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TULSA WELCOMES YOU

To the members of Pi Kappa Delta:
Greetings:
Tulsa heartily welcomes you as representatives of our nation’s outstanding younger citizenry, and the “oil capital” pledges itself to make your visit the most enjoyable, as well as profitable convention which you have had the pleasure of attending in connection with your organization.

Tulsa is known throughout the nation as the city of opportunity, which has attracted our country’s young people and has given them a prominent place in the forefront of its business and civic life. Its list of leaders carries the names of scores of progressive men and women still in their twenties and thirties and its Chamber of Commerce now has one of the youngest presidents ever seated by such an organization in a city of Tulsa’s size and importance.

We want you to see our $25,000,000 worth of educational institutions, churches, theaters, amusement enterprises, parks, boulevards, playgrounds, stadiums and other institutions that are making Tulsa “The City In Which To Live.”

Tulsa welcomes you!

Cordially yours,

GEORGE L. WATKINS, Mayor.
SHORTLY after this issue of the Forensic comes to you, I hope to have the happy privilege of renewing our acquaintance. It will be a joy to chat face to face inasmuch as all our “chatting” has had to be done through the Forensic or by correspondence.

We had a good time two years ago at Wichita. We hope to have a still better time this year at Tulsa, a delightful city with ample conveniences for our convention and tournament. Immediately at the close of the conclave at Wichita, I started plans for this convention. I solicited the aid of every member on the National Council and like true Pi Kappa Deltans, they responded wholeheartedly. I cannot say too much in praise of the National Council. They have the welfare of the organization at heart and have worked faithfully and well to make this convention a success. Our secretary and treasurer, G. W. Finley, knows his work and has been of the utmost worth and value in helping to keep things going.

Credit for the success of this coming convention necessarily goes to our second vice-president, H. D. Hopkins, who with his committee, will take care of us while at Tulsa.

All this year letters have been pouring in from the chapters assuring us of keen competition and a good attendance. True, times have been hard, but as ever before, lovers of the art of persuasion, beautiful and just, are finding ways and means of sending delegates and contestants. Administrators are recognizing the value of our forensic endeavors and are lending their hearty cooperation and support. With such backing, with the enthusiasm of Pi Kappa Delta members, with the tang of keen competition, with the untiring energy of those in charge and the royal welcome of all the Oklahoma chapters and especially Tulsa University, we cannot but look forward to the best convention of Pi Kappa Delta’s history.
Allow me to present a resume of procedure that you may follow while in Tulsa. If you arrive by train (which will enable you to travel for one and one-half fare round trip, providing you secure a convention certificate from your ticket agent) you will be greeted at the station by students from Tulsa University who will direct you to the New Hotel Tulsa, our convention headquarters. There you will be assigned to your room at the reduced rate of $1.75 per individual, two or more in a room. Undoubtedly, you have already received hotel room reservation cards, or you may write your reservations direct to the New Hotel Tulsa. Upon your arrival at the hotel, register for your rooms and then visit the Finleys at the convention registration desk in the lobby of the hotel. Do these two steps first, immediately upon your arrival. Having established yourself, you may proceed to the mezzanine floor of the hotel where you will find located the contest headquarters with notices posted giving you detailed information relating to the contests. Debate headquarters for the women's debates will be at one end of the mezzanine and men's headquarters at the other end. In the other mezzanine rooms, you will find the headquarters of oratory and extempore speaking. The first rounds of contests will be posted as early as Sunday. Familiarize yourself with the schedule, but take no chances. Changes may of necessity have to be made and these changes will be announced at the first general assembly, held in the ball room on the mezzanine floor of the hotel promptly at 8:15 Monday morning, March 28.

Please begin right now, pledging yourself to promptness in attendance at all meetings and at all contests. Things must proceed on time as scheduled.

If you arrive in Tulsa on or prior to Sunday, you are assured of a hearty welcome to the Easter services in Tulsa churches.

In the lobby of the hotel you will find an information booth run by the students of Tulsa University. They will help you with any and all of your problems.

These suggestions start you on a happy, though strenuous week of effort and good fellowship. A tournament as large as ours presents many difficulties. Mistakes will happen, but we are all good sports and we WILL keep sweet. Plan to have a good time and above all else, do all you can to see that everyone else has a good time.
We will have a number of business sessions. We will need you there and we will welcome your suggestions for the improvement of our organization. Tabulate the items of business that you want considered. The National Council meets every noon and will be glad to entertain your propositions.

