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The Publicity Committee is very anxious to encourage and enlist every possible interest in the affairs of Pi Kappa Delta. It is our aim to place before the public the activities of our chapters so that people may be informed of the high type of work and leadership that we sponsor and uphold. It is equally important that we ourselves become better acquainted with the work of the chapters. No one group should be content to retain its findings and accomplishments, but should pass them on and let all enjoy the benefits of their attainments. In this way much good will be accomplished; we can exchange practical suggestions for our forensic programs; the weaker chapters will be urged to measure themselves by the standards of the stronger; we can all become better acquainted.

The Publicity Committee will gather all of the Pi Kappa Delta information it can possibly find and send it out thru the Associated Press and the United Press. If we are to make this thing a go, we must have the information. Now that is where you come in; you are responsible for that. We want you to send us anything that you consider will make good publicity. Let us have your leading news from time to time, whether it pertain to your chapter activities or to your provincial conventions. If you have a winner or runner-up in a contest; if you have an unusual debate; if you have an international debate; if you have an interesting debate experience, or what not, send the news to one of the committee at the addresses given below and we shall draft a story for the press. Let the committee serve as a clearing house for Pi Kappa Delta news.

Our big task will come during the convention, at which time we shall provide every possible publicity facility to keep the convention before the public. But much can be done between now and the national convention if you will let the committee serve you, and, through you, the whole of Pi Kappa Delta.

C. W. Patton, Chairman, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla.
L. W. Courtney, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.
Harold Allen, Shurtleff College, Alton, Illinois.
V. M. Queener, Maryville College, Maryville, Tennessee.
MEMBERS and Friends of the National Association:

It is my pleasant duty to welcome you to the fifteenth annual convention of a most remarkable organization—an organization which began as a little group of "academic teachers of public speaking," but which now includes many hundreds of teachers, some of whom scorn to teach public speaking, and some of whom do not like to be called academic. Within our present field of interest are such apparently divergent subjects as conference speaking, argumentation, persuasion, debate, rhetoric, oratory, radio address, pedagogy of speech, oral reading, verse-speaking, interpretation, story-telling, drama, acting, stage directing, stagecraft, pantomime, pageantry, voice science, phonetics, physics of speech sounds, laryngology, psychology of speech, mental hygiene, pathology and correction of speech disorders, and—not quite lost in the shuffle—public speaking.

I have been asked frequently of late to explain how all these subjects can be considered as belonging to a single discipline; how a single department of instruction can presume to claim them all; and how a single national association that does claim them all can possibly hold together.

It has not been altogether an easy question to answer. I am not sure that it has ever been officially answered by the Association, or even considered in a formal way. But I have tried
to answer it unofficially, and if my answer is wrong I hope that you will set me right before this convention is over.

A Common Bond

I have answered that the members of our profession are bound together by a common conception of speech as the most distinctive characteristic of mankind; the characteristic which—apart from the soul—most distinguishes man from other animals; the characteristic which represents man’s highest achievement and the instrument for all his other achievements including thought itself. I have said further that with this conception goes inevitably the conviction that speech education is the most basic and purposeful of all disciplines.

Such a statement of the case sounds, I suppose, a bit high-falutin, and some of our colleagues may be pardoned if they set it down to an exaggerated professional enthusiasm. Nevertheless it is close to the truth. Certainly no one will deny that speech is man’s most essential medium of communication—not to mention woman’s. No one will deny that speech is older than writing; that writing is but a development of the attempt to record and perpetuate speech; and that speech is therefore the basis of the perpetuation of human knowledge. No one, I think, will deny that speech in its more highly developed forms is an instrument of culture on the one hand, and of leadership on the other. And if these things are true, it follows that the mastery of his own powers of speech is to the individual human being the most important of all skills, and to some degree the index of the whole man.

Personally, I came into this Association as an academic teacher of public speaking, and with others of my ilk I still share a certain distrust of the word Speech—especially with a capital S. I particularly resent any conception of the term which is too narrow to include public speaking, or which is limited to one specialized aspect of speech training, such as voice, diction, or enunciation. But I do believe in the essential unity of speech education in its broadest sense. I know that most of the serious difficulties I have to contend with in teaching public speaking are traceable to some maladjustment in the student’s early speech history, some warping or twisting of the speech situation which has resulted in the growth of inhibitions, or mannerisms, or misconceptions.

Has Inferiority Complex

A great deal has been said in the public press of late about the inferiority of American speech. It seems to be generally
admitted that in our verbal intercourse with other nations we Americans are at a disadvantage. We have a tendency to slowness in voice and diction, and we are subject to self-consciousness. In our own respective communities and our own local dialects we usually speak with some ease, but when we travel, or meet people from other regions, we are inclined to experience a sense of inferiority and to seek refuge in silence—all of us at least except the ones whose speech is least creditable and most offensive. They generally talk too much.

If we are to shake off this inferiority, and to master our own powers of speech to a degree consistent with our capabilities, it must come about through the cooperation of all the agencies represented in this Association. The time is ripe for a most rapid development, for the radio and talking pictures have created new agencies, of enormous potentiality. Something is going to happen to American speech in the next few years, and it is our responsibility to see that it happens for better, not worse. We cannot confine ourselves to remedial or re-educational work in high school and college; we must make use of the agencies which affect the formative period of life.

Elementary School Speech

It is in the elementary schools that speech education can be most effective because there it precedes the period of greatest self-consciousness. One of the greatest obstacles to re-education in the later years is the dread of affectation. The student hesitates to make any change in his habits for fear it will not seem natural. He often persists in what he really knows is bad, in order to avoid the suspicions of hypocrisy. But the chief difference between natural behavior and affectation is a difference of time. Man is not born with the power of speech; the whole speech function must be learned. What is learned early in life is regarded as natural. What is learned late, and therefore consciously, is regarded as an affectation. If good speech is learned early, good speech will seem natural, and there lies the opportunity for the elementary schools.

