President Foght Welcomes Pi Kappa Delta

To the Delegates of the National Pi Kappa Delta Convention convening at Wichita, Kansas.

Dear fellow members of Pi Kappa Delta:

I take great pleasure in extending to you the welcome of the University of Wichita for the occasion of your forthcoming biennial convention. The faculty and students of the University are very happy to place themselves at your service during your sojourn here in the sunny Southwest. The City Government and citizens of this, the boasted Air Capital of the United States, join hands with us to make your days here happy and profitable.

The University of Wichita, and the municipality to which it belongs, will leave no stone unturned to make this convention one of the most successful in the history of Pi Kappa Delta up to the present time. Believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

H. W. FOGHT,
President.
OUR NATIONAL CONVENTION WILL BE IN ABLE HANDS

We find it hard to believe that the R. R. of Prof. George R. R. Pflaum's name does not stand for Railroad. We do not mean that his methods suggest such an idea. Thinkless the thought! We have in mind rather his efficiency. Possibly the "George" of him accounts for the services accomplished. When Prexy Veatch "asked George to do it," as our National Convention Chairman he evidently knew his man. Unless we are much mistaken things are going to go right in our Wichita set-up.

GEORGE R. R. PFLAUM

President Veatch's Message

See You In Wichita
VEATCH AND FINLEY TO HAVE CHARGE OF DEBATE

Our National Secretary-Treasurer, who worries about all of us more or less from one National Convention to the next, deserves a rest, but the President says there is no rest for the righteous, and proceeds to name Prof. George W. Finley (another “George” by the way, wonder if W stands for Willing, or, quite as likely, Work?) as his right hand man to assist in the management of the Debate Tournament. With that duo in charge of debate we refuse to be further concerned about that department of the contest schedule.

MARSH TO HEAD AMENDMENT COMMITTEE

In appointing Prof. Chas. A. Marsh of the University of California at Los Angeles, chairman of the Constitutional Amendment Committee, President Veatch named the choice for this important post of more than himself. Mr. Marsh, as a pioneer and relentless worker for the promotion of Pi Kappa Delta affairs, is the right man for this responsible duty. Please note that all suggestions for changes in the Constitution should reach him before he leaves Los Angeles for the convention.
HOPKINS IN CHARGE OF ORATORY

Prof. H. D. Hopkins, whose efficiency at the last National Convention labeled him as a valuable man for P. K. D. occasions, will direct the contests in Oratory.

COUNSEL COON WILL MANAGE EXTEMPORNE BOUTS

We presume there are some of the Old Guard who frequent National Conventions who may have gained the impression that our National Counsel J. D. Coon attends these big occasions merely to speak at the big jubilee banquet, and lend honor and dignity to the occasion. We admit that it is partly his fault if such an idea is abroad, for 'tis a fact about the humor and dignity; and we'll ask with you, what the banquet would be like without him?

However, the ultimatum "he who does not toil neither shall spin yarns around the festive board" has been issued from Washington (Pullman) and J. D. must snap into it, so to speak. His chief responsibility shall be to see that the extempore speakers have their full share of opportunities. When we remember his work in this branch of activity two years ago at Heidelberg, little uneasiness for the complete success of this department will remain.
OTHER DIGNITARIES AT THE CONVENTION

In addition to Prof. A. Craig Baird of Iowa University, who will speak to the general assembly of the Convention, there will be present National President Houk of Delta Sigma Rho, Prof. Alfred Westfall, former President of Pi Kappa Delta and Editor of the Forensic, and Dean Hill of Kansas State. National Secretary of Tau Kappa Alpha is also invited.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE HONORED

Popular Kansas Journalist Elected to Membership in Kansas Zeta Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta

By BEULAH SAFFER, Kansas Zeta.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE, loved by the people of his birthplace and at home at Emporia, Kansas, as well as by all who know him, editor of the Emporia Gazette, a nationally and internationally known figure, has been elected to membership in the Zeta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta at the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.

The short explanation offered in "Who's Who" would be a scant introduction to the new member of Pi Kappa Delta. "Born February 10, 1868," this condensed biography states, but the full significance of the ripe years of his life becomes apparent when a roomful of junior high school youngsters announced that "today William Allen White is sixty years old." They have not forgotten, nor will they forget the man who renewed childhood experiences in "The Court of Boyville."

"Proprietor and editor of the Emporia Daily and Weekly Gazette," further continues the chronicle, but an editorial written on January 1, 1907, gives a clearer picture of the new editor. "Twelve years ago today a skinny young man with a guilty grin on his face put a hand to his mouth to hide a snicker as he pocketed $3,000 in cash from a brash-looking young chap in his
twenties, and after the skinny young man had gone around the corner to laugh, the brash-looking chap took formal possession of this paper; thus the Gazette passed from W. Y. Morgan to its present owner."

The articles of William Allen White continued to attract attention and gain response, whether he was enumerating the qualities desired in a horse which he wished to purchase (this particular horse, by the way, carried Mrs. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Roosevelt about Emporia to the embarrassment of the few who owned automobiles), or whether he was lashing populism as in the editorial, "What’s the Matter with Kansas?" The latter article was used as a campaign document in the presidential election of 1896 and was attributed to have been instrumental in electing the president of that year.
The wish of William Allen White that he might always sign “from Emporia” after his name came to be true and his many duties have not changed his place of living. Another look into “Who’s Who” would inform the reader that he was appointed by the Red Cross in 1917 as an observer in France, a delegate to the Russian conference at Prinkipo in 1919, a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, member of the Institution of Pacific Relations, and of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, vice president of the American Forestry Association and has a membership in the following clubs: Century (New York), Colony (Cambridge), Cosmos (Washington), University of Chicago.

Mr. White’s latest appointment comes from President Hoover. He is a member of the commission which will go to Haiti to investigate conditions there. Mr. White is the only member west of the Alleghenies to be appointed to this commission.

He has written twelve successful books. They are “The Real Issue and Other Stories,” “The Court of Boyville,” “Stratagems and Spoils,” “In Our Town,” “A Certain Rich Man,” “The Old Order Changeth,” “God’s Puppets,” “In the Heart of a Fool,” “The Martial Adventures of Henry and Me,” “Life of Woodrow Wilson,” “Life of Calvin Coolidge,” and “Masks in a Pageant.”

Increasing distinction has not lessened William Allen White’s desire to make his town more beautiful and he has kept young in spite of added duties thru his pleasure in the activities of young people. In the reply of what is to be done with the unusually brilliant college student, he writes humorously, “Opinions differ. Some think holding under the pump handle helps. Others favor making him a Phi Beta Kappa, and thus keeping him so busy with his keys that he won’t have time for other things. Often he is successfully jimmed by being just on the football team, but sometimes it takes athletics and a dash of calico to tame him. As a last resort, give him a whir on the college paper. That will bring down his grades to normal, but sometimes unsettles his mind.”

Most of the staff members of the Emporia Gazette are young people. The editor of the paper likes to take them and educate them to service on the paper and then if they wish to get jobs on larger newspapers he aids them. He has always been willing to sponsor enterprises at the Teachers College. The members of the Zeta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta feel that it is a great honor to have William Allen White a member of the organization.
Those Convention Expenses

The January Forensic contained a tentative statement of probable convention expenses for each delegate. Here's the latest on this important topic. It differs only slightly from the figures given at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration fee</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal tickets for four evening meals</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation in Wichita</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel room for six nights</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other meals</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The registration fee is required of all delegates. It covers the expenses of the convention banquet, the social evening planned for, expenses of special speakers for the convention, and other incendials. The meal tickets for the four evening meals at the Broadview are provided for the convenience and pleasure of the delegates. It is hoped that everybody, even our Wichita friends and hosts, will arrange to take the evening meal with the "gang." This is going to be one of the finest features of the convention. The transportation to and from the University will not be needed, of course, by those who have their own means of travel.

Noble & Noble to Publish Our Annuals

"Winning Debates and Orations," Volumes I and II, have been so well received that the publication has been taken over by no less a publishing house than Noble & Noble, of New York City. This is the house that already handles the series, "Intercollegiate Debates," Volume 10 of which is just off the press. The company has taken over our old stock and will publish Volume III for us in the spring. If you don't already have copies of the first two volumes, order at once from Noble & Noble, 76 Fifth Ave., New York City. The price is $1.00.
IT IS SAID that opportunity knocks more than once but I rather doubt it. If, by chance, you are neglecting to avail yourself of the opportunity of attending the National Pi Kappa Delta Tournament at Wichita, March 31 to April 4, you will be missing the biggest convention that Pi Kappa Delta has ever had. We are led to state, on good authority, that over six hundred will be in attendance. I have just returned from Wichita where I have again been checking up and reviewing convention plans, and everything looks very promising. There is no doubt but what we will have a big time. Be sure you do not miss this convention. May I call your attention to the following points:

First, plan to be there and to bring as many of your alumni members as you can because this is a homecoming tournament.

Second, decide right now that you participate in all activities wholeheartedly and do all in your power to make the convention a success.

Third, if you are a coach or a forensic director, come determined to do your bit in helping to judge contests, serve on committees, or anything that may be required of you for the good of the order.

Fourth, see if you can not plan some convention stunt that will advertise your chapter and prepare to present that stunt some evening during the dinner hour.

Fifth, make an effort to be present at each evening meal which we will enjoy as an entire convention in the roof garden of the hotel. We want everyone to attend these evening meals every evening during the entire week. This will be one of the biggest features of the convention.

Sixth, do not fail to call upon me for anything that I may be able to do to help you enjoy your stay in Wichita. Please give me the pleasure of meeting you personally at the convention.

See you any time or all the time in Wichita, March 31 to April 4.
How Many Will Attend The National Convention?

How many will attend the National Convention Tournament to be held at Wichita? Professor Pflaum, our convention chairman in charge of general arrangements, says there will be six hundred and that there is room for more.

Professor Finley, our National Secretary-Treasurer, has available registration information including registration figures up to February 7, from which he is able to give us the following totals for the various states. Additional registrations will no doubt come in, as there are here represented only 88 chapters of the 132.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Colleges</th>
<th>Number of Delegates</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Colleges</th>
<th>Number of Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28 states</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that Kansas leads by a wide margin, having almost twice as many delegates as its nearest competitor Texas. Nebraska, Iowa, and South Dakota follow closely with large delegations. Distant sunny (?) California is scheduled to send 12.

SEE YOU AT WICHITA
ANY changes in the regulations of the 1930 National Intercollegiate Oratorical Contest on the Constitution have been announced by the director of this year's contest.

The ten minute limit has been abandoned and a word limit of 1500 words has been set. The total amount of the prizes remains $5,000, the lowest prize being raised, however, to $400, but the first prize remains at $1,500, and the second at $1,000.

A new list of subjects, more in keeping with the maturity of college men and women, has been announced. The 1930 subjects are:

- The Constitution of the United States
- Constitutional Ideals
- Constitutional Duties
- Constitutional Aspirations
- The Constitution and the Supreme Court
- The Place of Constitutional Law in American Life
- The Constitution and National Progress
- The Constitution and Contemporary Executive Practices
- The Constitution and American Economic Policies
- Constitutional Incentives to Individual Initiative
- Constitutional Guarantees to All American Citizens
- The Constitution and International Affairs
- American Youth and the Constitution
- The Constitution and its Founders

This contest was inaugurated and is conducted by the Better America Federation of California. The finals will be held June 19 at Los Angeles. The entries close March 25 and each college or university should have selected its orator by April 15. Information concerning the details of the contest may be obtained from P. Caspar Harvey, Director of the Contest, Liberty, Mo.