Invitations for the 1934 convention will be called for at one of the early business sessions. Have your invitation well-formulated and check with the following suggestions presented by the conveniton committee:

**First,** a hotel with a capacity to house a delegation of five hundred, and that will guarantee to give right of way to the accommodation of convention delegates during the convention.

**Second,** about a hundred and twenty contest rooms, probably in public schools, centralized and easily accessible from convention headquarters.

**Third,** a dining room or banquet hall with a capacity for the whole delegation.

**Fourth,** a local Chamber of Commerce, who together with the local chapter, will take over such details as trophy cups, banquet favors, clerical service, building up a local judge list, etc.

**Fifth,** the entertaining chapter should be close enough to the site of the convention so it may readily handle the necessary details of organization.

All these things are essential to a successful convention.

Aside from our tournament and business sessions, we have other good things in store for you. We hope to have as our guests during the convention, Dr. J. H. Muyskens from the University of Michigan, Dean Ralph Dennis, Northwestern University, A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa, and Prof. H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin, national president of Delta Sigma Rho. These men are representatives of graduate departments of speech and will address us at our evening dinners. They are inspirational leading educators in speech, and you will want to hear them and learn to know them. You may wish to talk to them concerning graduate work in speech. They will be glad to help you.

On to Tulsa. Here is to a wonderful time and a great get-together.
I have just had word from Tulsa that brand new keys to the city are already waiting for us and that the city will be turned over to us with greater abandon than has been the good fortune of other conventions heading their way in many a day. And we are only one of some two hundred that this year have selected Tulsa as their convention city.

How many of you remember that convention at Estes Park, where two new members from Marietta set forth with an almost empty purse and a motor cycle that did not survive the trip? But that did not stop them. They arrived anyway and what a time they had! Or perhaps you remember the Ohio convention and the rambling red Ford which struggled over mountain highways from the south, and while it did not maintain its optimistically arranged schedule, still it did arrive, and again the crisis of a financial barrier was met. I remember a letter from a western chapter inquiring about the possibilities of using a local tourist camp to take care of lack of funds for hotel accommodations, and the boy from an eastern chapter who set forth with not even enough money to cover the bare costs for transportation—how he was welcomed by the entertaining chapter, provided a room in the local dormitory. He carried back to his chapter a genuine appreciation of the fellowship and fraternity of Pi Kappa Delta which certainly compensated both the home chapter and the boy himself for any hardship he might have been required to meet.

We have never held a convention but somewhere we have run across evidences of attendance in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles, and I know that not a single person of our membership meeting this challenge in the past would today hesitate an instant in undertaking even greater efforts were they necessary to make the trip.

I have been surprised this year at the evidence which today points to an even greater attendance than in past years. At all events, if the plans already made by our chapters are carried thru, the convention this year will measure with the best we have had in the past. The special note I want here to leave with
you is not however for those who already have their plans made but for those who have not yet found the way. I have heard from two or three chapters (whose attendance is necessary to maintain their membership in good standing) who state they cannot find funds for the trip. I am pointing out to them that in every convention in the past, a spirit of determination has met the challenge, and can meet it again this year, IF THE DETERMINATION IS GREAT ENOUGH. I know that the National Fraternity will view with genuine regret the eventuality of any chapter losing its standing because of difficult circumstances and that it stands behind me with the brand of fellowship which says how sincerely we want you with us, that we hope you may want to share our fellowship so keenly that you yourself will say: ‘Nothing can now stop me; I will be there.’ And if you will meet this challenge, we say to you that your problem at Tulsa will be met also.

All year I have been dreaming the dream of a national convention in which every chapter is represented. I believe thoroly that this is a possibility, but that to be permanent it will have to be built on the establishment of a two year period of preparation ahead of each convention within each chapter. I do hope that we can move along toward such an objective this year, not for the sake of a large convention but because when even one chapter is missing, our fraternity circle is broken. The longer I am associated with this splendid order of ours, the more I am gripped by the thrill that such fellowship brings. This year we CAN move along toward the objective of an unbroken membership at our national meeting. It is not too late to make a new decision. Plan to be among those present.

Many problems tangent to the real development of Pi Kappa Delta are to come before the convention this year. We need your counsel in shaping these problems. We need the knowledge of forensic conditions from your section of your state. We need the personal touch which only you yourself can add.

And what a convention this should be! As I write this, I have before me a letter from Secretary George Finley stating that responses from our many chapters give evidence of large attendance. Additional returns are daily reaching him and swelling the total and we have every reason to believe that before we hear the smack of Prexy Pflaum’s gavel at the opening session, we will have gone ahead of the records of the past.

