EFFECTIVENESS IN EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

To be effective an extemporaneous speech must possess the following qualities.

FIRST.—It must engage the subject directly. It must take up the topic assigned and develop it in a natural manner. It should not cut off only a part of the subject or give it some unnatural interpretation. Every listener should feel satisfied that the speaker has taken up the task it was intended he should when the topic was assigned to him.

SECOND.—The speech must show that the speaker has a knowledge of his subject. He must get beyond mere general assertions. He should mention names, give dates, and employ facts and figures. The use of specific and intimate details indicates an acquaintance with the subject which secures the confidence of the listeners.

THIRD.—The speech must show progress. It should begin at one point and move towards another without a halt in the advance. The listener must never feel that he is standing still. Two simple devices will help to secure progress. There should first be an arrangement of topics in their logical order. One should lead up to another. This requires an outline. Second, an enumeration of topics helps both the speaker and the listener; such as, “This plan has these three advantages,” or “the arguments against it are, first...., second....”

FOURTH.—There must be variety in development. One topic should be developed in a narrative manner to contrast with the next which is a logical analysis. “A personal experience used as an illustration serves to set off a set of statistics in the following paragraph.” Variety in development permits of variety in delivery.

FIFTH.—The speech must have the power to impress itself upon the minds of the listeners. It should lead logically and inevitably to some definite conclusion which can be stated in a single sentence. There should be some striking assertion, some pat illustration, or some forceful expression which will linger in the mind after the speaker has left the platform. Most of what a speaker says is forgotten before he is thru, but a figure of speech, a word picture, or a skilfully constructed climax may haunt the memory of the audience for days. Such forceful expressions are usually not happy accidents, but must be planted judiciously throughout the speech by conscious effort.
EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING IN AMERICAN COLLEGES

The first regularly instituted extemporaneous contests within a college, as far as I can find out, were the Hill prize contests established in Grinnell College in the early 90's. These contests originally came in Commencement Week the day before the Hyde prize contests in old line oratory. Never was there a more striking proof of the superiority of extemporaneous speaking over the old line type then these two contests furnished. A handful of audience attended the memorized speech contest, a full auditorium turned out to hear the vigorous, peppy contest in extempore speaking. Few men cared to enter the one, half the college wanted to try out for the other.

As far as I know, Macalester College was the first college to inaugurate contests with other colleges. Annual contests with Hamline University were arranged, and also with North Dakota University. Here again the interest both of speakers and of audience warranted going still further, so I was not surprised at the interest shown by colleges over the country when Pi Kappa Delta established the first national college contest in extemporaneous speaking in the United States. For there is no doubt whatever, and practically every great public speaker in the United States will bear me out, that the extemporaneous type of speaking is the most valuable type, unless it be debating, that the colleges can put in an organized form before the students of the country.—Glen Clark, Professor of English, Minnesota Alpha, Macalester College.

THE SIXTH NATIONAL CONVENTION AND SPEECH CONGRESS

Fort Collins, Greeley, Estes Park, Colorado
March 29, 30, 31, April 1, 1926

Convention objective: Means of increasing public interest in intercollegiate debating.

Contests:

MEN
Fort Collins
March 29, 1:00 P. M.
Preliminaries in
Oratory,
Debate,
Extemporaneous speaking.

WOMEN
Greeley
March 29, 1:00 P. M.
Preliminaries in
Oratory,
Debate,
Extemporaneous speaking.

Finals in all contests in Estes Park, March 30, 31. Railroad rates, fare and a half for round trip under conditions given on page 136.

“Demosthenes, when taunted by Pytheas that all his arguments “smelled of the lamp,” replied, “Yes, but your lamp and mine, my friend, do not witness the same labours.”—Plutarch—“Life of Demosthenes.”
LEADERS IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Catherine McCune, South Dakota Beta, Huron College

(This speech was awarded first place in the extempore contest of Northern Provincial ΠΚΔ convention, at Dakota Wesleyan University, April 8-10, 1925.)

The most tragic figures of history are those men who might have been leaders. In our own generation we have William Jennings Bryan, an admirable man,—a man who held forth great promise but who failed us. We have two men who attempted to win places of leadership last November—John W. Davis, and Bob La Follette. Both men held great promise for us but both men lacked something which might have made them leaders of the American people. Both men had some qualities of leadership but they failed when the final test came.

It would be a platitude to say that leadership is important and yet we, as citizens in this great Democracy, must realize that we must have good leadership. For though it sounds trite to say leadership is important, nevertheless this is a fundamental fact in our form of government. We have seen now that leadership is important, we have glanced briefly at our defeated leaders, but what are the elements which the people of America look for in choosing successful leaders? There are two things for which the people of America always look. The first of these things is that a leader shall hold the confidence of the people and of his co-workers. The second element which we require in every leader, to use the slang expression, is that he shall “deliver the goods.” That is, we demand that not only shall the leader enjoy the confidence of the people, but that he shall have the vision and the dynamic energy, which will bring results.

In all the different branches of government we need leadership. I might recall to you today hundreds and thousands of leaders in all parts of our nation. But instead of that I hope that you will think with me briefly of outstanding leaders in the outstanding branches of our American politics.

Let us consider, first of all, the legislative branch of our government. We have in the House of Representatives, as Speaker of the House, Representative Longworth, and in the Senate the Vice-President, Charles Dawes. Every Senator and every Representative is in some re-
spect a leader of our American people. But these men are representa-
tive of the leadership in the Legislative Department of our government.

Of Longworth, we know little. We know of him that he commands
the confidence of his constituency. But of his probable policy as speaker
of the House we can only conjecture. Will he be another Uncle Joe
Cannon, who ruled the House of Representatives with an iron fist, who
imposed his will upon our representatives? Or will he be a mere auto-
maton, giving that man the floor or recognizing this man? We cannot
wish that Longworth shall be a dictator, nor would we want him to be a
mere puppet! But surely there must be some middle course which he
will follow that will make him a trusted leader in Congress.

In connection with Vice-President Dawes, we have two of the most
dramatic instances in American history. First of all, came his dramatic
challenge to the Senate on March 4, when he laid down the law, up-
setting all the tradition of the Senate and showing his disregard of Sen-
ate procedure. Surely there was great promise here that this leader of
the American people should "deliver the goods." But less than three
weeks later came another dramatic moment in American history, when
Vice-President Dawes rushed into the Senate just too late, to break the
tie vote on the appointment of Warren, when he failed to fulfill the
promise he had made! Must we then infer that Vice-President Dawes
will always come in just too late or must we conclude that with his
ideals, his vision, and with his dynamic energy he may yet produce re-
sults!

We are told that Americans are always concerned with the "almighty
dollar" and since we are concerned in the prosperity and financial wel-
fare of our country it is only proper that we should consider our leader-
ship along this line.

We have two men in our government today who are admirably
fitted to this work—Herbert Hoover and Andrew Mellon. These two
men have shown us during the past administration, what their ability
is in bringing prosperity to our government. They have succeeded in
cutting down by one-fifth, the national debt. But they have a greater
task before them,—That of maintaining proper balance between tax re-
duction and expenditure which is necessary for the progress of our na-
tion. The settlement of this problem is what we shall expect of them
during the next four years.

Since we have considered what our leadership is in our own country,
let us go farther afield. As citizens of this Republic we must not only
see the importance of our welfare, but of our relations to the whole
world. We are not a separate entity, isolated—set off by ourselves. Our
whole welfare is bound up with that of other nations and with the com-
mon welfare of the world.

Now, let us think of our leadership in foreign relations. The out-
standing man in this field at this time is Senator Borah, Chairman of the
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Senator Borah is, first, a firm
constitutionalist. That is a fine thing. Second, Senator Borah believes that the people of America should not entangle themselves politically with any other nation. That is a fine thing. And because Senator Borah is so fundamentally conservative, he commands the respect and confidence of the American people. But we question whether his attitude on foreign relations goes far enough, whether it has the idealism and the vision which is necessary. Searching his policy further we find that he believes in co-operation between ourselves and the people of Europe in any way which will not bring us into political entanglements with them. He does not think that we should Join the League of Nations, because that would mean in his eyes political entanglements. But he does believe that we should go into the World Court if it is divorced from the League. He does believe that we should co-operate in economic and judicial conferences, while keeping ourselves distinctly aloof along political lines. Thus we see some ray of hope in Senator Borah's attitude in foreign relations. And though he may seem at times conservative, the American people may still hope that he will lead us on in our relations with other nations, to the highest sort of co-operation. Senator Borah has proved himself worthy to command the confidence of the American people.

The man in our government who commands the greatest respect and the greatest confidence is Calvin Coolidge. He is our supreme leader. Since the great war when it was so obviously proved to us that Americans could not keep themselves from all contact with other peoples we have wondered sometimes in what direction our relations with other nations are going. We have no Woodrow Wilson with his high ideals to lead us on to higher planes. We have no Theodore Roosevelt with his brisk determination to guide us through. But the man to whom we must turn is Calvin Coolidge. How does Calvin Coolidge measure up to our ideals of what a successful leader should be? Obviously he commands the confidence of the American people. With an overwhelming vote behind him he took his oath in the inauguration on March, as president. Evidently he commands the respect and confidence of his co-workers. But though he commands the respect of the people and his co-workers, we may wonder whether he will "deliver the goods." During the last year and a half, he has done wonderful work as president. But we have a suspicion, well founded in truth, that he was simply carrying on the ideals of President Harding. In his new administration, will he prove to be the leader the American people think him to be?

On March 4, last, I listened to Calvin Coolidge speak. I wonder how many of you here tonight heard him give his inaugural address? I wonder how many of you realized the greatness of that speech. There are two things in the program which he laid down. First, the things concerning our own domestic affairs. We have previously seen what our leadership is along this line. The second part of his program was concerned with foreign affairs. Here too we have great leadership. There were two things in this inaugural address which were particularly
striking. One of these was the fact that the entire speech was permeated with religious feeling. The second outstanding characteristic was the wealth of underlying principles, striking phrases, and great ideals. No other man in an inaugural address has laid down such broad principles of government as Calvin Coolidge laid down on March 4. If he lives up to those principles he will be a great man indeed. But these principles were not mere words. He also laid down a practical program in regard to both domestic and foreign affairs and there is adequate leadership in both lines to take us on to victory.

Thus with the co-operation of the American people, the vision and the dynamic energy and a concrete program he may produce results. Calvin Coolidge stands as our greatest living example of successful leadership. Surely under his guidance America shall go forward to great things.

CRITICISM

First, this speech represents a fair attempt to meet the requirements of the subject. Second, it abounds in definite material, altho there are yet places which show a lack of it, the treatment of Longworth, for example. Third, the analysis of leaders into groups and the naming of one leader after another give a feeling of progress. Fourth, more variety is needed. This could be easily secured by some variation in the method of treatment of the various people mentioned. Fifth, the speech is well knit together. There are a few more or less powerful statements which will be remembered. The use of the interrogative sentences gives variety and force to the speech, but is employed perhaps too much. Progress is slow in places where one sentence repeats the statement of the sentence before. Better expression would help this.

CRITICISM

(Marshall and the Constitution)

First, this speech, while it does not avoid the subject, does not meet it as directly and fully as it should. Second, it lacks somewhat in specific material. This is not true of the last part. Third, the variety of material creates a sense of progress. Fourth, there is a pleasing variety all thru the speech. Fifth, some of the illustration, particularly because they specify pictures and are given as the experience of the speaker, make a forceful appeal and will be remembered. The statement that the English friend had one of the original copies of the Constitution makes us wonder why our government should go to the trouble of preserving its copy in a glass case.
MARSHALL AND THE CONSTITUTION

Andrew Coleman, Oklahoma Beta, University of Tulsa
(This speech was awarded first place in the men's extemporaneous contests of the Southwestern Provincial ΡΚΑ convention, at Stillwater, Oklahoma, April 2-4.)

I feel today much like Eddie Guest when he said, "The Lord never intended me for a public speaker or He would have given me a different pair of knees to work with." However, it is always a pleasure to speak on the subject of the Constitution. Now that I look back over the past few years of my life, it seems strange that I never knew very much about the constitution until after my high school period. Stranger still, it was an Englishman who gave me the first vision of what the Constitution should mean to me.

In the spring of 1922 I was visiting in Portsmouth, England, in the home of a friend of mine. One day in the drawing room he pointed to a framed document above his coat-of-arms, and said, "My friend, there is one of the original copies of the American Declaration of Independence." I was surprised that such a document should be in the home of an Englishman, and so I said, "Then you think so much of this great document of ours."

"Yes," he said, "but there is something I think more of, and a something I would like to hang above this copy of the Declaration of Independence."

"What is that?" I asked.

He answered, "A copy of your Constitution."

"Then you admire our Constitution?" I inquired.

"Yes," he said, "but even yet there is something greater and that is the unwritten constitution given you by that master jurist, John Marshall. It was he who gave flexibility to that great document which is now your heritage."

I answered, "But I have never heard very much about John Marshall."

