Ben S. Paulen presiding and judges of the Supreme court judging. Almost all of the debaters of this year will be back for next year. The chapter is planning to send teams of both men and women to the national convention in Estes Park next year.—Washburn Review.

Gamma at Kansas State Agricultural College has closed a very heavy season. The feature of the season was the victory of the girls over the men from Oregon Aggies. The western team, traveling with a special press agent, announced that it was on its way east to debate Bates for the world's championship and stopped off at Manhattan merely to whet up its claws. The Oregon trip was to cover six weeks and to take the team thru 31 states. At Kansas the home girls had the negative of the \( \Pi K \Delta \) question.—Kansas State Collegian.

Twelve new members were initiated into the Iowa Kappa Chapter at Buena Vista at recent dinner at the home of Professor Lindsey. This marks the end of a successful season. Miss Green won the women's state oratorical and Miss Florey won third in the women's state extempore. The men on the negative lost a debate to Gettysburg, won from Western Union, but lost to the same institution in the affirmative. The girls lost twice to this, the Iota chapter. A no-decision debate with Huron ended in an open forum discussion.—The Buena Vista Tack.

Kansas Alpha and the first \( \Pi K \Delta \) chapter, Ottawa, has closed a very successful season. The official question was used thruout. The men won from Park, Baker, Emporia, and Missouri Wesleyan twice, once on each side of the question. The women won from Park and Teachers of Emporia on the negative, but lost to Washburn on the negative and to the Aggies, Bethany, and Washburn on the affirmative.—The Ottawa Campus.

Otterbein is a member of a conference in Ohio composed of Akron, Bluffton, Muskingum, Wittenberg, and Marietta. The question for next year's debates is that the Child Labor Amendment should be ratified. The conference cup has been won by Muskingum the past two years.—The Tom and Cardinal.

College of Emporia, Kansas Iota, has carried thru a vigorous season. The women defeated Pittsburg Teachers. The men on a trip thru Oklahoma defeated the Aggie, Oklahoma Baptist, and Phillips, but lost to Oklahoma City. Locally Emporia lost to Park, Baker, and Ottawa, but won from Missouri Wesleyan.—College Life.

Western Union has the unique distinction of having had two-thirds of the student body present at its home debates. With such support, teams have defeated Buena Vista three times and lost to them once; the girls winning both ends of their dual.—Western Union Glean.

Miss Frances Ryan and Miss Ruby McDonald represented California Beta at the provincial convention at Pasadena.—The Occidental.
Sterling, Kansas Lambda, won second in its conference, being awarded 550 out of a possible 600 points. By winning the same number of debates, but three more points, Wesleyan was able to win first. Victories were secured over McPherson twice, over Bethany on the negative, and Wesleyan. Tabor won both ends of a dual and Wesleyan and Bethany won single victories. One interesting feature of the contests in the conference was the fact that the affirmative won as often as the negative.—Ye Sterling Stir.

At Fairmount, Kansas Epsilon, the women are coming into their own. Miss Zickefoose was elected May Queen and Miss Anderson head of the local chapter. The girls affirmative on the ΠΚΔ question won three times, defeating Southwestern, Friends, and Bethel. The negative lost to Friends and Bethel. The men split with Bethel, but lost to Friends twice and to Southwestern.—The Sunflower.

Wesleyan, Kansas Eta, fought out the conference championship with Friends. Each institution won on the negative, but because the judges gave Friends a half of a per cent more in their grades, the championship was awarded to that institution.—The Wesleyan Advocate.

In the first debate ever held with the state University, the Aggies won. In the Missouri Valley league Gamma lost to South Dakota, Drake and Oklahoma, but won from Kansas University. The Aggies also lost a debate with Colorado before a women's organization at Junction City.

In order to further the interests of oratory in Eureka College, and to build a permanent memorial to one who was himself an orator of rare abilities, the members of ΠΚΔ in a meeting assembled adopted a constitution which henceforth shall govern the oratorical contests in Eureka College.

The girls took a trip earlier in the season and the men traveled to the west coast, engaging in ten debates en route, five of them no decision contests. Four debates on the affirmative of the official question were lost. Washington State was defeated on the negative.—Kansas State Collegian.