Although March 25 is the closing date for entries already 81 colleges and universities from 29 states have registered.

The competition for the greatest forensic honor open to college students in America will doubtless bring together this year the largest group of colleges and universities in any project of
the kind in the history of American higher education, according to the announcement made at the national headquarters.

The nation-wide interest in this contest is seen from the distribution of the 35 prize winning national finalists during the last five years among 32 schools in 20 states as follows:

### NATIONAL WINNERS—1925
(Over 300 colleges and universities participated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wight E. Bakks</td>
<td>Northwestern University, Illinois</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George A. Creitz</td>
<td>Franklin and Marshall College, Pa.</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William M. Ryan</td>
<td>St. Edwards University, Texas</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward T. Barret</td>
<td>Canisius College, New York</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack P. McGuire</td>
<td>University of Oregon, Oregon</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Duane Squires</td>
<td>University of North Dakota, N. D.</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence M. Gifford</td>
<td>Wesleyan University, Connecticut</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATIONAL WINNERS—1926
(Over 400 colleges and universities participated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles T. Murphy</td>
<td>Fordham University, New York</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth Meyer</td>
<td>Pomona College, California</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas F. Kelly</td>
<td>Harvard University, Massachusetts</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip N. Krasns</td>
<td>University of Michigan, Mich.</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vance Graham</td>
<td>Denver University, Colorado</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Burns Drum</td>
<td>Bucknell University, Pa.</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Tarrant</td>
<td>University of Virginia, Va.</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATIONAL WINNERS—1927
(Over 500 colleges and universities participated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. J. Oberholzer</td>
<td>North Carolina State College, N. C.</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur L. Syvertson</td>
<td>University of So. California, Calif.</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy M. Ray</td>
<td>Northwestern University, Illinois</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Beach</td>
<td>Maryland University, Md.</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Cusack</td>
<td>Dartmouth College, New Hampshire</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David A. Moscovitz</td>
<td>Rutgers College, New Jersey</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max N. Kroloff</td>
<td>Morningside College, Iowa</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATIONAL WINNERS—1928
(Over 525 colleges and universities participated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Albert</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma, Okla.</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert E. Wenig</td>
<td>Stanford University, California</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan M. Frew</td>
<td>Davidson College, No. Carolina</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee F. Lybarger, Jr.</td>
<td>Bucknell University, Pa.</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Conley</td>
<td>Loyola University, Illinois</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip H. Glatfelter</td>
<td>Princeton University, New Jersey</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul V. Keyser</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NATIONAL WINNERS—1929
(Over 540 colleges and universities participated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lex King Souter</td>
<td>William Jewell College, Missouri</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert G. Goodwin</td>
<td>Wabash College, Indiana</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. McNeny</td>
<td>Santa Clara University, Calif.</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton H. Williams</td>
<td>Wesleyan University, Connecticut</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Smith</td>
<td>St. John's College, New York</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee R. Mercer</td>
<td>No. Carolina State College, N. C.</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benj. Ungerman</td>
<td>Syracuse University, New York</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on page 436)
THE VALUE OF MELODIous SPEECH

Contributed to The Emerson Quarterly
By HAMLIN GARLAND
American Academy of Arts and Letters

(Reprinted in the Forensic by Special Permission of Mr. Garland and The Emerson Quarterly)

IT IS NOW almost forty-five years since I came to Boston with all my Western r's full-blown upon me, to study English literature and English speech. Born in a border town of Irish, Scotch and New England ancestry, it was inevitable that I should have the verbal faults of both my houses, along with the effects of association with the sons and daughters of German and Scandinavian peasant neighbors.

My grandfather Garland, a small man, eloquent and devout, retained the State of Maine accent, while his wife, a woman of fine native endowment, brought with her to Wisconsin some of the niceties of Boston culture. My mother spoke softly and sang sweetly but my father's voice was a clarion, reedy and vibrant. After twenty years on the border little remained of his education in the theaters of Boston. My uncles, the McClintocks, had unschooled but pleasant voices, with something of a Scotch burr on their tongues and some of the actual phrases of the Old Country.

Our neighbors were mainly from Michigan, New York or New England and our teachers, also from the East, were country folk like ourselves and made but scanty headway against the squawk of flattened vowels, and the trill of over accentuated r's. It is probable that I never heard English spoken beautifully as well as correctly till in my sixteenth year Wendell Philipps came
to our little town to speak on "The Lost Arts." He might have included on his list the lost art of good speech so far as our region was concerned.

I mention all these details of my up-bringing because they were typical of that time and because they accounted for my harsh and unlovely quality when in 1884 I made application at the Boston University for the privilege of listening to Professor Dorchester's lectures on literature and at the Boston School of Oratory for instruction in the art of public speaking. I had acquired some skill in writing and a certain power of dramatic expression but I was still handicapped by the verbal raucosities of my early training. My harsh and reedy voice and my insistent r's proclaimed me the Mid-Westerner at once.

This reminds that I should have begun this address as Bernard Shaw is reported to have done when he faced the microphone for the first time, with a warning. "Do as I say, and not as I do," he said, and so I wish you to think of me, not as an exemplar of excellent diction, but as a good example of bad practices, an exponent of faults we should all try to avoid. I should be a great deal worse than I am, however, had I not begun instruction under the greatest master of English of that day.

Within a month after my landing in Boston, that dreary autumn afternoon, Edwin Booth was announced for a six weeks' engagement at the Boston Museum, and the Transcript stated that he would play an almost complete round of his greatest roles. Poor as I was, and I was poor; desperately poor, I determined to hear every one of his Shakespearean characters at least. Cutting my food bill down to forty-five cents per day, I permitted myself the criminal extravagance of a fifty cent standee ticket, and there I was on the opening night of "Hamlet," at the back of the last row of seats in the first balcony, a highly excited and worshipful listener.

It was in this theater that my father had sat high in the gallery to hear the elder Booth, but I, eager to get nearer to the great tragedian, was willing to stand and wait for the feast which was to come. Night after night I stood there, with eyes fixed on the stage below while Lear, Iago, Macbeth and Hamlet stepped from the shadow and re-enacted their tragic lives before me. What did it matter to me whether I had had one meal or
two so long as I could be the auditor and the spectator to such a pageant?

The inspiration of these hours can not be measured. They went beyond any conventional college instruction. Edwin Booth revealed to me the splendors of Shakespeare. He taught me as he had taught millions of others the power, the flexibility, the music of English speech. As the velvet smooth vibrant tones of his voice came pulsing up to me, I realized that I had never before heard my native tongue in its majesty and its beauty. For the first time I felt the full power of the great dramatist. Here was the magic and the melody of words. The precision of the great actor's enunciation, the justness of his emphasis, the subtlety of his intonation filled me with adoration and delight, and, when the final curtain fell, I stumbled down the stairway on benumbed feet and crept across the Common to my hall bedroom in a mist of vague resolution to excel, not as Booth excelled but in some other noble way. My brain was a tumult of imaginings. I wonder if any youth of today could be so affected by any actor or any play.

Night after night, I found my way to the same place in the balcony and at last the boy ushers came to know me and occasionally slipped me into a vacant seat for an act. One night some person in the front row had to leave before the end of the play, and one of the boys took me down to that vacant seat and so for one glorious hour I saw the great tragedian's face at closer range than I had ever hoped to enjoy. The play was "Macbeth," and no part of the subtlety, the melody, the tragic intensity of the lines eloped me. I perceived everything and forgot nothing. Like a sensitive plate my mind registered every gesture, every facial expression of the actor, and as I walked home, I repeated over and over some of the most glorious passages of this most poetic of plays.

"Duncan in his grave; After life's fitful fever, he sleeps well. Treason has done his worst; nor steel nor poison, malice domestic, foreign levy—nothing can touch him further."

These nights with Edwin Booth widened my world. They opened the book of Shakespeare to me. The actor was a conjurer. Under the spell of his voice the dead cold lines of print glowed with mysterious beauty. He brought the figures of the plays to life but above all he set for me a shining standard. I caught a glimpse of something universal in the majestic music of Hamlet's musings and the tragic confessions of Macbeth.
From that time forward, all readers, actors and orators were judged by the art of Edwin Booth.

As the years went on, I added other actors to the list of noble exemplars. Edward Willard, Charles Wyndham, Martin Harvey, Forbes-Robertson, Otis Skinner, Walter Hampden, Julia Marlowe, Mary Shaw, Edith Wynne Mattthison, Ruth Draper and others that I might name, carried forward the art of beautiful speech, but notwithstanding their influence, and the teaching of the schools, it still remains true that as a nation we use our voices badly. Our orators are harsh and nasal. Our actors raw in tone and slovenly in articulation.

What is the reason for these almost universal faults? It is quite simple. Most of us are nurtured in homes and communities where rude habits of speech abound. We are the sons and daughters of pioneers. It is not merely a question of the wrong pronunciation of words, it is a matter of local accent, of strident displeasing tone.

The English and French accuse “the dreadful American voice” and they are justified. There is an American voice and it is dreadful. The clanging voices of our tourists proclaim their origin. The best of our speakers when heard in Europe are inescapably American and that would not matter if they were not unpleasantly American.

I heard ex-President Taft make a delightful and diplomatic speech at the English Speaking Union, but I wished his voice were not so sharply nasal. At the Liberal Club I applauded Harry E. Fosdick for his most adroit and eloquent speech, but when the secretary said to me, “His American accent wears my ear,” I was forced to agree with him. The orator’s message would have been so much more effective had he possessed a little of the beauty of tone which Edwin Booth would have given it. Most of our orators make a bad showing in comparison with English orators. I am patriotic, but I do not believe in excusing a bad voice because it is American. I would have the American voice distinguished for its charm, not for its stridency.

Recognizing these national shortcomings, the American Academy of Arts and Letters some few years ago established a fund for the award of a medal for good diction on the stage, in the hope of influencing in some degree the use of better spoken English. This medal has been awarded to Walter Hampden, Edith Wynne Mattthison, Otis Skinner and Julia Marlowe, to the effect at least of calling attention to their fine voices and to the need of their example in an age of slovenly colloquialism.
During these four years the growing influence of the radio and the radio announcer became a subject of debate, and some of us advocated the establishment of a fund to provide a similar award for good diction on the radio. In an address announcing this medal, Dr. Nicholas Butler, president of the Academy, declared that “The preservation of our English speech in its purity is for the Academy a matter of high concern. To resist the inroads of carelessness, of slovenliness, of vulgarity and of nastiness is a task to which we must constantly and with every effort set our hand. On the stage, on the platform, from the pulpit and in the daily round of life’s conversation, English speech is to be preserved in its purity and revealed in its nobility. Those whose task it is to greet the public every day and almost every hour have unexampled opportunity to influence common usage among our people.”

With President Butler's statement of the importance of maintaining standards in speech, the members of the Academy were in full accord. To offer a medal for good diction on the radio was a logical sequence to the award of a medal for good diction on the stage, for the radio station, like the stage, has already become a nation-wide school in which the spoken word is the only medium. In the microphone with its army of speakers the Academy recognized a cultural combination of high importance, one that had especial value in teaching English to our lately arrived European immigrants.