So far the National Association has had very little cooperation from the elementary schools, not because the schools decline to respond when reached, but because we have not yet reached them. In this convention we are trying to make a beginning in that direction. I would call your attention to the separate section for the consideration of elementary school problems this afternoon. I sincerely hope that it will be well attended and that from it will grow an active and wide-spread
movement for the betterment of fundamental speech training in the grades.

And now just one thing more. As many of you know, your officers have been planning a campaign to secure more adequate financial support for some of the projects now being carried on by the Association. This campaign has not yet progressed very far, but already we have found it necessary to formulate some kind of a statement defining the aims of the Association. With the help of several other officers, I have written out such a statement, and that also I want to lay before you, that it may be freely discussed during the convention, and if necessary revised, for the benefit of my successor who will carry on the campaign.

Aims of Association

I have ventured the assertion that the aims of the National Association of Teachers of Speech are as follows:

1. To afford all teachers of speech, through its meetings and publications, opportunity for the exchange of opinions and experiences, for cooperation and mutual assistance.

2. To encourage the effective and worthy use of man's greatest and most distinctive gift: the power of communication through articulate speech; a power without which his other achievements, even the power of thought, would be impossible.

3. To restore the ancient discipline for the cultivation of that power to the place in education which it held for the greater part of two thousand years.

4. To organize and bring to the service of the speech educator the resources of modern science and thought.

5. To encourage genuine research for the extension of these resources.

6. To direct the great potential influence of the radio, the talking picture, and other such inventions, to the improvement, rather than the degradation, of American speech.

7. Generally, to improve American speech as an instrument of communication, a vehicle of civilized thought and feeling, and an index of national character.

And to these should be added the following important negative statement:

8. It is not the aim of the Association to impose upon the American people any narrow standard of pronunciation; or to propagate any particular controversial theory; or to encourage any restrictive uniformity of method.

With this statement, ladies and gentlemen, I declare the 1930 Convention in full session.
DEBATING FOR THE AUDIENCE

By PROF. H. B. SUMMERS
Kansas State Agricultural College

THERE is an old vaudeville gag, well known to everyone, to the effect that when two Englishmen get together, they have tea; when two Scotchmen meet, they form a Caledonian Club; and when two Irishmen get together, they have a fight. The idea should be carried one step further: when two debate coaches get together, they hold an experience meeting and commiserate one another on the disappearance of the debate audience.

Certainly no one will question the statement that the old-time debate audience is almost as extinct as the famous dodo-bird. We can offer whatever alibis we wish; we can blame it on the movies, or the increase in social activity, or the emphasis on football, or the non-intellectual type of student which composes the bulk of our college population today. But regardless of explanations, the fact remains; audiences around our colleges simply do not attend debates. Of course, we can bring in a team of Englishmen from Oxford or Cambridge, and pack in a thousand sensation-seekers, anxious to be amused by the much-advertised wit of our visitors—but when the next “regular” debate is held, the audience shrinks to its normal proportions of six debaters, a chairman, a judge, a couple of coaches, and a handful of the faithful.

Editor’s Note—You may disagree with the author of this article. He will not object to that. IS he right in stating that “interest in debate is dead?” Do you agree with him that there is nothing in debating, as usually conducted, to interest an intelligent audience? Do you,—admitting shortcomings in the present system—believe that the big trouble lies in the choice of questions? Can debating, with right choice of subject, be made interesting to an audience—providing we can get the audience? Shall we discard debate conventions and technicalities?

Do you agree with Prof. Summers’ criticism of PI Kappa Delta that our organization discourages progress in debate; that “debate as we found it in 1912 is still our standard and our ideal”? Do we in PKD need to re-evaluate debating in light of modern needs, and change our basis in awarding advanced degrees?

Whether you agree or disagree with the author, you must admit that he is shooting hard and fast and pointing where he is looking. You will find this article interesting. You will note that we have placed it in the PKD Forum. Now if you do not like it; if you do not believe that debate is dead; or being dead did not get that way from the ills enumerated here, then man your argumentative guns and launch a counter attack. You, “being a member,” may especially resent the attack.
on “our worthy order.” In such a case it is your “patriotic” duty to rise and defend. There will be room in the Forum of the March Forensic for “reactions” favorable or otherwise to the point of view expressed here.

whose capacity for punishment has not yet been reached.

That’s the situation existing in nine out of ten colleges today. Interest in debate is dead. And the worst of it is, most of our coaches strew flowers over the dear departed, wring their hands and bemoan the situation—and that’s all. We’re content to let the dead rest in peace. Perhaps if we take the trouble to look at our debating from the point of view of our departed audiences, we might be able to see a few of the reasons why audiences refused to attend our discussions. The writer has had the experience—perhaps the word should be misfortune—of hearing nearly five hundred debates in the past seven or eight years, including both high school and college discussions, and in practically every part of the United States. On the basis of these discussions, it may be possible to postulate a typical American debate.

The question almost invariably is one not touching the lives of anyone in the audience, and in which the audience is interested only politely, if at all. Free trade, for example, or unemployment insurance, or world disarmament, or parliamentary government for the United States, or perhaps the creation of a department of education in the cabinet—very excellent subjects from the standpoint of two-sided-ness and ability to secure impartial judging, but wholly uninteresting to an audience, whether from the campus or from the town. Four debaters, or possibly six, haranguing their bored hearers with patently artificial passion, through eight—or even twelve—dull speeches. A minimum of consideration for the audience and its interests and problems; a maximum of consideration for the all-important matter of winning a vote of a judge. Much flourishing of debate technicalities—“burden of proof,” “affirmative,” “negative,” “colleagues,” “constructive case,” “rebuttal,” “major contention,” “Honorable Judge,” all meaningless to the debate-ignorant audience, yet introduced and reiterated ad nauseum. Nicely-planned traps, and righteous indignation when opponents refuse to stumble and commit themselves. Complete absence of clash during constructive speeches, then a sudden interest in what opponents have said in rebuttals. And finally, a tactfully-worded decision by a self-confessed “expert” judge (the writer is no exception) pointing out praiseworthy observance or unfortunate
lack of observance of various debate technicalities by one side or the other, "compelling me to believe that the better debating, by a very small margin, has been done by the Affirmative."