This contest is known as the Louis O. Lehman oratorical contest, and the winner shall be the official representative of Eureka at the annual intercollegiate contest of the Illinois Intercollegiate oratorical association.—The Eureka Pegasus.

In a debate with Washburn before the student assembly, each institution was represented by one girl. The question was that state control is preferable to private control in institutions of high learning.—The Kansas State Collegian.

Baker lost to Ottawa in the first home debate of the season by a 2 to 1 decision of the judges. The audience decision also taken, favored the home team.—The Baker Orange.

The Lombard people, Illinois Kappa, held their annual initiation and banquet at the Elks Club, April 29.—Lombard Review.
Michigan State, Delta, was especially strong on women's debates this year. The women won five of their six debates on the Japanese question. On the negative they defeated Kalamazoo Normal twice, Wheaton, Augustana, but lost to Parsons. On the affirmative they won from Kalamazoo Normal.

The men engaged in 11 debates on 3 questions. Four were no-decision debates. Delta won 3 and lost 4 of the remaining contests. Both the men's and women's teams took long trips.—*The Holcad*.

Nineteen new members were initiated into the Michigan Epsilon chapter at Ypsilanti at the end of the forensic season. The girls debated the Japanese question with Heidelberg. The failure of one judge to arrive made possible a tie in one contest. Epsilon won the other. The men defeated Bowling Green, Bluffton, and Adrian, but lost to Albion and Western State Normal.—*The Normal College News*.

Harold Janes and Robert Kemper tied in the local oratorical contest at Olivet. In the second contest Janes won out. He and Miss Esther Perry represented Michigan Beta in the state contests. In debate Beta defeated North-Western, lost two decision contests and engaged in two no decision debates on a Wisconsin trip where it met Ripon, Milton, Whitewater Normal, and Carroll.—*The Olivet Echo*.

In winning the state championship, Kalamazoo, Michigan Alpha, won four debates on the PIKA question without losing the decision of a single judge. Ypsilanti, Albion, Olivet, and Hope were defeated. A large cup was awarded the school. The women defeated Denison but lost to Franklin.—*The Kalamazoo College Index*.

The one debate the Macalaster affirmative lost was the only one the Minnesota Alpha chapter lost this year. Its girls defeated Jamestown, North Dakota University, and Gustavus Adolphus twice. The men defeated Dubuque, Hamline, St. Olaf, and St. Thomas, but lost to Gustavus Adolphus.—*The Mac Weekly*.

As a reward for winning the local oratorical contest at University of Detroit, Donald T. Wade was presented with a copy of the House of Representatives Constitutional Manual and Digest, autographed by Mr. Nicholas Longworth, the Speaker of the House.—*The Detroit Collegian*.

Hope won first in the women's and second in the men's state contests. The men on the affirmative of the Supreme Court defeated Alma and Oshkosh, and on the negative, Calvin. The negative lost to Kalamazoo and Kalamazoo Normal.—*The Hope Anchor*.

Bethany, Kansas Mu, has had an unusually successful season. The girls won second honors in the Pentagonal League, losing to Washburn. The men broke even with Sterling and Wesleyan in their duals.—*The Bethany Messenger*.

One unique feature of the season was the split team debate with Emporia Teachers. The audience gave the decision and also picked the best debaters.—*College Life*.
This year marks the opening of intercollegiate debating for women between St. Olaf, Minnesota Beta, and Carleton, both of which institutions are located in Northfield. A no-decision debate on government ownership of the railroads has been arranged. The men's negative on the ΠΚΔ question defeated Ripon, St. Thomas, and Gustavus Adolphus, while the affirmative lost to Macalaster, University of North Dakota and Morningside. The negative also lost to Morningside.—The Manitou Messenger.

The women of Missouri Beta, Park, in defeating Washburn broke their five years' jinx. Earlier in the season the girls had lost to Ottawa and Pittsburg. The men have had a good year, defeating Occidental, Kansas City, Phillips, and Oklahoma City on the negative, but losing to Nebraska Wesleyan on the affirmative and to Central of Missouri on the negative.—The Stylus.

Carl Baldwin, President of Missouri Eta, has just finished his term of service as a member of the Missouri State Legislature.