The need of this instruction is great. Only those who travel widely in America know how polyglot our nation is. A very large percentage of our people speak a broken English. It is said that when the Continental Congress first assembled, its delegates had some difficulty in understanding one another. Jefferson’s accent was widely different from that of Samuel Adams. These sectional peculiarities still persist. In certain rural settlements of German, Russian, Scandinavian, French and Italian peasants only a sadly mangled English is heard and in our great cities there are swarms of tenement dwellers who never hear a correct English word except as it comes to them through the microphone. Even among our native citizens we have communities where the Yankee twang, the Southern drawl or the Mid-Western burr predominate.

All of our old-world visitors, from the Revolution down to the present, describe our “grinding r’s,” our “barbarous nasals” and our “distorted vowels” and yet we go on using these barbarities long after we have acquired distinction in the art of writ-
ing English. We have laid off certain rusticities in manner, but our Congressional orators are still uncultivated in tone because the communities from which they come are of that quality. Our Senators are as discordant vocally as they are politically. They represent their constituents in their voices as in their votes.

To be entirely fair, I suspect that a convention of college presidents, or of professors of English, would present some of these divergencies, for they too come from localities where peculiarities rather than excellencies prevail. It is highly probable that an assembly of teachers of public speaking might present marked divergences, especially in respect of tone.

Nevertheless standardization is the law of present day progress and the radio is its prophet. As the daily press tends to standardize the written word, so the microphone tends to standardize the use of the spoken word. It is useless to deplore this process. Your task and mine is to see that it proceeds along the highest possible plane. When you realize that it is possible for a single voice like that of President Hoover or Colonel Lindbergh to reach nearly eighty millions of people you can no longer ignore this agency.

What school of speech can compare in potency with the army of three thousand young men announcers who address more than half our population every hour of the day and night? Their voices entering the lamp-lit circle of fifteen million homes form an educational staff of almost inconceivable potentiality. They reach millions of individuals to whom no other school is open. They set standards and it is our duty to see that their standards are high, and they should be called upon to promote a better use of the spoken word. It was in the hope of influencing this tremendous agency for culture that the American Academy restricted its award for good diction on the radio to regular announcers of the radio stations.

Meanwhile, before the first year's audition had ended, another equally great instrumentality for standardization was demanding consideration. Suddenly, almost in a night, the silent drama took on voice. The photographed forms began to speak, and the producers at once realized that in order to retain their public the voices of the actors must be as pleasing as their moving pictures and, as the screen had made the forms and faces of movie stars familiar all over the world, so the sound film would
carry their voices wherever the English language was understood.

Granting that the radio and the talking pictures are the most powerful present day instruments for standardizing our common speech the question naturally arises: What shall the standard be? Manifestly it can not be British. The Oxford accent would not be acceptable to a majority of our own citizens and it is equally manifest that we should not promulgate the lingo of the New York subway. Our standard diction should not be that of Vermont, or Texas, the Middle West or any other locality. It should be a blend of the best usage of the Old World and the New.

In discussing this point with Douglas Fairbanks, we agreed that the best speakers of English we had ever known were those actors who had been trained on both sides of the Atlantic, men like Sir Charles Wyndham, Martin Harvey, Forbes-Robertson, Augustus Thomas and Walter Hampden, whose voices blended the music of the best English voice with the clarity and flexibility of the best American voice. Similarly the best women’s voices we have are those of Ruth Draper and Edith Wynne Matthison, who have had training on both continents.

If we can put such English on the radio, and on the talking film, we can teach the millions without their knowing it the power and the beauty of our common tongue. These two agencies, the microphone and the film, have inconceivable penetrating and correcting power. It is your duty as well as mine to hold them to their high responsibility as exemplars of spoken English.

Admitting that it will be difficult to find such voices I am certain they can be developed, for one of the greatest dramatic teachers in the East told me that his first talk with every freshman class was to smooth away their localisms. “Before I cast them in any play I make them aware of their vocal crudities, handicaps of which they are usually entirely unaware. I say to them. ‘Before you can characterize you must shake off your parochial accent.’” Every teacher of dramatics will confirm this. Theatrical managers still find it difficult to secure young American men who can speak like gentlemen. They employ those with an old world training.

When first the talking pictures success burst upon Hollywood, the producers turned in a panic to near-by teachers of speech, well aware that, no matter how beautifully their crude
little girls and raw young men photographed, they could not speak in character.

On this point we have the testimony of William De Mille who has put this point into print.

"It is interesting, and frequently appalling, to realize how much screen personality may be changed by the addition of voice. The actor's very appearance seems different. Many delightful young women lose all their charm the moment their voices are heard, stalwart 'he-men' may shed their virility with the first sentence they speak, the rolling Western r's give the lie to an otherwise excellent 'society' characterization, and uncultured enunciation destroys the illusion created by beauty. In very few cases does the voice of the screen idol satisfy 'fans' who for years have been imagining it.

"On the other hand, those players who have beauty of voice find a new world opened to them. No longer is it necessary to make personality one hundred percent visual. Actors who for years have been almost unnoticed may arrest attention vocally and convey to the public a charm of personality which they have been unable to do through the eyes alone. It is Judgment Day and many will be raised up while others are cast down."

The truth is displeasing speech is a handicap in any walk of life. A lawyer or business man may succeed in spite of an ugly tone but he is carrying a useless load. The young man or woman eager to succeed on the talking screen or the radio can not afford to cherish their local accent. When a speaker is only a voice, he must needs be a good voice. This is especially true of the radio which strips every singer and speaker of all adventitious aids. The voice of the actor on the screen must be in harmony with his character. The queen must not have the accent of a Texas cow-girl. When a romantic character employs a vulgar intonation he does himself as well as the character an injustice. This the talking motion picture producer now realizes.

You will understand that we are not working for the benefit of the radio speakers, or the actors, or the talking screen, we are saying that through these agencies we can blunt the accusation that all Americans have dreadful voices. When a cultivated American speaks English with the intonation of a European peasant he leads his hearers astray. The Old World immigrant is not trying to corrupt our speech, he is working to acquire it, and his great teachers are the public schools, the radio and the talking screen. Standardization does not mean the destruction
of individual charm, but it should mean the spread of correct and pleasing English speech.

The English managers of the radio took account of its effect on the common speech of England a year before the American Academy voted its award, but the Committee which the English appointed was purely advisory and dealt only with pronunciation of the word. It had nothing to say of accent or tone, although England has more than a score of local accents. The difference is in the status of the Cornishman who uses a vernacular and the American who speaks with a Mid-Western "flat a" and "hard r." The one is not a representative of England to the outside world while the other is held to be typically American. Our social system permits our badly educated men or women to carry an atrocious accent all over the globe. Education with us does not insure an educated manner of speaking. Some of the ablest men I know have detestable habits of speech. The cultivated Englishman on the other hand is unmistakably a man with a background. I don't know how John Masefield acquired his beautiful intonation, but Lord Balfour got his by inheritance and through early training. I am told that certain of the elementary schools in England foster a standard tone and that schools like Eton and Rugby foster a charming tone.

In listening to the members of Parliament I am always delighted by the colloquial ease of the speakers. It is true some are of the good old hesitating type but most of them, even those representing labor, speak in richly modulated voices. As I listen I compare them with our senators who with a few exceptions are raw and harsh, retaining local peculiarities of speech not pleasant to hear. As I sit in at New York banquets where speakers of other nationalities are mingled with our own, I find the American toastmaster almost always inferior in tone. Eloquent, ready, witty and full of humor as they often are, they sound "hick" in contrast with the cultivated Chinaman, Spanish-American or Englishman, unless our orators chance to be of the rank of John Finley, Bliss Perry and Augustus Thomas. The best political speaker of the campaign, so far as I listened in on the radio, was Senator Bingham of Connecticut. Most of the voices were bad. Nearly all the fine voices I know are the result of Old World contact. George Gray Barnard, Frank Chapman, John Finley, all have had training in Spain, France or England.

Why should a crude unpleasant speech predominate? After all our language is English, however much we may talk of mak-
ing it American. What warrant have we for debasing it? To glorify our slang and whang is not a very high plane of national intelligence. If we are to have an American English let us make it a musical English, not a whining flat corruption. How shall we do this when the majority of our people are without home-training in the art of speech?

Our hope is in the public schools, but how much attention can they give to the cultivation of a pleasing tone? They teach the pronunciation and the meaning of words but quality of tone is ignored for the reason that the teachers are themselves in most cases woefully unqualified or so over-worked that they can lend no aid in the development of charm.

Then come the universities with their departments of public speaking and the colleges with their dramatic departments but at their best they reach only a fraction of the students and few of them definitely teach the art I am trying to emphasize. For one reason or another nothing is done to lighten the vocal handicaps of the pupils, only in certain private schools of oratory like Emerson College is any part of this work attempted. The proof that it is not being done is to be found in the clamor of our people when brought together at receptions and dinners and teas.

The stage has been a great school but of late years, dominated by New York audiences and managers, most of our actors are no longer exemplars of good speech. In making our award for good diction next year we shall have some difficulty in finding a man on the stage who belongs to the class of Hampden or Otis Skinner. They are mostly careless mumblers, realistic reproducers of slovenly and unlovely speech. In order to find an actor to play the part of a gentleman, the managers look to England. In listening last year to a beautiful little play, "The Cradle Song," I was greatly pleased by the melodious, quietly authoritative voice of the actress who was Mother Superior of the cast. Later I was told that this was Mary Shaw. Hers was a colloquialism which was at once truthful and touched with nobility. She made me feel once again the decline in diction on the present day New York stage which largely caters to a people with no respect for the tradition of the English stage.

This brings me to a restatement of the great and growing influence of the radio which can not be upper Broadway. Like a great magazine it must be national, it must serve widely separated communities, and I am happy to state that the managers of the two greatest radio organizations, The National Broadcasting Company and the Columbia Broadcasting Company, are
co-operating most cordially with the American Academy in the effort to raise the standard of the announcers’ speech, for they realize he is to be a great factor in the inculcation of better spoken English.

Finally we now have the talking screen which is likely to dwarf all other agencies by the universality of its appeal and the direct inspiration of its actors. The boys and girls of today adore the movie stars as I, in my youth, adored Edwin Booth and Madame Modjeska. As I was instructed by those great artists, so the youth of today can be inspired by Douglas Fairbanks and Mary Pickford. There is magic in their silent dramas; let us hope there will be equal magic in their vocal films. It is heartening to be told that other producers for purely commercial reasons are hurrying to secure actors whose voices will harmonize with the characters they are to depict. It will not do to have the gorgeous picture queen utter her commands in the voice of a girl from the Wabash.

It is possible for the talking film to bring the voice of Walter Hampden and Ruth Draper to every nook and corner of America. The scope of this invention is limitless. It will carry the American language all over the world, along with American shoes, hats and cigarettes. It is because of the almost universal infiltration of the talking screen that it threatens to subordinate the legitimate stage. It offers seats within the reach of the many. Improvement is certain to result from such instruction. The radio speaker and the actor on the sound film will set new standards for such communities as magazines have set new standards for domestic architecture and interior decoration.

What is culture but a growth in comparative knowledge? In a community where standards of taste are local, excellencies are accidental, but as a single noble building in an ugly town establishes new measures of architectural value, putting the flimsy local shacks in their proper places, so a beautiful speaker either on the screen or over the air may be an inspiration to all those who are minded to put away their unlovely habits of speech.

