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Can intercollegiate debate survive as a national activity or is it doomed to a period of regionalism and provincialism? This is a question with which we have found ourselves faced. We at Mississippi Southern believe that many of the values to be gained for students in intercollegiate debating are found by traveling to tournaments in other regions. Such travel enables students to meet representatives of other schools from quite diverse regions and through these experiences enables them to learn valuable lessons in the human relations problems of getting along with people with diversant views, of learning the feasibility of enjoyably participating with such people. We make a concerted effort to try as far as the obvious limitations of budget permit to carry as many of our debaters as possible to tournaments outside our immediate region.

Considering the high intellectual ability of the students who go out for debate, we feel that it is most certainly worthwhile to do all possible to guard against having the students develop in a provincialistic intellectual atmosphere. In most instances, our theory has proven correct. However, recent experiences have led us to raise the question we posed earlier.

Before proceeding further, we would like to point out, perhaps with some lack of modesty, that I am in a better position to comment on the problem we wish to discuss than most of us. Having debated as a student and undergone graduate training in the north and having coached for two years at the Wisconsin State College in River Falls before coming south, I certainly cannot be accused of having a strictly southern viewpoint. However, as Director of Public Address in one of the larger southern schools, I also am in a position where I can be sympathetic to the problems that many of my students have.

To illustrate the kind of problem that we are discussing, let me mention some of the experiences we had in a recent northern tournament. Some of the incidents verged on the ludicrous were it not for the ramifications that they may have on our activity. For example, we had one student participating in an individual event who faced a situation of having the faculty judge ridicule her pronunciation and speech pattern. We do not wish to suggest that by any means a judge should not feel free to offer criticism of diction since certainly any speech student should learn good diction, but it would appear to us that excessive ridicule taking the form of mockery is hardly called for on the part of a professionally trained person. The situation is made even more ludicrous by the fact that this student was not a Mississippian, but rather had come to us from North Virginia—at a point noticeably north of the school from which this particular judge came. This situation was heightened by the fact that this particular bit of mockery came before the speech as he called on the student.

After one debate the debaters returned to me with compliants which though, of course, I did not hear the critique and do not know to what extent their complaint is justified, merit consideration. Apparently, one of the judges, when given the opportunity for a verbal critique after the debate, instead of discussing the debate at all, launched into a harangue at our team attacking Mississippi political institutions with which he did not agree. This is, also, somewhat amusing in that the team that he was haranguing consisted of a debater from North Tennessee and another who was not a native of south Mississippi.

One begins to wonder whether one of our teams which consists of a student from New York City and another from Connecticut would also be attacked for their southern political views just because they happen to be representatives of our institution at a tournament. We do not object to people holding any view they may wish and we do not take the position that should any of our students support southern political institutions that they should not be forced to defend them. But, it is our belief that the de-
bate situation with the relatively unequal position of a judge holding a ballot is hardly the ideal position to launch into such a discussion. And, furthermore, it is distressing to find people entirely prejudged on the basis of what school they represent without the judges seeking to make any attempt to ascertain what their particular personal views happen to be (or for that matter paying any close attention to their diction before criticizing). It would seem only fair to suggest that if a person insisted on attacking the diction of a speaker, it might be well to listen to it first before doing so. We are not against criticism, we are not against constructive comment, we are against prejudice on the judge’s part when it influences his decision in a forensic event. We do not mean to suggest the majority of coaches engage in this sort of thing, but the few who do pose a very serious problem. After one judge goes out of his way to make it clear that he had been highly influenced by what he considers to be the racial attitudes of the people whom a particular group of students are representing, it is very difficult to convince these students that the judge’s comments, decisions, etc. are impartial, objective analysis of the events occurring in the debate or in any particular individual events round. This is not meant to be any sort of blanket criticism of coaches anywhere, but rather a call for all of us to re-examine our own reactions within the debate situation and to guard against allowing our prejudices to unfairly influence us either in the decisions we make or perhaps more importantly in the criticisms and comments that we offer.

When the students who travel are subjected to ridicule because they are traveling out of their region, then the educational values of such travel are lost and the activity will cease to be a national one. Consider specifically the problem that in carrying the students we are trying to get over some elements of provincialism and hyper-regionalism that some of the students may feel. Taking them into such a situation does not tend to make them more cosmopolitan in their attitudes but instead will make them, if anything, extremely defensive on things which they may not even wholly agree with, for faced with various kinds of bitter vituperations, almost any individual will seek to defend himself.

It is also interesting to note that, where-
Disappearing Research

JACK HOWE

This fall there appeared on the debate scene a modern refinement of the debate handbook about which I can no longer maintain silence. I am referring to the printed debate quotations which now present ready-made evidence to the debater on a four-by-six card. To me, these display a trend and pose a problem which only the united attitude of coaches can alter, and it is in the hopes of provoking a discussion of the subject that I am now writing.

Of the many values that debate experience provides for the student, certainly training in research must hold a high place in everyone’s scale. Not only should it supply training in ferreting out sources of information, but likewise in teaching that only by reading an entire article or book can one be sure a quotation is not being used out of context. Then, once evidence has been acquired, students should sharpen their powers of organization by constructing their own briefs and cases.

Years ago the debate handbook and I “squared off” against one another, but with the passage of time I have become reconciled to it as an existing evil (if not a “necessary” one). There was always the consolation, at least, that few teams were so poor as to be willing to admit their lack of personal research by lugging a handbook with them to the debate room; there was some satisfaction in knowing that most debaters were obliged to recopy the quotations from the handbooks onto cards, which meant that they at least had to read their evidence before the debate began.

This season, however, we are confronted with a new and more dangerous menace to genuine research. When the debater can purchase his research already printed on the very card from which he can read it during the debate and when such factory-prepared evidence can be used without fear of detection by judge or opponents, then a tremendous temptation has been placed in the path of sound debating.

It is well and good to say that debaters will use these cards merely as guides to their further reading and will check the validity of whatever they might wish to use in a debate. But don’t we know our debaters and their eagerness for victories well enough to know that they will not be overly conscientious in these respects? Cards will be purchased by the hundreds, placed in the files, and neither read nor checked until in the heat of the debate a glance at the card index accompanying these weapons indicates one which seems pertinent and it will be immediately introduced into the debate.

Similarly, it can be argued that small college libraries are inadequate for the debaters’ needs and must be supplemented. Yet, I would argue that inter-library loans and the purchase of select back issues of periodicals that are pertinent can equip a team for debate far better than such purchased evidence. In particular, if this is to be the argument in defense of such materials, then it is being confessed that the articles cited by the printed cards cannot and will not be checked as to authenticity, and the debater will be relying entirely upon the discretion and veracity of the publishing house which puts them out.

Again, someone might argue that research is not that important in debate and that the time saved for the debater can then be used on speech preparation and delivery. Yet, is it too fanciful to suppose that before long there will be obtainable on the market first affirmative and first negative speeches, legibly printed for easy reading and equipped with markings for gestures and voice inflection? Briefing has been unnecessary for years, since prepared briefs could be obtained; reading sources and accumulating cards is passé as of this year since quotations can be obtained already on the cards; surely speech construction has not long to wait before an enterprising publisher attacks it as well.

Perhaps I am unduly alarmed because at a recent tournament I noted a team with excellent potential using these cards. May-

(Continued on page 6)
During the last biennial Pi Kappa Delta convention at Bowling Green University in Ohio there was much muttering and grumbling about our Constitution. In large and small rooms, smoke-filled and otherwise, individuals by twos, threes and clusters queried the validity of many of the provisions of the document by which we govern ourselves.

Questions and statements such as these filled the air: “The National Council is the party in power,” “Why do you need such a long period of apprenticeship?,” “Is it necessary that the machinery roll in such a way that the Vice-President automatically becomes President?,” “The National Council members should not be immediately re-electable,” “So many business meetings are unnecessary,” “There should be more meetings, more meaningful,” “Membership requirements are too lax,” “The local chapters have too little say-so!” And so it went—often far into the night.

Many of these comments reflected sheer ignorance of the items at issue, others may be perceptive and perhaps should be pursued further.

This is not an open invitation to rifle the Constitution—far from it!

Now is the time to follow through on these grumblings. Is there light or merely heat? Study the Constitution. Examine it carefully. Peruse the history and the traditions of Pi Kappa Delta. If weakness is found, the area should be crystallized and considered in the provincial meetings, weighed pro and con, analyzed further—and, if accepted at the province stage, should be formally presented at the next national convention.

Our Constitution is not a static, but a living document. If it is any good at all, it can bear intensive perusal and keen analytical examination. However, it should grow organically—out of past experience.

The Pi Kappa Delta Constitution does reflect, as it should, our thriving vigorous organization. It serves as a guide for the present as well as for future growth. It shapes and is shaped by the past, present, and future.

In the pursuit of excellence, know your PKD Constitution.

**Disappearing Research**
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be I am overly excited because a fine coach from a good debate school shrugged off the appearance of these cards as a matter of no consequence. Maybe I am merely so conservative as to feel that change does not always connote progress nor labor-saving devices mean the good life for debaters. If there is a valid substitute for long hours of reading and research that does not detract from the quality of debating and the benefits of it for all concerned, then both my debaters and I would like to know about it.
The development of intellectual curiosity, from my point of view, is the paramount objective of real education and is the answer to the criticisms that are being directed toward American education. With intellectual curiosity we will not be content to accept an answer because it is an answer or a condition that has been with us. Instead, we will want to know the truth and replace hasty-judgments with decisions based on the intellectual pursuits of logical reasoning and scientific research.