Then in a kindly way he placed his arm about my shoulder and said, "My friend, you will come to realize that you cannot speak the word 'Constitution' without thinking of John Marshall, or speak of John Marshall without thinking of the Constitution. They are inseparable, and my advice to you is to begin at once to seek knowledge of them." John Marshall and the Constitution; a subject with beauty and sentiment.

One day I stood on the ruins of ancient Carthage and saw the place...
where Hannibal daily knelt and vowed vengeance upon Rome. Looking towards Rome, the Mediterranean Sea stretched as an unbroken field of blue. What inspiration. Surely a civilization built under such inspiration would thrive. But no, I looked about me and there before me lay stones piled upon stones, the barren city a glistening white under the rays of the noon-day sun. The code under which Carthage lived was wrong; her scale of values was wrong, and so today Carthage lies in barren ruins on the shores of Northern Africa.

On another day I stood in the top of the Woolworth tower and looked out over the great city of New York, and then on and on over toward the western horizon where lay the commonwealths which make up this union of ours. What is it that makes this nation so great, you ask? Under what code are we living? And then perhaps you may answer your own question, "Why, the Constitution is the guide to our national life. The Constitution is the code under which we live." Surely, that is not all, for in Washington the original copy of the Constitution of the United States rests under a plate of glass. The ink is beginning to fade; the document is beginning to crumble. Surely we are not living under a rigid, fading document. No, we may truthfully say in addition that we are living under a great unwritten Constitution as given to us by that great jurist, John Marshall.

John Marshall became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in 1801. During his service on the Supreme Court bench fifty-one decisions were made on Constitutional questions. In thirty-four of these John Marshall rendered the decision himself, indicating with what great scope of interpretation his mind worked on Constitutional questions. And we must not forget that the period of Marshall was a critical one. Many cases were arising under the Constitution, testing its very fundamentals. Let us remember that during Marshall's time there was the greatest array of lawyers ever presented at one time in American history; Pinckney, Martin, Clay, Calhoun, and the towering Webster heading the list of Marshall's contemporaries. These men argued Constitutional cases before Marshall, and Marshall had to decide in the face of these great legal minds. He was equal to the task, and oftentimes in a single sentence he would clear away the fog of long arguments, and present the issue at hand in such a clear way that there was no doubt left as to the wisdom of his decision.

Through such decisions Marshall rendered a great service to his country, because in them he formed a precedent of a great unwritten Constitution, which has come to form a great unwritten law that serves to hold the American people more closely together. In such ways Marshall was the greater welder of the Constitution. So, however we may try otherwise, when we think of the Constitution we think of Marshall. We cannot think of one without thinking of the other. They go together.

We may, therefore, place upon the tomb of Marshall these words; "Here lies the body of John Marshall—expounder and welder of the Constitution."
CAN LEGISLATION BRING HELP TO THE FARMER?

Harold Roberts, Missouri Delta, William Jewell College

(This speech was awarded first place in the men's extempore contest at the Western Provincial ΠΚΔ convention, at Culver-Stockton College, April 23-25, 1925.)

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The chairman has been kind enough to state my topic. I find myself indebted to the first three speakers who have preceded me on tonight's program for stimulating me in thought upon my subject by their brief, but well-taken remarks concerning the agricultural problem with which we are today confronted. I am happily indebted to the gentlemen for very considerably leaving me something to say about a subject rather hard to approach.

I am sure that there is none of you who hasn't had called to his mind a question of current and, may I say, momentous importance? Perhaps you have been face to face with it as a farmer or a farmer's wife or son. Perhaps it has been called to your mind by that rather crude question voiced in a popular song set to the music that we term indigenous to the Hottentot. The question rather uncouthly stated, but of compelling importance today, is "how are you going to keep them down on the farm?" It must be to the answer of this question that thoughtful Americans address themselves.

I am not here to eulogize the farmer. I rather think that as our great orator said of Massachusetts, the farmer "needs no encomium." The farmer is the man behind the throne of stability and yet we have made it hard for him to enjoy stability. The farmer has fed the millions as they rushed madly to progress almost too hurriedly to pause to thank him. Something must be done. I realize how intangible is my subject. However, it is my frank opinion that legislation can bring help to the farmer if it be conditioned on a practical understanding of the farmer's needs and not on political expediency.

Of one thing I am quite sure, that the policy of laissez faire must go. We must act. We must legislate for the farmer. I shall even subscribe to paternalism in his favor if nothing else can be done. Far too long have we regarded the farmer's problems as the sunshine and the rain—to be accepted but done nothing about. The farmer buys in a protected market and sells in an unprotected market and we sit idly by and by our silence assent to this unfairness. We learn from the wisdom of
little children. I remember the story I read not long ago. The little farmer's boy asked of his father:

"Daddy, why is it that we always ask the storeman what he will give us for what we have to sell and how much he will take for what we want to buy?"

The national government must legislate laws of a remedial nature for this end. We have regulated the hours of women and children in industry—in late years there has been no end of legislation by the federal government to alleviate bad social and economic conditions. I recall that when Viscount Bryce first published his "American Commonwealth" he was able to state that the state government had an almost absolute control over the individual, that rarely did the national government reach directly down to him. But modern progress with its attending problems of a social and economic character has altered the situation. Uniformity was needed. States bickering among themselves presented a hopeless outlook. The only recourse was action by the national government and more and more has such action been taken. Today the statement of Lord Bryce doesn't hold good. The farmer is held back by evils that could be remedied by legislation. The second speaker, Mr. Tate, mentioned that the farmer pays for the paved road while the motor bus proprietor reaps the benefit. The merchant, the manufacturer, the packer have the advantage. Proper legislation could equalize matters.

But I condition my statement. Such legislation must be passed out of a practical understanding of the farmer's needs and not as political expediency. Too often we have been angered by a Congress mutilating needed legislation and passing it only after it has been emasculated of its strength because of party play. Sometimes the Congress and the President have used their law making powers and so shaped their veto as to secure re-election. The bonus bill that makes it possible for a man to get his bonus only at death is a marked example of political expediency. It must not be so in the farmer's case.

Fortunately the executive and the Congress seem to have sensed the real need. Despite the fact that I have been reared in a staunch Democratic home and taught that judicious action was second fiddle with all Republican presidents, I must confess that Mr. Coolidge's action in appointing Mr. Jardine is a severe blow to my teaching. Mr. Jardine has risen by dint of hard work. He is in vital touch with the farmer's needs. He understands the grave biological and economic aspects of the farmer's problems. He has captured us by his ready work. He speaks candidly of the situation. He calls big business to his aid. Unthinking persons accuse him of being too close to big business. It is an unmerited accusation. Big business and the farmer need to be friends; each can be of benefit to the other and Mr. Jardine readily seeks to establish helpful relationships.

Nor has Congress been idle. The Purnell act has trebled the expenditures to be used in educating the farmer. This is the true course
of action. Better methods of farming, how to preserve the fertility of
the soil by rotation of crops, a genuine appreciation of the true worth of
farming,—these are the crying needs of the farmer. Beneficent legisla-
tion that sponsors education will bring help. Let Congress be advised
by economists. This is not a problem for cornerstore whittlers or mem-
bers of the court-house stove league who hold their sessions in mid-winter.
Let legislation be of a judicious practical character and the farmer
will then enjoy his deserved profit.

CRITICISM

First, the speech only half way engages the subject. While the answer
to the question is a definite “yes,” the material employed in the development
is not direct. Second, there is a real lack of specific material which shows
a knowledge of the subject. Third, there is lack of progress. It is hard to
measure how far we have gone as we finish the speech. Fourth, there is
some variety and also the of it. Fifth, the speech, since it does not frankly
enough take up the subject, does not make a clear-cut impression. Outside
of the story told, it lacks vigor and force of expression. “Legislate laws”
is an example of how not to use words.
SHOULD THE UNITED STATES DEMAND THE PAYMENT OF THE INTERALLIED WAR DEBTS?

Edith E. Frieden, Iowa Eta, Upper Iowa University

(This speech was awarded first place in the women's extempore contest at the Western Provincial IKA convention, at Culver-Stockton College, April 23-25, 1925.)

Ladies and Gentlemen:—Since the close of the great World War the problem of the interallied war debt has been one of the most important and vexing before our country. In considering the problem we must deal with three important factors; the justness of the debt, the ability of the allies to pay, and the effect of this payment of debts.

First, in estimating the justness of the debt, our attention is called to the loans made by our country during the war and also to the benefits we derived from the war. If we had been asked whether we wished to furnish men or money we would undoubtedly have named the latter. We were given no choice, however, for money was greatly in demand and the allied countries had none to offer; hence the United States gave financial aid. When we gave our millions to the cause, we did not give it as a donation, but as a loan. The other countries did not lend the lives of men—they donated their men to the cause. Hence, we are now able to calculate the debt owed to us financially, but the allies cannot estimate the human losses which they sustained in the terms of dollars and cents. Are we therefore justified in asking for the payment of this money when we did not make nearly so great a sacrifice as the other countries?

Before the war we were heavily in debt—we owed money to several European countries. Since we loaned so much money during the war, we are now creditors in almost all the allied countries. Thus, the United States benefitted financially by the war. Because of the United States’ failure to make donations rather than loans, and because of our financial benefits it seems that we cannot but consider the war debt unjust.

We must next consider the ability of the allies to pay. This calls our attention to the dependency of the European countries upon each other. If we demand our money from England, that country must be paid by France. If France is to pay England, it must receive payment from Germany. We know, however, that Germany is at present unable to pay. Because of this status, our demand for payment of the debt would necessitate crushing of France. In this case, the United States would be called upon for aid and we shall have gained nothing. This
close relationship among the countries makes the question of the debt a vast problem.

We must also consider a means of payment of the interallied war debt. This might be by either of three methods, namely; gold, imports, or by the three corner system.

If we were to ask for gold in payment, we might expect to be paid for only a small part of the debt, for there is a very limited amount of gold in all the European countries. Then, if all the gold were taken from the treasuries, no capital and hence no means of production would be left as resources for our debtors. Consequently, by this means we would hamper all chances of payment.

In consideration of exports as a means of payment, we must remember that the United States already has an over supply of production. During the war, we learned to produce goods that we had previously imported. At the present time, we are equipped to supply all of the needs of our country. If we accept the exports of European countries, our country will be flooded with produce which will result in a great deal of waste to us.

Our last resort in finding a means of payment might seem to be the three corner system, but even that has proved itself inadequate. If we export goods from the United States, we must expect to lose on the transactions, and allow the other countries to gain if we wish to have the allied countries replenish their treasuries. If we do this, however, our country will be approaching an economic downfall—we will be paying the European countries the very money by which they in turn will pay their debt. By this means, there can be no gain in our demanding the payment, for we will lose rather than profit and much time and labor will have been uselessly expended. Thus it seems that neither gold, exports, nor the three corner system will supply us with the needed means of payment.

Before we ask the allied countries to pay the debt, we must consider what the effect of the payment would be. It is important that we think especially of the effects on economic and social conditions. It seems that the economic burden would bear more heavily on France than on any of the other countries. If that country were forced to pay her debts and could receive in turn no payment from Germany, poverty would reign. No means of production would remain and France would be left with no funds and no possibilities of advancement. Social destruction would also be wrought. Poverty would bring about its appalling results. The only possibility of saving France and other countries from such a condition is by financial aid from some other country.

Since the United States is the only nation so situated that it can supply this aid, the burden would again fall on us. Thus, because of the social and economic effects in other countries and because of the immediate burden upon us, the results of the payment of the debts are evident. Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, the unjustness of the debt, the
inability of the allies to pay, and the undesirable effects which are inevitable, convince us that the United States must not demand the payment of the debt. The United States embodies the spirit of fairness and justness, and if we would uphold those ideals for which our country stands, we must extend our spirit of brotherhood by not demanding the payment of the interallied war debt.

CRITICISM

First, the speech takes up the subject at once and grapples with it all the way thru. Second, it is rather vague and general. Some precise facts, definite figures, or quotations would make it more convincing. The speaker needs to get beyond generalities. Third, logical analysis and treatment of topic after topic give progress. Fourth, there is no variety. One paragraph is like another. We feel the need of examples, descriptions, or direct quotations. Fifth, there is one definite impression created. This is interrupted by the inadequate and confusing explanation of the “three corner system.” There should be some expressions which rise above the dead level of the speech.
THE CONSTITUTION AND ITS AMENDMENTS

Theodore M. Metz, Kansas Beta, Washburn College

(This speech was awarded second place in the men’s extemporaneous contest of the Southwestern Provincial ΠΚΔ convention, at Stillwater, Oklahoma, April 2-4, 1925).

Three thousand years ago a great leader of wandering and homeless people stood on a hill in a barren waste land. This mighty man was worried, for although he had done his best and had made laws and good laws, still there was great confusion among his followers. Out of the sky then came great flashes of lightning and emblazoned upon a slab of stone ten new laws. Then Moses took the Ten Commandments and combining them with his laws went back to his people and ruled them in harmony.

A hundred and thirty-five years ago the leaders of a new and struggling nation met and drew up a contract of government. The constitution was well done, for the leaders like Moses had done their best. Like his laws, though the constitution was not complete until the people themselves had emblazoned in it the first Ten Commandments.