Let no one fear a dead uniformity of excellence. There will be no loss of character when we abandon our faults. The mastery of speech technique will set the speaker free as the mastery of the painter’s technique sets the artist free. As a nation we can only gain by developing a melodious tongue. I urge upon you as representatives of the art of speech to take your mission

(Continued on page 436)
I AM ASKED to talk on “Salvaging Debate.” Salvaging debate implies a general shipwreck. It visualizes a crew of college debaters clinging to the masts, argumentation teachers casting out life lines, with perchance some educators, yea, even some speech brethren, standing idly on the beach. I need not quote statistics or cite evidence to remind you that the picture is a false one. The seas are still calm—if they can ever be calm where debating holds sway. But debating does need, if not salvaging or salvation, at least stimulation. Argument still has a stout heart, but it bears the scars of battle. Its accusers have damned it because it has spread far and wide the doctrine of competitive debate, because it has presumably harbored sophistry, because it has reversed the educational philosophy of analysis first and synthesis last, and because it has injected a never-say-die element into every discussion.

Where and how shall we apply the stimulant? Shall we speak of decisionless debates? Of tournaments? Of releasing attractive publicity? Of instituting compulsory attendance at debates? Of entertaining far-wandering teams? Of a string of victories? These programs properly managed will certainly augment the power of debate among the student-body politic. In any case, and here is the point of my speech, the ultimate source of reform must be in the class-
room. The true stimulus in debating will come from an efficient teacher of the subject. Let us focus on this teacher and his course.

Item one: The argumentation instructor is first of all a teacher and not a coach. His duties and privileges will and should include the direction of public teams. By training and temperament, however, he will also be an educator in the classroom.

Item two: The chief purpose or end of his course in the curriculum will be to teach oral controversy or discussion. As one interested in controversy he will have a vision of our democracy progressing through discussion to the solution of its recurrent problems of races and tariffs and peace pacts, industrial and international. This argumentation instructor will envisage his course as furnishing a technique in oral discussion for the free and fair handling of these issues. And I have said that his chief purpose should be to teach ORAL controversy, stressing the art of effective speech.

Item three: He will teach not simply technical debate but discussion as well. He will equip the lawyer of tomorrow and the debater of today. Even more to the point he will stress persuasion, public discussion, and committee discussion. Growing out of this suggestion is another one.

Item four: Our instructor will teach from the vantage ground of the newer philosophy of education, which calls for an identification of education with life and in this case for adjustment of the entire debating project to the needs of the world in which we live.

Item five: Our instructor will go at his teaching from the angle of the later psychology, especially social psychology, with much attention to the audience and to audience participation. (This suggestion means emphasis on audience voting.)

Item six: He will utilize in the classroom and in his direction of extra classroom debating the educational device of competition.

Item seven: His course will be robust in content. The weak will falter, but the strong will go forth with a serviceable tool and with open eyes.

Item eight: The students in this course will respect truth as a goal. They will lessen their prejudices and increase their skill in discrimination of arguments and attitudes.

Item nine: The students will develop systematic methods of investigation. They will have if not creative imaginations at
least added facility in analysis. These students will shun the merely spectacular, exhibitional, and strategic.

These nine recommendations mean that these students in company with their instructor will have a genuine educational experience. Such a course Emerson describes in his "American Scholar" when he speaks of types of American Colleges: "They can only serve us when they aim not to drill but to create; when they gather from far every ray of genius... and by concentrated fires, set the heart of their youth on flame."

If courses in public discussion are thus presented as an educational adventure for undergraduates, debating will continue to develop as an educational enterprise. It will draw to its self hardy souls among the students. Incidentally it will help us teachers who sometimes sit perched on our stools beset on one hand by decisionless debates and on the other by the critic judge.

---

University of Iowa Debate Team
Tours England

Information contained here was given us by the Service Bulletin of the University of Iowa

The University of Iowa engaged in its first debating tour of England in May, 1929, under the auspices of the National Student Federation of the United States and of the National Union of Students of Great Britain. These organizations sponsor each year one American University debating tour of Great Britain. The traveling expenses of the Iowa team were met by contributions from alumni members of Delta Sigma Rho, student organizations, Iowa Alumni, and friends of the University. Entertainment in England was provided by the various entertaining institutions.

The Iowa team, composed of Herschel G. Langdon, L1, Burton A. Miller, A4, and Louis F. Carroll, L3, engaged in nine debates with British universities, including Oxford and Cambridge. The discussions were conducted according to the British plan with an audience vote on the merits of the question, the argu-
ments of Iowa winning in seven out of the nine debates. The itinerary of the team as reported by Louis F. Carroll follows:

The three speakers left Iowa City on Tuesday, April 22. On Thursday they were entertained at luncheon at the Western Universities Club, New York, whereat they were photographed and interviewed by the press and otherwise treated beyond their ordinary stations in life. Thursday evening the team was entertained by the same group at a dinner theatre party. The three men sailed the following night, Friday, April 26, on the Cunard ship "Caronia."

May 4. Upon arrival at Plymouth, the team proceeded immediately to London by train (at 80 miles per hour) and were adequately and hospitably met at Paddington Station by representatives of the National Union of Students. Arrangement had been made to accommodate the men in private homes. They were particularly fortunate in their assignment to a charming and wealthy hostess, who provided them an entire floor including a sitting room, art gallery, and even a gas heater.

May 6. The first debate was held at London Day Training College, a normal college, at 4:30 Monday afternoon. It was preceded, as was subsequently found usual, by a deliberate and friendly stuffing of the speakers with tea and pastry. The College Union president asked to vary the program by holding impromptu debates upon a number of subjects. The Americans graciously consenting, brief debates were held on the topics "Matrimony should replace the classics in the college curriculum;" "The English climate leaves much to be desired;" and "This House favors a policy of reduction of naval armaments." The Iowa team conducted their side creditably, especially when opposing each other. The Americans adjourned to a dinner dance given by the American Universities Union at the English Speaking Union.

Carroll and Miller lunched with Lady Struthers, who is much interested in America and Americans. She has been hostess on occasion to every American ambassador to St. James since Choate.

Langdon lunched with Sir Ernest Benn in Fleet Street and received an autographed book from the famous publisher.

May 7. Luncheon with Mr. MacAdam, Secretary of the National Union of Students, followed by a matinee.

May 8. The Iowans went by train to Reading, 30 miles west of London. They were quartered in the Reading University men's dormitory, which looks like the original of the Iowa Quad-
rangle. They ate for the first time in an English university common dining hall. Their first glimpse of cricket was had in the afternoon and the unanimous conclusion was that it is not so much of a game as a gentlemanly endurance contest—i.e., after a day or two one captain is gentleman enough to call it off. In the evening reduction of naval armaments was debated. Iowa opposed the motion with two main speakers, which motion lost 200 to 100.


A magnificent dinner preceded the debate. The Oxford men were resplendent in tail coats and white vests. The hospitality was warm but the climate was not. Iowa debated again before a goodly union audience and a full gallery, on naval armaments. Two things were noteworthy: (1) that the second Oxford speaker spent his entire speech in upbraiding the Conservative party; (2) the main speakers were conducted from the hall after their speeches and given refreshments while the debate from the floor went on for two hours. The motion carried by a small margin.

The team lived in the colleges, each man in a different one. Langdon in St. John’s drew a gas heater and Miller in Christ’s Church had a nobleman’s room and a valet. Carroll lodged in Trinity College.

May 10. A short tour of Oxford and then north by train to Birmingham. Met by three jolly students, including a charming girl. Debated at 5:30 p.m. against reduction of naval armaments but the motion carried. No foreign team from America or England had won here in years. Here again most excellent private homes were opened to the Iowans.

May 11. Correspondence day. The team visited Birmingham U. and wrote letters. Attended the famous Civic Repertory Theatre in the evening.

May 12. A young lady and the Union President escorted the team by auto through the Shakespeare country. A delightful relaxing trip.

May 13. Traveled from Birmingham to Manchester. Quartered in a small hotel near the Manchester Union and immediately began filling the gas meters with English pennies. The team spent the afternoon by themselves inspecting the very large and somewhat drab city. The Union Committee entertained at a
smoker in the evening and did it well. The committee must spend much of its time rehearsing songs, for the renditions were polished and well memorized.

May 14. A good debate in the afternoon in which Iowa disapproved of nationalism. The opposition was “ragged” by the Union members, who were polite, however, to the visitors. The motion made by Iowa carried after some excellent speeches from the house. Here the procedure included two main speeches by each side, a prolonged discussion from the floor, and a final summation speech by each side. A banquet and a play entertained the guests after the debate.

May 15. To Newcastle-on-Tyne from Manchester across northern England. The team was met by the Union President, who introduced us to three young ladies, a hostess for each man. Thereafter the Iowans met only upon serious occasions. Through a mishap in the Prince of Wales’ schedule, the Iowa team visited Armstrong College a day behind him, but the hospitality had not been exhausted. Miller and Carroll had a ride to the mountains on the Scottish border. Langdon met an amateur photographer of note and became engrossed in a temporary hobby.

A splendid dinner-dance at the Union occupied the evening. The men and women at Armstrong were especially fine hosts and hostesses. The Americans found that the English girls could dance extremely well.

May 16. To the North-East Coast Exhibition just opened by the Prince. Major Seagrave’s car was an interesting exhibit. Then an after-tea debate on reduction of naval armaments—the best of the trip on that subject. Iowa, as usual, opposed a reduction and the motion lost by a small margin. The members voted by filing to the right and left of the house at the end of the debate.

May 17. Down the island to London. Miller and Langdon left immediately to go to a country place south of London. Carroll stayed in London and went to a farm near Ipswich for the Whitsunday holiday.

May 20. Monday. The team assembled and compared notes at Cambridge. As at Oxford, the men were quartered in colleges, Miller and Langdon in Trinity and Carroll in Kings. The weather was beautiful and Cambridge wove a spell about the visitors. The team went to Duxford, a Royal Flying Corps airport, for luncheon with the Commander, a magnificent fellow whom Miller and Langdon had met over the week-end. A very interesting show was put on by bombing and pursuit planes. In the evening
dinner in the common hall was followed by attendance at a play.

May 21. Another day of clock-work entertainment. Hats off to Mr. Stanley Brown, the chief clerk and ancient genius of the Cambridge Union, who is an arranger par excellence.

Tea with Lord Pentland, opponent of the Iowa team and vice-president of the Union, a fine young fellow studying engineering and cramming for exams when the Iowa boys broke in on him.

Debate in the evening after a fine dinner. This was an entertaining debate—at least to the Americans. The audience seemed to enjoy it too. Langdon was superb on this occasion.

May 22. Back to London and then to a debate with the London School of Economics on nationalism. The best serious debate of the tour. The audience was exceedingly cosmopolitan; one of the opponents of the motion, the president of the Union, was a Hungarian. The discussion involved the Balkans and trod on the toes of some of the Albanians and Serbs present. Verbal fireworks! The motion supported by Iowa carried.

May 23. Debate in the afternoon with the University College, London. The subject was again nationalism, Iowa affirmative. The motion carried.

May 25. To Geoffrey Hart’s beautiful country place southwest of London at Hampstead Heath for lunch and tea.

Dinner and bridge with Sir Harold and Lady Reckitt. Lady Reckitt was an American before her marriage and is a cousin of Secretary of State Stimson.

May 26: To Paris by the Imperial Airways in two hours and twenty minutes. Three days in Paris.