Missouri Eta, Central Missouri State Teachers, and Missouri Gamma, Central College, engaged in both men's and women's no-decision debates. The men lost to Utah Aggies on the negative of the ΠΚΔ question.—The Student.

Because of the new rule of not limiting the number of speakers, in the debate between the freshmen of Redlands and Cal Tech., Redlands, while having of course only two constructive and two rebuttal speeches, used three different men in the debate on the California Criminal Syndicalism law. The method was successful for Redlands.—The California Tech.

The Teachers at Pittsburg, Kansas Zeta, have had a good year under the active leadership of Professor Pelsma. They defeated Kansas City University in one of the first debates of the season, but lost to Friends when they upheld the affirmative of the ΠΚΔ question.—The Collegio.

Maine Alpha, Colby, broke even in six debates on the ΠΚΔ question. The negative defeated Maine, Clark and Middlebury, but the affirmative lost to Maine, Clark, and Lafayette.—The Colby Echo.

Central, Missouri Gamma, has participated in 19 men's debates. Nine were won, 7 lost, and 3 were no-decision contests. The women engaged in 3 no-decision debates.—The Central Collegian.

Kentucky Wesleyan and Georgetown broke even in the dual on the Supreme Court question, the negative winning each time.—The Kentucky Wesleyan.

Hamline, Minnesota Delta, lost to Gustavus Adolphus and Macalester on the affirmative, but won from St. Thomas on the negative.—The Hamline Oracle.

Missouri Epsilon at Wesleyan defeated the women from Des Moines, won from Baker, but lost to William Jewell, and Park.—The Criterion.
Montana Beta, the Aggies, won in debate from Kansas Aggies, but lost in a dual oratorical with the same institution. The Beta chapter also won from Mount St. Charles.

The most novel feature of their season was their trip to Utah. One of the debaters broke out with the measles just as he arrived at Brigham Young. Coach Barger was forced to take his place in a no-decision debate. Here the Montana people borrowed one of the Brigham Young debaters to help them against Utah University, and had to catch him in the swimming pool and drag him away to make the train connections. This contest too was a no-decision contest.—The Weekly Advocate.

William Jewell, Missouri Delta, has had a very successful season on the Supreme Court question. The features of the season were the affirmative victory over Occidental and the negative win over Indiana University. Washington University of St. Louis was defeated on both sides of the question. The affirmative won in both debates of the dual with Kansas City Junior College. The affirmative won from Southwest Baptist and Westminster, the negative from Des Moines, Central of Missouri, Friends, Drury, and Nebraska Wesleyan.—The William Jewell Student.

The Nebraska Alpha women at Nebraska Wesleyan opened the season with a victory over Sioux Falls on the negative of the Japanese question. The men lost to Morningside while the women won from the same institution. The affirmative defeated York, Park, Des Moines, and Washburn, but lost to Midland, Grand Island, and Southern California. The negative won from Grand Island and Omaha, but lost to Hastings and Midland.—The Wesleyan.

Cotner, Nebraska Beta, won 7 and lost 5 debates. It defeated Omaha in both ends of a dual, but lost both to Wesleyan. It split its duals with Doane and Hastings, the affirmative winning in one and the negative in the other. The women lost to Kansas Aggies on the affirmative and Washburn on the negative. The men won from Des Moines and Phillips. The ΠΚΔ question was used throughout.—The Cotner Collegian.

The squad system was used at Grand Island this year and more debaters than usual given opportunity to compete. Eleven people on the squad each debated at least twice. Victories were won over Hastings on the affirmative, and over Des Moines and Kearney on the negative. Hastings also defeated the affirmative and the Central City debaters won on both sides.—The Volante.

Hastings, Nebraska Delta, won both ends of its dual with Kearney, defeated Wesleyan on the affirmative, and broke even with York and Grand Island in duals, the affirmative winning in one and the negative in the other.—The Hastings Collegian.

A local prize of $25 for the best debating was split into three prizes and awarded to Mary Goldstein, first; Richard Johnson, second; and Margaret Rice, third.—The Volante.