Just as the Commandments dealt with the sins of life, so the Bill of Rights dealt with the sins of government. Just as the Commandments said, “thou shalt not steal, commit adultery or lie,” the Amendments said to governments, “thou shall not deny to the people the rights of freedom of speech, trial by jury or freedom of religion.” Today the first ten amendments have become our governmental guide just as the commandments are our religious guide and one seems almost as sacred as the other.

The framers of our government built it upon the theory that just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. Accordingly they provided a way to keep always in touch with the governed. We find the voice of the people speaking first in the ten amendments of 1789, but that voice has never been silent, and since that time nine more amendments have been added to the original ten.

There are three great problems existing in all governments and at all times. These problems are ever changing and are ever demanding new solutions. They are political, social, and economic. Let us now consider how these great problems have been met as they have arisen. First we should note the political. Early in the life of the constitution it was realized that there was more of evil than of good in the provision of the constitution which allowed an individual to sue a state in the supreme court. Quickly the people declared against such practices and
passed the eleventh amendment. Again early practice showed that the constitutional way of electing the vice president was not satisfactory and the twelfth amendment was added to the constitution. After much of struggle and turmoil suffrage was given the freedman in the fifteenth. At the time of the adoption of the constitution it was believed, and probably rightly so, that a higher type of senators could be obtained by having them chosen by legislators of the states than by popular vote. This was probably so at the time of the original constitution, but as the nation progressed the people became a little more capable and one more step was added to popular government by the passage of the seventeenth amendment. And when the people were ready for it another step was taken and by the nineteenth amendment the women were given the ballot. Thus political questions, confusing and conflicting, have arisen and have been settled quickly by amending the constitution.

After the nation had been torn in two by a great civil war, a million of ignorant and incapable human beings were released from their bonds of slavery and turned out upon a nation. Indeed a great problem arose and just what was to be done was a great puzzle to legislative, judicial and executive branches of government alike. This problem was not settled until the people were asked and they answered in the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments. Thus a problem over a century old, and over which a bloody war was fought was settled. When the use of alcoholic drink became a menace to the welfare of the people then another great social problem was dealt with by the eighteenth amendment. Again we find them standing ever ready to meet the social problems that arise and for them they are never too large for solution.

For years it was realized that the burden of taxation fell heaviest on shoulders least able to carry it. It was evident to all, yet what was to be done? For years this problem was tossed from Congress to Judiciary, each body with its views irreconcileable to the views of the other. The struggle between the two branches not only went on but likewise the unjust taxation went on without a settlement until the people spoke by the sixteenth amendment and the problem was settled.

Thus in the past any problem whether political, social, or economic has been settled by the people speaking thru an amendment. Today, with some, the amendment process has fallen into disfavor and they have branded it as slow, even inefficient; they have advocated a change in it and some would even abolish it. I believe the deep thinker will not call it slow and surely not inefficient. Problems are many but solutions are few and the people are loath to give up the remedy they have well used for so many years. By the use of the amendment they have played a great part in raising our government to the high position it now holds among the nations of the world. They have made it their government, for the sun never rises on a day with its political problems so complex nor sets on a night with its problems so dark, that the people cannot enlighten, even solve by their way, their constitutional way, an amendment.
AMERICAN RELATIONS WITH JAPAN

William Gruhn, South Dakota Zeta, Northern State Teachers College

(This speech was awarded second place in the extempore contest of the Northern Provincial ΠΚΔ convention, at Dakota Wesleyan University, April 8-10, 1925.)

The United States is not an isolated nation as some of our conservative statesmen would have you believe. We have very definite relations with every nation of the world, socially, economically, politically. But we have avoided making any bitter enmities such as exist between France and Germany, Italy and Austria, Turkey and Greece, and Germany and England. We are indeed proud that, with but a few interrupted exceptions, our relations with practically all nations have been of a friendly nature. But a problem that has caused a great deal of comment in recent months is our rather uncertain relations with Japan. Ever since the passage of the Exclusion Act our relations have been repeatedly questioned.

In order to understand the present situation we must have a clear conception of our past relations with this rising power in the Far East. During the latter part of the nineteenth and first part of the twentieth centuries, a large number of Japanese laborers poured into our Pacific Coast states, chiefly into California. Because of their thrift and diligence they provided a competition in the labor market that could not be met by white laborers. As a result of this influx, California passed a series of acts restricting the freedom of the Yellow Man to such an extent as to be almost prohibitive to his residence there.

In 1907 Theodore Roosevelt, in an effort to relieve strained relations due to the existing conditions in the West, negotiated and concluded with Japan a Gentlemen’s Agreement, which provided that no Japanese laborers should be permitted to emigrate to this country. Since that time there has been no serious agitation in regard to this question until about a year ago. Japan had quite lived up to her agreement and few laboring men had entered since 1907. But in 1924 the Congress of the United States by the mere act of passing an immigration bill brought from the clear sky unexpected and renewed agitation over this sensitive problem.

This brings us to the existing relations between the two nations. It is not, as one might have thought a few months ago, that of enmity and hard feeling; it may rather be called that of strained friendliness. The attitude of this nation is just as it was before this unwise act, both
friendly and cordial. The exclusion bill does not represent either the attitude of our people or that of our government. It was passed only as a rider on the immigration bill through the influence of anti-Japanese interests. Our attitude toward Japan is the very same as that which we demonstrated a year and a half ago when we so willingly extended our sympathy and our aid to the suffering people of that nation following the great earthquake disaster.

Neither can we say that the attitude of Japan toward us has actually become unfriendly during the past year. The militaristic threatenings that have come to our ears are merely the outbursts of the radicals and do not in the least reflect the sentiments of the people and the government of Japan. But although the thinking people and the government of Japan have not become embittered against us, we can say with fair accuracy that they are indeed sorely perplexed and deeply hurt by our unexpected action. If we were to ask Japan today how our action has caused her to feel she would probably answer: "We have always considered you the best of our friends. In 1907 we saw the need for the exclusion of Japanese laborers from your shores and we were willing to bind ourselves to the Gentlemen's Agreement; and we have faithfully tried to fulfil its conditions. In the meantime you have always stood by with a ready hand in time of need. You sent us your missionaries to help our people. You helped us to develop our educational system. You brought to our shores Western civilization and culture. In the recent earthquake disaster your ships were the first to enter our harbors with sympathy, aid and relief. You were the first to offer your money and services in our time of extreme need. And now in spite of all this cordiality and sincere friendship, for no reason at all, you turn and slap us." Japan is truly only perplexed and deeply hurt at our unexpected action.

But we are interested in this question only because of the results that it may bring. Oh, yes, we have heard a great deal about war between the United States and Japan. From both sides of the water the radicals echo: "War! War." But a little investigation will show us that this is indeed absurd and almost impossible, at least for the immediate future. In the first place, the feeling that exists between Japan and the United States at the present time is not such as would lead these nations to throw themselves at each other's throats. We have just participated in a great struggle which has cost millions of lives and enormous sums of money. And with our present feeling toward Japan we would not be willing to repeat such a conflict which would only cost lives and property to both nations.

But not only is there lacking that feeling of enmity that must exist before nations will be willing to permit human life to be slaughtered, but Japan is in no position to go to war for a long period to come, because of lack of resources. We know from our experience in the last war that the victor is not the one who has only large armies and powerful
navies; it is rather that nation with the most inexhaustible supply of resources,—the nation with the natural resources, the economic power and the ability to provide her own food and manufactured goods. But Japan, because of the millions of people crowded on her small islands, is almost helpless in supplying herself with food. Because of her lack of natural resources and modern industries she cannot manufacture her own goods. China and Russia would be her only source of supply. But Japan could not maintain a sufficient army on the Asiatic continent to gain and control the vast territories or any part of them that these great nations possess. This would be an almost impossible task.

Japan’s only hope would be to purchase her supplies. But again we find that she is incapacitated in this respect for some time to come. The recent disastrous earthquake not only destroyed millions in material wealth, but the great cost of reconstruction has placed an enormous economic burden upon the Japanese people. The entire economic power of this nation must for some time be concentrated on the reconstruction of her devastated areas.

But if war will not result from our recent action, there is another and greater possibility of an undesirable effect. For a century and a half this nation has been practicing a policy of fair play toward all and discrimination against no one. We have always demanded fairness in dealing with every nation. In 1898 we intervened in behalf of the suppressed Cubans. At Paris in 1919 we stood practically alone in demanding fair play toward the conquered nation. As a result of our actions the smaller nations of the world have looked to us as a great power and yet as one that could be trusted. But by our action against Japan are we going to destroy this prestige and this confidence that we have established? Are we going to set a new precedent by adopting a policy of discrimination against the weaker nations? You may say that little will be lost by merely destroying this feeling of confidence. But it will indeed mean vast sums in terms of money. If the smaller nations find that they cannot trust our government, they will certainly not have confidence in our business and commerce. It will mean a setback in American industry in the Far East, as well as in other small nations of the world.

If we would save our prestige and keep from destroying the confidence these nations have in us, there is only one course we can follow. We must retrench from the stand that we have thus arbitrarily taken. In order to retain confidence and support for our business men in the Far East and the world, we must revoke our policy of discrimination against Japan, and continue to practice equality and fair play toward every nation.

**CRITICISM**

First, the subject is fairly well followed and developed. Second, while there are some specific details, many more are needed. The present restrictive measures should be explained, for one thing. Third, there is good pro-

*(Continued on Page 124)*
SHOULD THE PHILIPPINES BE GRANTED IMMEDIATE INDEPENDENCE

A. Frances Nielsen, Illinois Gamma, Carthage College

(This speech was awarded second place in the women’s extempore contest at the Western Provincial ΠΚΔ convention, at Culver-Stockton College, April 23-25.)

Ladies and Gentlemen:—The question as to whether the Philippine Islands should be granted their independence has found staunch advocates on either side. In bringing the subject to your attention, I wish to follow four main lines of thought. The Philippines should not be granted their independence; first, because the natives of these islands, as a group, do not desire their freedom. We have but to examine their leading newspapers to find statement after statement saying that the Philippines as a nation are not advocating a change. Since newspapers generally are expressive of the will of the people, we at once conclude that the Philippines actually do not desire independence. Then, too, the leading citizens of a country may also be taken as mouth-pieces of the public will. In the leading citizens of these islands, we also have the expressed desire that the United States will continue to be the guiding star of the Philippines. The radical element in the Philippines is very small, though there are a few people who desire freedom, yet this is not to be considered seriously. There are always those who are not satisfied with the best of conditions.

My second thought is that it would not profit the Philippine Islands to break away from the United States. The Philippines realize that there are decided advantages in being associated with the United States. The United States is a nation of prestige. It is a well known fact that every other nation in the world looks up to us. The Philippines regard it as a privilege to be so closely connected with the United States. Then let us consider just what war would mean to the Philippine Islands were

(Continued from Page 123)

gress thru the narration in the first part, but rather uncertain progress towards the last. Fourth, there is not much variety. The direct quotations employed do break the monotony, but other devices are needed. Fifth, the speech could be more unified in its impression. It also needs some striking expressions, some figures of speech, or some skill in words. The greatest fault with the speech is that it is unfair. If even half the statements made in it are true, Congress betrayed the nation. An endeavor to build up one side should not lead a speaker to create the impression that the other side has nothing to it but fraud.
they independent of the United States. They would doubtless have allies, but is there not a decided advantage in being more closely connected with the United States than any treaty of alliance would be? There is but one logical answer to this question.

Thirdly, the United States has given social and economical advantages to the Philippines. General culture and civilization depend upon three things; namely, religion, education, and commercial interests. We have brought the Christian religion to the Philippine Islands. We have sent missionaries who, in turn, have instructed natives to carry the gospel throughout the islands. We have given our own American educational system to the Philippines. They have grade schools, high schools, universities, and colleges. The institutions of higher learning prepare physicians, lawyers and statesmen to carry on the work in their various branches. Since many of the natives rely upon the tilling of the soil for obtaining their living, it is interesting to note that the raising of their chief agricultural products is done on a strictly scientific basis.

Through the efforts of the United States, the Philippine Islands have established a firm basis for trade relationships with many of the leading countries of the world.

Lastly, there is every opportunity for self expression in the government of the islands. The civil governor is appointed by the United States. The members of both the upper and lower houses of the assembly are elected by the Philippine Islanders themselves. The assembly has adopted many measures for the purpose of further developing agricultural, educational, and adminisitrative conditions. In their democratic form of government, the United States merely acts as a guide and the Philippines realize fully that to gain their independence now would be fatal to their best interests.

In view of all these facts, I maintain that the Philippines should not be granted their independence.