May 30. To London by boat and train. Election night and a great crowd in Piccadilly and Trafalgar. Some excitement but considering the intensity of the preliminary weeks’ campaigning the finale seemed somewhat tame.


The man who is worthy of being a leader of men will never complain of the stupidity of his helpers, of the ingratitude of mankind, or of the inappreciation of the public. These things are all a part of the great game of life, and to meet them and not go down before them in discouragement and defeat, is the final proof of power.—ELBERT HUBBARD.
Pi Kappa Delta Friendships

Pi Kappa Delta has become a thing of personality. It is more than a Constitution and By-Laws. It is more than its nine thousand members, more than its one hundred thirty-two chapters in thirty-three states. It is a large fellowship family, interested in the achievement and health of its household. When national winners are mentioned in any contest, I am interested in knowing whether they are members of Pi Kappa Delta. I have learned to expect P. K. D. representatives among such achievement groups.

I am glad there are other forensic honor organizations. More power to them. But in some respects Pi Kappa Delta is different from others. It is unique in its national convention tournament. Our organization would be much less effective in stimulating forensic endeavor without the biennial national competition. Certainly its fellowship phase would not be so well established.

This year's convention, with its opportunities for fellowship
each evening at dinner, will be especially enjoyable. These associations contribute to a sense of belonging.

Let us contribute to our happiness and to the opportunity for larger service by making sustaining friendships.

Our Pi Kappa Delta Convention at "the air capital of America" should be a friendship convention. Do you not agree with the poet that:

If you had all the land and gold
It were possible for man to hold;
And if on top of that could claim
The greatest share of earthly fame,
Yet had to live from day to day
Where neighbor never came your way,
You'd trade the gold you had to spend
To hear the greeting of a friend.

'Tis friends alone that make us rich
Not marble busts in glory's niche;
Not money, wisdom, strength or skill
With happiness our lives can fill;
With all of these we still would sigh
If neighbor never happened by
To share with us from sun to sun
The joys that our work has won.

Regardless of the many errors of omission or commission, as Editor of The Forensic, I can pass on to my successor the assurance of reward to him thru larger friendship. This fact proves that Pi Kappa Delta is more than a Constitution and By-Laws. It has become a thing of personality!

——

"POETIC JUSTICE" OR "IRONY OF FATE"

The South Dakota Theta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta was installed in the Madison State Teachers College on February 7. Debaters from this, our "baby" chapter, won two debates, one for the men and one for the women, over South Dakota State College. Professor George McCarty, editor of The Forensic and head of the Department of Speech at South Dakota State, was the installing officer of the new chapter. In compensation for his work both of his teams were defeated. J. D. Coon, National Counsel for Pi Kappa Delta, was the critic judge.
McCarty’s Open Letter to Pflaum

South Dakota State College
Brookings, South Dakota
Today and Now

Prof. George R. R. Pflaum
Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas.

Dear George:

THANKS AGAIN!!!

I greatly appreciate, and I am sure the “Brotherhood” generally appreciates, the original bibliography and now the supplement to it on our debate question. These are additional proofs to me of the efficiency and attitude of service on the part of George R. R. Pflaum.

I believe the six hundred other delegates of our one hundred and thirty-two chapters will want to meet and become better acquainted with our efficient Convention Chairman.

I have been wondering where the expression “let George do it” came from. I had supposed that “he who was first in war, first in peace,” had something to do with it. He may have started it, but I believe you have given it current emphasis.

Your cooperation has helped to make much less difficult, and more pleasant, my task as Editor of The Forensic.

Sincerely yours,

George McCarty.

MORE INTERNATIONAL DEBATES

Yale University debaters will sail for South America next June where they will debate South American teams in Spanish.

Expenses for the trip will be partially met by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The Yale debaters comprise a group entitled Centro Espanol de Yale. Their purpose is to improve their ability to understand the culture and conditions of the “other Americans,” in order to help foster friendly international relations.
SHOULD debates be judged and decisions given, or should we merely debate? The settlement of that question is not yet. The solution to Hamlet’s query addressed to himself was simple in comparison since he had only one person to convince—himself. Many remain unconvinced on both sides of this proposition. Or can we say “both sides?” Perhaps there are three sides to it—yours, mine and the wrong side.

In the January issue of “The Gavel,” the official publication of Delta Sigma Rho, honorary forensic society, most of the articles were on the subject of decision debates. Some writers say unequivocally and emphatically “Yes, decisions should be given,” while others quite as definitely pledge themselves to the opposite view; still others see virtue in variations in the form of audience opinion, split teams, open forum or a combination of two or more plans. Note the varied viewpoint suggested in these titles: (1) “Students Prefer Judged Debates;” (2) “Decisionless Debates Are Becoming Popular;” (3) “I Believe in Decisions;” (4) “Splitting the Teams Has Advantage;” (5) “I Prefer Decisions;” (6) “No-Decisions Are the Real Tests After All;” (7) “I Believe in Decisions;” (8) “Overcoming Dislikes for No-Decision Debates.”

Prof. Earl Wiley of Ohio State University believes that “the strength of American debating lies in its careful preparation, in its analysis and evidence,” and that “these important qualities are due to decision incentive.” He attaches little value to mere winning but would retain “the incentive engendered by the decision.” He apparently believes the incentive especially strong, and the decision valuable when given by a critic judge.

Prof. Shaw of Knox College would hang both the jury and the judge—especially the judge. We quote Prof. Shaw: “The one thing we exclude is the Olympian-browed judge, the superman critic from outside the community who poses as an expert or authority in determining debating skill.” But we believe you will want to read both Prof. Wiley and Prof. Shaw. Their articles follow:
"I have just had a poor season," confided one football coach to another. "The wolves are snapping at my heels. In such a situation what would you do?"

"I would shout like hell that football is primarily to develop character, not to win games," smiled back the man to whom the question was addressed.

The cagey old coach knew his psychology.

Debating is fundamentally competitive, and all competition leads to decision. The lawyer wins or loses his cause, the salesman wins or loses his prospect. The business of academic debate is to provide the student with training in the art of debate. To alter this objective is to make debating something other than it is. Without the competitive feature it may become an affable form of afterdinner speaking or a rough and tumble corner of Tin Pan Alley.

By a decision debate I have little reference to the decision itself; that is but the necessary evil attached to it. I refer to the incentive engendered by the decision. The fact that a judge, preferably an expert judge, is to be present at the debate, to weigh every argument presented, to scrutinize the evidence adduced, to analyze the issues emphasized, all means that the debaters go at their problems with greater care and diligence than when the debate is to be an open house affair. The fact that the decision is to be made becomes the generator that drives men forward to dig up the facts, to weigh and ponder the question, to talk it over with others.

The strength of American debating lies in its careful preparation, in its analysis and evidence. These important qualities are due, I believe, to the decision incentive.

The English debater is typically the non-decision debater. The weakness of this style of debating, it seems to me, is in analysis and evidence. He lacks the incentive of the decision to build up his case in these elements. But he develops compensating values. He speaks fluently. His humor is excellent, and his wit is often clever. He wins his audience, even away from the American debater; but he does it by force of speaking ability, not on solid argument. He founders all too often in the issues. His evidence often consists of poking fun at the earnest attempt of his American opponents to assemble evidence. He howls at statistics. Plainly, he is mystified and discomfitted by evidence.
The tendency of the non-decision debate is not toward the discovery of the truth of propositions. It is a tendency to change the color of American debating from one of argument into a form of afterdinner speaking and the *ad personam* style of the politician.

**OPEN FORUM DEBATING AT KNOX**

By PROF. WARREN CHOATE SHAW

Knox College

Knox College is committed permanently to the open-forum, no-judge system of inter-collegiate debate. Students, faculty, alumni, and towns-people are all enthusiastic for this new form of debating. Nothing but a long inter-regnum and a complete revolt in sentiment could force Knox to revert to the old system of meaningless decisions and artificially stimulated, partisan exhibitions of so-called skill in debating, which more often than not is mere skill in the declamation of second-hand argument.

We believe, at Knox, in substituting the term *no-judge*, for *no-decision*, in describing the negative phase of our debating system; because we really do ask for a decision, though this decision is never made a matter of record. It is always a decision on the case, and not on the merits of the debating; and it is expected from each member of our audiences.

The one thing we exclude is the Olympian-browed judge, the superman critic from outside the community, who poses as an expert or authority in determining debating skill. We care nothing for him or for his pretense; because we believe that usually he has no definite, accurate, and dependable standards of measurement for skill, and that persistently he rejects the only ultimate standard, which is—*Does the debater attain his alleged goal?*—*Does he create or maintain belief?* If the debater aims at any other goal than to create belief in what he says, then the whole performance is hypocrisy, sham, strut, and bombast. This, the whole Knox body has come to believe whole-heartedly and without reservation.

The no-judge feature of Knox debating is not that feature, however, upon which we depend to build enthusiasm. We get our enthusiasm from the open-forum element, which is conducted on the basis of cross-examination. Members of the audience cross-examine the debaters. There are no speeches from the audience—only questions. And the debaters are limited to answering questions; they, themselves, cannot ask questions.
That this method of debating at Knox is a success is attested by requests from business men’s and women’s luncheon clubs, year after year, to be given intercollegiate debate programs for afterdinner entertainment. Both on the college campus and in the down-town clubs, our open-forum discussions extend for an hour and sometimes for two hours beyond the conclusion of the formal debating.

The success of this method of open-forum debating depends as much on the chairman as on the debaters and the audience. The chairman must have something of the spirit of the ringmaster and the auctioneer. He must be skilled, not in suppressing, but in promoting, general discussion. If open-forum debating is to succeed generally, the fossilized, funereal chairman must give way to a red-blooded promoter of community discussion.

Knox is satisfied with its distinctive form of debating. We are not propagandists for it; but we are happy and prosperous in its use. If others care to adopt it, we shall be ready to congratulate them upon seeing a great light. If not, we shall proceed serenely on our course, utterly indifferent as to others, and confident that for us this method of debate is all that could be desired.

THE VALUE OF MELODIous SPEECH
(Continued from page 421)

seriously. Influence the individual pupil certainly, but beyond that, influence as you can, first the community in which you labor, second our schools, third the stage, fourth the radio, and last of all the talking screen. Through them you will be able to mollify the American language as it is spoken. You and your fellows all over America, should unite to falsify the accusation that America is a land of dreadful voices.

ORAEORICAL CONTEST ON THE CONSTITUTION
(Continued from page 419)

Please note that of the 5 annual contests already held, Pi Kappa Delta schools have won first place twice, H. J. Oberholzer winning for North Carolina State in 1927 and Lex King Souter winning for William Jewell College last year. Also in 1927 Max N. Kroloff, representing Morningside, won seventh place in the national finals, and last year Lee R. Mercer won sixth as a national finalist, speaking for North Carolina State.
THE ART OF GOOD SPEECH

Some of the Elemental and Important Things That Contstitute the Equipment of the Orator
Lecturer

By HENRY GAINES HAWN

Reprinted in The Forensic by special permission of the Platform World and of the author himself.

THE Public Speaker has three duties to perform: to be heard, to be understood, and to be attractively understood.

With any one of these elements of delivery wanting, he is not a public speaker, but a public nuisance. If these attributes had to be pre-natal characteristics, it were futile to enlarge upon them, and most discouraging to those who have the necessity or the urge to make public addresses. They can be acquired.