What is there in a performance of that kind to interest an intelligent audience? What stimulus to intelligent thinking? What light upon subjects of current popular interest? Nothing, of course. As coaches, we admit it. In fact, we take pride in it. Debate isn't intended for the masses. It's intended for the few who can appreciate it—apparently the professional judges. Of course, once in a while we become alarmed at the enthusiasm with which everyone remains away from our little parties, and attempt to inject some life into the dying horse by using some novelty or other. We bring in a team from some other section, or we use the innovation of an open forum and allow our bored listeners to ask questions after the debate, or even introduce legal cross-questioning of opponents into the discussions in the hope that novelty may counter-balance lack of content. But even these innovations, worthy as they may be, are insufficient to bring back the crowd. The debate audience has been hooked before; it resolutely refuses to even nibble on the bait so temptingly displayed.

And all the while, we stand in the class-room and tell our students of speech that the purpose of a speech is to persuade the audience—to make our hearers think, or feel, or act in a different manner than before. We tell them that the success of a speech is measured by the degree to which we affect audience reactions. We hold up for admiration the great speakers of bygone years—men who, in times of stress, moulded the beliefs of great audiences on questions of vital interest to those audiences. And then we retire to our offices, and arrange for still another debate in which the speakers are asked to concern themselves with displaying sufficient debate technique to win the vote of a judge.

Wouldn't it be possible for us to attempt a slightly different kind of debate—one in which debaters, really believing in the arguments they advance, discuss questions of present day vital importance before audiences directly concerned in the subject chosen? Might not our debaters discuss that proposed increase in state taxation before audiences of tax-payers who will be called upon to foot the bill? Might they not discuss the success or failure of the farm board before audiences of wheat-growers who have just watched the price of
wheat tumble to half the level of a year ago? Might they not consider before men whose businesses are affected, not the theoretical desirability of free trade, but the effects of the Smoot-Hawley tariff itself?

Numerous schools have experimented with debating of this kind in the past few years. Vanderbilt and Tennessee annually hold a series of discussions before business-man audiences all over the state, on whatever question is selected as most vital to Tennessee. Pittsburgh has used the same idea with various opponents; so have Missouri, Drake, Nebraska, Kansas, Kansas State and Oklahoma. The writer has been present at a dozen or more discussions in various localities; in every case, the audience has been vitally interested; frequently surprising changes in attitude toward vital questions have resulted; almost invariably organizations before which such discussions have been held have invited the participating debaters to return for discussion of other vital questions at a future date.

The writer suggests that debate coaches who are faced by loss of audience interest in debate in their own schools, consider seriously the possibility of supplementing their present programs with a few of these more practical discussions each year. Opportunities for such discussions are plentiful; labor unions, chambers of commerce, civic clubs, women's clubs, farm bureaus, high schools, churches, and even fraternal organizations will usually welcome the possibility of holding such discussions before their membership. But the difference is not merely one of audiences; the change should go far deeper than that.

Technicalities Should Be Put in Discard

Purely academic questions must be discarded; the subject selected should be one which directly affects the interests of those composing the particular audience, and which is of immediate public interest. Debate technicalities should be forgotten; there is no need to bewilder the audience with technical discussions of burden of proof. Probably it would be desirable to abandon the conventional order of speeches, with artificial division into constructive and rebuttal arguments, and permit each speaker to appear only once with perhaps a very short concluding rejoinder for the side opening the discussion. But most important of all, the minds of the speakers should be centered upon the idea that the audience is keenly interested; that they are speaking in behalf of or are opposing an idea which is being seriously considered; that they must win their hearers to their own way of thinking. The aim of every speaker must be not to impress a judge or the au-
dience itself with the speaker’s ability as a debater and his mastery of the question, but to win the minds of his hearers for his cause. That is the essence of practical debating.

The introduction of this more practical form of debating does not and should not involve the abandoning of the present formal academic style of debate. After all, the debater is a student; at least one important purpose of all of our debating is to give him training; and no better device has been discovered for training a student in the use of argumentation than this existing form of debate. However, the training of the debater should not end with formal contest debating. After the ground-work has been laid by this method, the student should be given opportunity to try out his powers of persuasion under practical conditions, in discussions of vital public questions before interested audiences.

Perhaps the whole matter might be clarified if the debates in which college students participate were classified under three general heads. First would come the debates of the type which today are usually our non-decision arguments—those held entirely for the purpose of giving speakers platform experience and some knowledge of the rudiments of debating. These might be termed “freshman debates” whether the speakers be freshmen or upper-classmen; better still might be the term “novice debates,” for so far as college debating is concerned, the participants might still be assumed to be in the novice class. For such discussions, no audience need be present unless perhaps one composed of other debaters, and no decision need be rendered—faculty advisors and coaches of the participants could supply all of the criticism desired. Next might be listed the formal type of academic debate most common today, with debaters who have progressed beyond the novice class. For these, small audiences would be desirable, but not essential. The purpose of such debates would still be primarily the training of the debaters, but now perhaps in the finer points of argumentation. Decisions for these debates would be valuable, particularly those rendered by critic judges, as a means of giving the speakers a broader viewpoint on the demands of effective debating. But after the debater has had sufficient experience in these two types of debate, there should still be open to him the opportunity of participating in practical discussions in which he could use his persuasive powers to win adult audiences to his own point of view concerning vital public questions. This third stage of debate might be termed audience discussions, informal debates, or
whatever other term seems suitable. In the opinion of the writer, a program of training following these lines and covering a period of not less than three years in ordinary cases would be far more valuable to the debater than the widest experience in the form of debating customary today.