To develop intellectual curiosity, we must learn to use our own brains instead of relying on the brains of others. We must develop the power of thought—the magic of the mind. We must know and beware of the fallacies of thought so that we may achieve a solidarity in our thinking. We must acquire the conviction of the essential beauty of truth as may be seen only through a fully disciplined mind.

I like the Pi Kappa Delta motto, “The art of persuasion, beautiful and just,” because its accomplishment bespeaks a student who has met the criteria of intellectual curiosity. I also like debate because it provides an avenue for meeting those criteria. If it were not so, why has inter-school debating survived in spite of the critics who have condemned and prophesied its death for more than a quarter of a century? Why else has it grown to the place where national news commentators, congressmen, and the president express interest in the proposition selected for debate; national magazines, newspapers and organizations publish special issues, articles, and books on the topic; and more thousands of students study, analyze, and organize arguments for participation in more thousands of debates than ever before in the history of civilized man? I like debate for the intellectual awakening and growth I’ve seen it bring about in students.

I am proud to be associated with an organization whose membership is composed of men and women united in the ideal of free speech—the art of persuasion, beautiful and just. For almost half a century, Pi Kappa Delta members through research, leadership, and service have nurtured, encouraged, and promoted higher ethics and increased proficiency in the use of the spoken word as the means of clarifying, guiding, and protecting the democratic processes of our American heritage.

I salute you for your desire for intellectual curiosity, knowing that the America of tomorrow will be safe in your hands and man will continue to enjoy the privilege of unsuppressed speech.
Nine Simple Ways for Coaches To Win Friends And Influence People At a Forensic Tournament

ELDON BAKER

Prof. Jack H. Howe of Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas, wrote Six Simple Ways to Lose a Debate in the January, 1957, issue of THE FORENSIC. Trusting that Prof. Howe’s article has produced noticeable results, my purpose is to shift the emphasis from debaters to coaches and present Nine Simple Ways for Coaches to Win Friends and Influence People at a Forensic Tournament.

During the past five years, most of us have been confronted with the subject “. . . win friends and influence people.” Books, books and more books have been written to remind us about this subject lest we become careless and forget. However, to my knowledge, no one has ever written specific suggestions on how coaches may win friends and influence people at a forensic tournament. Let the aspiring coach, therefore, take the following suggestions into consideration:

First, always complain about how far you had to walk across campus in order to arrive at the room in which you were scheduled to judge. Complaints on this matter may be directed toward any available student participants and timekeepers, but for maximum results, complain directly to the tournament director who is responsible for your discomfort. If the tournament director turns out to be a real friend, he will know better next year and schedule all events in the same building. Better yet, if you influence him strongly, he may decide not to hold the tournament next year at all.

Second, arrive five to ten minutes late for your judging assignment. This characteristic will show that you possess power since the event can’t start without you. Moreover, being late for an event keeps the timekeeper from asking that “awkward” question, “Are you the judge?” Once you get there, though, it is advisable to complain about the room temperature and acoustics before you signal the event to commence.

Third, always complain to other coaches and especially the tournament director about the types of ballots being used. This complaint indicates that you are a scholar in your field and usually elicits an academic response.

Fourth, complain to anyone who turns your way about the high cost and low quality of restaurant and living accommodations you have been subjected to during the tournament. This shows that your tastes are high but that you still hold an eye for thrift.

Fifth, shuffle your feet, gaze out the window, or cat nap during the rounds you judge. Don’t be conspicuous, but the early-morning and final rounds provide natural opportunities to display these manifestations of boredom. One word of caution is in order. When cat napping, be sure to doodle with your pencil as this gives the student participants the impression you are still commenting on the things you hear.

Sixth, it is essential that you tell the other coaches the various and new kinds of debate cases you have heard so far in the tournament. This shows that you are a good listener and eager to share the creativity and research of others. Since you don’t

(Continued on page 11)
The most satisfying feeling imaginable to a speaker is to leave the podium, after engaging in formal argument, assured that he has proved his point. The most flattering experience imaginable to a speaker is to discover that the audience has remained unimpressed.

A determinative factor in formal argument, whether it be presented at a civic gathering, in a private or employer-sponsored debate league, in a television or radio program on current events, in intercollegiate debates, or in political disputes, is the efficient and persuasive use of evidence. Often a speaker well armed with evidence will mount the rostrum confident that he can drive home his argument but finds that the audience for some reason remains cool to his appeal. Although he does not yet realize it, the manner in which he has presented the ample evidence he carried to the speaker’s stand has failed to convey its content. In some cases, poor use of “good” evidence can serve to cloud the issue rather than resolve it.

The stringent and often archaic rules of evidence employed in courtroom argument are not generally applicable to other forms of formal debate. But in their origins and purposes these specific rules were dictated by a soundness and a planning which has been perverted by the retention of certain rules long after their usefulness has disappeared. That soundness and planning is not always found in other fields. Studying the tight and tediously observed legal rules of evidence we can see that we can extract certain general principles which can be useful in all formal arguments and which contribute to the persuasive use of evidence. These arguments can be molded into the following rules.

The Use of Opinion Evidence—The laying of a Foundation—If opinion evidence is employed in the argument, a proper foundation must always be laid. In the courts the areas in which laymen can present opinions are very few and very well defined. The opinion of a witness is seldom acceptable unless he is testifying as to something which anyone having the ordinary experience of life could observe, i.e., that a man staggered, that a street car was moving, that there was a full moon in the sky that evening, etc. Generally, only an “expert” can give his opinion on matters contested in the courtroom. Before he will be allowed to speak, however, we must be assured that he is an expert and qualified to deliver an opinion in this particular case. The questions asked the witness to solicit his qualifications and connection with this occurrence are grouped under what lawyers call the “laying of a foundation.” So highly do lawyers rate the persuasive effect of enumerating their expert’s qualifications that often they will refuse an offer by opposing counsel to stipulate to his qualifications and save the time of listing the experiences of the witness.

The rule, applicable to other forms of argument, to be drawn from this courtroom restriction is that when you are citing someone’s opinion be certain you have convinced the audience that this individual is worthy of their confidence. The listener must believe that this person’s opinion is one deserving of great weight and reliance. This may be done by mentioning the significant books he has written, by associating him with a learned institution or project, or by calling attention to an accomplishment with which the audience might be familiar. His education, his present or past position and his honors can all, in an individual case, be important to the listener. The pitfall here is, I am sure, apparent. It is in boring the audience or wasting valuable time which could be used in presenting substantial material by “run-
ning off at the mouth” and reading too long a list of qualifications. Something short will and must suffice. But it must be something calculated to convince the listeners that this man’s opinion is worth hearing.

To this basic rule that a foundation for the use of this opinion evidence must be laid, we may add other hints and conclude with the following three points of presentation:

1. Describe your source and his background fully but briefly.

2. Read the opinion in a meaningful manner, picking out beforehand the critical sentence, phrase or single word to emphasize.

3. Relate the evidence to the problem you are arguing, showing why this evidence is significant. This “clinches” the point.

Competency, Credibility and Relevancy —A second principle which can be borrowed from the legal rules of evidence is that any supporting material must be germane to the issue being discussed—it must be relevant.

While this general requirement seems, at first, elementary and one which we would assume is understood by all, we find that speakers nevertheless tend to “gang aft aglay” inserting unrelated material into any otherwise excellent and polished polemic presentation. The inclusion of the irrelevant is probably due, in part, to the speaker’s inability to distinguish between competency, credibility and relevancy of evidence. In the courts evidence is competent if the law of evidence does not prohibit its introduction. The best example of this is the refusal, in certain types of cases, to allow entire classes of persons to testify. A wife, under certain conditions, cannot testify against her husband, etc. Evidence is credible if the jury believe it and they alone can determine how much of it is to be believed. Evidence is relevant if it is intimately connected with the issue at hand.

Therefore, a metallurgist can be competent because he is not disqualified from giving his opinion; what he says may be wholly believed and far from “incredible”; but he may be delivering an opinion of the metallic properties of pickaxes or shovels while the issue being debated is whether or not a particular kind of hammer was badly manufactured causing it to shatter and injure someone’s eye. His testimony is therefore irrelevant.

It is not difficult to confuse these three separate and distinct evidentiary rules in analyzing your own arguments. You find the statement of an economist and fit it into your debate case. There is nothing in the formal regulations governing your debate to expressly exclude your quoting the economist. His testimony is, therefore, competent. Since his background does not indicate bias and his qualifications are superlative your listeners are willing to accept his views. He is, therefore, credible. But after carefully reading and re-reading the quotation you suddenly discover that, despite the impressiveness of the statement, the quotation supports your argument only in a general way and does not serve to buttress the particular point you are stressing in this part of your speech. In my own three years of college debating I found myself evolving from a fondness for the romance of language into a desire for word economy and cautious study of content.

The concept of relevancy has been described by Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. as a “concession to the shortness of life.” The loss of time is certainly an important consideration in litigation. But in other forms of formal argument other reasons for excluding irrelevant evidence fortify the rule that only evidence closely pertaining to the matter at hand should be selected and should be used in a manner which makes its relevance readily apparent. These reasons center about the word unfairness. It is clearly unfair to one’s opponent to bog down the argument in a morass of minutiae; it is also unfair to the audience to make them sit through the presentation of this material of little direct value; but it is unfair to the speaker himself, for he is competing against the clock and boredom as well as a human antagonist. The minutes wasted in introducing evidence of doubtful relevance could always be better utilized.