To begin with, all good speech depends upon good voice production. No matter how excellent is the subject matter of your speech, how perfect your grammar, how apt your diction (choice of words), how funny your jokes, how poetic your figures of speech—if your voice is nasal, raucous, gutteral, your delivery is offensive.

Good speech (private or public) depends upon good voice—but the reverse is true, good pronunciation gives good voice. Here let me drop into the first person singular, as I want to make none of my colleagues responsible for my conclusions. I do not believe in any mechanical training for the art of speech. The organs of speech cannot be consciously moved or adjusted except to a limited degree, i. e., the lower jaw, the lips and the tongue; but even here, no two of us make identical manipulations to produce any given sound. This is owing to the fact that no two mouths are alike in the conformation of the teeth, in the length or thickness of the tongue, or in the lip-form. When it comes

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Platform World is honored in being able to offer its readers an article by probably the greatest living authority on the art of speech—Dr. Henry Gaines Hawn of New York City. Every platformist and, indeed, every layman who is ever called on to "make a few remarks" will find the accompanying article of tremendous value if carefully studied and made a part of the reader's experience.
to the vowel sounds (the voice part of speech), we cannot be in the least conscious of the changes demanded in going from one vowel to any one of the sixteen qualities in English speech.

A striking illustration is that of a man with protruding upper teeth. His lips cannot be pressed together to give any of the labials “b,” “p,” “f,” “v,” but by using the upper teeth for a resisting surface, he can give these sounds perfectly; and generally does so unconsciously.

**Rouse Mental Ear**

The only mode for the training in speech is the arousing of the mental ear. Let a man hear the difference between “wotter” and “water,” between “motch” and “much,” between “tot” and “taught,” between “brast” and “breast,” and he will correct his own speech without knowing anything about the physical process; and in addition he will (again unconsciously) superinduce correct phonation or voice production. This has been an unfailing experience with me, in training actors, lawyers, clergymen and lecturers.

These sounds cannot be taught by any kind of diacritical marks; and it is self-evident that the duration of the qualities cannot be indicated by printed texts. One man drawls his vowels, another clips them.

To summarize: speech as regards both sound and duration must be imparted and acquired by oral illustration.

Thus, audibility is more a matter of purity of tone, correct vowel utterance, accent and clarity of enunciation than of loudness (volume).

**Must Be Understood**

But to be heard is not sufficient. A speaker should be understood. This is largely dependent upon giving proportional emphasis to words, to avoiding sentences of unusual length, and to the use of a vocabulary in common use among the people who compose a special audience. Nothing is more boring to a layman than to be forced to listen to a lecture filled with scientific or technical terms.

As to be an attractive speaker, any one who faces an audience with an honest purpose, to instruct or arouse, who neither condescends nor flatters, who has some mastery of speech technique, language, poise, position, gesture, who is earnest and sincere, who is not too “long-winded” or verbose, who varies his expression, who uses “eye service” by seeming to appeal to each
intelligence before him individually, can attain the reputation of being a good speaker—and be one in fact.

**Gestures Interpret Thought**

Gesture should be defined as any movement during the act of speaking. These gestures are of two kinds, personal and interpretive; and a law, never to be neglected, is this: **Never** use a personal gesture. By personal gesture is meant, for example, running the fingers through the hair, toying with the table implements, watch-chain, eye-glasses, the back of a chair, etc., etc. These movements, clearly, have no connection with what is being spoken by the speaker, and are confusing and often ludicrous. One of our best intentioned public speakers creates merriment by going through the motions of hitting a punching-bag every time he wishes to employ a gesture of emphasis.

Let your gestures be interpretive of your thought, or make none. Avoid filling in the pauses, if talking extempore, by such meaningless sounds as “rer, rer”—the favorite cry of despair of the after-dinner man called upon for a “few remarks.” What is more painful than “Rer, rer—Mr. Chairman, rer, rer—ladies and gentlemen: I am—rer, rer—asked—rer, rer,—etc?”

**Living Message in Demand**

Despite the radio and the printing press, there is more demand for, and delight in, a living message given by a living personality today than ever before. The sole trouble with speaking as a profession is this, that the bureaus foist upon their patrons, men and women, often of intrinsic merit, whose selling-point is not, primarily, that they are equipped platform speakers, but have an extraneous reputation as authors, poets, game hunters, scientists, etc., or (more deplorable still) are the sons of celebrated men.

My definition of a genius is this: “A man or woman endowed with sufficient talent to obey the laws of an art intuitively.” But, notice, they obey the laws of an art-form. As most of us are not geniuses, let us strive to learn these laws, remembering that Browning says, “Art was given for that. God lets us help each other so by lending our minds out.”
EMPATHY AS A PRINCIPLE IN EFFECTIVE SPEECH

By PROF. GEORGE McCARTY
Editor of The Forensic

“EMPATHY” may be defined as that force or influence growing out of action, whether of artist or acrobat, of musician, actor, interpreter, a jockey on the race course, or the man with the hoe, which, when observed, causes the observer to attempt to imitate. A comparatively recent thought in psychology holds that whatever is understood, whatever “gets over” to the listener or observer, whatever impresses him, does so by influencing him to try to do the thing observed.

This does not mean that he actually does the thing, but that he has the feeling as if he were doing it. Thus when we witness a pole-vaulter we find ourselves pushing up to clear the bar; we try to help the cross-country runner, nearly exhausted after a four-mile run, to carry on until past the goal tape, (if we have had the experience of the runner our muscular response as we try to help him may be much more pronounced); we strain with the competitors in a tug-of-war; in the tense scene as presented by the war movie “Wings,” we swerve and dip and “zoom up” to an advantageous altitude, in our effort to help escape from and to destroy the enemy, not only because we are in sympathy with the hero but also because by his facial expression and action he “let’s us in” on his concern for his safety; likewise in the film version of “Ben Hur” we strain at the oars with the galley slaves and feel the imprisoning chains at our ankles; the roar of the Niagara causes one to stand high and strong, as may the strength and massiveness of Notre Dame or the bigness of an occasion. We march in rhythmic swing with marching soldiers; one may drive from the back seat and be as tired as if he had actually driven.

Dr. Woolbert explains this as the “feeling in” (not the “feeling with”) of the observer. The “feeling with” he reminds us is sympathy, and empathy is quite a different matter. Certainly it is true, however, that the “feeling in” as Dr. Woolbert expresses it, or the experiencing, understanding, appreciating,
and the consequent attempt to be the thing observed, is heightened by fear or love for—sympathy with—the hero, as in the case of “Wings,” of Ben Hur and like emotional settings.

But the response is not merely a psychic reaction. Bodily changes actually take place involving physical organisms. It was from this notion that the modern theory of emotion came. A part of that theory states that we stimulate emotions by going through the movements characteristic of such emotion, that our feeling of the emotion is the feeling of the bodily changes that ensue, that the physical reaction produces the consciousness of the feeling.

The importance of the principle of empathy then, applied to speech, is evident. It is common knowledge that a speaker by a monotone, lack of interest, with a limp posture that goes with such mental attitude as he drones away, may actually induce sleep on the part of his audience—a sort of hypnotism. Conversely also, the energetic speaker who leans toward his audience, evidently interested in the thought presented as he emphasizes his thought, through action, not only in emphasis by increased volume, change of rate of speaking, etc., but also by physical action which may be observed, causes his hearers to be alert, if his action is appropriate to the thought presented. The response is a physical one, as an emphatic reaction. “Briefly stated,” says Professor Gray, “the proposition is this: Gestures call forth an emphatic reaction on the part of the audience; that is, there is a tendency on their part to go through the same movements as the speaker is going through; these actions, which are the actions characteristic of certain emotions tend to call up those emotions in the hearers. In this way, therefore, in addition to the matter of making images more definite and clear, gestures add to the emotional response of the audience.”

The least we can say regarding action is that it is extremely important for efficiency before nearly all types of audiences. The strictly academic group is perhaps the most notable exception. A group of scientists very much interested in the presentation of a scientific discovery do not require action on the part of the speaker that they may give their entire attention. The fact that they are extremely interested in the thought-content of the speaker, together with the fact that they are trained to habitual attention to that type of information, makes them a very different group from the average popular audience. Dr. Woolbert points out that in the case of college students busy taking notes of classroom lectures requires also a minimum of action
since because they are busy writing they do not see the speaker. They have no time to look up. Mr. Woolbert observes that “few audiences are compelled to listen under pain and punishment or privation.” Perhaps the best example of a case in which no action is necessary is that of radio speaking, yet even here suggested action is necessary if more than mere information is to be given. If shades of meaning in interpretation are required then action, in the broad sense, though not seen, may be manifest. Image-creating stimuli may be induced by the speaker, through emphasis in the form of volume, change of rate of speaking, and the pause. Also in the presentation over the radio of dramatic situations, various sounds indicating action are resorted to and make effective thru induced imagery the principle of empathy. Empathy, therefore, indirectly—if empathy may be indirect—becomes a force even in radio speaking. It must be remembered that action, when this type of radio presentation is made, is necessary if the audience is to be held. It is easy to turn the dial and get one of the 700 other broadcasting stations. The radio audience is notably one of the cases in which the audience is not compelled to listen.

If action, then, is so important, what shall it be? How much action shall one use? Of course, action must be appropriate if it is to produce stimuli which will create the desired response in the hearers, but the best rule, at least for beginners, seems to be to employ much action, of a varied kind in order to free the inhibitions of the speaker and to find himself through expression, in action of some kind. The basis of appropriate action is to do that which will appear to the observer to be right, not over-demonstrative, but sufficient to cause the hearers to feel that what is done is that which they would do if they could. The gracefulness or awkwardness of action, the strength or delicacy of it, depends upon the audience, the occasion, and the theme of the speaker. Effective action permits of every degree of strength and energy and their opposites. The actor or interpreter of Falstaff—the swaggering braggadocio Falstaff—may appear awkward and at times uncouth, but if to portray Falstaff, then the action is appropriate and not therefore overdone. Action of some kind and degree will be necessary for all but the unusual audience, whether the speaker’s proposition is to do the Mark Anthony act of inciting the mob to burn the homes of the conspirators or merely to inform on the day’s market reports—if the latter is to the interest of more than the farmers.
Before the speaker can be effective in action, even before he may feel the urge to gesture in any manner, he must have an emotional background. He must build up within himself the basis for emotional responses so that he may induce like responses in the minds of his hearers and observers. How may this be done? This basis of response involves one's whole training and experience and is too big a subject to treat adequately here. I wish to point out merely this, that if one is to interpret a selection, a knowledge of the life of the author, the circumstances under which he labored, his moods, something of the tragedy of his life, if there was such, may help one not only to get the author's thought but will build up in the speaker an appreciation for the message to be given. He will, by that cultural experience-appreciation background build up in his own consciousness a basis for emotional response. Stated briefly, he will stimulate himself emphatically.

In music, surely, a like value would result to the interpreter of a composition. For example, if the interpreter—the artist, knows that Schubert worked under very great hardships; that he was one of a large family living under dire poverty; that he labored under almost continual ill-health; that some of his colleagues who should have been able to appreciate and inspire, discouraged him instead, by their criticism and failure to see the greatness of his work; that he died at the age of 31 after a life of effort and tragic circumstances; that although he gave to the world great musical compositions which have inspired the hearts of peoples everywhere since his death, that at the time of his death he had barely $12.00—far too little to give one a decent burial—that artist knowing these and other facts, by having this basis of appreciation, this necessary background for the portraying in a more effective way the beauty of the great composer's contribution to the world, may hold attention, in part thru emphatic stimuli.