Kearney won from Grand Island on the negative but lost to Midland on the affirmative of the ΠΚΔ question.—The Antelope.
Heidelberg, Ohio Beta, debated three questions this year. The girls engaged in a decisionless debate with Baldwin-Wallace on Philippine independence. Most of their debates however were on the Japanese exclusion question. The affirmative lost to Wittenberg and tied with Ypsilanti; the negative lost to Ypsilanti and Albion. The men debated the St. Lawrence waterway project. They opened by defeating Capitol twice in debates held before high school audiences. They won from Wittenberg and Akron, and from Otterbein on the affirmative but lost to Baldwin-Wallace on the negative. The season closed with a big three course dinner and program.—The Kilkilik.

Otterbein, Ohio Epsilon, is stealing a march on the rest of us. They have selected their debate teams for 1926 this spring and plan to practice all summer. Last year Otterbein had a percentage of .664, while this year its three wins out of eight gave it only .375. Those representing the college this year were publicly presented at chapel. On the St. Lawrence waterway question the affirmative lost to Heidelberg and Capitol. The negative lost to Baldwin-Wallace and Muskingum, while winning from Capitol. The affirmative won from Wittenberg.—The Tan and Cardinal.

Reading the pledge vow in chapel and pinning a red rose on each candidate was Oklahoma Epsilon’s, Oklahoma City, method of announcing its new members. On the negative the girls won from Northeastern Teachers but lost to Tulsa on the affirmative. The split team system was employed in the women’s debate with the Aggies. The men won from The Aggies, Tulsa, and College of Emporia on the negative, but lost to Oklahoma Baptist on the affirmative. Epsilon won second in the state oratorical.—The Oklahoma City Campus.

Tulsa, Oklahoma Beta, lost to the Baptists and Oklahoma City in the opening debates of the season. It ended the season with a double victory, the men on the affirmative defeating Texas Christian University and the women on the negative, Phillips. With Northwestern Teachers Tulsa broke even, both negatives winning on the Supreme Court question. The girls won from A. and M. The men lost to Trinity and College of the Ozarks.—The Tulsa Collegian.

Akron, Ohio Delta, women defeated the women of Hiram, Ohio Gamma, before the Rotary club of Youngstown on the affirmative of the St. Lawrence Waterways question. The men on the affirmative of the same question won from Ohio Northern but lost to Wittenberg. The negative lost to Heidelberg, Muskingum, and Hiram.—The Bucktelite.

Gustavus Adolphus, Minnesota Gamma, claims state honors by virtue of wins over St. Thomas on the affirmative, and Hamline and Macalester on the negative. A no-decision debate with St. Olaf was held at a neutral point. Over thirty students accompanied the team to hear the contest. All debates were on the ΠΚΔ question.—The Gustavian Weekly.

In a debate before the Kiwanis Club of Ravenna, the Hiram affirmative won from Akron according to the decision of the audience. The negative won from Ohio Northern. The negative lost to Akron and Bluffton and the affirmative to Wittenberg and Otterbein. The St. Lawrence waterway question was used.—The Hiram Advance.
The Oregon Alpha chapter at Linfield has established the custom this year of giving a commencement play. "Adam and Eva" is the comedy chosen to begin with. The play is to provide entertainment for the visiting alumni as well as to support the chapter.

The freshmen broke even with Oregon Aggie freshmen in a debate on the resolution that the mutual guarantee and disarmament protocol drawn up by the fifth assembly of the League of Nations should be ratified by all nations. Both affirmatives won.

In its debates on the Supreme Court question Linfield began the season by losing on both sides to Albany and Eugene Bible University. A no-decision debate was held with Willamette. The men also lost to Occidental on the negative.

The women engaged in decisionless contests with Albany and Willamette on the Japanese question.—The Linfield Review.

On the Supreme Court question Presbyterian, South Carolina Beta, lost on both sides to Davidson. On the Child Labor question Beta lost to University of South Carolina and The Citadel, and won from Wofford and Newberry, winning and losing on both sides of the question. The freshmen broke even with Newberry and Wofford on the Japanese question when the negative won all around.—The Blue Stocking.