Inflaming the Passions, Playing to the Prejudices of the Listener—Arguments grounded in the emotions may have a favorable immediate effect but arguments based on reason, if carefully and cogently expressed, will have a more permanent
Nine Simple Ways
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have a lot of time to discuss this matter between rounds, it might be advisable to wait until lunch. More people are gathered together at this time anyway, and if you talk loudly enough, more coaches and student participants will know what the other debate teams have for cases.

Seventh, when writing criticisms on the back of ballots, never write legibly or grammatically correct. This business is just for students! Besides, student participants and coaches pay little attention to written criticisms. The numbers on the ballot are what count and tell the complete story.

Eighth, when the tournament is over, be persistent in asking the following questions: (1) “How soon will the awards be announced?” and (2) “How soon will the mimeographed results be ready?” Ask anyone who seems to be busy around the tournament headquarters these questions, preferably the tournament director. Make sure you can be heard and ask the questions five or six times in case these people have other things on their minds. Be straightforward in your questioning! Don’t take “Five minutes!” for an answer.

Ninth, if your student participants don’t do well at the tournament, it is protocol not to thank the tournament director for a good tournament; also complain about the low caliber of judging on your way out the door.

These are the nine important but simple ways for coaches to win friends and influence people at a forensic tournament. Any one method is beneficial, but a combination of all nine will guarantee maximum effectiveness. Any additional suggestions you may find that get results in the future should be worthy of note. By the way, “No Smoking” signs at a tournament mean that you make paper ash trays out of scratch paper and ignore the signs.

At the laying of a cornerstone, President Calvin Coolidge turned a spadeful of earth and then remained silent. The gathering expected him to speak, however; so the master of ceremonies suggested that few words would be fitting. Mr. Coolidge looked at the upturned earth. “That’s a fine fishing worm,” he said.
Aristotle’s Topics as Sources of Proof

RAYMOND YEAGER

It may be charged with some validity that our debaters in this so-called “enlightened era” develop their briefs with little knowledge or conception of logical reasoning. The debate topic, in practice if not in theory, is selected for them; sundry concerns offer “proof” in the form of quotations and statistics which relieve debaters of the necessity for research; and, indeed, stock cases appear in handbooks in October and then re-appear in debate tournaments from October through January.

As the new year starts, however, some debaters begin to realize that there are certain issues of prime importance in the proposal (and I am perforce excluding delivery). These debaters file their evidence cards and set about constructing a brief based on logical reasoning, using the former “proof” only as auxiliary aids. For these debaters who are now on the right track, I wish to present Aristotle’s topics as the sources of proof.

Aristotle made probability the essential substructure of his Rhetoric. Men do not debate that which is known and certain. It is in the realm of speculation and controversy that argument is to be found. The topoi or topics that Aristotle presents are statements designed to bring to mind arguments usable for either side of a case. As Everett Lee Hunt points out, the topics constitute a “sort of rhetorician’s first aid. They assist him in producing immediately, and perhaps without any knowledge of the subject, a plausible argument upon either side of a debatable proposition.”

There are four possible issues in a dispute, and whether or not a debater has ever read Aristotle’s Rhetoric he should be skilled in the handling of these issues. The debater may contend against any proposal that (1) it cannot be done; or admitting that the proposal can be accomplished, he may contend (2) that it is unjust; or (3) that it will do no good; or (4) that it has not the importance that the opposition attaches to it. Here is the plan for attack on any affirmative plan or negative counter-plan.

When an issue is in dispute under the need contention, however, the debater must bring proof to bear upon it by demonstrating (1) that the act was not committed; or if admitting the act, that (2) it did no harm; or (3) that the harm done was less than alleged; or (4) that the act was justified despite any accompanying harm.

An issue which arose under the 1956-1957 collegiate debate topic concerning economic aid to foreign countries was whether such aid resulted in a loss of prestige for the United States. The debater cannot deny the act of economic aid, but he can deny that it has caused us to lose prestige. He may also argue that any loss of prestige is slight, or that economic aid is necessary despite such a loss. We witnessed this approach in Anthony Eden’s statements to the House of Commons on the Suez affair. Sir Anthony could not deny British intervention, but he vigorously argued that it was justified despite the accompanying harm.

In further illustrating Aristotle’s injunction on the handling of issues, I leave myself suspect. Rather than support this point through reference to debate propositions, I call attention to our political debates. Contrary to popular opinion, there is often more logical reasoning in the arena of political warfare than in the sacrosanct exercises of collegiate forensics.

An excellent example of the handling of issues occurred on September 27, 1952, in Louisville, Kentucky, when candidate Adlai Stevenson replied to a speech by candidate Dwight Eisenhower. The Republican nominee had charged the Truman administration with direct responsibility for the Korean War. The Democratic nominee’s refutation of the charge was notable Aristotelian. (1) He did not deny Truman’s inter-

Dr. Raymond Yeager is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics, Bowling Green State University.
vention in Korea, but argued (2) that the action in question was justified at the time; (3) that the harm done was less than Eisenhower alleged; and (4) that the Republicans were either equally culpable or mainly responsible for our lack of preparation at the time. Whether Mr. Stevenson's refutation was politically wise does not concern us here. The point I wish to make is that his debating technique was rhetorically sound and this despite the fact that Mr. Stevenson is not conversant with Aristotle's Rhetoric!

Returning to our collegiate debater, we note that he is usually well-supplied with vital statistics and statements by authorities. However, statistics and testimony do not prove an argument. Rather, they support it by indicating a trend or connoting certain areas of opinion. Too many of our present day debates unfortunately resolve into mere clashes of authorities and numbers. This is the major complaint against American debating made by our British friends who annually meet us on the forensic field of battle.

The real basis for logical reasoning lies not in facts, but in probability. For proof in the realm of probability, the debater must rely upon examples and enthymemes. Aristotle makes clear this startling statement: "Whenever men in speaking effect persuasion through proofs, they do so either with examples or enthymemes; they use nothing else." Now before you say to yourself that you do not know what an enthymeme is and would not recognize one if you saw it, may I explain that an enthymeme is rhetorical induction. In spite of all the verbiage you may find about the enthymeme, that is simply what it is.

Our debater, with his head filled with the knowledge of his subject matter, must conceive ready arguments to prove his case and to refute the arguments of his opponent. To find such arguments, he must know where to look for them. The solution to his dilemma lies in Aristotle's topics (topoi).

There are four general topics containing arguments common to all branches of knowledge (and I recommend that you look into them); however, I wish to limit this discussion to the universal topic. Aristotle suggests twenty-eight topics, which are by no means all-inclusive, where specific arguments may be located.

A topic (topos) is a head, under which are grouped arguments or lines of arguments. If the debater knows what the topics are, he will know where to find the argument for a special case. The twenty-eight topics are areas or regions where we may pursue arguments as a hunter pursues game. If we are hunting for pheasant, we go to the fields where pheasant are likely to abound. If we hunt deer, we go to the forests where deer presumably live. It is so with arguments.

Space does not permit discussing each of the topics, but by illustrating several, the value of Aristotle's topics as sources of proof should be adequately demonstrated.

One of the most useful arguments in debate comes from the topic of opposites. If there are two things, one of which is said to be true of the other, then their opposites should also be true. For example, if we are foolish to trust our enemies, then we are wise to trust our friends. But the opposite of an argument does not always bear up under examination. Looking at the disagreement between Britain, France, and the United States over the Middle East, one might argue that if we cannot rely upon our friends and allies, then we should put our trust in our enemies!

Our debaters would do well to attack the logic of their opponent's reasoning. I have heard affirmative teams argue that United States economic aid has antagonized the foreign recipients. The opposite of such an argument should upset the proposition, for logically, if we eliminate our aid, the former recipients should be pleased. The error in reasoning is that our friends object not to economic aid but to the political strings attached. Also, if American gifts injure the pride of the people in underdeveloped countries, then financial indebtedness to us should make these people proud as peacocks—the more indebted they become, the more pride they will have! An argument which appears strong on the surface may often be destroyed through its opposite, and become reductio ad absurdum.

A Republican friend recently argued that since Maine elected a Democratic Governor, Georgia, its opposite, could elect a Republican Governor. The fallacy in his reasoning lies not so much in the realm of improbability as in the fact that the two are not necessarily opposites. The real argument is that if Republicans in Maine elect-
ed a Democratic Governor, then Democrats in Maine could elect a Republican Governor—much more probable, of course.

The topic of opposites that we are considering provides a veritable mine of arguments. A political speaker discussing the Taft-Hartley Act also dealt in the realm of probability, drawing his arguments from opposites. "If we talk too much in terms of labor wars," he said, "then we ought to talk in terms of labor peace." Continuing the argument, he used the same topic as the source for his proof. "If we talk too much of stopping things by law, then we must talk in terms of establishing industrial democracy." The arguments are based on the premise that if a thing is bad, then its opposite must be good.

Under the topic of correlative terms, we find arguments to prove or disprove that what is true in one instance should also be true in another. For example, some observers have noted that Mr. Nehru of India was quick to condemn the aggression of Britain and France in Egypt, but he was hesitant to condemn Russian aggression against Hungary. The observers argue that aggression is wrong no matter who aggresses, and that all aggressors should be condemned. What is true for one ought to be true for the others.

In advocating some governmental control of labor unions, a political speaker relied upon the topic of correlative terms for his argument. "If government, which is open to all on equal terms, grants some of its powers to unions, then unions should also be open to all on equal terms." The speaker is reasoning that what is true for one ought to be true for the other.