Perhaps the greatest enemy to effective speaking at the present time is the attitude so commonly held and often encouraged, in and out of classrooms, that emotions are rather an abnormal thing, that they are effeminate, that an honest expression of one's emotions tends to make one ridiculous, and like thought. Such a view is, of course, inimical to empathic reactions on the part of the speaker or audience. Walter Dill Scott says, (and it is a commonplace, at least amongst psychologists) that "if one is to move an audience he must first move himself."
JUST why it is that college debating has taken such a flop is a question well worth considering. It is not only of importance to that small circle in our schools today who are attempting to continue the tradition, but it is also of significance to outsiders who seek an insight into certain phases of our present civilization.

That interest in intercollegiate debating has declined is almost a truism. Its importance has varied almost inversely with the passage of time. With its increase in years its stature in comparison with other college interests has grown less, until today it scarcely leads in prominence the university social service organizations. Assuming there is a skeptic, let him face the facts. On May 2, 1893, a Harvard College team traveled to New Haven to meet the Yale University debaters on the question of a protective tariff. The affair was recognized by both students and towns-people as somewhat of a social event, and over a thousand jammed the small hall. This included the so-called “best people.” Presiding at the debate was the Honorable Chauncey M. Depew. The three judges were President Seth Low of Columbia, President Gates of Amherst, and Professor Smith of Columbia. Imagine, if you can, a college debate being assisted today by such a distinguished group of men. Moreover, this was not a wholly exceptional case. Three years later a similar meeting drew the assistance of the following gentlemen: Chairman, Hon. E. J. Phelps; Judges, Hon. Elihu Root of New York; Albert H. Shaw, Editor, Review of Reviews; Walter Hines Page, Editor, World’s Work.

Now come with me to another auditorium on an evening in the spring of 1928. Once again the representatives of Harvard
and Yale mount the rostrum. Once again a question of international significance is before the house. But what a house! The audience is composed of a few more than one hundred individuals, but most of these are present for a motive ulterior to that of hearing college students talk. Their real purpose, it must be granted, is to enable the morning newspapers to carry the story that the policies of a famous Italian have been successfully vindicated by the very learned representatives of Harvard University. The presiding officer as well as the official judges are men of capacity but not of more than local distinction. I venture to say that the speeches presented on this evening are comparable in quality with those which preceded by three decades, but the genuine interest which was so evident at that time has almost completely disappeared.

Of the reasons for this decay the college man, I believe, is responsible for but one. That is the fairly general suspicion that debating is a pretty immoral activity. This sentiment was early expressed by Theodore Roosevelt in his Autobiography: "Personally I have not the slightest sympathy with debating contests in which each side is arbitrarily assigned a given proposition and told to maintain it without the least reference to whether those maintaining it believe it or not. . . . The present method of carrying on debates on such subjects as 'Our Colonial Policy,' or 'The Needs of a Navy,' or 'The Proper Position of the Courts in Constitutional Questions,' encourages precisely the wrong attitude among those who take part in them. There is no effort to instill sincerity and intensity of conviction. . . . I am sorry I did not study elocution in college, but I am exceedingly glad that I did not take part in the type of debate in which stress is laid, not upon getting a speaker to think rightly, but on getting him to talk glibly on the side to which he is assigned, without regard either to what his convictions are or to what they ought to be."

Shortly after this appeared, debating was dropped from the list of subsidized activities at Harvard. Just a few days ago a professor told me that he believed the college had moved wisely, as he considered this form of forensic activity to be exceedingly detrimental to the morals of the participants. In vain I protested that he was thinking of debating as it was twenty or twenty-five years ago; that the practice of dual debates had made speaking against one's convictions unnecessary. My breath was wasted. The damage had been done. Hence a considerable share of the public suspects that the college speaker is, if not a hypocrite, at
least somewhat of a cynic, and that when he storms on the rostrum he is attempting to impart to them convictions which he himself does not share. Of course people who believe such things cease attending college debates, so this misunderstanding accounts for a few less people in the modern audience.

But the chief reasons for a decline in interest are attributable less to the failings of the student orator than to the changes in the conditions of our everyday life. The “Gay Nineties” were not one-twelfth as sporting as one might suspect, and there weren’t a tremendous number of places where respectable people might pass other than a homey evening. Consequently the college debate was a real recreation, with an appeal similar to that of Sunday meeting, where one might go and see hundreds of bald and hairy heads, meet friends and feel perfectly proper. Judge McCutcheon was there with his moustaches well waxed, and so was Mrs. Baker Belmont Jerome. Though the speeches were rarely interesting, one might go home with an excellent conscience.

Contrast that situation with the glamorous night life of today. Every town has its evening picture show, and many afford theater entertainment. The radio offers constant diversion at a trifling cost. The criteria of respectability have changed: there is greater informality, and with increasing prosperity the average person does not find himself confronted with the task of finding something to do, but rather of selecting something from a variety of offerings. Under such conditions college debating, at least as it is conducted now, must suffer. To attract sizeable crowds today a program must be either entertaining or of very great educational value. Unfortunately the college debate fulfills neither requirement. It has retained the stiff-collared formality of the Nineties while the rest of the world has donned knickers. It has remained dismally serious while competitors have entered the market peddling smiles. Yet neither is it, nor can it by its nature, hope to be a really good educational medium. A youth of twenty cannot in his spare moments over a period of two or three weeks accumulate and organize enough subject matter to enable him to contribute a great deal to the thought of the community. The public has come to know this. Moreover with the great increase in the number of college men the public has become more intimately acquainted with the breed, and though perhaps this familiarity has not provoked contempt, it at least has nullified any awe which once may have existed. No longer do people attend a debate simply for the thrill of seeing the college man in action.
You may counter that though these reasons may partially explain a decrease in the support of debating by outsiders, they are wholly insufficient to explain the fall in student attendance. Perhaps you were one of the throng that packed old Cornell Armory some thirty years ago, when the home team met a rival from the South. Maybe you recall that three-fourths of the student body attended that debate. Why, you ask, have those enrolled in the college withdrawn their support?

The answer to this question, although partially dependent on the factors already enumerated, is perhaps to an even greater degree affected by a changing conception of the importance of victory and by a significant trend of student philosophy towards individualism.

In the heyday of debating the rendering of the decision was almost universally conceded to be the big moment of the evening. It was for this, and this alone, that scores of students walked miles and sat for hours on hard-bottomed chairs. Almost any torture could be endured as long as there was a prospect of hearing the rumbling voice of the chairman announce that “Hoopsis is the winner.” Debating was a game, and the much maligned American victory “complex” was already making itself conspicuous. In at least one New England college, debating is still a game, and it is said that only a few months ago at the conclusion of one of these contests the chairman received the ballots from the judges, dashed to the pulpit, and beaming from ear to ear shouted, “Hurrah, we’ve won again!” But the novelty of winning is wearing off in most schools, and victory alone is hardly a sufficient inducement for attendance at a debate. If it is victory that you want you can attend football games, basketball games, crew races or any of a dozen other sports, and get your final thrill plus a great many in between. But if you are like most students, you are getting tired of this victory business, and are becoming more and more exacting of the content of your amusement. The content of the average college debate is today, as it has always been, rather unsatisfactory. Consequently there is no compensation for the loss of sporting appeal, and the attendance of students has been reduced.

Coupled with a decrease in the evaluation of victory has come a similar decrease in the social unity of the college. Perhaps it is because of increasing attendance; perhaps because of a changing philosophy due to other factors. At any rate the college man appears to be assuming a different attitude toward his school and his fellow students than was true thirty years ago. Some have blamed the war for it. Regardless of cause, the student of today
does not feel the moral obligation to attend group functions that was common at the period of his father’s education. A generation ago the college man considered it somewhat of a duty to spur the school’s representatives on to whatever they were striving after, even though his bit might only consist of warming a chair in the auditorium. The old speech that used to be made before every football game—“There are two parts to the team which meets Tate tomorrow. One part consists of eleven men on the field. The other part consists of you (invariably accompanied by a pointing of the finger) in the grandstands!”—conveyed a social philosophy which was generally accepted and which guaranteed a full dinner pail to every school activity. But for some reason or other this “We play,” and “We win,” spirit has come to be considered as a trifle ridiculous, and this shift in attitude has had an inevitable effect upon debating. No one longer feels obliged to sit through a dreary discussion of “Resolved: that the jury system should be abolished,” and consequently almost no one does.

This accumulation of factors has virtually prepared traditional debating for the embalmer. In its place there must be created a new type of intercollegiate speaking. Above all this must be made interesting. It should actually entertain, yet at the same time be informational and convincing. The better English teams have proved this to be possible. Also the ridiculous “We are wholly right and you are wholly wrong” attitude must be substituted by more liberal and fair-minded tactics. There is little reason why a team should not acknowledge the good points of its opponents provided it has nothing better to offer as a substitute. Above all the attitude that debating is a game in which victory is of supreme importance must go.

In an effort to re-orientate this speaking activity into the modern world various novelties are beginning to appear throughout the country. One Texas college is sending on tour a team which dresses in native, cow-puncher costume—“boots, spurs, chaps, ten gallon hat and all.” At the conclusion of the debate they present “twenty to thirty minutes of clean entertainment,” consisting of “cow-boy ballads, cow-boy stories, stories of the western country in which they live, and like items.” Although this appears to be a bit extreme, it is of cultural value, and constitutes a sincere attempt to make debating something more than a bore.

A West-coast college is also pioneering, and has devised the “Oregon Plan.” Each team is composed of two speakers. The
first speakers are allotted twenty minutes apiece in which to present the complete case for their side. Then the second speakers are allowed ten minutes each in which to cross-examine their opponents. The debate is concluded by ten-minute summaries. In this arrangement the period of cross-examination is actually exciting, and according to reports the schools which have adopted the plan are once more filling their auditoria for debates.

Whether intercollegiate forensics proceed to revive, or die a sullen death depends upon the success with which those interested in public speaking meet the new conditions resulting from a greatly increased competition in the field of evening amusements plus a changed attitude toward debating on the part of outsiders and students. If the decision element is minimized or abolished, and if debating is made genuinely interesting, then rejuvenation is possible. Otherwise the chairman's gavel and the inevitable pitcher of water must be relegated to the museum for the edification of future generations.

Is Training In Speech Practical?

A year or so ago a Midwestern university's extension school sent business men a questionnaire designed to indicate in which subjects, as offered by the school's curriculum, executives were most interested. The results were surprising. For of all the subjects in which the school offered courses . . . two stood out in demand above all the rest. They were public speaking and the writing of letters.—Reprinted by special permission from The Saturday Evening Post, copyright 1929 by The Curtis Publishing Company.
Do You Want a Job As Coach of Debating?

Several years ago a sort of "Placement Bureau" for well-prepared Pi Kappa Delta graduates was established. The national organization undertook to do what it could to help find coaching positions for students who desired them and who were prepared to fill them. Quite a number of students have been placed each year.

Until this year this work was handled through the National President’s office. This year it has been transferred to the office of the National Secretary. This office is now trying to get in touch with schools and colleges who are in need of a coach for 1930-31. The next thing we need is a list of Pi Kappa Delta men and women who would like to fill these positions. If you are interested write to Secretary Finley at once.