Unfortunately, Pi Kappa Delta takes a position today which definitely discourages any such form of debating as that suggested above. The constitution of Pi Kappa Delta (and the writer was a member of the committee which drafted the provisions) lays all stress on decision contests, and penalizes any form of discussion in which a formal decision is not given by making such discussions count but little toward securing advanced degrees in the fraternity. From the standpoint of the constitution of the organization, it is far more of an accomplishment in debate to stand in an almost empty room at a national or provincial convention, and convince one judge that you are a better debater than your opponent, than it is to convince an audience of five hundred business men that the tax increase which they oppose is necessary to the welfare the community. And it is this attitude which has done as much as any other single factor to bring debate to the unfortunate position which it occupies today.

Pi Kappa Delta is an organization devoted to the fostering of debate; presumably to the elimination of glaring weaknesses in debate and the encouragement of improvements. It is an unfortunate fact that in the entire life of the organization, no particular effort has been made by the fraternity as a whole to directly improve the quality of debating done. To be sure, debate has been made more convenient, both through the adoption of a national question each year and through the holding of provincial and national tournaments; likewise the fraternity has worked consistently toward higher ethical standards in forensics. But we have given far more attention to the problem of securing a large attendance at our national conventions than we have to the more vital matter of discovering the cause of the loss of interest in debate on the part of the audience. We have discouraged rather than encouraged innovations; debate as we found it in 1912 is still our standard and our ideal.

Many of the debate coaches in our colleges and universities feel that in practical informal discussion of vital questions there is to be found a forward step in debate. Would it be too much to suggest that Pi Kappa Delta recognize and en-
Shall We encourage such discussions as worthy of the attention of its members? Would it be too much to ask that debating of this type be given a position at least of equal importance to formal decision debating as a basis for advanced degrees? Or might one even go a step further, and suggest that Pi Kappa Delta even more decidedly encourage this more practical form of debating by the creation of a new degree, open only to students who, having attained special distinction, have participated worthily in a reasonable manner of public discussions of this kind?

No doubt these suggestions are extreme. Discussion of the type considered in this paper is still in its infancy; perhaps it is too early to urge its encouragement in positive fashion. But the experiments with informal discussion by dozens of colleges and universities, some of them among the largest and most progressive in the land, do show that such discussions are worthy the consideration of every member of Pi Kappa Delta. Perhaps in public discussion, used to supplement our existing forms of formal debate, we may find an answer to the all-too-common question, “What’s wrong with debate?”

---

Albert Tener (left) and Theron Ashley (right), of Park College (Missouri Beta), winners of first place in the men’s division of the annual debate tournament of Southwestern College (Kansas Delta). The cup pictured was awarded to the Park team.
Banquet of Southwestern Practice Intercollegiate Debate Tournament, Winfield, Kansas, December 5-6, 1930.
Over 200 were at the banquet—all debaters or coaches.
A NEW type of debate tournament has been developed recently which is attracting wide and favorable attention. It is the pre-season, practice tournament. A year ago the first tournament of this kind was held at Southwestern College, Winfield Kansas, and on December 5 and 6, 1930, the second tournament was held. How widespread this idea has gone and how favorably it has been received is attested by the fact that forty-four colleges from the five states of Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas sent a total of 132 teams to participate in the tournament.

For many weeks prior to the opening of the tournament Dr. J. Thompson Baker, head of the Department of Public Speech at Southwestern, has been sending out matter advertising the tournament and explaining its character. All colleges which attended last year were anxious to return, and many new ones enrolled.

The tournament is just what its name indicates, a practice tournament. To it the debaters come, not fully prepared or in any sense polished speakers; but they come with a general knowledge of the subject under consideration and here thru practice and exchange of ideas and wits in actual debating have the benefit of a real training school in debate.

The tournament began with a great banquet at six o'clock in the big Stewart gymnasium. More than 200 debaters and coaches partook of this banquet, and it looked like a healthy young brother of the national Pi Kappa Delta banquet. Dr. Baker acted as toastmaster and the following program was carried out in a spicy and interesting way:

"The two horns of the dilemma"------------------------Miss Maude Webster, from the Long Horn State (Texas)

"The kernel of the corn"-------------------------------Prof. Leroy Laase, from the Cornhusker State (Nebraska)

"Keeping the Sunflower Smile"------------------------Prof. Marcus A. Hess, from the Sunflower State (Kansas)

"Show us in debate"-----------------------------------Miss Lucille Beals, from the Show Us State (Missouri)

"Eventually, why not sooner?"--------------------------Prof. O. W. Rush, from the Sooner State (Oklahoma)

At 7:30, the banquet closed, and all went to the high school where the tournament was held. Two rounds of debate were held
Miss LaVerne Geeslin (left) and Miss Hester Irion (right), of Northwestern State Teachers' College, (Oklahoma), who as first place winners in the women's division of the annual debate tournament of Southwestern College (Kansas), were awarded the cup shown herewith.

that night. According to the plan of the tournament, there were five rounds of the debates before the eliminations began, so that each team was assured of five debates, win or lose. After the five rounds, all teams which had won at least four of the first five debates went into the eliminations. As soon as any team lost two debates it dropped out, whether the loss of one was in the first five or not.

All teams were prepared to debate both sides of the question, and as far as possible alternated sides throughout the debating. Substituting was freely allowed, with the provision that if a debater or team was once withdrawn it was not permitted to go back into the tournament again. As a result of this plan, many more teams came and were used. In fact, tho there were but 104 teams entered at the beginning of the tournament, teams were substituted freely; so that there were altogether 132 teams in the tournament.

Altogether there were 281 debates from eight o'clock on Friday night until two-thirty Sunday morning. Since in the national tournament at Wichita last March during the five days there were but 470 debates, it can be seen how enormous was the tournament held in Winfield and how strenuous the program. In fact, it was altogether too strenuous, and already plans are under way to make a better tournament next year and at the
same time eliminate some difficulties experienced this year.

Altogether there were twelve rounds to the tournament, and it was at the same time like a three-ringed circus, for three distinct tournaments were running simultaneously; one for men and one for women of senior colleges and one for mixed teams of junior colleges.