Another facet to the topic of correlative terms involves whether the punishment fits the crime. If a bandit kills a child, does the bereaved father have the right to hunt down and kill the bandit? In other words, does the father have the right to take the law unto himself? Or, since Israel invaded Egypt, does Nasser have the right to appropriate the property of the Jews living in Egypt? The reasoning is based on the Old Testament injunction of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. We may upset the proposition by arguing that the terms are not necessarily correlative, for two wrongs do not make a right.

The last topic I wish to illustrate concerns the topos of a fortiori—more and less. The argument is based on the principle that if the more likely thing does not happen, then that which is least likely will not occur. Or the opposite can be utilized, that if the least frequent thing occurs, then the more frequent one occurs. There are also other combinations. Here lies the reasoning in the argument that if God be for us, who can be against us. An argument from the topos of more and less which has frequently appeared in debate topics is that if man has the intelligence to wage war successfully, then certainly he has the intelligence to achieve peace. If we can do the more difficult thing, then we ought to be able to do the easier one.

We have heard the argument that if it is wrong to menace, then it is much worse to hurt. This is also part of the topic of more and less. Pursuing the principle, we might apply it to our prisoners-of-war in Korea who defected to the Communists. If we condemn the turncoats who have come back to us, we should condemn even more those who still refuse to return. On the international scene, we may argue that if it was wrong for Egypt to seize control of the Suez Canal, it was worse for Britain and France to attack Egypt. Returning to the debate proposition, the debater might well argue that while the advance of world communism may not have been completely halted by our economic aid, it would have been far greater without our economic intervention.

In summary, Aristotle's topics present forms of argument adaptable to debate, and, indeed, indispensable to it. Each of the twenty-eight topoi are lines of argument suitable for special cases. If the debater is to become skilled in logical reasoning, he should first know the topics. The special topoi offer arguments which may be utilized to either demonstrate the probability of truth in your proposal or to refute that probability in your opponent's argument. The topics are as necessary to debate as is the proposition itself.

If debate is to be primarily argumentation, then the debater must know Aristotle's Rhetoric. In it the debater will find instruction on how to handle issues under the need contention, how to attack or defend the plan, and more importantly, the places where arguments are found. Aristotle's topics are the debater's sources of proof.
Chapter reports indicate a number of new sponsors this year. These include: Ronald H. Denison, Alabama College; John Lama, Monmouth College; M. Jack Parker, Southern Illinois University; Alfred E. Rickert, Franklin College; Leslie Beckter, Simpson College; Clyde G. Smallwood, Northeastern State College, Okla.; Randall M. Fisher, Northern State Teachers College, S. D.; Barbara Kersten, Black Hills State Teachers College; Virginia M. Edgett, Southern State Teachers College, S. D.; Charles M. Stantham, East Tennessee State; Edna C. Sorber, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater; and Arda S. Walker, Maryville College.

A special effort is being made to provide information for the benefit of new sponsors and chapter offices. Last year the history of Pi Kappa Delta was brought up to date and made available for the first time in twenty years. This proved to be a popular item and our supply has become depleted. A new printing of the history will be found in this FORENSIC. A brochure containing information and answers about Pi Kappa Delta for new members and prospective chapters has gone to the press and will be available in a few days.

The Constitution appeared in the last issue of THE FORENSIC. Save your extra copies for your new members. Other supplies that have been requested are being mailed from this office as time will permit. On some items, supplies have become exhausted and these will be sent to you as they become available.

Occasionally, we receive applications from graduates who did their forensic speaking more than twenty years ago. Last month an application was received which had been filled out in 1929. We continue to get orders to replace lost keys. For many graduate members the Pi Kappa Delta key increases in value with the passing of time.

Keep your record in this office up to date by sending the Form B Application each year. This may save several weeks on key orders made at some time in the future.

Last year more than 950 new members were added to Pi Kappa Delta. Total membership should pass the 33,000 mark within the next month.
The History of Pi Kappa Delta

INTRODUCTION

It was almost fifty years ago that two college students, John A. Shields and Edgar A. Vaughn, met for a weekend to make the final draft of a document that had been discussed by mail for several months. After the final touches had been made late one night, the boys flipped a coin to see which would have the privilege of signing it first. Thus, the Constitution of Pi Kappa Delta became a reality. One of the young authors ventured a prediction that someday as many as three hundred members might be added to the organization—perhaps even three hundred and fifty.

That the young organization was destined to serve a definite need has been proven as almost fifty years later it has granted 260 charters and added more than 32,000 members.

For a number of years The Forensic included accounts of the formative years of Pi Kappa Delta. However, little has been done to bring the history up to date for almost twenty-five years. Realizing a need for a more complete history, the Public Relations Committee was authorized to prepare a history for general distribution. This version is based on a study of the historical accounts given in the early FORENSICS, an examination of records, and correspondence with the past presidents and other officials.

It would take an entire volume to record the history of Pi Kappa Delta. A complete history should contain the winners of national contests, results of business meetings, members who have served on the National Council, the record of admission of chapters, and achievements of outstanding alumni. In this brief edition, no attempt has been made to include all such details, however, that is a project that the next Public Relations Committee might consider. The information assembled by the Committee was submitted to the National Secretary for editing.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FRATERNITY

The concept which resulted in the creation of Pi Kappa Delta was the realization of the need for a means of providing recognition for orators and debaters in the small-colleges. The idea came to two of the Founders of the fraternity, John A. Shields and Egbert R. Nichols, almost simultaneously.

In the autumn of 1911, Shields was a junior at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas, and Nichols, who had been a professor of English for two years (1909-1911) at Ottawa, began his work at Ripon College, Wisconsin, as head of the Department of Composition and Public Speaking. The two were friends and kept in touch with each other by occasional letters.

Nichols related how his debaters on a trip to Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, discovered the debaters there wearing a forensic key. Lawrence College had just been admitted to an organization, which at the time established only one chapter in a state. This suggested to the Ripon debaters the need of establishing a new organization.

In Kansas, Shields had likewise discovered the need for such a society. When the speakers in the Kansas State Prohibition Oratorical Association assembled in Manhattan, Kansas, Shields found another person, Edgar A. Vaughn, who was also interested in a means of giving recognition to orators and debaters.

The Ripon group adopted a constitution and sent it to Shields at Ottawa and it was adopted by the Kansas group with some changes. Suggestions for the design of the key were also made. After some modification, a pear-shaped key with two jewels was accepted, and the first key was ordered by Vaughn in January, 1913.

The name for the organization was supplied by Miss Grace Goodrich, a student in Greek at Ripon College. Pi Kappa Delta was chosen because it was composed of the initial letters of the phrase Peitho kale Dikaios, “the art of persuasion, beautiful and just.”

The Kansas group proposed the idea of including degrees as well as orders in the new society, which showed the Masonic influence—both Shields and Vaughn were Masons. Vaughn had the imagination to see the essential purpose of the organization, which was to bestow an honorary key on orators, debaters, and coaches; he wished
to show by jewel ing the key the distinction of each individual.

Shields received credit for taking the action that officially launched the organization. He selected the officers from the founders and, as secretary, cast the ballot which put them into office. According to Shields' selection, Nichols became the first president; Vaughn, vice-president and chairman of the charter committee; Shields himself acted as secretary-treasurer; and J. H. Krenmyre, Iowa Wesleyan, the historian. A. L. Crookham, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas, and P. C. Somerville, Illinois Wesleyan, were appointed on the charter committee.

The National Conventions, 1916-22

The first national convention of Pi Kappa Delta was held in the spring of 1916, with Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas, serving as the host chapter. The constitution was put in more complete form, the insignia and the ritual were designed, and the plans for interfraternity relations were developed.

The first contest was held at the second national convention at Ottawa University, 1918, and was a debate between Redlands and Ottawa. Later the contests became the chief feature of the national conventions. It was announced that plans were being made to establish an arrangement with Delta Sigma Rho for co-operative forensic endeavors.

The third national convention was held at Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, in 1920. An oratorical contest was included in the program. No debate tournament was held, but teams arranged debates to be held en route to and from the convention, and during free periods of the convention. To facilitate debate plans, Secretary Marsh suggested that the colleges adopt the same debate question, which was the first step toward the policy of selecting an official question.

The Development of Policy, 1922-26

The fourth biennial convention was held at Simpson College, Iowa, in 1922. To facilitate scheduling debates, an official question had been adopted by chapter vote for the first time in 1922. The question was: "Resolved that the principles of closed shop are justifiable." This was a period of rapid growth for Pi Kappa Delta as the society added forty-one chapters during two years.

Provincial Organizations. In 1923, the chapters in some of the provinces initiated provincial conventions. These regional meetings were of historical importance since from them developed the debate tournament, the first being held at Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas. At the close of the first tournament a prediction was made that it was not beyond reason to expect that within the next biennium other provinces would hold like meets, resulting ultimately in intra-provincial contests.

Extempore Speaking. Experiments were made in extemporary debate in which the question was not revealed until twenty-four hours before the debate. Also the extemporary speaking contest was developed and was added to the program of the 1924 national convention at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois.

International debating brought the British system of debating before the American colleges. This tended to free debating in the United States from its rigid system of memorized speeches and increased the popularity of the audience decision. But the development of the tournament plan with its crowded program of many simultaneous debates and contest after contest on the same question forced the American schools more and more to the single expert judge, usually a debate coach, a method of judging which was gradually adopted for general use.