CRITICISM

First, the speech accepts the obligations given in the subjects and discharges them in a very satisfactory manner. Second, it is very general. No name or facts are given. It is a series of general assertions which are not convincing. "....., though there are a few people who desire freedom, yet this is not to be seriously considered. There are always those who are not satisfied with the best of conditions." This is an assertion, not evidence. It means nothing. Third, the division of the subject into topics and the listing of these topics by numbers give a sense of progress. Fourth, there is no variety of treatment or expression. Fifth, while the speech makes a unified impression, it lacks originality and vigor of statement. There is nothing that will be remembered. This is not a fair treatment of the question. This speech denies that there is an appreciable demand for freedom rather than considering the demand.
POLITICIANS—THE DOWNFALL OF STATESMANKSHIP
R. E. Hedberg, Kansas Gamma, Kansas State Agricultural College

(This speech was awarded first place in the men's extemporaneous contest of the California Provincial Μ Κ Δ convention at California Institute of Technology, April 11, 1925.)

Our neighboring state, Oklahoma, has hardly forgotten her late experience with factional politics. The home of that sensational ex-governor, J. C. Walton, is still pointed out to visitors of Oklahoma City. As the central figure in a political fight of many months, Mr. Walton gained the gubernatorial office, only to misuse its functions, waste its funds and eventually to be impeached on five different charges. His brief term of office is hardly considered kindly, yet every citizen of the state is ready to admit that he is a "clever politician."

A few months ago our Secretary of State Mr. Hughes announced that he was about to retire from public life. His resignation induced no change in the policy of our State Department. Neither did it create any unusual situation. Yet Mr. Hughes' retirement provoked the consternation of people in all parts of the world. Americans and Europeans alike were aware that the United States was to be denied the services of a great statesman, a mind which had deftly shaped our foreign policy, a man of international popularity. And so we think of Mr. Hughes as our "greatest living statesman."

In our great political structure we have many "Governor Waltons" and not a few "Secretary Hughes." Politicians have always dominated every form of government. France had Louis XIV and America had Andrew Jackson. We have seen our politicians wage great struggles for their parties and oppose even the people in order to protect their political faiths. In our cities political groups have long controlled our municipalities. We have witnessed their activities in our mayor-council governments, in our commissions, and even occasionally in our city manager systems. Always it has been a factional fight, force blocked by force to prevent civic betterment. Our state governments have been the scenes of similar activities. Politicians have pitted party against party to paralyze our legislatures. We have observed the manifestation of these affairs in delay and extravagance, waste and inefficiency. In national circles the same fight has existed. We have seen that great political ring-Tammany, grip New York and the East with powerful determination. Every newspaper carries an account of some new scandal in Congress. Each day brings us stories of new party fights and political tangles. Obviously, politicians have taken no small part in our governmental life.

But we must not forget our statesmen—those men who hold as their champion, not party but perfection of state; those leaders who care little
for popularity or political allegiance. We hear little of them in our city governments in spite of their presence. It is easier to look back and think of the time when our governors and presidents were leaders in municipal activities. It is, nevertheless, the statesmen in our cities who work quietly under the din of municipal scandals and build cities in spite of political barriers. We more easily recognize the presence of statesmen in our governor's chairs and we usually reward them with advancement worthy of their ability. In our national government, the truly worthy have found their task. Statesmanship has been demanded and statesmen have responded to the cry. They have from the first preserved our nationality and built soundly our structure of state. It has been our statesmen who have ever stood for governmental soundness regardless of popular desire or partisan demands.

Must we protect our state against the ravages of political turmoil? Do politicians endanger statesmanship? A brief review of the past will answer those questions. Statesmen formed our government and launched it upon a sea of political bitterness. At times we have seen our vessel almost engulfed by politicians. Yet as the need has come statesmen have appeared to guide us safely through the troubled periods. In periods of crises we have had our Lincolns, our Roosevelts, and our Wilsons. Politicians have hindered and even at times controlled our offices yet the light of statesmanship has never been extinguished.

We have observed a long governmental fight with politicians urging, stimulating, twisting and manipulating our public offices and statesmen struggling doggedly forward, holding a steady course in the conflict. As international difficulties manifest themselves, our statesmen have formulated America's attitude and advanced her convictions. When civil discontent has become evident, statesmen have protected our national unity in the very face of dissolution. If politicians have aimed their attacks at statesmen they have missed their mark. Statesmanship has suffered but has not been defeated. The need for ability in state affairs is too great to be robbed of its own talent.

Politicians, then, may hinder but never destroy statesmanship. Instead they create the need, and statesmen, forgetful of party, people, and prejudice, come forward with the remedy.

CRITICISM

First, there is a question as to whether or not this speech takes up the topic given for it. This is partly the fault of the subject itself, for it is not good for such a contest. Its meaning is not clear. Where do statesmen cease to be statesmen and become politicians? The terms do not have a definite meaning. Second, there is a very positive lack of definite material. The author is lost in generalities. Third, there is no progress. Some paragraphs contribute nothing to the development of the topic and are a mere collection of words, as, for example, the third from the last paragraph. This paragraph, since it bears little logical relationship to the others, could come one place in the speech as well as another. Fourth, there is little variety after the first two paragraphs. Fifth, there is nothing to remember, nothing is proved. The only conclusion to which the speaker comes is the statement that "as the need has come statesmen have appeared to guide us safely through the troubled periods," which is a juvenile conclusion. Vigor of expression is lacking because there is also a lack of vigor of that.
To enable the national council to prepare for the convention and insure the comfort of all delegates, the national secretary has been sending out blanks to the chapters asking them to report the number of delegates they expect to send to the Sixth National Convention. Not all have replied. To date replies have been received from 69 out of 113 chapters. This is less than two-thirds of the chapters, and yet this number promises a minimum of 298 delegates, with a possible maximum of 323. This is enough to insure the convention rate of a fare and a half, even allowing for the fact that some will come on railroad passes and that many of the delegates from the Colorado Alpha and Beta chapters will not have to travel by railroad.

Omitting the two entertaining chapters, the other 67 are planning to send a minimum of 258 delegates, or an average of almost four to the chapter.

The 44 chapters which have not yet reported will probably not keep up this average, but they should send at least 100 more delegates. In fact, word has been received from some of them that they do plan to have a good delegation present. In many cases there have been articles in their college papers describing their plans. But as the following list is official no institution has been included in it unless a signed statement from some officer has been received.

There are also a number of chapters which were granted charters since the last convention under the obligation that they would have at least one delegate at this convention. Of course all of these chapters will be represented as they have agreed to be, altho several have not yet reported the exact number of delegates they plan to send.

It is interesting to note that so far only one chapter has reported that it does not plan to send any delegates. It is yet hoped that it may find a way to send some one. Our ambition is to make this a 100 percent convention. Many chapters are making great sacrifices to send a worthy delegation. It is hoped that every chapter will feel the obligation to contribute what it can to the enthusiasm and importance of the convention by sending at least one delegate. This convention will be the largest and perhaps the most important forensic conference ever held. No chapter can afford to miss it.

In addition to the delegates reported here, a number of others, alumni, friends, college presidents, members at large, forensic representatives from institutions which do not have chapters of ΠΚΔ are planning to attend.

Below is the report by chapters of the number of delegates that are expecting to attend the convention. Perhaps Iowa has the best showing. Nine of the 11 chapters have reported with 48 delegates promised, an average of more than 5 to a chapter. Kansas has 9 out of 13 chapters reporting 54 delegates, an average of 6 to the chapter. This will prob-
ably be the largest state delegation. Probably both of these states will have a 100 percent representation before they are thru.

If your chapter has not yet reported how many delegates it plans to send, will you please see that a report is sent at once. It is your obligation to the national council to cooperate with it in this matter. It must know how many are coming if it is to prepare for the convention. If you want it to make you comfortable when you get here and to make the convention a real pleasure and success, please help it to this extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Number of Delegates</th>
<th>Possible Additional Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Beta—Ouachita</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha—Redlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—California Tech.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Pacific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Southern Branch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Alpha—Agricultural College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Teachers College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Western State</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Alpha—Wesleyan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Eureka</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Carthage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Bradley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kappa—Lombard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Alpha—Franklin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Alpha—Wesleyan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Des Moines</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Morningside</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Simpson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeta—Parsons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eta—Upper Iowa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iota—Western Union</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda—Dubuque</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Alpha—Ottawa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Agricultural College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Southwestern</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeta—Teachers of Emporia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theta—Teachers of Pittsburg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iota—College of Emporia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lambda—Sterling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mu—Bethany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nu—Teachers of Hayes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Gamma—Wesleyan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Alpha—Kalamazoo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Olivet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—State Normal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Alpha—Macalester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Hamline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Alpha—Westminster</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Central</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—William Jewell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Wesleyan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Alpha—Intermountain Union</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Agricultural College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Alpha—Wesleyan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta—Cotner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Hastings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Grand Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Beta—Heidelberg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Hiram</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Otterbein</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Alpha—Agricultural College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma—Baptist University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Oklahoma City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Linfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Alpha—Wesleyan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—State College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epsilon—Sioux Falls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeta—Northern Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eta—Augustana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Beta—Tusculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Alpha—Southwestern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta—Howard-Payne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Alpha—Ripon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National General Chapter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 298
ARE YOU IN DANGER OF LOSING YOUR CHARTER?

The business of Π K Δ is carried on by its national conventions which are held every two years. Without these conventions the society could not exist, for they adopt its policies, select its national officers, and direct its activities. It is therefore the duty of every chapter to attend these conventions and to take some share in the work of the organization. The chapter which does not do this is living on charity, for it receives the benefits of the efforts and sacrifices of the other chapters without contributing anything to keep the society a going concern.

Because a few chapters have not understood this and have taken the attitude that whether or not they attend is a personal matter which concerns them alone, the Fifth National Convention passed some amendments to the constitution which require chapters to attend at least every other convention to hold its charter. This was not voted in the sense that it was a penalty on any chapter, but out of the feeling that a chapter which does not attend the conventions misses the best that the society can contribute to the betterment of its forensic activities, and the conviction that the society could not be 100 per cent efficient, unless each chapter was doing its share.

The society has no desire to lose any of the chapters it has. It takes great pride in the fact that it has lost only two chapters during its life, a record which can be approached by few honorary or social fraternities. It does not feel that the obligation thus imposed is an unreasonable one. But lest any chapter should overlook this it prints below the sections of the constitution which apply to attendance on the convention and the names of the chapters which are bound to attend this convention by the provisions of these sections. Many of these chapters already have their plans made to send delegations. This list is printed in the desire to save any mistakes.

Article 5, Division A, Section 13: Any chapter failing to have a delegate at the first national convention after the granting of its charter, or any chapter failing to have a delegate at two consecutive convention shall have its charter suspended. Any charter thus suspended can be regranted only by action of a national convention before which some delegate of the institution appears in person.

Article 9, Section 2: All institutions petitioning for a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta shall obligate themselves to send a delegate to the first National Convention following the granting of their petition.

The following institutions, because they were not represented at the Fifth National convention, must have delegates at the Sixth or forfeit their charters:

Arkansas
   Beta—Ouachita
California
   Beta—Occidental
   Delta—Pacific

Connecticut
   Alpha—Agricultural College
Illinois
   Gamma—Carthage
Kansas
  Iota—College of Emporia
  Nu—Teachers of Hayes
Kentucky
  Alpha—Georgetown
  Gamma—Wesleyan
Maine
  Alpha—Colby
Michigan
  Delta—State College
Minnesota
  Gamma—Gustavus Adolphus
Missouri
  Gamma—Central
  Delta—William Jewell
  Epsilon—Wesleyan
Montana
  Beta—State College
North Dakota
  Alpha—Jamestown
Nebraska
  Gamma—Doane
  Delta—Hastings
  Epsilon—Grand Island
Ohio
  Alpha—Baldwin-Wallace
  Beta—Heidelberg
  Delta—Akron
Oklahoma
  Beta—Tulsa
  Gamma—Baptist University
  Delta—Northwestern Teachers
  Epsilon—Oklahoma City
Oregon
  Alpha—Linfield
Pennsylvania
  Alpha—Grove City
South Carolina
  Alpha—Wofford
  Gamma—Newberry
South Dakota
  Delta—State College
  Zeta—Northern Teachers
Tennessee
  Beta—Tusculum
Texas
  Alpha—Southwestern
Washington
  Alpha—College of Puget Sound
Wisconsin
  Beta—Carroll

The following institutions, because they were granted charters under the amended constitution requiring them to attend the next following convention, must have delegates at the Sixth convention, and have obligated themselves to have them there in accepting their charter.

Colorado
  Gamma—Western State
Iowa
  Dubuque
Kentucky
  Delta—Transylvania
Louisiana
  Alpha—Louisiana
Missouri
  Eta—Central Teachers

North Carolina
  Alpha—State College
Ohio
  Epsilon—Otterbein
Texas
  Beta—Trinity
  Gamma—East Texas Teachers
  Delta—Howard Payne
  Epsilon—Baylor
PI KAPPA DELTA RADIO PROGRAM FEBRUARY 24

The Colorado Alpha and Beta chapters of ΠΚΑ, who are acting as hosts for the Sixth National Convention, have arranged with Station KOA of Denver to broadcast a program February 24, as one of the preliminaries to the convention. KOA is one of the General Electric Company's three powerful stations. It uses a 323 meter wave length and can be picked up readily in any state in the union. This program is being broadcasted as part of the welcome the Colorado chapters are extending to the others and should be received by each chapter. The program will begin at 8:00 o'clock mountain time and will last approximately two hours.