Thirteen men's teams, twelve women's teams and five junior college teams, a total of just thirty teams entered the elimination contests, which began with the sixth round. The junior tournament was completed in the ninth round, when one team from St. John's College, of Winfield, won first place, and another team from St. John's won second place. The women's tournament ended in the tenth round, with Alva Teachers of Oklahoma winning first place and Wichita University women winning second honor. The men's tournament proved to be a veritable endurance test, and not until 2:30 Sunday morning in the twelfth round was it decided, when Wichita University won first place and Park college of Missouri won second place. How sharp and even was the competition is indicated by the fact that not a single team went thru the tournament without defeat.

All the debates except the last were judged by a single judge, but in the final debate there were three judges. The judges used came from the coaches in attendance, the faculty of Southwestern College and the Winfield high school, and from business and professional men and women of the town.

There is no enrollment fee of any kind at this tournament. Rooms are provided in the best homes of the city or at the hotels at fifty cents per person per night, and meals are furnished for thirty-five cents each. The banquet supper costs but fifty cents. Six fine silver loving cups were awarded to winners of first and second places in the tournament. These cups were donated by the Winfield Chamber of Commerce.

The size of the tournament has become a real problem, but arrangements already are under way to provide for taking care
Winners Invitation Debate Tournament at Winfield, Kansas, December 5-6. There were 54 men’s teams and 36 women’s teams entered from five states—Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. The University of Wichita Men’s team of Tom Croft and George Squibb won first place. And the University of Wichita Women’s team won second place. Mr. Croft and Miss Neff are freshmen, Mr. Squibb is a sophomore and Miss McIntire is a senior.

Leroy Lewis, Coach.

of it in an improved manner another year. It would seem from the fact that Southwestern but two weeks before this tournament held a huge high school debate tournament on a similar plan, with almost 100 teams competing, and then staged this great college tournament, Winfield has a right to claim to be the “tournament capital of the U. S.”; for so far as we have any record these are the largest debate tournaments held in 1930.

Those who have participated in these tournaments are loud in praise of the benefits derived from them. They are a combination of the best depository of debate material and a training school to develop the essentials of better debating.
DIGNITY
By GEORGE ADE

HEN a man cannot be anything else, he can be dignified. Dignity is the sure-fire asset of the twenty-two calibers. The physiognomy must be stern and rock-bound. It is better to wear dark clothes. The vox humana should be keyed low.

All horse doctors, phrenologists, and justices of the peace are dignified. Also the head floorwalker. Also the village embalmer.

In every community there are citizens who are useful only as background to a public speaker. The visiting celebrity and the pitcher of water are at stage-center, and the local examples of Dignity are in minstrel formation behind—a massive border of self-conscious rectitude and wisdom. They have brain lobes of exactly the same chemical composition as kohlrabi. But they look like the council of the League of Nations.

All during the vocalizing they gaze at the speaker with a heavy and frowning simulation of interest. Each smile bestowed upon a pleasantery is painful compromise.

They have been hand picked to provide a draping of gloom to the proceedings, and they never wander from the assignment.

Sheathed in the armor-plate of Dignity, many a counterfeit travels undetected from the grammar school to the grave. Probably no one, except his wife, is ever on to him.

Nine times out of ten, a godlike demeanor may be regarded as the facade of a Greek temple opening abruptly into a one-room bungalow.

Dignity was invented to mask the absence of works. Some men are silent while brooding over the solemnities of life and others are silent because they haven’t anything to pass out through the window.

Profound calm and an air of abstraction may prove that the subject is meditating on the Lodge theory of life beyond the grave or they may indicate that a short circuit has been estab-

(Continued on page 129)
NEWS OF THE PROVINCES
From S. R. TOUSSAINT, Supervisor of Provinces
When and Where They Will Meet—These dates and places should be the focal points of your Forensic season.

1. Province of Kansas—Pittsburg Teachers College, Pittsburg, April 9, 10, 11.
4. Province of Illinois—Wisconsin State Teachers College, Oshkosh, April 1, 2, 3.
5. Province of the Pacific—Did not report.
6. Province of the Sioux—Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, March 26, 27, 28.
7. Province of the Lower Mississippi—Baylor University, Waco, Texas, April 2, 3, 4.
9. Province of the Lakes—Bowling Green State College, Bowling Green, Ohio, April 9, 10. (Tentative.)
11. Province of the South Atlantic—Farmville State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia, March 27, 28.
12. Province of the Northwest—Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon, March 27, 28.
13. Province of Kentucky—Centre College, Danville, Ky., March 30, 31, April 1.

A Suggestion—to Province Governors
Why not send messages of greeting to the provinces meeting at the same time you are—it won’t cost much and will be a splendid expression of fellowship.

Will YOUR Chapter and YOUR Province be Named?
From the reports sent in by the province governors on the blanks to be prepared for that purpose, the supervisor of provinces is going to make honorable mention of the winner or win-
ners in each of the following friendly contests. Watch for the results in the May issue—the BIG province number.

All Right—LET'S GO!!
1. Which provinces will have 100% attendance of chapters at the convention?
2. Which province will have the largest gathering seated at its banquet?
3. Which province will have the most novel or interesting feature at its convention?
4. Which chapter will have the greatest person-mileage at province conventions? A few traveling a long way will balance many going a short distance.
5. Which chapters will have the best records in tournament competition among the various provinces?

Province 12 Sends the Challenge Out of THE NORTHWEST
Governor R. D. Mahaffey writes: “We are making big plans for our convention next spring. We are going to try to have 100% representation and the best convention in the country.

“Our local chapter is planning to furnish all the entertainment for our visitors that it is possible to get up. We want to have something doing all the time and have a number of committees at work. I will let you know future facts concerning the ‘BIGGEST LITTLE PROVINCE CONVENTION IN THE COUNTRY’ as soon as these facts are settled.”

How about it? Can they get away with that? Well, I'm thinking that twelve other provinces will give them a run. I know that Province 4—the Wisconsin-Illinois corn and dairy farmers—will do their best to wreck their northwestern brothers’ claims.