During Marsh's term of office, a number of Pi Kappa Delta members were interested in formulating a code of ethics. The National Council suggested that such a code covering "every phase of debate" should be undertaken.

During the early years of the 1920's there was a great deal of interest in the problem of judging. As debates multiplied in number, it became difficult to provide disinterested judges. In an effort to improve the judging, H. B. Summers, Kansas State College, compiled and published a directory of judges, listing men in all parts of the country who had served as judges and giving a summary of the estimates of their ability made by the institutions they had judged.

The fifth national convention of Pi Kappa Delta was held at the Bradley Polytechnic Institute in Illinois, April 1-3, 1924. The addition to the program of the extem-
pore speaking contests and the scheduling of separate contests for men and women in both extempore and oratory attracted more delegates. Plans were made at this meeting for the inauguration of a national debate tournament at the next convention.

**The Period of National Tournaments, 1926-42**

The sixth national convention was held in 1926 at Fort Collins and Greeley, Colorado. For the first time national debate tournaments for men and women were undertaken and the double elimination plan was used. At this convention the plan was adopted of holding provincial meetings in the years in which the national conventions were not held. The official debate question for 1925-26 was the proposal to control child labor by an amendment to the constitution. “The Crime Situation in America” was the topic selected for the men’s extempore contest and the women’s topic was “Marriage and Divorce.” Pi Kappa Delta planned a certificate for proficiency in debate coaching to be awarded upon graduation to students who had been active in forensics. It was voted to publish the winning speeches of the national conventions; Volume One of *Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations* appeared in 1926.

**Chapter Activities.** The year 1929 marked the use of the airplane for debate travel. G. R. McCarty, South Dakota State College, and his debaters traveled by air from Oklahoma City to Chickasha to maintain their schedule. The College of St. Thomas debaters flew from St. Paul to Chicago for one of their forensic engagements.

Wichita, Kansas, was selected for the location of the eighth national convention which was held March 31 to April 4, 1930. The tournaments had developed gradually with no definite plan; however, in 1930, an organization was planned for their administration, with carefully selected officers and committees in charge of each contest. At previous conventions, a chapter could enter more than one team. At Wichita, for the first time, each chapter was limited to a single team.

**Changes in Contest Procedure.** The addition of contests in debate, oratory, and extemporaneous speaking resulted in a great increase of interest in the Pi Kappa Delta national conventions. Business sessions, side trips, banquets, and other special features were included in the convention programs; however, the contests were the outstanding features of the conventions. During the early years of the national contests, the National Council did most of the work of planning and conducting the events. In time, special committees were appointed to take charge of the contests with a different committee being responsible for each event. In the first contests in oratory and extemporaneous speaking, the contestants were divided into several divisions for a preliminary round with the best two or three in each division competing in a final round.

In the early tournaments the double elimination plan was used with a team being dropped after its second loss. The number of preliminary rounds in debate was increased to five at the 1932 convention held at Tulsa, Oklahoma, with an elimination bracket set up for those teams that had lost none or one debate at the end of five rounds. This plan was used in the national conventions of 1934 and 1936.

The next major change in contest procedure was made in 1938 at the Topeka, Kansas convention. In debate, the preliminary rounds were dropped and each team was scheduled to debate eight rounds, with the teams being given a rating based on the number of debates won. The committee in charge of debate asked tournament directors to recommend outstanding teams that were to be “seeded” teams. These teams were placed on the bracket at regular intervals in an attempt to provide equalized competition for all teams. In the individual events, four preliminary rounds were held and the six best speakers selected for a final round in which they were ranked from first to sixth.

Another new feature of the 1938 convention was the addition of a student congress. State and regional congresses had been held for several years, resulting in a demand for such activities at the national level. The Pi Kappa Delta congress was held in the Kansas Capitol as a two-house legislature. Each chapter was invited to send one delegate to the lower house, and each province elected two senators to comprise the upper house. Interest in the congress resulted in a new attendance record for Pi Kappa Delta conventions with more than 800 delegates and visitors being registered.

At the Knoxville convention in 1940, the plan used in debate was a combination of
that used at Topeka and the earlier tournaments. Each team was scheduled to debate eight rounds and was given a rating based on the number of debates won. Teams winning seven or eight debates were rated superior; those winning six were rated excellent; and those winning five were rated good. At the end of eight rounds, eight teams were selected for a quarter final bracket with first and second place winners being selected after three additional rounds of debate.

Because of the popularity of the student congress at the Topeka convention, another congress was held at Knoxville. Several changes in the rules were made as a result of the previous congress; however, without the atmosphere of the State Capitol, the congress received less attention than the one held at Topeka.

In 1942, in the convention at Minneapolis, dissatisfaction with the combination plan resulted in a return to the 1938 pattern in which teams debated eight rounds and were rated on the number of wins and losses. The plans for the convention had already been made before the start of the war and an attempt was made to conduct the convention with as little deviation as possible. The student congress was retained as one of the features of the convention but was modified to an unicameral house.

**The Contemporary Organization, 1947-60**

*Post-War Conventions.* Following a five-year interim of war years, Pi Kappa Delta resumed its national tournaments in 1947. In the individual events four preliminary rounds were held and eighteen speakers selected for the fifth round. In oratory and extemporaneous speaking, the 10 per cent of the speakers ranking highest were given the rating of “superior”; the next highest 20 per cent were rated “excellent”; and the next highest 20 per cent were rated “good.” The major change at the 1947 convention, held at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, was the substitution of discussion for the student congress. An interesting experiment in the discussion was the use of ratings by student participants. Ratings were given in discussion on the same basis as in extemporaneous speaking and oratory, with the rating based entirely on scores given by the participants from round to round.

The 1949 convention was held at Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois. Discussion was continued with a combination plan of coach judging and judging by participants, with final ratings based on the combination scores of the two groups.

In 1951 the Pi Kappa Delta national convention was held at Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Oklahoma; this proved to be a popular place for a convention site as delegates from 135 chapters assembled for a four-day convention. The plan for the contests had become standardized from the previous conventions. The major change at Stillwater was that of doing away with all judging and ratings in the discussion event.

The next national convention was held at Kalamazoo College, Michigan, in 1953. The decline in college attendance as a result of the Korean War was reflected in the attendance at Kalamazoo. However, the contests were held with little change from the procedure of the previous national. A distinctive feature of the Kalamazoo convention was the acceptance of an invitation that had been extended over a period of twenty-five years to hold the next national convention on the West Coast.

The 19th biennial convention was held at Redlands University in 1955 with 117 chapters sending 554 delegates. At Redlands a return was made to a five day convention in order to allow free periods for sightseeing and other special features. The growth of Pi Kappa Delta in California has been impressive with an increase from five to thirteen chapters since the close of World War II.

The 1957 convention was held at South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota. A new feature added to the program was a session devoted to professional problems with Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State University, as the speaker. The tradition of making a Distinguished Alumni Award was started at this convention with Senator Karl Mundt being selected to receive the award. Plans were made to inaugurate a Pi Kappa Delta forensic scholarship in honor of one of the founders, John A. Shields.

In 1959 the convention returned to the site of its 1947 meeting, with Bowling Green State University again acting as hosts. In attendance were more than 700 delegates and visitors from 135 chapters. The Distinguished Alumni Award went to
Dr. Dwayne Orton, editor of *Think*. Plans were made by the Convention for the celebration of Pi Kappa Delta's Golden Anniversary, plans especially directed toward bringing the alumni of the fraternity into the celebration.

Pi Kappa Delta has made a number of contributions to forensics for which it may be proud. It was the first of the forensic societies to hold a national convention. It was the first to sponsor an oratorical contest as a part of its program. It was the first to adopt the policy of selecting a question for all chapters to use. It was the first to add the contest in extemporaneous speaking to its national program. It was first in making an effective provincial system to sponsor activities on the regional level. Out of one of its chapters came the first debate tournament, and it was the first to add the debate tournament to its national program.

**Conclusion**

Pi Kappa Delta is proud of its significant contributions to intercollegiate forensics. It helped to fill the period between the decline of the literary society and the development of the speech department as a major phase of higher education. The organization on a national basis was established to co-ordinate the work of the local clubs, and to give recognition to orators and debaters according to uniform criteria. Experiments were carried on with new types of speech activities, and policies were developed to guide forensics on the local, regional, and national levels.

High ethical standards have been maintained and requirements for membership increased from time to time to make affiliation of greater value. Pi Kappa Delta has provided a service magazine, *The Forensic*, to members as a means of unifying the work of the local chapters and providing other information on speech and forensics.

At the regional and national level, conventions, tournaments, and congresses have been provided that have brought students together from all parts of the country. Many of these young people, otherwise, would never have had the opportunity to attend a national meeting with the many personal benefits to be gained from participation in forensic activities on such an extensive basis.

Although Pi Kappa Delta was the third fraternity of its kind to be organized, it has become the largest in terms of the number of chapters and total membership. This may be attributed to its more liberal policy of granting charters to smaller institutions, and its more vigorous policy of sponsoring regional and national conventions and tournaments. With strict attendance requirements, as many as 145 chapters have sent more than 800 members to participate in some of its national assemblies.

Pi Kappa Delta is the only forensic society that has provided several orders in which membership may be earned and a series of degrees through which the member may progress from year to year. After three years of forensic activity one may qualify for the highest degree and the distinction of wearing a diamond in his key.

**Requirements for Admission**

Pi Kappa Delta has endeavored always to keep its standards of admission, those which would be in harmony with the principles of an honor society. In order to do this, certain procedures have been developed which must be followed by all applying institutions.