Oklahoma Alpha, the Aggies, won from Texas A. and M. on the affirmative of the IIKA question, but lost to Southwestern and Emporia on the negative. The debate with Southwestern was held before the Shidler high school. The women lost to Oklahoma Women's colleg and Phillips on the negative.—The O'Collegian.

South Dakota Alpha, Dakota Wesleyan, won the women's state championship by defeating Sioux Falls and Aberdeen on the Japanese question. The men won from Sioux Falls on the affirmative of the Capital Punishment question, but lost to Yankton on the negative. —The Phrena Cosmian.

Jamestown, North Dakota Alpha, won from Aberdeen on the negative of the capital punishment question but lost on the affirmative. The dual with North Dakota University resulted in a negative victory in each debate. This was on the Supreme Court question.—The Jamestown Collegian.

Oklahoma Baptist, Oklahoma Gamma, won 10 of its 13 debates. It has defeated Southwestern, College of Emporia, Washburn, Harding, Ouachita, Austin of Texas, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City. It lost to College of Emporia, Howard-Payne, and Austin.—The Bison.

Yankton, South Dakota Gamma, was again successful in the state debating league, not losing a debate. Last year the Yankton team gave Carleton the first defeat on its home floor it had sustained in 12 years. —The Yankton Student.

Wofford, South Carolina Alpha, and Presbyterian, Beta, won first and second in the state oratorical contest.—The Blue Stocking.
Huron, South Dakota Beta, won six of its eight debates, losing to Augustana on the affirmative of the capital punishment question and on the negative of the Japanese question to Northern Normal in the girls' contest. The girls took a trip thru Iowa where they debated Buena Vista and Iowa Teachers in open forum debates, one of them an extemporaneous debate on the Osborne mutual welfare league plan of prison administration. The men traveled thru Iowa and Illinois, winning from Monmouth, but losing to Penn, besides meeting Yankton and McCombe Teachers in open forum debates. At Galesburg they were entertained by the Knox chapter of Delta Sigma Rho at the dinner given in honor of the visit of the national president, Stanley B. Houck.—*Huron Alphomega.*

One of the outstanding achievements of the year as far as winning debates goes, is the record of the centennial chapter, South Dakota Eta, at Augustana. Under the able direction of Professor Keiser, the chapter won the 16 debates in which it participated, varsity and freshmen, men and women, and upon both sides of three questions. Besides its orator won the state contest and was one of the three winners of the western division of the interstate.—*The Augustana Mirror.*

Ivan Johnson and Deda Rae Sits of South Dakota Delta, State College, broadcasted a debate over KFLY at the end of the forensic season. Those listening in gave the decision to the man.

Miss Smits was awarded the handsome forensic silver trophy by the student association as the outstanding debater of the college for the year.—*The Industrial Collegian.*

Sioux Falls, South Dakota Epsilon, women won from Huron affirmative on the Japanese question, but lost to the Wesleyan negative. On the capital punishment question the men lost to Wesleyan and Augustana. The freshmen won from Columbus affirmative on the Philippine question, but lost to Augustana on the other side.

Tusculum, Tennessee Beta, split even with Maryville and King in both varsity and freshmen debates on the Supreme Court question. The girls won a dual from Maryville on the Philippine question.—*The Nolachuck-ian.*

The women of South Dakota Zeta, Northern Teachers, won and lost on each side of the Japanese question. The men won on the negative of the capital punishment question twice and lost twice on the affirmative.—*Zeta News.*

The debate prizes of $15 and $10 given by National Counsel J. D. Coon and his brother were awarded Robert Harris and Paul Krueger.—*The Sioux Falls Stylus.*

Howard Payne, Texas Delta, won from St. Edwards on the affirmative of the Philippine question in the first debate of the year.—*The Yellow Jacket.*

In the oratory Linfield placed third in the state peace contest and eighth in the state oratorical.—*The Linfield Review.*
COLGATE IS CHAMPION

The World's Championship in intercollegiate debating has finally passed out of the hands of Bates, a small Maine college, and now rests with Colgate. The latter is a university in New York state, almost as small as Bates. After having defeated the debaters of Cambridge and of Ohio Wesleyan, champions of the middle west, the Colgate team won a victory over Bates on a 2-1 decision of the judges. The question was, "Resolved: That members of the President's Cabinet should have seats and a voice in the deliberation of Congress." Colgate upheld the affirmative, Bates negative.