Attention, Debaters!
With the season about to begin, you will soon be experiencing many contacts, some pleasant, others not so welcome. Be on the lookout for your most pleasant debate relationships and experiences of the year. The committee on inter-chapter relations will have an announcement of interest to you in the March Forensic. We usually broadcast our troubles; we are going to give you a chance to let the world know of some of the good things that come your way. Watch for the notice in the March issue.
THE 1932 NATIONAL CONVENTION

BY PRESIDENT PFLAUM

The Council has been in a long debate and investigation concerning the location of its next national convention. I am now ready to announce the place for the holding of that convention.

I have always felt and earnestly believe that the convention should be passed around geographically so as to equalize over a period of years the expenses of chapters in traveling to and from the convention, and that the various sections should enjoy the privilege of entertaining this important project.

At the last national convention held in Wichita, Kansas, we asked for invitations for the next convention. We received three. Bloomington, Ill.; California; and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. It was time that the convention should go either east or west. Preferably west. The convention vote was slightly in favor of Oklahoma.

The convention and its operation has rapidly grown in size and the demands for a smooth running tournament are many. Having gone thru several conventions and coping with its many problems it was thought best not to make a hasty selection without first making a rather thorough investigation. Consequently the convention chairman and national president made such an investigation. The most ideal situation should be one in which we can house the convention in one hotel or in hotels close together. The contest rooms should be close to the hotels thus avoiding a difficult transportation problem. The convention city should be able to provide a large banquet hall for the evening meals and for the banquet. These are only a few of the many requirements.

California because of its great distance from the majority of the chapters was out of the running for this time. However, we owe it to the western chapters to go to California. I sincerely wish that we might do that in 1934. These western chapters always have the longest trip. Bloomington with two colleges looked like a good possibility. However, our housing situation would have split up the convention. It is hard during a tourna-
ment to get out notices, etc., if the convention is scattered. We would also have some distance to go to contest rooms and meals. No adequate place was available for the evening meals and the banquet. However, we would have had splendid help and cooperation and enthusiastic chapters and leaders to help with the various problems.

Oklahoma City was a sleek slippery place, reeking with wealth and oil. Its hotels were not built as yet and promises for wonderful accommodations were plentiful. But seeing is believing and we felt that we did not dare schedule a convention without some of the simple necessities definitely assured. Oklahoma City is a wonderful place and the people there do things up right so we could not resist the temptation of keeping the convention in that territory. We visited a neighbor of Oklahoma City, namely, Tulsa. They happened to have what we needed. Good hotels, contest rooms two blocks from the hotel, and many of the other convention requirements. It looked like the most possible location and so accepting the kind invitation of the Oklahoma Beta chapter we take pleasure in announcing that our next national convention will be held in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1932. Professor Hopkins, national convention chairman, will start giving you information in the near future.

St. Paul, Minn., was also considered and geographically would have been ideal but at the present time St. Paul is hardly ready to accommodate us. It presents a wonderful place for some future convention.

May I add a word about cooperation? Many of your council members would rather see the convention in another location. I know there are many chapters that would like to have seen a different location, but after due and careful consideration we have selected an ideal place for our convention. You will like and enjoy Tulsa. You will also see one of the best organized and smoothest running conventions that we have ever had. Regardless of how you may feel at present about the location, I am convinced you will be more than pleased with the next National.

I beg of you your whole-hearted support and loyal cooperation.
Dear Members of Pi Kappa Delta:

A Happy and Prosperous New Year:

Again I wish to use the Forensic as a means of getting in touch with each individual member. My letter in the October issue brought many replies and I certainly appreciated them. It shows that we have an active and live wire membership for they are thinking of Pi Kappa Delta and are sending in many helpful suggestions.

I am sorry that we can as yet make no announcement as to the next convention location. *We are not in a hurry and want to be very careful in our choice, thus assuring you that we will have a wonderful convention and have it running very smoothly. We hope that you are saving and planning means of raising money so that you will be able to attend that convention wherever it will be held. Will you please follow the suggestion that Vice President Hopkins presented in the last issue and send to the Forensic Editor information concerning the methods your chapter is employing on financing your way to the next National Convention?

At Wichita we tried to introduce a few stunts at our evening dinners. Are you and your chapter keeping in mind that this opportunity will again come to you at the next Convention? Now is the time to prepare to out-stunt the other stunts.

We want a few National Pi Kappa Delta songs. Will you or some member of your chapter be the author of the National Pi Kappa Delta song? We have those presented at Wichita. We hope to take one evening meeting and adopt a PKΔ song. Come on, you songsters, get busy!

We are planning on changing the program of the next National Banquet. You will be pleasantly surprised and will find something entirely different. That banquet will stand out like “Mars at Perhillion” in your memory. Don’t miss it.

* Since the above was written, Tulsa, Oklahoma, has been selected
Professor Jacobs and his committee presented a very good report on Chapter achievements. Where did your chapter rank? Are you determined to make improvements? Speaking about reports, Finley’s report should be studied,—some of these times we may have to raise our initiation fees. This is one of the questions that will undoubtedly present itself at the next Convention. What about it?

I am receiving quite a number of reports on plans for the provincial meetings. They are looking good. I wish I could take an airplane and drop in at each provincial meeting. That would be a very enjoyable time for me. You may rest assured that I will be thinking of you in your provincial tournament and silently wishing you much success.

Hoping that you will continue to keep plugging for a better and more beneficial Pi Kappa Delta, I am

Fraternally yours,
Geo. R. R. Pflaum.

---

DIGNITY

(Continued from page 123)

lished between the cerebellum and the medulla oblongata and all the cylinders are missing.

Only those who have moral courage can stand out in the presence of Dignity and be frivolous and deliberately normal. The man who fights off the temptation to be dignified must expect an inferior rating. Only the connoisseurs will identify him as a hero.

Nevertheless, avoid the blight of Dignity. Don’t use any of it.