It was hoped when the program was being arranged, that the Colorado chapters could speak more of the convention, tell about their plans, and call the roll of chapters. This cannot be permitted, however, as the programs for this great station are picked up all over North America by millions of people and must therefore be planned to appeal to the large audience. There will be some things of particular forensic interest, however. We suggest a radio party by each chapter the evening of February 24.

The program, in which the musical conservatories of the two colleges are cooperating, is as follows:

BY THE COLORADO STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

1. Trio Op. 90 .............................................. Dvorak
   Where My Caravan Has Rested .......................... Lohr
   Elegia from Trio Op. 32 .............................. A. Arensky
   College String Trio

2. To Watch O'er Thee .................................... Pinsuti
   Settin' Aroun' the Fire ................................ Parks
   Say I've Got a Little Brother ...................... Kratz
   State Teachers College Male Quartette

3. Saxophone—Valse Vanite ............................... Rudy Wiedoeft
   Mrs. Lester E. Opp

4. Serenade ............................................... Victor Herbert
   Trio in D Major, No. 1, Op. 56 ..................... Cadman
   Forgotten ............................................. Eugene Cowles
   College String Trio

5. Cello—The World Is Waiting for the Sunrise ........ Seitz
   Kashmiri Song ......................................... Woodward-Findien
   Lester E. Opp

6. Ah, Love But a Day .................................... Protheroe
   The Pilot .............................................. Protheroe
   Hymn to the Night .................................... Tipton
   J. Allen Grubb—Tenor

7. Address—The Epic of the Cowboy ..................... W. O. Orr
   (This is the oration Mr. Orr will use in the national contest as the representative of the Colorado Alpha chapter.)

8. Concertante for Four Violins ........................ L. Maurer
   First violin—Editha Todd
   Second violin—Dorothy Milne
   Third violin—Myrna Louise Sydner
   Fourth violin—Violette Finley
   Piano—Mrs. O. T. Worth
9. Violin Solos—
   Ave Maria ......................................................... Schubert
   Gavotte .......................................................... Beethoven
   In the Time of Roses ........................................... Reichardt
   Rondino .......................................................... Eddie Brown

   Editha Todd

   (Miss Todd, who is a member of the Colorado Alpha chapter, won third place in the women's oratorical contest at the Fifth National Convention at Peoria.)

BY THE COLORADO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE CONSERVATORY
OF MUSIC

10. Piano Solo—Staccato Etude ........................................... Rubinstein
   Lois Jones

11. Baritone Solo—Arm, Arm, Ye Brave (Judas Maccabaeus)—Handel
    Where E'er You Walk (Selem) ............ Handel
    Paul Crist
    Mrs. Alexander Emslie, Accompanist

12. Bass Solo—Honour and Arms (Samson) ......................... Handel
    Who Treads the Path of Duty (Magic Flute) .. Mozart
    Alexander Emslie
    Mrs. Alexander Emslie, Accompanist

    Clarence James
    Alberta Getchell, Accompanist

14. Vocal Duet—Graceful Consort (Creation) ...................... Handel
    Soprano—Dorothy Becker
    Bass—Alexander Emslie
    Accompanist—Alberta Getchell

15. Soprano Solo—Day and Night .......................... Hildreth
    The Pool ............................... Hildreth
    Dorothy Becker
    Alberta Getchell, Accompanist

16. Address—Winter Sports
    Alfred Westfall, National President

17. College Song .................................................. Service-Getchell
    Aggie Singers
DEBATE COACHES

Here are some of the debate coaches who will attend the national convention in Estes Park. We are in hopes that the debate coach from every chapter can attend and shall be glad to receive the names of any others who plan to be there. This list does not pretend to be complete, but is all that we have to date.

California
W. C. Dennis, Redlands.
W. H. Veatch and Charles M. Marsh, University of California, Southern Branch.

Colorado
Harvey H. DeWeerdt, Colorado Agricultural College
H. M. Randall, Colorado Teachers College
Caroline Mattingly, Western State

Illinois
James J. Fiderlick, Illinois Wesleyan.

Iowa
Dorothy Scholl, Central
Edith Whitaker, Simpson.
C. B. Swaney, Upper Iowa
Roy M. Smith, Western Union
Dale Welch, Dubuque

Kansas
R. H. Ritchie, Ottawa
H. B. Summers, Kansas State Agricultural College.
Geo. R. R. Pflaum, Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.
J. R. Pelsma, Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg
J. H. Lawrence, College of Emporia
Clarence E. Mitchell, Sterling
Martin Holcomb, Bethany
James Start, Kansas State Teachers College of Hayes.

Michigan
F. B. McKay, Michigan State Normal College

Minnesota
Chas. S. Templer, Hamline

Missouri
J. M. Moore, Park
P. Casper Harvey, William Jewell
B. W. Folsom, Missouri Wesleyan

Montana
A. E. Taylor, Intermountain Union
J. Wheeler Barger, Montana State

Nebraska
Enid Miller, Nebraska Wesleyan
Franklin Knowler, Hastings

North Carolina
C. C. Cunningham, State College

Ohio
Hana D. Hopkins, Heidelberg

Oklahoma
H. H. Anderson, Oklahoma A. and M.
Newyel S. Sawyer, Oklahoma Baptist

South Dakota
F. W. Lambertson, Dakota Wesleyan
H. Gilkinson, Yankton
Geo. McCarty, South Dakota State
Hugo A. Carlson, Augustana

Texas
W. Dwight Wentz, Southwestern
O. E. Winebrenner, Howard-Payne

Wisconsin
H. B. Body, Ripon
REDUCED FARE FOR THE CONVENTION

The railroad officers have officially acted upon our petition for reduced fares for the convention. The fares will be granted under the terms which apply to all such requests. Please note them carefully.

First, 250 must attend who have certificates showing purchase of one way fares of not less than 67 cents. (The earlier announcement that 150 would assure us of the convention rates was an error due to incorrect information given by a lower railroad official. The smallest number for which the railroads can issue a special fare is 250.)

Second, delegates must return by the same route they came to secure the special fare. There are no exceptions to this rule.

Third, the only stop-over privileges allowed are those allowed on the usual one way ticket.

Fourth, if you have to follow an out of the way route to carry on some debates, you can call for a certificate for the last part of the journey. For example, if you are coming from California to Estes Park by way of Washington and Oregon where you have some debates, you can perhaps plan to come thru Salt Lake City and return the same way. You can then get the benefits of the special fare from Salt Lake City and back by asking for a certificate when you buy your ticket there.

Fifth, even tho you can not return the same way you came and cannot therefore benefit by the special fare, get your certificate. No one can get the special fare unless 250 certificates are presented. You can help the others secure this special rate.

Please read the following directions carefully. They are supplied by the railroad officials. In case of question, apply to your own railroad agent or write to the National Secretary, Mr. Finley.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO MEMBERS

A reduction of one and one-half for the round-trip on the "Certificate Plan" will apply for members (also dependent members of their families) attending the meeting of H K A to be held at Estes Park, Colorado. The arrangement will apply from the following territory:

- All states in which there are chapters.
- The following directions are submitted:

1. Tickets at the normal one-way tariff fare for the going journey may be bought on any of the following dates (but not on any other date). March 22-28. Certificates will be honored showing the purchase of going tickets to Denver, Longmont, Lyons, Loveland, Greeley and Fort Collins.

2. Be sure when purchasing your going ticket to ask the ticket agent for a certificate. Do not make the mistake of asking for a receipt. If, however, it is impossible to get a certificate from the local ticket agent, a receipt will be satisfactory and should be secured when ticket is purchased. See that the ticket reads to the point where the convention is to be held and no other. See that your certificate is stamped with the same date as your ticket. Sign your name to the certificate or receipts in ink. Show this to the ticket agent.

3. Call at the railroad station for ticket and certificate at least 30 minutes before departure of train.

4. Certificates are not kept at all stations. Ask your home
station whether you can procure certificates and through tickets to the place of meeting. If not, buy a local ticket to nearest point where a certificate and through ticket to place of meeting can be bought.

5. Immediately upon your arrival at the meeting, present your certificate to the endorsing officer, Mr. G. W. Finley, as the reduced fare for the return journey will not apply unless you are properly identified as provided for by the certificate.

6. No refund of fare will be made on account of failure to either obtain a proper certificate, or on account of failure to have the certificates validated.

7. It must be understood that the reduction for the return journey is not guaranteed, but is contingent on an attendance of not less than 250 members of the organization and dependent members of their families at the meeting holding regularly issued certificates from ticket agents at starting points showing payment of normal one-way tariff fare of not less than 67 cents on the going trip.

8. If the necessary minimum of 250 regularly issued certificates are presented to the Joint Agent, and your certificate is validated, you will be entitled to a return ticket via the same route as the going journey at one-half of the normal one-way tariff fare from place of meeting to point at which your certificate was issued up to and including April 5.

9. Return tickets issued at the reduced fare will not be good on any limited train on which such reduced fare transportation is not honored.

---

**EUREKA COLLEGE DEBATE CHAMPIONSHIP**

Eureka College, of Eureka, Illinois, is not only a producer of championship basketball teams, but also of championship debate teams. Last year marked the organization of the Illinois Intercollegiate Debate League, in which Eureka took initial steps, and marked also the winning of its first championship by Eureka.

The League is composed of nine Illinois colleges: Augustana, of Rock Island; Bradley, of Peoria; Eureka; Illinois, of Jacksonville; Lombard, of Galesburg; Monmouth; State Normal, of Normal; Northwestern, of Naperville; and Illinois Wesleyan, of Bloomington. Each college participated in four debates, the championship being awarded to the school receiving the largest number of judges' decisions. Eureka and Augustana each gained nine out of a possible twelve, in the four scheduled debates. In the final debate for the championship, held at Lombard, Eureka won a two-to-one decision and the championship.

Eureka College has a most enviable record in debate. Beginning in 1907, from which time a consecutive record is available, Eureka has won 31 debates and lost 16. With the exception of 1910-12 and 1923, her debaters have won at least one debate every year.

The Eureka Illinois Beta Chapter of IKA, national forensic honor fraternity, has grown rapidly in membership during the past several years. The Eureka chapter was installed on May 1, 1916, during the presidency of Dr. H. O. Pritchard, who was active himself in debating circles while in Eureka. Ten men became charter members of the society.
Today there are twenty members now in college, more than a score who have graduated, and several students who have not yet been initiated into the organization. To be eligible for membership to IKA, a student must have taken part in at least one intercollegiate debate.

During the past season, Eureka has trained more teams and engaged in more debates than ever before. Two varsity teams, two girls’ teams and two freshman-sophomore teams engaged in ten debates and were victorious in seven.—Contributed.

---

**RULES FOR CONVENTION CONTESTS**

**ORATORY**

These rules shall govern both the Men’s Oratorical Contest and the Women’s Oratorical Contest.

1. CONTESTANTS. Each Pi Kappa Delta Chapter may enter an orator in each contest, who shall be an active member of the chapter he or she represents.

2. ENTRANCE FEE. Each chapter shall pay an entrance fee of one dollar for each orator entered.

3. ORATIONS. Orations shall not exceed 1500 words in length, and shall not contain more than 150 words of quotation. All quotations shall be indicated by the proper marks. Each contestant shall send a typewritten copy of his oration to the National Secretary together with the entrance fee of one dollar, not later than March 15, 1926. The National Secretary shall examine each oration to determine its eligibility under this rule.

4. PRELIMINARY CONTESTS. Preliminary contests shall be held simultaneously, the number of such contests being determined by the number of contestants entered, it being provided that not more than eight speakers shall appear on one program. The National Council shall determine the arrangement of schools in the preliminary contests.

5. FINAL CONTESTS. The number of speakers appearing in the final contests shall be determined by the National Council in accordance with the number of preliminary contests held.

6. TIME OF CONTESTS. The time for holding each contest shall be determined by the National Council and shall be announced in the printed program of the convention.

7. JUDGES. Each contest shall be decided by three or more disinterested judges to be chosen by the National Council.

8. METHOD OF JUDGING. Judges shall mark on general excellency, including thought, composition and delivery, giving each orator a grade between the percents of 75 and 100. No judge shall give any two orators the same grade.

Members of the National Council shall tabulate the ballots and determine the results. The markings of each judge shall be ranked 1, 2, 3, etc. Any orator ranked first by a majority of the judges shall be awarded first place.
If no orator is thus ranked first, all the rankings of each orator shall be totaled and the orator having the lowest sum of ranks shall be awarded first place. The orator having second lowest sum of ranks shall be awarded second and the orator having the next lowest sum of ranks shall be awarded third place. In case of a tie, the rankings shall be made again by omitting the contestants not concerned in the first three places, and the tie thus broken.

9. PRIZES. The winner of first place in each final contest shall be awarded a gold medal; the winner of second place shall be awarded a silver medal, and the winner of the third place shall be awarded a bronze medal. The college represented by the winner of first place shall be awarded a silver trophy cup.

All arrangements for the contests not covered by the above rules shall be in the hands of the National Council.

EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEECHES

These rules shall govern both the Men's Extempore Speaking Contest and the Women's Extempore Speaking Contest.

1. CONTESTANTS. Each ΠΚΔ Chapter may enter a contestant in each contest, who shall be an active member of the chapter he or she represents.

2. ENTRANCE FEE. Each chapter shall pay an entrance fee of one dollar for each contestant entered. Notice of intention to enter the contests, together with the fees, shall be sent to the National Secretary not later than March 15, 1926.

3. SUBJECTS. At least two months before the convention the National Council shall announce a general subject for each contest.

4. SUB-TOPICS. A disinterested party chosen by the National Council shall divide each general subject into ten sub-topics. These sub-topics shall be kept sealed until the time for the contests. One hour before the beginning of each contest the contestants shall by lot select sub-topics. Each speaker shall confine his discussion to the sub-topic chosen.

5. PRELIMINARY CONTESTS. Preliminary contests shall be held simultaneously, the number of such contests being determined by the number of contestants entered, it being provided that not more than eight speakers shall appear on one program. The National Council shall determine the arrangement of schools in the preliminary contests. No contestant shall be permitted to hear the other speakers in any preliminary contest.

6. FINAL CONTESTS. The number of speakers in the final contests shall be determined by the National Council in accordance with the number of preliminary contests held. No contestant shall be permitted to speak in the final contest upon the same sub-topic upon which he spoke in the preliminary contest.

7. TIME OF CONTESTS. The time for holding each contest shall be determined by the National Council and shall be announced in the printed program of the Convention.
8. LENGTH OF SPEECHES. Speeches shall be not less than eight minutes nor more than ten minutes in length. Each speaker shall be given a warning by the time-keeper at the expiration of eight minutes.

9. NOTES AND QUOTED MATTER. No speaker shall be permitted to take upon the platform more than one hundred words of notes. No speaker shall use more than two hundred words of quoted matter. Quotations may be either read or memorized.

10. JUDGES. Each contest shall be decided by three or more disinterested judges chosen by the National Council and in accordance with the rules for judging prescribed for the National Oratorical Contests.

11. PRIZES. Prizes similar to the ones given in the National Oratorical Contests shall be awarded to the winners of the first three places in each Extempore Speaking Contest.

All arrangements for the contests not covered by the above rules shall be in the hands of the National Council.

DEBATE TOURNAMENT

These rules shall govern both the Men’s Debating Tournament and the Women’s Debating Tournament.

1. CONTESTANTS. Each ΗΚΔ chapter may enter one or two teams in each contest. The members of these teams shall be active members of the chapter they represent.

2. ENTRANCE FEE. Each chapter shall pay an entrance fee of one dollar for each team entered. Notice of intention to enter the contest, together with the fees, shall be sent to the National Secretary not later than March 15, 1926.

3. QUESTION. The official ΗΚΔ question shall be used in all of the debates.

4. SPEECHES. Each debater shall have two speeches, one of ten minutes and one of five. The affirmative shall speak first in the first speeches, and the negative first in the second speeches.

5. ELIMINATION. The debates shall be conducted upon the elimination plan. A team must be defeated twice to be eliminated. The arrangement of the debates in all the contests shall be in charge of the National Council.

6. SIDES. Each team must debate on both sides of the question. After the first series the National Council shall attempt, as far as possible, to schedule each team in each succeeding debate for the side of the question opposite to the one it last debated.

7. PERSONNEL. The personnel of a team may be changed during the tournament, but such changes must be announced before a team is assigned its side in the next debate.

8. JUDGES. Each debate shall be decided by competent judges selected by the National Council.

9. SCOUTING. The tournament will be open. Debaters are not prohibited from attending other debates during the tournament.
10. PRIZES. Prizes similar to the ones given in the National Oratorical Contests shall be awarded to the members of the winning teams of the first three places in each debating tournament.

All arrangements for the tournaments not governed by the above rules shall be in the hands of the National Council.

GETTING GOOD FROM THE CONVENTION

"We are planning to send two debaters to the national convention," writes Professor A. A. Hopkins of the Oklahoma Baptists.

"We had also hoped that one could enter oratory and the other extempore speaking, but we note your warning in the last FORENSIC against this because of schedule difficulties. There is also the point of handicap to the student who is trying to excel in two lines. Still we might be willing to hazard this latter if the scheduling could be handled.

"It seems to me that in view of the cost of travel it would be better to spread the contests over enough time to permit double entering, rather than to make necessary the sending of another man. It would cost much less to keep the two men there an extra day or two than to send a third man. Like many others we find it necessary to economize. Does it seem to you at all feasible to try to make such provisions as I indicate for double entries?"

As we suggested before, a man can enter more than one contest. We shall do all that we can to make it possible for him to appear in both lines. With so many things to handle, there are great dangers of conflict. Where there are such conflicts, we can not permit them to hold up the whole program. The chances are that no one man will get beyond the preliminaries in more than one line, anyway.

There is such a thing as being too close to the trees to see the forest. A man who works himself to death trying to compete in everything will miss much of the best of the convention and wear himself out into the bargain. It would be better for him to concentrate his efforts along one line, go as far as he can in that, and then have time to take in as much of the convention as possible. The value of the convention will not be in the contests, but in the plans for bettering forensics which each delegate can carry home and put to work on his own campus.

It will be possible for a man to compete in more than one line, but it will not be advisable. This advise comes from those who have been most closely in contact with previous conventions. It is given with the idea of helping each institution and each delegate to get the greatest benefit from the convention.
The Editor's Personal Page

Where inconsistencies cease from troubling and logic is at rest.

The first the Retort Courteous; the second the Quip Modest; the third the Reply Churlish, the fourth the Reproof Valiant; the fifth the Counter-check Quarrelsome; the sixth the Lie with Circumstance; the seventh the Lie Direct.—As You Like It.

"There is no true orator who is not a hero."—Emerson.

FAMOUS ARGUMENTS OF HISTORY

Job, versus Eliphaz, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar.
Socrates versus Xantippe
Cicero versus Cataline.
Luther versus the Diet of Worms.
"Johnny, I'm not going to speak to you again. If you don't get that coal right now, I'll take the stick to you."

"A knock-down argument 'tis but a word and a blow." —Dryden-Amphi-tryon.

"In arguing, too, the parson own'd his skill,
For even though vanquished he could argue still."

Goldsmith—"The Deserted Village."

"Be calm in arguing; for fierceness makes
Error a fault, and truth discourtesy."

Herbert—"Temple".

There was a young lady from Park
Who thot debating a lark.
She argued so late
With her very best date
They had to go home in the dark.

Recently the papers carried a story of two ladies who held up a bank in South Dakota. The ladies, unfortunately for themselves, began their operations in the county where the public welfare is safeguarded by our worthy national counsel, J. D. Coon. Since the event Mr. Coon has received letters from all over the United States advising him as to what he should do with the ladies.

The Forensic suggests that he bring them to the national convention. They would prove useful in a number of ways.

As they have demonstrated their ability to collect funds, they could assist the National Treasurer in collecting fines and dues from some of the refractory chapters. The one with the big gun and the nervous trigger finger would make an admirable judge to use for those debaters who like to argue with the judge over the decision. Perhaps if they were appointed chaperones for the convention, we should not be troubled with the pesky young gentleman who thinks it smart to stay out late.
COLLEGE ENGAGEMENTS

"May a man permit the girl to whom he is engaged to wear his \( \Pi K \Delta \) key?" writes a member who evidently has serious intentions.

The answer is that there is a distinct difference between a social fraternity and an honorary society. The custom of using fraternity pins to indicate engagements is well established in college circles. There can be no objection to the custom. A fraternity does not admit women. If a girl appears wearing a fraternity pin, no one accuses her of attempting to masquerade as a fraternity member.

The badge of an honorary society is presented as a reward for some achievement. The man who wears it indicates that he has the right to that distinction. \( \Pi K \Delta \) admits both men and women to membership. A girl who wore the key of the man to whom she was engaged would expose herself to criticism, for those who knew that she was not eligible to wear the key might think she was pretending to an honor she did not deserve. For this reason it has never been customary in college circles to use the emblems of honorary organizations to indicate an engagement, and this is particularly true of the emblems of organizations which admit both men and women.

Furthermore our own constitution expressly prohibits it. Article VI, Section 3: "It shall be cause for expulsion of any member if he shall voluntarily permit anyone not eligible to his standing in \( \Pi K \Delta \) to wear his key."

WATCH US GROW

J. H. Neff, Iowa Eta, Upper Iowa University, recently received membership card No. 5556.

The last key issued is No. 3576. Clifford Roach, Kansas Eta- Kansas Wesleyan University, is now wearing it.
HELP US RENDER BETTER SERVICE

One of the best forms of service THE FORENSIC can perform is to acquaint each chapter with what every other chapter is doing along forensic lines. We should have some news items about every chapter in every issue. To do this we must have a regular and reliable source of forensic news. The college paper is the best one, the most regular, and the most complete. For this reason we have attempted to arrange exchanges with the college paper in every institution where we have a chapter. Last year we had exchanges with all but six institutions. This year we have not been able to do so well.

We need help. Below is the list of colleges with which we do not have exchanges. We have written at least six letters to each one of these, some to the college paper and some to the chapter president. In many cases we have received promises of exchange, but no paper. Don't you chapter presidents in the chapters on this delinquent list feel that you owe it to the national organization to give us just the little cooperation it would require for you to get us on your exchange list? You wish us to serve you and you benefit from the forensic news we publish. Then you should play fair by seeing that your institution contributes its share. Besides it is good advertising for your college. Please help us out.

The college paper from the following is not being received at the office of THE FORENSIC.

California
  Occidental
  Pacific
Connecticut
  Agricultural College
Illinois
  Wesleyan
  Normal University
  Carthage
  Lombard
  Hedding
Iowa
  Des Moines
  Buena Vista
  Upper Iowa
  Dubuque
  Coe
Kentucky
  Centre
Michigan
  Kalamazoo
  Detroit
Minnesota
  Gustavus Adolphus
Missouri
  Park
  Culver-Stockton
  Central
Nebraska
  Cotner
  Hastings
Ohio
  Baldwin-Wallace
  Otterbein
  Akron
Oklahoma
  Agricultural College
  Northwestern Teachers
  Oklahoma City
South Carolina
  Presbyterian
Tennessee
  Maryville
  Tusculum
Washington
  Puget Sound

HELP FOR THE EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKER

All who are planning to enter extemporaneous speaking contests should have a copy of the booklet on "Self-cultivation in Extemporaneous Speaking," by Professor Glenn Clark of Minnesota Alpha, Macalester College. It is the classic in its field, brief, logical, helpful. The book is well known, widely used, and highly recommended. It is published by the Minnesota Alpha chapter of Pi Kappa Delta and sells for twenty-five cents.
YOUR CONVENTION DELEGATION

Every chapter should be earnestly considering the personnel of its convention delegation. Who should be sent to the Estes Park convention?

First, what is the purpose in sending a delegation anyway? The main reason for attending the convention is to get some ideas or inspiration which will improve forensics on the local campus. Those selected to represent the college should be the ones who will be able to do the most to advance forensics after the convention. With this general principle in mind, we can make this answer to the question.

First, there should be the students who will be the forensic leaders the next year. It is unwise to send a delegation all of which are seniors. They leave too soon after the convention to be able to give back the most to the college.

Second, as many lines of forensic interests as possible should be represented.

Third, both men and women should be represented, if that is possible.

Fourth, the students who have done the most for forensics should be sent, partly because they deserve it, and partly because they will be the ones who can do the most in the future.

Fifth, the debate coach should be a member of the delegation, because he is the director of forensics and should have opportunity to get in touch with every forward movement.

Sixth, the college president should be invited to attend, for as director of all the activities of the college, he should know what can be done in forensics and can help the convention shape its policy.

Seventh, as many delegates as possible should be sent.

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS HAVE BEEN INVITED TO THE CONVENTION

The National Council has sent invitations to the presidents of all of our colleges urging them and their wives to attend the Sixth National Convention. It is hoped that each chapter will follow up this invitation with a personal one. It would help us a great deal to have a number of presidents at the convention to help us in our work. Perhaps it would help them to become more interested in forensics.

We have not yet had time to hear from all of them. A number have written that they hoped it would be possible for them to attend. Two have replied that they plan to be there. We are expecting a number of other acceptances. The following letters are encouraging.

Dear Mr. Westfall:

Your letter concerning the national convention of P K D at Estes Park next March received. I shall plan to attend.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) H. D. HOOVER,
President of Carthage College, Illinois Gamma.
My dear Mr. Westfall:

Thank you most heartily for your very good letter of December 12th, the spirit and content of which Mrs. Kohlstedt and I appreciate more than words can express. We have decided to accept your invitation and will plan to attend the Sixth National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta in Colorado, March 29th to April 1st, inclusive.

Our society is planning to send delegates, and we are looking forward to a very pleasant and profitable meeting. It was my privilege to be one of the three college presidents in attendance at the national convention in Peoria, Illinois, two years ago, and I am glad indeed to be able to plan at least to attend the coming convention.