Any group wishing to petition for a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta should make application to the National Secretary Treasurer. One of the basic factors is that of a local forensic organization upon which the chapter may be built. The chapter committee, headed by a member of the National Council and composed of selected members, will be guided by the governor of the particular province in which the school is located and by the opinion of the schools in the province.

An institution considering application should have had forensic contact with all of the schools in its area, demonstrated interest in and a desire to maintain a sound extracurricular speech program. In keeping with this, the school should have a budget sufficient to assure the continuance of the program as well as qualified faculty leadership for the same reason. Since Pi Kappa Delta is an honorary, applying institutions are expected to be fully accredited. The application should have the unqualified endorsement of the administrative officers. For further indication of strength within the school, a well-defined program of academic speech courses is desirable. No institution which has a chapter of one of the other *a-

*(Continued on page 26)*
The Far East—
Impacts and Impressions

WILLIAM SCHRIER

In this issue is concluded the account by Dr. William Schrier of his experiences in Korea as a member of the University of California's Far Eastern Educational Program. As was the case with the previous article, what is printed is an excerpt from a speech prepared by Dr. Schrier after he returned to the United States. Dr. Schrier is Chairman of the Department of Speech, Hope College, Holland, Michigan.

I would like to cover three points, each beginning with "M." My first point is the MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT. One of my first "Impressions" was the vast extent and nature of our military installations throughout the world. Congressman "Jerry" Ford, in one of his letters to his constituents a few months ago, referred to the fact that we now have 250 military bases located on the soil of our allies in 73 foreign areas. I've personally taught at 14 of these bases and probably visited an equal number more. In simple terms of feeding and housing, to say nothing of equipping and training over a million uniformed men in the army alone, plus some 700,000 civilian employees, that is of course a mammoth undertaking, and certainly an eye-opener to a civilian. In a speech a few years back, General Maxwell D. Taylor referred to the army as the biggest single business operation of the entire country, and no one can dispute that fact. Secretary of the Army Brucker says the army is backed up by more than 40 billion dollars worth of equipment, of which over 25 billions are for weapons.

I saw considerable of that equipment. En route to Area X in Yokohama, a residential area for U. S. personnel and dependents where my son-in-law lived, you pass a place where, as far as the eye can see, row upon row, are trucks and jeeps guarded by sentry dogs and Japanese security police. Since the peace treaty with Japan we are no longer there as occupation forces, and this equipment is for Japanese defense. Coming direct from the States and perhaps from a tour at Pearl Harbor and seeing the half-submerged battleship "Arizona," a civilian gets a rather uncanny feeling at so strange a turn of events in so short a time.

One can't help wondering, too, about the terrific financial cost of war as represented by those thousands of jeeps and trucks sitting there out in the open skies, exposed to the elements, and becoming obsolete. In fact, that impression was even more vivid at my last teaching assignment near Inchon in Korea at the 74th Ordnance Battalion, at OMAD, as it was called, Overseas Military Army Depot. Here, heavily guarded of course, were vast stores of heavy equipment, huge tires, tractors and vehicles of all kinds. Colonel Ellison, in charge at that base, told me his main job was to strike a balance between having this equipment readily available in case of a resumption of hostilities and at the same time to keep moving much of it out to Okinawa and Japan since it would be such a rich prize if it were captured.

My second "M" today is MORALE, defined loosely as "the state of mind" of our military men in foreign countries. Two words stand out on that score: 1) they're ready, and 2) they're very, very lonesome. Upon the matter of their military readiness for renewal of fighting, I'm obviously no expert. But a combination of little incidents put together leave me with that impression.

At the 7th Division teaching assignment on the front lines in Korea, I was often challenged by sentries: "Halt! Who goes there?" and asked to produce the password. The first time it happened, I stopped dead in my tracks—I wasn't going to take any chances with a trigger-happy G.I. of not getting back to my job at Hope College.
On another occasion there, during our smoking break midway in a three-hour class session, I started to light a cigarette, and was immediately told by a guard to extinguish it. He explained to me that a "CPX" was on, meaning "Command Post Exercise," and that a blackout was on which I, coming in the afternoon from another base, hadn't known about. Waving his gun toward the mountains, he said: "There's 40-50 guys in them that hills and they'll be there on manoeuvres all night." I remember, too, in the early part of the course at the 24th Division, another sector of the front lines, that many absences were incurred because the enrollees were away for 10-day periods in gunnery practice on what was called Nightmare Range. In Sendai, Japan, I taught the First Cavalry Division, the actual combat troops who have now moved to Korea. I well remember an effective speech by a lieutenant there, who urged that the government make allowance for study time for those taking night courses because of the dog-weariness of students after an exhausting day of training. From these and other little incidents, I got the impression that our military men are prepared against any eventuality and this struck me as all the more remarkable when no immediate resumption of hostilities seemed imminent.

Now the second word about the morale of both enlisted men and officers alike—they're lonely. That I'm sure of. I wish I had the necessary wizardry of words to convey to you adequately their feeling of isolation and loneliness. Especially in Korea, practically from the moment and the day that the soldiers arrive, they start counting the days when their drab, dreary 16 months of tour of duty will be over. I remember one cold bleak afternoon at this same 24th Division seeing a newly-arrived group of replacements. They hadn't yet been billeted, were standing around shivering next to their duffle-bags. I couldn't help feeling sorry for them, knowing better than they themselves did what they were in for. This was the area, you may recall, which Secretary of the Army Brucker visited in the late fall of 1955 and who thereafter said we'd have to get the boys out of tents by Christmas. With the aid of two huge searchlights on two mountains, around-the-clock construction of barracks was going on to achieve that goal.

At this particular place, existence was drab and dreary because there weren't the little luxuries of living such as at Seoul Military Post, for example, where there were hobby shops, a record and reading library, and two movie houses to choose from.

One thing that could make the lot of the servicemen brighter would be for folks back home not to forget them and to write more frequently. In my first teaching assignment at Seoul Military Post, I noticed how eagerly the soldier boys looked forward to mail call, and how crestfallen and disappointed they were when no mail would come.

And now let me take up as my third "M" the MORALS in our armed forces. In approaching this subject, the statement of James Russell Lowell comes to my mind: "The art of writing consists in knowing what to leave in the ink-pot." Similarly, the art of speaking, especially upon this delicate subject, consists in knowing what to leave unsaid. I think it was Aldous Huxley at a Hollywood party who said he didn't quite know whether it was a sign of American strength or weakness that every time one mentions "Monroe," Americans think of Marilyn rather than James.

For anything new I learned about this subject of army morals, I might as well have stayed home. I merely confirmed what I or any other adult could know, viz., that wherever there's an army, you'll find in the vicinity another army of camp followers plying the oldest profession in the world; that young men, freed from parental, church and community restraints, are subjected to unusual temptations of liquor and lust. I take a dim view of the argument that the army is a character-building organization. On the other hand, I also confirmed that, given a good home background, it is possible for servicemen to resist those temptations. Certainly, there are plenty of army agencies to help them do so: army chapels and chaplains, hobby shops, service sports, libraries, and occasional visiting entertainers. I base this observation in part upon an "over-all" impression of the personnel of my classes, although I'm not forgetting that in my classes I was dealing with "the cream of the crop," young men who were profitably spending their spare time in study on top of a full-time military job.

I find myself reluctant to make sweeping
generalizations on this subject of army morals. On the one hand, there is much immorality. Here’s a statement in the June, 1958, Methodist Story, by a very highly regarded, reputable Methodist clergyman, Rev. Donald Tippett, which reads as follows: “An official German survey has reported that there are 67,743 illegitimate children in West Germany, the legacy of 10 years of allied occupation. Of these, 36,334 were fathered by Americans. In Pusan, Korea, the Masonic Hospital reported receiving monthly nearly 200 abandoned babies, nearly all of them fathered by Americans.” These are things that no one can or should close his eyes to, nor try either to minimize or deny.

On the other hand, I can’t escape the impression that it would be easy to draw wrong conclusions, and to place undue emphasis upon this aspect of the service-man’s life abroad. Let me illustrate what I mean. In my son-in-law’s Yokohama home, Michi was employed as a housemaid. Her father had been a well-to-do merchant in Korea; he lost everything at the end of the war. Although Michi had traveled to Europe for pleasure, she was now reduced to the status of a domestic. Upon one occasion, after her maid’s day off, my son-in-law in a kidding way asked her: “Michi, did you catch yourself a boy friend on your day off yesterday?” She hesitated a moment, demurely lowered her eyes, then hesitantly said: “Captain shouldn’t talk that way—makes me feel I woman of streets.” Perhaps I am incredibly naive, but I couldn’t escape thinking that perhaps here was a more typical representative of Japanese womanhood in the hinterlands than were those women one sees around military installations where one has to run a gauntlet of pimps and prostitutes.

I am rather of the opinion, too, that perhaps some prudish persons may forget that the laws of human nature have never been repealed, that propinquity of men and women leads to acquaintanceship, that in turn to friendship, and friendship to love and marriage, in other words, that not all association between servicemen and women is on a lust level. I think, too, that after we’ve said all about the bad behavior of the G.I. abroad, which helps to give us as a nation a bad name, we shouldn’t neglect to mention some compensatory quali-
ties. I’m thinking here of the fact that the average G.I. is not a snob, that class distinctions mean little to him, that he’s generous to a fault, that he can’t see why “kids” need to go hungry nor why, if there is food available, he shouldn’t feed such youngsters, and support orphanages and other worthy causes in stricken lands.