Dignity received a body blow when the frock coat went out. The dancing-craze, and golf, and Roosevelt, and the Eighteenth Amendment, and other influences have weakened the cult. Bourbon whisky supplied many an old-time lawyer with Dignity which is supposed to impress juries.

Doctors are no longer identified by their whiskers, and college professors are becoming approximately human. Is it not true that the young man in the box office at the theater is less like King Solomon than he was a few years ago? Piano-tuners are more affable. There is hope.
IT LOOKS LIKE ANOTHER BIG PROVINCIAL YEAR
Province Governors Write of Their Plans

Finley and Westfall to Speak at Province-of-the-Platte Banquet

WILBUR E. MOORE, Governor, Province of the Platte

"It is our hope here at Colorado Agricultural College that when the provincial convention convenes here March 19, 20, and 21, every chapter will be represented in every contest. We have already had letters from several of the chapters which indicate that they have no thought in them but the convention. It is our plan to provide audiences for most of the contests by holding them before neighboring high schools and local civic clubs. At our banquet former President and Editor Westfall and Secretary Finley will speak. We have also been fortunate to secure Mortimer Stone, a local attorney, who is much demanded by bar associations and university assemblies to be our principal speaker. We plan also to give the delegates at least one trip through a part of the scenic 'Rockies.'"

Pittsburg Teachers Give $250.00 to Kansas Province

PROF. A. E. LEACH, Baker University, Governor

"The Kansas provincial this year is to be the guest of the Pittsburg State Teachers College on the dates of April ninth, tenth and eleventh.

"In addition to the fine facilities thus afforded the Kansas province they are handing us $250 to help defray expenses of judges and trophies.

"Under the inspiration of the last national so lately in our midst and also of the coming one at our very doorway (in Oklahoma) next year, we hope to reach such excellence and high attainment that it shall be an outstanding event in Pi Kappa Delta history.

"The tournament is to feature debate, oratory and extempore address for both men and women. Two entries may be made in each event. The reports so far received indicate a fine interest and cooperation."
All of the colleges of the province having Pi Kappa Delta chapters voted to invite other senior colleges, which do not have chapters, to participate in the tournament; and most of these have already accepted the invitation.

The subject of the general field for extempore for women as voted by the chapters of the province is "Women in Politics" and for men "Prohibition."

Both the contests in oratory and in extempore as well as the debates will be carried out on the tournament plan, similar to that of the province tournament of two years ago. This plan was originated by Dr. J. Thompson Baker of Southwestern College, and met hearty approval at the last province tournament. Dr. Baker is the lieutenant governor of the province, and has been designated as the director of the tournament this year.

The contests in extempore and oratory will be held in the forenoons while the debating will take place in the afternoon and evenings. Thus conflicts on the part of any who may wish to enter more than one contest will be avoided.

There will be three rounds of debates, win or lose, before eliminations. Substitutes allowed at will and two defeats before a team is eliminated from the contest.

Province of the Lakes to Feature Banquet and Award Prizes in Member-Miles Contest

PROF. K. G. HANCE, Albion College, Governor

"In our convention we plan on having a full set of contests: men's and women's debate, men's and women's extempore, and men's and women's oratory. The first and second place winners in each event will be presented with the awards provided by the National Council through the official jeweler. Each chapter may enter two men's and two women's debate teams and one extempore speaker and orator in each contest. In order to stimulate interest, we plan on giving a prize to the chapter having the greatest number of member-miles represented in its delegation, (number of representatives multiplied by the mileage to the convention). Furthermore, we are planning on a banquet, at a popular price, at which we hope every person will be in attendance. About a month ago I sent a letter to each chapter outlining plans and asking for answers to about twelve questions (concerning choices of extempore topics, etc.), and the response has been nearly a hundred per cent. So far, then, we look forward to a good chapter representation at the convention. It will be held
at Bowling Green State College, Bowling Green, Ohio, on the Thursday and Friday of either the first or second week in April.

"At the convention held at Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Michigan, two years ago we found that the feature of the session was the banquet held the evening of the first convention day. This insured the attendance of even those who might not care to remain for the final events. We had well over a hundred people present, and everyone seemed to consider the good fellowship which it created a very worth while part of the session. This event we hope will be the feature of the 1931 convention.

"For the good of the 'brotherhood' I suggest one thing: admonition to the chapters to reply promptly to letters sent by province governors. We are helpless unless we have answers to letters and questionnaires."

The Sioux Province Tournament—a "Little National"
PROF. P. J. HARKNESS, South Dakota Zeta, Governor

The 1930-31 Sioux Province tournament will be held at Morningside College at Sioux City, Iowa, on March 26, 27, 28.

The schools of this province represent three states: North Dakota, South Dakota and Iowa, and comprise the following Pi Kappa Delta chapters:

North Dakota Alpha, Jamestown College, Jamestown.
South Dakota Alpha, Dakota Wesleyan College, Mitchell.
South Dakota Beta, Huron College, Huron.
South Dakota Gamma, Yankton College, Yankton.
South Dakota Delta, South Dakota State College, Brookings.
South Dakota Epsilon, Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls.
South Dakota Zeta, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen.
South Dakota Eta, Augustana College, Sioux Falls.
South Dakota Theta, Eastern State Teachers College, Madison.

Iowa Delta, Morningside College, Sioux City.
Iowa Iota, Western Union College, La Mars.
Iowa Kappa, Buena Vista College, Storm Lake.

The Sioux Province is carried on in miniature national tournament fashion. Each chapter is assessed from $30.00 to $40.00 to cover expenses of the tournament. This pays for the judges, including the expert judge usually called in for the final contests. From six to eight rounds of debate are usually held with compe-
tition keen from the very beginning. The Sioux Province was the first to give medals to individuals. This was done at the last provincial meet at Huron, in 1929. We plan to carry on this system of awards. In every department and phase of its convention, it is like the national,—the Sioux Province “Little National.”