Very cordially yours,
(Signed) E. D. KOHLSTEDT,
President of Dakota Wesleyan University, South Dakota Alpha.

THE PERSONNEL OF THE DEBATE TEAMS

"Can we enter a team for the affirmative and another for the negative if we have the men at the convention, or must each team debate both sides of the question?" writes one of our debate coaches. In order to be fair to all, the national council has ruled that each team must be prepared to debate both sides of the question and the drawing will be seeded after the first preliminary to compel a team on each debate to take the side opposite to the one it last debated as far as this is possible.

An institution can enter more than one team if it desires to. Also, the personnel of the team may be changed for any debate, but these changes must be announced before the side for the debate is drawn in order to prevent a coach using certain men for one side of the question and others for the other side. This provision is to take care of the coach who has three or more men at the tournament and who wishes to give each one an opportunity to debate. It is the desire of the national council to make it possible for the maximum number of people to take part in the speech contests.

CHAPTER 110 INSTALLED

The installation of the Colorado Gamma chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, national forensic fraternity, was in charge of Prof. George W. Finley of Greeley, national secretary and treasurer of Pi Kappa Delta, Monday December 7, at six o'clock in the La Veta Hotel. The installation was followed by a four-course dinner in the dining room at seven.

Miss Letha Brooks, president of Gamma chapter was toastmistress; Mrs. Margaret White O'Leary, patroness, gave a toast on "The Campus Infant"; George Berg, secretary and treasurer, spoke on "Modern Trend in Debate"; Miss Caroline Mattingly, coach of local debaters, talked on "Debate Prospects for 1926"; Prof. Finley, national secretary and treasurer, gave an account of the "Convention at Estes Park"; and Dr. Samuel Quigley, president of the college, addressed the meeting on the topic of "The Value of the Forensic Fraternity."

The national colors of Pi Kappa Delta, red and white, were carried out in the table decorations, and the fraternity flower, the red carnation, was used as favors.

Prof. Finley was assisted in the installation by Miss Lois Borland,
head of the English department, and Dr. Russell W. Tallman, head of the department of Education, who had been initiated some time before. The guest list of the installation and dinner includes: Dr. and Mrs. Samuel Quigley, Dean and Mrs. John C. Johnson, Prof. and Mrs. L. O. Machlan, Mr. and Mrs. T. O'Leary, Prof. Finley, Miss Caroline Mattingly, Miss Frances MacOuat, and Miss Lucy Green.

The members of the new chapter are Miss Letha Brooks, '28, Charles Coyle, '27, George Berg, '27, Roland Smethurst, '27, Prof. Lois Borland, sponsor, Dr. Russell Tallman, and Prof. J. S. Ferris.—Top O' The World.

Professor F. W. Lambertson, Dakota Wesleyan, has been named Western Divisional Manager for the Interstate Oratorical contest. One section of the Interstate will be held in South Dakota this year at the home of the winning orator.

A very useful pamphlet containing some well selected excerpts on the Child Labor question has just come to the editor's desk. The pamphlet is a publication of the Students' Research Agency of Baylor University, Waco, Texas. It is interesting to PKD people for two reasons. First, it is very good material for this year's question. Second, one of the compilers is a PKD man, H. G. Stovall, formerly of Kansas State Agricultural College. All debaters should get a copy.

COMMITTEES:

Chapter: W. H. Veatch, Chairman, University of California, Southern Branch.

Interchapter relations: W. C. Dennis, Chairman, University of Redlands.

Constitutional Amendments: Charles A. Marsh, Chairman, University of California, Southern Branch; Professor H. B. Summers, Kansas State Agricultural College; P. Casper Harvey, William Jewell College.

If you have any suggestions which should go to these committees, send them in now so that the committees can have plenty of time to consider them.

EXTEMPORANEOUS DEBATES CALLED FOR

Dear Editor:

At a meeting of the college debate coaches of Iowa a few days ago, ways and means of increasing interest in debate were discussed. The matter of questions for debate was not overlooked. The coaches were quite unanimous in the belief that the ΠΚΔ question would be of little interest to our audiences. A number of the colleges decided to do some extemperaneous debating. This permits of the discussion of a number of topics of local interest and enables us to give our audiences more variety than is otherwise possible. At a meeting of the ΠΚΔ colleges it was decided to request ΠΚΔ to hold an extemperaneous debate tournament at the National Convention next year, and I was chosen to transmit to you that resolution.

At our state meeting most of us scheduled all of our women's debates on the uniform marriage and divorce question. Today we received
your letter in which you state that this will not be used in the National Tournament. I don't know just what we will do at this late date. Also, I notice that some colleges are debating the prohibition question, and that they desire to debate at the National Tournament. An extemporaneous debate tournament for mixed teams would take care of all of these situations. It would give us most of the advantages of standardization without entailing it many disadvantages.

Sincerely,
C. H. McREYNALDS,
Iowa Alpha, Iowa Wesleyan College.

TRI-COLLEGE EXTENMORE CONTEST IN KANSAS

It was a triangular extemporaneous speaking contest between Washburn College, of Topeka, Kansas, State Agricultural College at Manhattan and the Kansas State Teachers College at Emporia. Each school had three representatives. The subjects for the contest were made up by Professor Westfall, National President of Π Κ Δ. Each man drew three subjects and then chose one of the three as the subject upon which he was to speak. He was allowed one hour for preparation and then presented an eight minute speech.

In the contest Manhattan took first place, Washburn second place, and K. S. T. C. third place. Mr. Frank Glick of the K. S. A. C. was ranked first, having for his subject "Should Radicals Be Admitted to the United States?" Mr. R. E. Hedburg of Manhattan ranked second with the subject of "What Is the Locarno Pact?" Mr. Rodney Stone of Washburn ranked third with the topic of the "League of Nations and Its Functions in the Greeco-Bulgarian Trouble." The judges for the contest were Prof. Conrad Vandelveld of the College of Emporia, Prof. E. C. Buehler of the Department of Speech at Kansas University, Prof. T. M. Tollefson of the Department of Political Science at Kansas University.

The contest in general was very interesting and the speeches were quite commendable. This was the third contest of this extemporaneous organization.

GEO. R. R. PFLAUM, Kansas Zeta,
Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.

DEBATING IS CROWDING FOOTBALL AT CENTRAL

The rapid development of forensics at Central College in the last few years deserves special notice by all of the members of Pi Kappa Delta. Up to three years ago, our debating activities were confined to about two triangular debates, each team being allowed only one debate per year. The appropriation for debate was small, but even with its smallness, it was never all used up.

However, the stopping off here of a team from Denver University in 1924 sounded the note of progress which has been carried on ever since. In the 1924 season, Central debated 11 times and lost only 3 of that number. However, the distinction came, not from the number of debates won, but from the quality of the opponents defeated. Outstanding in that season was the defeat of Park College, and of Westminster College, our ancient rival in every form of intercollegiate activity.

Last year, forensics branched out further than formerly. In February a team was sent as far west as Denver to engage in debate with colleges along the way. Two debates were lost on this trip, one was won,
and the one with Denver University was a split team debate, the affirmative winning.

However, later in the year this same team defeated William Jewell College twice, and then won the province championship, the tournament being held at Culver-Stockton College. More debates were held last year, more debating material was developed, and best of all, the college authorities realized the importance of debate, and we have this year a member of the faculty whose duties are solely connected with public speaking.

Central never likes to boast of past performances, and this year she will endeavor to live up to her past record. We will send a two-man debating team to the convention. Also we intend to send an orator, and our coach. We are coming out in March, and will let our actions speak further for us.

MISSOURI GAMMA CHAPTER, II K Δ.
Nelson Flinks, Secretary.

The following students have been selected for the Eureka teams this year: Affirmative, Maxwell Carey, captain; Max Cooper, and John Welker. Negative, Willard Shelton, captain; Walter Gibson, and Dan Benefiel. Women Affirmative, Elizabeth Mayes, Elizabeth Stubblefield, Reba Huff, and Dorothy Warner. Negative, Vivian Ingram, Edith Frazier, Eva Thompson, and Virginia Tannar.—The Eureka Pegasus.

By a three to two vote the Southern California conference decided to retain the decision form of debate. The two colleges opposed to the decision debates felt so strongly on the subject however that they threatened to break up the conference. At a later vote the conference then reversed its previous action and adopted the no-decision form of debate.—The California Tech.

The women of the Southern California conference are discussing the question made popular by the English teams, that this house pities its grandchildren. The Oxford style is being used in the debates. Redlands has met Pomona, La Verne, Southern Branch of the University of California, and Occidental.—U. of R. Campus.

The Henderson-Brown girls will debate the II K Δ question with the women from the State Teachers College, while the men will discuss the World Court with the men from that institution. Elmer Hood and Custer Kidd will compose the men’s team.—The Oracle.

Ellsworth Meyer of Pomona won first place in the Southern California Extempore contest. Warren Van Camp of Redlands won second. The present situation in China was the general topic of discussion.—The California Tech.

The Southern California Debate Conference selected the following question for its debates; That war, except in case of invasion or internal insurrection, should be declared by direct vote of the people.—U. of R. Campus.

Members of the debating teams at Ouachita were awarded white sweaters with a large O. Inside the O is the II K Δ key.—Ouachita Signal.

Warren Van Camp won the Fowler Extempore prize of $25 and the right to represent Redlands in the state contest.—U. of R. Campus.

Redlands will open its forensic season with a debate with Ohio Wesleyan.—U. of R. Campus.
The California Gamma chapter at California Institute of Technology continued its production of classical dramas to raise funds to send delegates to the national convention. This year the play was a rollicking comedy, "The Captives" by Plautus. Gilmore Brown, the director of the celebrated Pasadena Playhouse, who has been engaged to conduct the dramatic activities of the Institute, was in charge of the production and pleased the capacity audiences which greeted the two productions of the play. The play was produced in Roman costumes, with all the parts played by the men of the chapter.—The California Tech.

"I have deposited two bound volumes of The Forensic in the library of the California Institute of Technology where they are in charge of the librarian in a locked cupboard, subject to call, but to be read only in the library," writes former president John R. Macarthur. "This might be announced in the magazine for the benefit of the chapters around here, in case any one should ever be interested in looking up the first volume, which is rare."

This announcement will be of interest to those interested in the society. The first volume, which includes The Forensic for the first six years it was published, is indeed rare. There are less than a dozen copies in existence.

The Southern Branch of the University of California conducted a series of interclass debates on the question of compulsory membership in the Associated Students. The freshmen won.—California Grizzly.

The Indiana Alpha chapter had a home-coming dinner for all former debaters and members at the time of the annual home-coming day. Among those present were Mr. Branigan, a member of the board of Trustees who represented Franklin in the state oratorical contest in 1892, and Dr. Ross Payne who represented the school similarly in 1893.—The Franklin.

The women of California Epsilon at Southern Branch have debated the question of whether or not we should pity our grandchildren in four decisionless debates with La Verne, Pomona, Occidental and Redlands.—California Grizzly.

Professor Alan Nichols of the University of Southern California spoke on the office of extemporaneous speaking before the Agore forensic society of the Southern Branch of the University of California.—California Grizzly.

The women of Colorado Teachers and the University of Wyoming opened the debating season December 12, with a discussion of the World Court. The audience gave the decision.—The Mirror.

Members of the Colorado Beta chapter presented the World Court problem to the students at one of the chapel periods just before the student vote on the question was taken.—The Mirror.

The Indiana Alpha chapter is sponsoring a series of inter-fraternity debates on the PiKΔ question. A silver loving cup will be awarded to the winning fraternity.—The Franklin.

Arthur E. White represented The Southern Branch of the University of California in the state extempore contest.—California Grizzly.

The Eastern Inter-Collegiate Debate League, composed of nine colleges, will discuss the football question.—The New Student.
The Illinois Inter-Collegiate Oratorical contest was held at Eureka College December 11. The results were as follows:


Also speaking:

—The Eureka Pegasus.

"Just what has been accomplished in collegiate debate this season is hard to determine," said Professor Ross. "However, this one thing is certain, that 4,000 students from 600 colleges and universities in the United States can not participate in 3,000 debates, in which more than ten national and international questions were analyzed, without having a mighty influence upon the thinking of those who listened and without deriving unlimited educational value themselves."—News Letter, The Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia.

The Society has a lusty infant in the Colorado Gamma chapter just installed. Altho it is farther from Gunnison to Estes Park than it is from some of chapters in Nebraska, the new chapter is planning to send ten delegates to the national convention. One of the first accomplishments of the new chapter was to get the forensic fee raised from sixty cents to $1.20 per student. That's putting forensics on a better basis in a hurry.

The members of the Colorado Alpha chapter at the Agricultural College had a week-end retreat in Estes Park just after the forensic squad was selected. Plans for the forensic season were made, arrangements for entertaining the convention were discussed, and skiing was indulged in.—The Rocky Mountain Collegian.

The Illinois State Debate League decided to have half of its debates judged and the other half of the open forum type. The question for the men is the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. The women will discuss uniform marriage and divorce laws.—The Argus.