Take it all in all, Americans have a good reason to be proud of their sons abroad, no matter which of these three “M’s” be considered.

In Memoriam

MRS. DANA T. BURNS

Mrs. Dana T. Burns, a former faculty member at Baldwin-Wallace College, died November 21, in Daytona Beach, Florida. She and her husband had arrived there November 15 to spend the winter.

Mrs Burns was well-known to many members of Pi Kappa Delta. Not only was Mrs. Burns instructor in speech and dramatics at Baldwin-Wallace from 1940 to 1947, but she acted as assistant in debate and accompanied her husband, the director of forensics, to numerous provincial and national conventions of Pi Kappa Delta.

Before serving as instructor in speech, Mrs. Burns was instructor in English and history at Baldwin-Wallace from 1922 to 1935. Her husband, who now holds the title of professor emeritus of speech, taught at Baldwin-Wallace from 1921 to 1953. During most of these years he was active in the affairs of Pi Kappa Delta. Both were graduates of Ohio University, and both were members of Pi Kappa Delta.

Mrs. Burns is survived by her husband and a brother, Dr. J. H. Caldwell of Warren, Ohio. Alumni and friends may send contributions to her memory to the Baldwin-Wallace Dramatic Scholarship Fund in care of the speech department.
MARYVILLE COLLEGE

David Pierce the president and Dr. Arda S. Walker the sponsor for the current year. Maryville hosted the Tennessee State Forensic Tournament, February 11-13, with twelve colleges participating. In over-all standings David Lipscomb first, Maryville second. Judy Null first in women's original oratory and, with Arlene Ford, on the winning women's debate team, a current problems seminar sponsored by the chapter so popular that it is being continued into the second semester. Nine new members elected this year.

STETSON UNIVERSITY

Florida Beta in the midst of another active year, with successes gained in three tournaments... at Carolina Forensics Bill Sims and Dick Jenkins third among negative teams... at Univ. of Florida Meet George Patten and Jerry Seaborn tied for first among affirmative teams and squad as whole second with 9 wins in 12 debates. Charles Royal and Wes Johnston tied for negative winner on won-loss record at Birmingham Invitational. Sims named among top speakers at first, Johnston at last-named meets.

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

New officers for Ohio Delta are Dan Salden, president; Veraelea Mihaly, vice-president; Susanna Falardeau, secretary-treasurer; George Seyfarth, corresponding secretary. In October, George Seyfarth and Dan Salden appeared in an exhibition.

On Monday evening, October 19, 1959, the University of Akron debated with a pair from Cambridge University on the motion that "The American high school is the grave of American greatness" before an audience of over 200. The teams were split according to the above grouping. From left to right: Roger Warren Evans and Veraelea Mihaly held down the negative, and the Honorable Julian Grenfell and Dan Salden upheld the motion, while William Bachman was Chairman. Evans and Grenfell are the visitors.
The top debaters on this year's teams from Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois, are, from left to right, Don Johnson, Clarinda, Iowa; John Sieffin, East Moline, Ill.; Richard Smith, Freeport, Ill.; and Alan Johnson, Chicago. In the center is Professor Martin J. Malcomb, coach at Augustana since 1932. So far this year, the squad has had an unusually successful season.

cross-examination debate on the high school question against a team from Bowling Green State during the Ohio Speech Education Conference in Columbus, Ohio ... played host to visiting debaters from Cambridge University ... and will entertain the annual Northeast Ohio Debate Conference varsity meet on March 12 ... and the Men's State Individual Events on March 18 and 19.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Michigan Theta Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta to host approximately 75-100 alumni of the chapter as they return to campus May 14, 15, to attend the 20th Anniversary of the founding of the chapter by Dr. Wilbur E. Moore, vice-president of Academic Affairs and former head of the Department of Speech. ... The chapter, which began as a group of four students and Dr. Moore, has increased to a present total of 29 students and nine faculty members. ...

General chairman is Ed Poynor ... assisted by Virginia Schillinger, Norma Beth McKenzie, and Lynn Hagman. ... Dr. Gilbert Rau, Director of Debate, the advisor of this committee.

Other faculty members cooperating with the program are Dr. Judson Foust, president of Central Michigan University, Dr. Charles L. Anspach, President Emeritus, Dr. W. C. Smith, Vice President of Public Affairs, Dr. Herbert Curry, former advisor and present Director of Forensics, and Dr. Emil Pfister, present advisor and Head of the Department of Speech. ... The program for the weekend consists of tours of the campus to point out new facilities and buildings, coffee hour get-togethers, and highlighting the activities will be a banquet
the evening of the 14th, followed by the alumni viewing the Alpha Psi Omega, dramatics fraternity, production of the "Solid Gold Cadillac . . ." Theta Chapter has been saving money at the rate of $30.00 a year for the past four years in order to finance this 20th Anniversary.

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

Four William Jewell debaters flew to Boston for Harvard Invitational Debate Tournament in February . . . came back with a trophy when Donald Herrick, senior, took first in extempore to receive the Edward Everett award . . . this being Herrick's fifth first this season . . . 11 of 16 debates won by the two teams making the trip.

ILLINOIS STATE NORMAL UNIVERSITY

I.S.N.U. the host to the Illinois Inter-collegiate Oratorical Association's annual meeting, February 19-20. . . . First and second place winners, respectively, in the several contests were as follows: Men's Oratory, K. Saunders, S.I.U., D. Van Treese, Monmouth. . . . Women's Oratory, D. Jones, I.W.U., M. Thompson, Ill. College. . . . Women's Extempore, S. Loveless, S.I.U., G. Shadwell, E.I.U. . . . Men's Extempore, K. Brandon, S.I.U., R. Miller, Bradley. Fourteen schools and thirty-nine student speakers competed. . . . Taken in as new members of the Association were Carthage College, University of Illinois, and Millikin University.

WESTMINSTER

Tom Baumgardner, president of Missouri Alpha, also serving as president of the student body this year . . . freshman Cal Kent chosen as one of the top discussers at the Grinnell College Discussion Conference in October . . . also top speaker at a fourschool meet sponsored by the University of Missouri in November.

Kent and Paul Vassar, Brad Kent and Mike Linihan undefeated in senior and junior divisions, respectively, at the Midwest Speech Meet at Kirkville . . . Kent and Vassar battled on the national topic with a visiting team from New Zealand in February.

Pictured is Judge Don Musser, District Judge and President of the Alumni Association of Kansas State College of Pittsburg, receiving his honorary membership in Pi Kappa Delta and a letter of appreciation from the Kansas Theta Chapter. Presenting the letter are Jane Shanks, president (left), and Linda Green, secretary.

Judge Musser has been active in support of the local debate program, acting as a judge for the Annual Debate Tournament and being a generous contributor to the Debate Scholarship Fund. He addressed the Annual Spring Banquet of the Theta Chapter and has addressed many other local groups.

The History of Pi Kappa Delta

(Continued from page 20)

ational forensic honoraries will be considered for membership in Pi Kappa Delta until such association has been clearly terminated with the full understanding of the national officers of both organizations.

Each applicant should be familiar with the requirements as specified in Article 9, New Chapters, of the constitution of Pi Kappa Delta. Upon approval of the charter, a sufficiently large group of initiates should be available to give the new chapter the impetus and continuance which it will need.

The partisan, when he is engaged in a dispute, cares nothing about the rights of the question, but is anxious only to convince his hearers only of his own assertions. . . . False words are not only evils in themselves, but they infect the soul with evil.

—Socrates
Alumni News

From the Illinois Bell Telephone Company comes information that Clarence D. Richardson, Illinois State Normal University, '41, has been promoted to the newly created position of General Operations Supervisor for the new state area.

Clarence L. A. Wynd, Bradley University, '21, will be the new general manager of the Kodak Park Works of the Eastman Kodak Company, it has recently been announced. Wynd, already a company vice-president and a director of the East Gelatine Corporation, will succeed Ivar N. Hultman, who is retiring.

The following tidbits come from Illinois Psi at the University of Illinois, Chicago Division. Kenneth Burns, '49, is in San Antonio, where he is an assistant attorney general of Texas. Corrine Chapman Lee, '49, is speech therapist for the new Chicago School for Retarded Children. Nicholas Biro, '50, is Music and Vending Editor for Billboard. Raymond Fredrickson, '50, is General Sales Manager, Manitowoc Equipment Works, Manitowoc, Wisconsin. Hugh Jones, '50, is the school psychologist at Dover, Ohio. He is married and has two children. Spencer K. Johnston, '51, is Legal Aid Adviser to the Navajo Tribe. He wrote recently: "I am living on the largest Indian reservation in the United States. . . . My duties consist of providing free legal advice and service to the 90,000 Navajos living on this 15,000,000 acre reservation." Spencer's address is Window Rock, Arizona.

The Upsilon Chapter at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale is spreading the good word and good works forensically. Donald McHenry is now teaching speech and coaching debate at Howard University. E. Neil Claussen is director of forensics at Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado. Richard Rieke is debate coach at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Ted Foster is coaching debate at Evansville, Indiana. Susanne Loes is directing forensics at Georgetown University, Georgetown, Kentucky.

MEET OUR DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI

The many Pi Kappa Delta friends of Robert A. Forsythe will be glad to learn that on November 2, 1959, he was sworn in as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Legislation. This was a presidential appointment.