PARLETTE
PROPHECIES
PERFECT
PROVINCIAL
ARLEY

By Prof. John Parlette, Morningside College
Executive Secretary Sioux Province

Here it is folks; absolutely the feature of the season. “Province of the Sioux” is staging a miniature national convention at the “shopping center of four states.” We are getting the course in readiness and will plan to tee off for the “wax eloquent” green on the Morningside estate in Sioux City. The muddy Missouri, according to present indications, will furnish no water hazard. The chief hazards on this course are those schools in South Dakota who played “Bobby” Jones at the national convention at Wichita.

We made Wichita, with its great “air” industry, the “Hot Air Capital” of the United States; what shall we make Sioux City with its stock yards and packing plants? May prevailing winds be with us.

Banquet With Little Speaking to Feature the Meeting of the Lower Mississippi Province

PROF. L. W. COURTNEY, Baylor University, Governor

The Lower Mississippi Province will meet with Baylor University, Waco, Texas, on April 3 and 4, 1931.

“Thus far the plans are tentative rather than fixed. Two or three letters have gone to each chapter in the province. To these letters approximately half the chapters have sent replies. From the present indications, I judge that the province meet will be well attended. More than one chapter will have full delegations. “If time permits, there will be two features outside of the
regular order of contests. We plan to have an informal dinner, only one or two short talks, no set speeches to take the edge off the enjoyment of the occasion. A ride through the city, city parks, and a motor boat outing on Lake Waco will be offered for the second afternoon.

“Additional plans are being worked out with the City Manager, who shows a definite interest in the coming of the Pi Kappa Deltas from the various cities of our province. Waco, “The City With a Soul,” will endeavor to make the 1931 provincial meet a pleasure to all who come.”

Prominent Speakers for Oklahoma Province

PROF. C. W. PATTON, Oklahoma Baptist College, Governor

The Oklahoma Province will meet with the Northwestern State Teachers’ College, Alva, Okla., March 13-14. We are trying to secure some prominent speakers for the banquet at the close of the meet. Programs will be sent to each chapter in Oklahoma.

Wichita Convention Gives Impetus to Province of Upper Mississippi

Prof. Abner Haugen, St. Olaf College, Governor

The Provincial Convention of the Upper Mississippi will be held at St. Olaf College on Friday, April 10. At that time we hope to have contests in both men and women’s extempore speaking contests in which the representatives of five Minnesota colleges and three Iowa colleges will take part. Besides these contests the Minnesota colleges will enter contestants in the State Peace Oratorical to be held on the same day.

I feel that the National Pi Kappa Delta Convention at Wichita last spring has given an added impetus to forensic work in our province and as a result we are preparing plans for a good contest here in April.
RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE STATUS OF THE FORENSIC FRATERNITY ON THE CAMPUS

By FOREST H. ROSE, National Vice President P. K. D.

This report is the result of a questionnaire sent to the president and debate coach in each of fifty schools. The schools were selected at random, and were all of college and university rank, the only item entering into the selection being that the school have a forensic fraternity, national and honorary. Thirty of the presidents and forty-one of the debate coaches returned the questionnaire, making a total of seventy-one answers from one hundred questionnaires sent out, and representing forty-one of the fifty schools. It should be stated that five presidents turned their copies of the questionnaire over to the debate coach for answering, in which case the answer has been counted once for the president and once for the coach. I believe that this method of handling the situation has been fair and that it was the only possible way of counting these reports. It should also be stated that the great majority of schools represented in this report were Pi Kappa Delta schools. The schools included in this report cover twelve states.

| Is the forensic fraternity on your campus a live organization or is it merely another organization? |
|---|---|
| **Presidents** | **Coaches** |
| Very lively and worth while—doing a constructive piece of work | Very lively and worth while | 1 |
| Not particularly alive | Merely another | 6 |
| Live as any | Not particularly lively | 1 |
| Active during debate season | Fluctuates | 2 |
| Doing pretty well | Live as any | 1 |
| Properly alive | Alive | 19 |
| Alive | Very alive and active | 3 |
| Very much alive | Very much alive | 8 |
| Accomplished a great deal | 1 |
| Very valuable | 1 |

29

41
**THE FORENSIC OF**

Do you believe that the forensic fraternity stirs interest for forensic endeavor in those who would not ordinarily be interested?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt it</td>
<td>Doubt it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think so</td>
<td>Not much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Among some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among some</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decidedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are sure it does</td>
<td>Beyond a doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than anything we've tried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Do you believe that the money and time expended by your local group in attending national and regional conventions is justified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not wholly</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a general way, yes</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, as long as schools spend so much for athletic coaches, equipment, and trips</td>
<td>In a general way, yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>Probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment has justified itself</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Has forensic fraternity on your campus complicated the disciplinary situation in any way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the least</td>
<td>Not in the least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No—helped in that it has kept some busy</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Improved it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No; kept those busy who might have led less worthwhile enterprises</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30

---
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Do you believe that the presence of a forensic fraternity on your campus has aided inter-school forensic relations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has indeed</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are sure it has</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has indeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certainly has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decidedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you had no forensic fraternity on your campus, would you be favorable again to the installation of such a fraternity on your campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If speech professor desired</td>
<td>Perhaps not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, on basis of our experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now have one</td>
<td>By all means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most certainly</td>
<td>Yes, indeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answer</td>
<td>Most certainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHICH SIDE WINS IN A DEBATE?

How many times did the affirmative and how many the negative win in the Disarmament question debated at Wichita?

We were interested in checking the results to see. Of the 150 women’s debates, the affirmative won 71 times; the negative, 79 times. Of the 256 men’s debates, the affirmative won 133 and the negative 123. For both men’s and women’s debates totaling 406, the affirmative won 204 times and the negative 202.

We have often heard people say that, “Usually the affirmative wins because of the great advantage of having the last rebuttal speech.” We have heard it said quite as often that “The negative wins most often because of the affirmative handicap of having the burden of proof.”

What would you conclude from the statistics above?

So would we. In other words, we believe the best debaters usually win a debate—not the affirmative or negative of the proposition.