Iowa Wesleyan has been having some popular debates between teams of men and women at which heckling has been permitted.—The Iowa Wesleyan News.

John Stafford won the Walter J. Miller prize of $25 at North-Western and represented that college in the state contest.—The College Chronicle.

At Illinois Beta five former IKA members, all of whom had debated for Eureka, acted as judges in the debate try-outs.—The Eureka Pegasus.

Bradley is planning to send a men's and women's debating team to the National Convention.—The Bradley Tech.

Monmouth has Bates and Cambridge on her schedule this year.—The Monmouth College Oracle.
Morningside has scheduled debates with South Dakota University, Ripon and Montana State. A three year contract was signed with the University of South Dakota which specifies that each debate is to be judged by five judges, four of whom will be members of the faculty of the home institution and the fifth the visiting debate coach.—The Collegian Reporter.

The Iowa Wesleyan chapter took charge of the chapel program at the beginning of the forensic season. A single sheet of lively debate news and take-offs was distributed. At the close of the meeting all interested in entering the forensic try-outs were invited to come forward. Over sixty responded.

Kansas Gamma, the Aggies, is broadcasting a special course of debate instruction on the Kansas high school question from the college radio station. The chapter there is so active that it meets for dinner and business every two weeks.—The Kansas State Collegian.

A series of inter-society debates have been conducted at Morningside. They will be followed by the inter-fraternity debates. Many of the college debaters will be selected from those appearing in these debates.—The Collegiate Reporter.

Stanley Garrity, Alexander Hotchkiss, Rednet Stone, Arthur Claussen, Harry Dawdy, Howard McCue, Dena Mae Harmon, Alice Wells, and Florence Eaton have been selected for the forensic teams at Washburn.—The Washburn Review.

Penn and Parsons will engage in an eight hour debate at Ottumwa. The debate coach at Iowa University will select three questions for them. They will decide on one of these eight hours before the debate.—The Portfolio.

"The Crime Situation in the United States" is the topic for the Iowa Extempore contest. The extempore and oratorical contests will be held at Parsons March 4 and 5.—The Portfolio.

Iowa Epsilon of Simpson is planning to send a woman orator, a man orator, two men debaters, and the debate coach to the national convention.—The Simpsonian.

Thru the efforts of the Iowa Alpha chapter the forensic budget at Iowa Wesleyan was increased over 70 per cent with probably further increases in sight.

Great interest is being displayed in forensics at Kansas Alpha this year. Candidates are hard at work.—The Ottawa Campus.

More than fifty candidates tried out for places on the debating teams at McKendree.—The McKendree Review.

Mary Packer, Indiana Alpha, was awarded the Pan-Hellenic Scholarship trophy at Franklin.—The Franklin.

More than forty candidates responded to the first call for try-outs at Western Union.—The Gleam.

Parsons debated the "grandchildren" question with the Cambridge debaters.—The Portfolio.

“For they yet but ear-kissing arguments.”—“King Lear”.

"The Forensic Of..."
UPPER IOWA HAS A CONVENTION FUND OF $475

Iowa Eta had thirty on its debate squad at the beginning of the forensic season, more than were out for any athletic team. The number includes eight men and three women of college experience.

Debating was allowed a budget of $600 at the beginning of the year. One hundred of this was set aside as a convention fund. To this has been added $3 in local dues and $6 initiation fee charged all IKΔ members. Then each of the nine delegates to the convention has been charge $25. Local graduates and alumni are being solicited for the $200 still needed to complete the fund.

A large thermometer has been placed in the college chapel to show the progress in raising the rest of this fund. – Claire C. F. Hoyt, President Iowa Eta.

At the close of the season last year Professor B. F. Ross of the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, was asked to pick the mythical conference debate teams for eastern Kansas and Western Missouri. He named the following. Men—John Moore, Park; Theodore Palmquist, Ottawa; Orlo Cowgill, College of Emporia; and Frank Morris, St. Marys, alternate. Women—Lucille Spencer, Emporia Teachers; Miss Swanson, Kansas Aggies; Miss Rowe, Washburn; and Miss Bates, Washburn, alternate. – News Letter of the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.

Lucille Spencer, Maurine Allen, Ava Jackson, Sarah Loomis, Orietta Bower, Maurine Karr, Florence Vosburg, Mary Hart, and Blanche McClun will represent Kansas Nu, the Teachers of Hays, in the Women's Pentagonal League. – The Leader.

Kansas Aggies and the Teachers of Pittsburg will debate before the Frontenac High School January 18. Frontenac, which is coached by Copeland Bowers, a former Pittsburg debater, won the state championship last year. – The Collegio.

George Sawalleshe, Bentley Barnabas, Archie Booth, Emil Brack, Zora Anderson, Madge Bryant, Mildred Dobson, Zora Gifford, and Helene Williams are the debaters who will represent Fairmount this year. – The Sunflower.

Fairmount, Kansas Epsilon, has given two performances of "Enter Madam" to raise funds to send a delegation to the national convention. – The Sunflower.

Alice Manuel will represent Sterling in the Women's State contest and Kenneth Porter will represent it in the Peace contest. – Ye Sterling Stir.

The Kansas Theta chapter at Pittsburg has scheduled debates with Ripon, Franklin, and the Kalamazoo Michigan Teachers. – The Collegio.

Recognition of the Soviet government of Russia is the question selected by the Kansas League of eight colleges. – The Wesleyan Advance.

Cash prizes of $25 and $15 have been secured for the winners of the oratorical contest at Kansas Teachers at Pittsburg. – The Collegio.

The Kansas Aggies freshmen opened the forensic season with Park College December 9. – The Kansas State Collegian.

Kansas Theta plans to send four men, four women, and a coach to the convention. – The Collegio.

Southwestern of Kansas plans to send 8 or 9 delegates to the convention.
“Resolved, that the family is an unnecessary element in the progress of civilization,” was the question upon which a debate was scheduled between the women of California and Stanford. President W. W. Campbell, when he learned of the debate the morning of the day it was scheduled, ordered it cancelled, stating that “academic freedom does not involve the right of any one to discuss any subject of his or her choice upon a University of California platform before an invited general public.” The debate council, after the action of the president, reaffirmed its approval of the question.—The New Student.

Kansas Aggies and Bethany opened the forensic season December 16 in a novel manner. In the afternoon the women engaged in an extemporaneous debate. The debaters were coached by a single student in each case but were without faculty supervision after they received the question two days before the debate. The men had a debate in the evening on the Soviet question.—The Bethany Messenger.

Sixteen men and nine women competed in the oratorical contests at Michigan Normal College. Carl W. Forsythe and Ruth Thompson were the winners, each receiving a $25 prize. They will represent Michigan Epsilon in the state contests.—The Normal College News.

Four Bates College men sailed for England May 10 to debate the universities of Liverpool, Oxford, Birmingham, Cambridge, and Manchester. The Americans are denying that all countries should recognize the Soviet government of Russia.—The Bates Alumnus.

Michigan State, Ames, and Purdue are to debate the following question: "Resolved, That the policy of centralizing power in the federal government of the United States is desirable."—Michigan State News.

Michigan State debated Cambridge on the question, "Resolved, That Democracy is a Failure." The ΠΚΔ chapter entertained the debaters after the contest.—Michigan State News.

A state oratorical association for college women has been completed in Kentucky. The present members are Georgetown, Berea, Transylvania, and Wesleyan.—The Georgetonian.

"We are making plans to attend the convention at Estes Park and also to enter the different contests."—Jesse Auton, Debate Manager, Kentucky Alpha, Georgetown.

Four students presented the World Court problem to the student body at the Emporia Teachers to aid them in their vote on the question.—The Bulletin.

The question of “Red” Grange turning professional was debated at Maine Alpha as one of the steps in uncovering new material.—The Colby Echo.

Kansas Iota has been conducting a series of debates as part of the tryouts for places on the debating teams.—College Days.

The Michigan Debating League will discuss the recognition of Soviet Russia.—The Olivet Echo.

Olivet is preparing to indulge in its first women’s debates this year.—The Olivet College Echo.
The Chicago Club of IIKΩ members held its first dinner-dance at the Edgewater Beach hotel December 9. Leland Case, special distinction from Macalester, now a graduate student in journalism at Northwestern University, was elected president of the group. Curtis D. MacDougall, Ripon, also a journalism student at Northwestern, was elected vice-president. C. L. MacLean, a teacher in the New Tier High School, is secretary; and O. H. Nicholson, formerly of Southwestern, Kansas Delta, treasurer.

It is planned to hold two more social functions during the school year. There are probably 200 former IIKΩ members in school in Chicago or living there. The officers are anxious to get in touch with them. Communications should be addressed to Mr. Case at 630 University Place, or Mr. MacLean, 2637 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Illinois.

The Michigan Epsilon chapter had charge of one of the regular chapel programs at Michigan State Normal College. It gave its plans for the forensic season, announced that it would send the best debaters to Estes Park, and called for candidates for the teams.—The Normal College News.

Central Missouri State Teachers will use mixed teams this year giving men and women an equal chance to make a place on any debate team. A comprehensive schedule is being worked out with probably a trip to the national convention.—The Student.

North Carolina State and Duke University are preparing a debate on the adoption of the Dawes suggestions for the Senate rules. The debate will probably be of the open forum type before some neutral audience.—The Technician.

Sixteen societies competed in the intersociety debates at St. Olaf. The college debaters are selected thru this system of debates. A college holiday was given for holding the debates.—The Manitou Messenger.

A debate league between the junior colleges of Kansas City, Missouri, Kansas City, Kansas, St. Joseph, and the freshmen-sophomores of William Jewell has been organized.—The William Jewell Student.

About 30 candidates reported for debate at Montana Alpha. This is a large number for a student enrollment of about 250. Six or seven delegates will be sent to Estes Park.—Capitol City Collegian.

For the first time in its history Hamline women will enter the field of intercollegiate debate. Two practice debates with Gustavus Adolphus have been scheduled.—The Hamline Oracle.

The Huron chapter was planning to send five delegates to Estes Park. The bank in which it had its funds failed. It is now trying to see what it can do to raise a new fund.

A freshman-sophomore debate is part of the organized competition between the underclassmen at Montana State.—The Weekly Exponent.

The sophomore girls at Nebraska Wesleyan won the interclass debate series, defeating the seniors in the final debate.—The Wesleyan.

Nebraska Zeta, Kearney, is undertaking the heaviest debate schedule it has ever attempted.—The Antelope.

Inter-class debates were part of the try-out system at Doane.—The Doane Owl.
Vinton Burt has been selected to represent North Dakota Alpha, Jamestown, in the national extempore contest at Estes Park. Bennie Gustafson, William McPherson, and Kroeze are the debating representatives elected by the chapter to attend the convention. A series of inter-society debates and some plays have been given to raise funds to send the delegation. Jamestown is inviting the next convention to North Dakota. It is evidently planning to have a good delegation present to issue the invitation to the other delegates.—Jamestown Collegian.

The Ohio Beta chapter at Heidelberg has organized a speakers bureau. It is distributing 1,500 circulars announcing the lectures and concert number members of the Heidelberg faculty are prepared to give. In addition the chapter is furnishing experienced debaters as judges for the high school contests. One debating conference has already voted to use none but experienced college debaters for judges.—The Kilikilik.

The following women have been named for the debating squad at South Dakota Alpha: Alice Bauman, Ruth Wilcox, Marion Douglas, Irene Frahm, Lois Crouch, Mildred Knebel, Elvera Kron, Ruth McVay, Alice Friend, Catherine Morgan, Margaret Courtney, and Vera Trimble.—The Phreno Cosmian.

The freshmen teams of South Dakota are debating the question of the state operation of the cement plant there. Huron and Wesleyan freshmen have met twice once before the Kiwanis Club of Mitchell and the other time before the Lion's Club of Huron.—The Huron Alphomega.

"According to plans being formulated by the IIKΔ members S. F. C. will send a debate team, an orator, and an extempore speaker out to the convention. The trip will be a mighty fine prize to work for."

—The Sioux Falls Stylus.

John Sinclair won the $15 Flanagan debate prize at Yankton. Paul Simons won the second prize of $10. The $10 Saunders prize open only to freshmen was won by David Tschetter.—The Yankton Student.

Cecil Gilkinson with the oration, "The Soul of Genius," won the $25 Lay oratorical prize at Yankton and will represent the college in the state contest.—The Yankton Student.

Carmi Lawrence will represent Augustana in the South Dakota Old Line contest and Arthur Berdahl in the Peace contest.—The Augustana Mirror.

Ohio Beta, Heidelberg, plans to send a debate team an orator, and the debate coach to the national convention.—The Kilikilik.

The Oklahoma Delta chapter at Northwestern Teachers is giving a drama to raise a convention fund. It expects to send three delegates.

Oregon Alpha is planning to send a team on a big debate trip this spring.—The Linfield Review.

It costs a quarter to miss one of the regular fortnightly debate meetings at South Dakota Zeta and a penny a minute to be late.—The Exponent.

Macalester plans to send a men's and women's debate team to the convention tournament.—The Mac Weekly.

Thirty-four candidates appeared for debate at Texas Alpha.—The Megaphone.