Having suffered only one defeat since 1916, Bates has long been recognized as a champion in the forensic world. Year after year she defeated debaters from Yale, Harvard, Cornell, and from many other American colleges. Then she went out after international honors. She twice defeated the Canadian representative team of Queens University, Ontario. Three victories were won over Oxford and a decisive one over Cambridge.—New Student.

DO WE NEED A NEW METHOD OF AWARDING DEGREES

Editor of The Forensic:

I would like to call your attention, and to the attention of the readers of The Forensic, a matter which I think should be taken up at the next national convention. One of the new ideas in debate, which is being put into operation by a goodly number of schools in this vicinity and, as I understand, in many other communities throughout the country, is that of having "NO DECISION" contests. Now this condition brings us face to face with a new problem, namely, that of granting degrees.

I think that if this new idea is to persist, and we can tell more about it by the time the convention meets in 1926, that a new method of granting degrees will have to be devised. The odds are against the student who participates in no decision debates for he cannot, and does not, hope to win. His chance for a higher degree depends, often times, on the winning element.

I shall not attempt to suggest a new method here as I think that it will be much better to get our members started to thinking about the matter. There undoubtedly will be several plans suggested and through a proper elimination of them we may arrive at a solution satisfactory to all.

This matter has been weighing heavily upon me for some time, and I hope that you and all readers of The Forensic will give it your thorough attention.

Fraternally,

Mr. Cortie Ellis Stevens
Kansas Theta,

Ripon, Wisconsin Alpha, won the triangular with Olivet and Northwestern by winning both debates unanimously. In addition the chapter carried thru a heavy schedule of decision and no-decision contests. —Ripon College Days.

Texas Alpha, Southwestern, won and lost on both sides of the ΗΚΑ question in her debates with Trinity, Texas Christian, and the dual with Howard Payne. Austin managed to win on both sides, however, when it met the Alpha debaters.—The Megaphone.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oration</th>
<th>Judge Rank</th>
<th>Judge Total</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Modern Girl&quot;</td>
<td>1 3 3 4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Womanhood and War&quot;</td>
<td>4 5 1 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Power of Youth&quot;</td>
<td>2 1 4 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Grappling With the Iron Man&quot;</td>
<td>5 6 2 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Unfulfilled Promise&quot;</td>
<td>3 7 5 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Our Uncrowned Kings&quot;</td>
<td>6 2 7 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Sword or the Cross&quot;</td>
<td>7 4 6 6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colorado Alpha, the Aggies, attended the debating conference at Denver where it engaged in debates with Colorado Teachers, Colorado College, University of Denver, and Western State College. The Oxford split team system was used in these debates with the audience decisions. The debates were given before churches, clubs, high schools, and labor groups. This supplied interested audiences. One debate was held before the University chapel. There were four speakers, two men and two women, and each represented a different institution. Altho the debaters had never met before they assembled for the debate, the contest was a very interesting one.

In addition to the conference, the Aggies won from Western State on both sides of the ΠΚΔ question, but lost to Inter-mountain union while upholding the affirmative and to South Dakota University on the negative. They won on the negative from Kansas Aggies.—The Rocky Mountain Collegian.

In the first debate between The University of California at Berkeley and the Southern Branch of the same institution at Los Angeles, the California Epsilon ladies at Branch won a split decision on the affirmative of the the question, that the four years liberal arts course as taught in American colleges is a waste of time. The men followed the good example of the southern ladies by winning from Stanford on the negative of the Japanese immigration question. Earlier in the season the negative defeated Pomona and the affirmative, Occidental.—The Grizzly.

Tennessee Alpha at Maryville closed the season with a double victory over Birmingham-Southern College. The girls had previously divided honors with Tennessee on the Philippine question while the freshmen lost their dual with the same institution. The co-ed freshmen have also scheduled a dual with Tennessee.—The Highland Echo.

Trinity won from Southwestern on the negative and lost to Texas Christian on the affirmative of the ΠΚΔ question.—The Trinitonian.

The girls broke even in a dual oratorical with Baylor.—The Megaphone.