Are You Eligible For a Coaching Certificate?

Pi Kappa Delta grants coaching certificates to students who can meet the requirements. Here they are:

Whereas the student has participated in inter-collegiate forensics for at least three seasons, and whereas the student has successfully carried work in five hours of speech, including a course in argumentation and debate, and whereas the student has done superior work in all of his or her class work and can present recommendations as to character and personality from three members of the faculty, including the president;

Therefore Pi Kappa Delta gives the certificate of preparation for coaching forensics.

If you are eligible write to the National Secretary’s office for application blanks.

---

WATCH US GROW

Membership card No. 9649 issued to Joel L. Crouch, North Dakota Alpha, Jamestown College.

Last key, No. 6850, to Leonard R. Linsenmayer, General Chapter.
I AM THE TOWN where they quit having lectures two or three years ago. I don't know anything, I don't want to know anything, and I'd rather die than think.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

These one-man shows don't interest our folks none. They was a "Tom" show here once that stood 'em up, tho. And last lecture course they was a bunch of purty gals here that made some right good music, but Charlie Chaplin an' Buster Keaton is what our folks likes.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

Street carnivals clean up here, and there's a big sale for them kind o' picture cards you can't send thru the mail. We got four dance clubs. The bootleggers got plenty of money to run a course, but they don't want none. They say lectures is bad fer business.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

There was a young man buried here last week who died of starvation. He used to take subscriptions for magazines. Our high school boys an' girls are a great problem to us, and the preachers are all considerin' quitting their jobs.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

These shows that just has somebody talkin' is frosty. Our young folks want something snappy. They won't turn out to a lecture or to church, and the busiest man in town is the truant officer. Two of our best families is all stirred up over the arrest of their folks crap-shooting.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

What does a line o' talk get you? It won't bring no money into the town treasury, or buy you no clothes or saxophones or jazz. No fun in it.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

Them that wants education can go to school, and them that wants religion can go to church, can't they? And if anybody wants any other information, let 'em read it in a magazine, if they can find one in town besides Sex Slush.

I Am the Lectureless Town.

My motto is every feller fer himself an' the devil take the hindmost. Brownstown, seven miles away, has a lecture course, an' we got 12 more people than it has, altho it has a lot bigger schoolhouse. But what does schoolhouses get you?
TAU KAPPA ALPHA JUDGING PREFERENCE

We are indebted to Tau Kappa Alpha for information on preferred kinds of judging of debates. Replies from eighty-five colleges and universities disclosed the following division of opinions:

- Single expert judge, 31.
- Board of three judges, 22.
- No-decision, 15.
- Audience decision, 8.
- Audience decision, with votes before and after debate, with judgment hinging upon number of persons changing or modifying opinion, 3.
- Oregon system, 1.
- Two expert judges and third vote by audience decision, 2.
- Decision by radio audience, 1.
- Open forum, 2.

Page Marie Antoinette—We Must Borrow Her Fan

Mr. George McCarty, Editor
THE FORENSIC
State College Station
Brookings, S. Dak.

Dear Mr. McCarty:

I have just finished reading the January issue of The Forensic which your business Manager, Mr. G. W. Finley, has kindly sent me.

I am so impressed with its interesting articles and general makeup that I want to take my hat off to the Editor. Every page contains something that should be of interest to each one of your subscribers. I have never read any magazine that is so full of punch and pep. You have good reason to be proud of your work as Editor and your subscribers should be grateful for all the interesting news you give them in quarterly installments.

Here's hoping that the contest at Wichita will be the most successful one that has ever been held. I wish it were possible for me to be present.

Yours sincerely,

G. CLIFFORD NOBLE,
Noble & Noble, Publishers.

P. S. I am enclosing my check for a two-year's subscription.
A LUCKY “BREAK”

A college man—Dudley L. Harley, of Lehigh University, ’30—has won over many thousands of entrants in a national essay contest for $10,000. Harley, whose home is in Martinsburg, W. Va., is a candidate for a Rhodes scholarship from his home state, and expects to use his new wealth in furthering his education and his ambition to be a writer.

The essay which won the contest for the Lehigh undergraduate was composed, written and bound into book form during an enforced extension of his summer vacation, while both wrists were in splints. The wrists were broken in a fall from his horse and the fact that he could not return to school led to his decision to enter the contest. This apparently could be classed as a “lucky break.”

---

AMONG FORENSIC FOLK

If this section of THE FORENSIC contains no news of your chapter, let us hear from you.—The Editor.

---

California

Alpha

The U. of Redlands are to meet a debate team from the University of Hawaii on February 17.—U. of R. Campus.

Gamma

California Tech. won a unanimous decision over Whittier on February 13, upholding the affirmative of the disarmament question—The California Tech.

Delta

The College of the Pacific is participating in the Provincial Pi Kappa Delta meet. Other schools competing are: California Tech., Occidental, University of Redlands, U. of Cal. at Los Angeles. Contests will be held in debate, oratory and extemporaneous speaking.—Pacific Weekly.

Colorado

Beta

C. T. C. met a team from the U. of Colorado at Greeley February 14, debating Philippine Independence.—T. C. Mirror.

Gamma

The men’s debate team of the College of the Pacific, Stockton, California, will meet Western’s team at Gunnison, April 11, on their return from Wichita.—Top o’ the World.

Connecticut

Alpha

Connecticut A. C. teams are debating the following questions: 1. “Resolved, that the Canadian system of liquor control is preferable to that of the U. S.” 2. “Resolved, that the administration of Mussolini is beneficial to Italy.” 3. “Resolved, that the United States should recognize Soviet Russia.”—The Campus.
Alpha

Hilda Ragan, Wesleyan's representative in the woman's division of the Little Nineteen Oratorical contest held at Wesleyan February 14, won first place and Virgil Martin was awarded second place in the men's division. Other winners in the contest were as follows: Women's division — Katherine Cossun, Shurtleff, second; Blanche Davis, Illinois State Normal, third. Men's division — Donald Winbigler, Monmouth, first; Virgil Martin, Wesleyan, second; Atwood Reynolds, Illinois State Normal, third.—The Argus.

Zeta

Winning a majority of the votes of the judges, Donald Winbigler added to the line of Monmouth victories in the state oratorical contests by capturing the gold medal in the 1930 meet held at Wesleyan University, Bloomington. This marks the third straight year a Monmouth speaker has won the contest and the fifth win in the last six attempts. Winbigler's triumph was the most sweeping a local representative has enjoyed in many years. Of eight judgments rendered in the contest, he was the first choice of five and the second choice of the other three.—The Oracle.

Theta

The McKendree affirmative team overwhelmed the negative from Central Wesleyan College of Warrenton, Missouri, by the score of 46 to 0 in an audience decision, Monday evening, using the P. K. D. question.—The McKendree Review.

Lambda

Women's debate teams from Shurtleff College debated before the local Rotary Club of Alton, using the Illinois Women's question, "Resolved, that the chain store is a menace to public welfare."—Shurtleff Pioneer.
seventh consecutive year of the national contest in which more than 2,000,000 high school girls and boys participate annually. It is sponsored by forty newspapers in all parts of the country.—The Collegian.

Theta
K. S. T. C. of Pittsburg, Kansas, open their debate schedule February 6 to close with contests at the National Tournament.—The Collegian.

KENTUCKY
Gamma
Eugene Gough was the winner of the oratorical contest and Stuart Lester, Jr., of the essay contest of Kentucky Wesleyan on the subject, "Ten Years of Prohibition." This contest was entered into by all the colleges in Kentucky, being sponsored by the Anti-Saloon League of Kentucky. The aim of the contest was to promote greater interest in prohibition on the part of the students.—The Undercurrent.

MAINE
Alpha
Colby's debating team meets the varsity debating team of Boston University in Boston. The question will be the official Pi Kappa Delta question.—The Colby Echo.

MICHIGAN
Epsilon
The campus chapter of Pi Kappa Delta plans to send a men's debate team, a women's debate team and three other speakers in oratory and extempore speaking to the National Convention at Wichita.—Normal College News.

Zeta
Debates with the University of Detroit and Pennsylvania State College will feature the Detroit City forensic program this year. The schedule will be the most intensive ever attempted by a Detroit City squad. Twenty-five meetings have already been arranged for the six-week period from February 13 to March 25.—The Detroit Collegian.

MINNESOTA
Alpha
John Acker, former University of Minnesota debate star, who is at present working towards his master's degree in Speech at the University of Minnesota, has recently been appointed as coach of debate and oratory at Macalester for the remainder of the school year.—The Mac Weekly.

Gamma
Gustavus won a critic judge decision over Marquette University debating the P. K. D. question.—Gustavus Weekly.

Delta
Hamline's men and women's teams this year are composed of veteran debaters who are well able to represent their school. These students are willing to sacrifice their time and energies to represent Hamline; surely they deserve a hearing. Let's make this year "different" and pack the auditorium for the debates.—(From an editorial in "The Hamline Oracle")

MISSOURI
Alpha
Beginning on February 8 and lasting until the time for departure to the Wichita Convention, Westminster has a very heavy debate schedule.—The Fortnightly.

Gamma
Sam L. Meyer, veteran debater for Fayette College, is the captain of the debate squad.—Central College.

MONTANA
Beta
Montana State expects to meet colleges of Nebraska, Utah and Colorado enroute to Wichita.—The Weekly Exponent.
NEBRASKA

Gamma

Seven hundred and thirty miles of travel and three debates in two states constitute the record made by the men's affirmative team at Doane. Kansas State Agricultural College, William Jewell college, and Washburn college were the institutions invaded.—Doane Owl.

Delta

Hastings was scheduled to meet Wheaton College on the Disarmament issue February 21.—Hastings Collegian.

NORTH CAROLINA

Alpha

The State College affirmative debate team composed of E. W. Buchanan and M. B. Amos, won their second consecutive debate of the season when they defeated Wake Forest recently by a two-to-one decision. This was the same team which defeated the Albion speakers by a unanimous decision two weeks before.—The Technician.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alpha

Jamestown College met the University of North Dakota in debate before the Lions Club at Jamestown.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Beta

A debate team representing Huron College contested with a team from South Dakota State before a Presbyterian Church audience at Huron on the evening of February 16. The audience apparently was pleased with the disarmament discussion as a church program.—The Huron Alphomega.

Delta

Aaron Meckel, representing South Dakota State College in the annual extempore speaking contest, won first place. State College had the distinction of winning this contest a year ago also.—The Industrial Collegian.

Zeta

The Northern State Teachers College debate team composed of Rose Ranthum and Thelma Milnor, won a decision over a team from the Moorhead (Minnesota) State Teachers College on February 4.—The Exponent.

Eta

Three representatives, two in oratory and one in extempore speaking, competing in the annual state oratorical contests won two firsts and a second, respectively, giving them the high score, among the ten colleges, members of the state association. The cup annually awarded for high point placing was, therefore, awarded to Augustana College.—Augustana Mirror.

Theta

Eastern State Teachers College at Madison will send representatives to the National Convention to participate in all activities of the tournament. Eastern recently realized considerable profit from a seven-act vaudeville performance, said profit to go toward financing their trip to Wichita.—The Eastern.

TEXAS

Eta

In a recent issue of "The Campus Chat," there are listed several ex-students who were prominent in forensics during their college life, who are now highly successful in their chosen after-school work.—The Campus Chat.

SEE YOU AT WICHITA