As a student, Mr. Forsythe had the unusual distinction of participating in three national conventions, all while at St. Olaf College. He was at Knoxville in 1940 and at Minneapolis in 1942; then, after service in the army during World War II, he participated again at Bowling Green. After graduating from St. Olaf in 1947, he was awarded an LL.B. from the University of Minnesota Law School in 1949. From 1947 to 1953, he was on the faculty of the College of St. Catherine in St. Paul, Minnesota, where his teams won numerous national honors in forensics.

Mr. Forsythe's particular job is that of handling the entire legislative program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and all of its agencies. The department has 55,000 employees, with nine regional offices throughout the United States.

For the benefit of his old friends, Bob's
address is 312 White Street, Falls Church, Virginia.

Conn Withers, Missouri Delta, class of 1928, was honored at the annual William Jewell College Achievement Day in November. Five alumni are selected yearly to receive citations of achievement for outstanding work in their field. Withers is a successful Liberty, Mo., lawyer and has also served as probate judge. He was a navy officer in World War II, is active in civic and county affairs, and has been president of his college national alumni association. He was a diamond key debater as an undergraduate.

ARE YOUR ALUMNI ORGANIZED?

The Illinois Psi Chapter at the University of Illinois, Chicago Division, has a vigorous Alumni group. These alums sponsor annual parties for new debaters, take over judging duties, and help subsidize forensic events. Now a new project is in progress. A major activity of this organization during the last six months was the distribution of names and the topics of alumni who are available as speakers. Those currently on the list are Bernard Baum, '56, Sam Evins, '56, Bill Haase, '57, Morris Kaplan, '55, Kent Kirkwood, '54, Richard Palewicz, '48, Gerald Reese, '51, Lawrence Robbins, '51, and Joseph Wenzel, '56. Also on the list are Eric Vesely, '54, who is an attorney and consultant on office management, Richard Lenoir, '55, who is an assistant buyer in the Foods Department of Marshall Field and Co., and Dr. James Hunter, '50, who is a heart surgeon at Presbyterian-St. Luke's. Those planning programs and desiring a copy of the list of speakers and topics should write to S. John Insalata, 3518 N. Fremont, Chicago 13. Mr. Insalata, '54, is a member of the national nominating committee of the American Society of Legal Historians. In addition to working as an attorney for the Social Security Administration, he has a law office at the corner of Addison and Halsted.

EMINENT PI KAPPA DELTAN TO RETIRE

Dr. Harold F. Schory, author and teacher, will retire at the end of the summer from Western Illinois University, where he has taught English and speech and directed plays and debate for the past thirty-four years. He has taught speech for forty-two years, and before receiving any degrees had given private speech lessons to university students.

Dr. Schory was instrumental in building up forensic enthusiasm and establishing chapters of Pi Kappa Delta in three schools where he taught, namely, Coe College, Iowa Theta, Midland College, Nebraska Kappa, and Western Illinois University, Illinois Nu. He never sought political advancement in Pi Kappa Delta, though he holds the key of special distinction, for any spare time he had from the exacting task of coaching debate and dramatics was spent in writing.

In addition to several textbooks, Dr. Schory wrote The Christmas Cycle, which comprises four big Christmas plays that have been given in many cities throughout the country. His latest book is the Sanctuary of Silence, published by the Christopher Publishing House of Boston.

Dr. Schory says: "Hot and cold wars, the vast growth of material power, and the great increase in the tempo of living have contributed to a materialization of thought and shaken long-established dogmas and mores, so that human frailty can hardly withstand the stress and pace of modern
must be countered by a spiritual power of atomic proportions if mankind is to sur-

Dr. Schory believes that the forensic activities sponsored and promoted by Pi Kappa Delta offer college youth of America its greatest opportunity for gaining those skills and enlightenment that are so necessary in trying to solve our national problems. “Every national Pi Kappa Delta conven-
tion,” says Dr. Schory, “is a conclave of great enthusiasm and inspiration. Wherever our national conventions are held, citi-
zens comment on the high quality of young men and women present.”

Many students whom Dr. Schory has coached have attained high rank in the fields of education, radio, authorship, war correspondence, politics, and business.

The Forensic feels privileged to join, even in a small way, its voice to the many tributes which are being paid to Dr. Schory at this time for his years of fruitful activity. We wish him health, happiness, and con-
tinued productivity during the period of retirement which he has ahead of him.

You are young, my son, and as the years go by, time will change and even reverse many of your present opinions. Refrain therefore awhile from setting yourself up as a judge of the highest matters.—Plato

New Members of Pi Kappa Delta

Heidelberg
32685 Pat Kropf
32686 David Swinehart
32687 Bruce F. Gischtel

University of Houston
32688 Eugene Cook
32689 Shelby Zimmerman
32690 Katherine Taylor
32691 Louis Patronella
32692 Russel Stanley

Georgetown
32693 Tom Glen Henry
32694 Charles T. Walters

Eastern Montana, Billings
32995 Vera Lou Abbott
32996 Joe Backman
32997 Lorraine Gilman
32998 Betty Hooker
32999 George Neal Liningler
32700 Barbara M. Matelich
32701 James Rowlan

Wake Forest
32702 Charles G. Johnson, Jr.
32703 James E. Baucom
32704 Levis M. Morgan
32705 Thomas T. Long, III

St. Martin’s, Wash.
32706 Richard Hendricks
32707 Henry R. Kramer
32708 Joseph Kenna, Jr.

N.W. Nazarene, Idaho
32709 Jack Wright, Jr.

McKendree, Ill.
32710 Mrs. Mary Ellen Williams

Humboldt, Calif.
32711 Dianne Gillespie

Univ. of Ill. at Chicago
32712 Nicholas G. Biro

Concordia College
32713 Orville L. Freeman

Humboldt St., Calif.
32714 Muriel Armstrong

N.W. Missouri
32715 Roger Blackwell
32716 Marilyn Gillis
32717 David Hargrave
32718 Jeanne Kramme
32719 Mary Pritchard
32720 Delbert Smith

George Pepperdine
32721 Warren S. Jones

McKendree
32722 Monica McCracken

Seattle Pacific
32723 Bonnie Loeffler
32724 Eleanor Johnson
32725 Dennis Bergum
32726 George DeBell
The Good Chapter

A local Pi Kappa Delta chapter is an organization within a college of a group of students and faculty members interested in advancing forensics. What are its functions and what are its obligations? These may be divided into two groups.

First, because it is a local organization, what are its obligations on its own campus? They are to do everything it can to promote a healthy forensic atmosphere. Among the things it certainly should do are some of the following:

- It should plan and carry through a well-balanced forensic program which will bring opportunity to as many students as possible.
- It should help to maintain high standards of excellence in debate and oratory.
- It should see that forensics receive attention in the college and local papers. Well written, timely stories of forensic events should be supplied to the papers.
- There should be some program for discovering and interesting new forensic talent.
- The chapter should hold regular meetings.
- There should be a banquet or a formal meeting some time during the year. The initiation service should be well put on.

Second, because the chapter is a unit in a national organization, its duties to the general society should be carefully discharged. These are:

- Keeping in touch with the national officers by supplying them always with the names of the local officers so that communication can be maintained.
- Answering promptly all letters and demands from the general offices.
- Keeping the national society informed as to what the chapter is doing. The FORENSIC should be supplied with news.
- Attending provincial meetings and taking part in the activity of the province.
- Attending the national conventions and taking part in them.

A healthy chapter should function on its own campus and contribute something to the national organization to help it to grow and function. Check your own chapter. Are you doing all that you should, both at home and abroad?

The above is reprinted from the March, 1937, FORENSIC. It seems as true now as then.
The Editor Signs Off

A few weeks ago an untitled article came to my desk. In many ways it is the most disturbing article which I have received as editor of The Forensic. You can read it for yourself, because it is the lead article in this issue. With the writer's consent, I have labeled it "Prejudice Is a Two-Way Street."

Teaching as I do in a college that is almost smack dab in the middle of the Midwest, I have had no contact with the problem which Professor Simonson describes. The somewhat strict rules of our faculty on class attendance prevent our traveling very often outside our own cultural bailiwick. Comment on Professor Simonson's article is therefore solicited from the readers of The Forensic. I would like to feel that the events and experiences he narrates are unique; I hope that no confirmation is forthcoming. But if what he tells has been a general happening, then things have indeed come to a sad pass. If prejudice and feeling are so high that students are treated discourteously, then Pi Kappa Delta should take action.

Fortunately, not all the articles in this issue are so depressing in the picture they paint of the current forensic world. Eldon Baker's tongue-in-check presentation of "Nine Simple Ways for Coaches to Win Friends and Influence People at a Forensic Tournament" is a glorious spoof on a type of person we have all seen in action at one time or another, but which we realize is an exception rather than the rule.

But perhaps I am talking too much about the articles. If I am, it may be because I don't have much else to talk about. The response to requests for chapter and alumni news was noticeably weak this time. Much of it was picked up incidentally, rather than from information sent to the three co-editors of the magazine. Nor have those student articles which were promised come through. Remember, we want to carry some information about each chapter in each issue. But we cannot get the news; someone at your school has to send it in to us. This is your magazine; give us your help.

The next issue is the last for this year. By the time it appears, the provincial conventions will all have been held. Whatever else, The Forensic wants a complete story on your provincial. Send us the results and the pictures before you go home from that provincial. Make it your last act to slip the data into a manila envelope and to mail it as you drive out of town. In that way, we will be able to carry a notice of every provincial in the May issue.
Finally, brothers, whatever things are true, whatever things are honest, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure, whatever things are lovely, whatever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think of these things.