See you at Tulsa!
## WHO WILL ATTEND THE NATIONAL CONVENTION AT TULSA

(Preliminary Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Redlands</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltec</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. of Pacific</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. C. L. A.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri. College</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri. College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. of Idaho</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Tech.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. S. N. U.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton Col.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Col.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons Col.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque Univ.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake Univ.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Col.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Col.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. of Emporia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Univ.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany Col.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Col.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary Col.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. W. La. Inst.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Col.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamline Univ.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. of St. Thomas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millsaps Col.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Col.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver-Stockton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirksville T.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Col.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin-Wallace</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg Univ.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School                  Number
Hiram                   1
Akron                   3
Bowling Green           6
Otterbein              4

Oklahoma:
Baptist Univ.          8
Okl. City Univ.        6
Col. for Women         6
Ada Teachers           8

Pennsylvania:
Grove City Col.        3

South Carolina:
Wofford                3

South Dakota:
Wesleyan Univ.         6
Yankton Col.           6
State College          5
Aberdeen Teachers      7
Sioux Falls Col.       4
Madison Teachers       5

Texas:
Southwestern Univ.     3
Trinity Univ.          3
East Texas T.          8
Baylor College         6
Texas Christian Univ.  8
Denton Teachers        4
Simmons Univ.          5
Baylor Univ.           5
Sam Houston Teachers   5

West Virginia:
Wesleyan Univ.         6

Washington:
Col. of Puget Sound    2

Wisconsin:
Carroll College        5

Number of delegates reported                     392
Number of chapters reporting                     77

Since these 77 chapters report 392 delegates it would seem reasonable to guess that the other 52 chapters still to hear from would bring the figure well above 500.

The delegation of six from The College of St. Thomas, St. Paul Minnesota, report that they will go by airplane.

Preliminary reports from the chapters give the following entries in the convention contests: Men’s debate, 69 teams; Women’s debate, 38 teams; Men’s oratory, 50; Women’s oratory, 30; Men’s extempore speaking, 54; Women’s extempore speaking, 33. These numbers should be materially increased by reports from the rest of the chapters.

Following the custom established in former conventions, colleges that are petitioning for a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta are invited to send delegates to the convention at Tulsa and to take part in one or more of the contests.

Among the colleges asking for chapters this year are the following: Alabama, Howard College; Arkansas, College of the Ozarks and Arkansas College; Florida, Rollins College; Louisiana, Polytechnic Institute; Michigan, Alma College and Hillsdale College; Minnesota, Augsburg College; Missouri, Northwest State Teachers and Southeast State Teachers; Nebraska, York College; North Carolina, Asheville State Normal; North Dakota, Dickinson State Teachers; Ohio, Kent College and Bluffton College; Oklahoma, Central State Teachers and Southwestern State Teachers; Oregon, Albany College; Tennessee, Southwestern University, Memphis. A number of these colleges will be represented in the national contests.
In our pre-convention number of March, 1930, the Forensic carried not only the picture of our president, W. H. Veatch, but also the pictures of George Pflaum, Charles A. Marsh, George Washington Finley, H. Dana Hopkins, and J. D. Coon, all of whom were in charge of important duties. J. D. Menchhofer was not pictured, but he was there and plenty busy.

We are not featuring these men pictorially again this year, partly because we did prior to the last national meet, partly because we believe many of the "Brotherhood" will know them anyhow. These officials will be on the job again, if not in the same capacity, in some other where ability and efficiency is demanded.

You will note that we are again featuring George Pflaum. Two motives prompt us here. First of all he is our national president, not a mere committee chairman as before the Wichita convention. Then, too, we want you to see his latest photograph. We believe you will know him nevertheless, and we are sure you will find him as democratic as ever, in spite of everything.

There will be new officers also, with whom you should get acquainted. Look for Professors: Toussaint, McElmeel, Carmichael, Ewing, Rose, Miller, Laase, Whitaker, Anderson, Courtney, Queener, Parlette, James, McKay, Harkness, O'Connell, Walmsley, Jacobs, Mahaffey, Haugen, Hance, Orton, Moore, McCluer, Leach, Englund (debate coach at Tulsa), and others who are province governors, committee chairmen, or committee mem-

(Continued on next page)
THOSE CONVENTION EXPENSES
GEORGE W. FINLEY, National Secretary

1. Transportation: One and a half fare on the railroads, on the certificate plan. Be sure to get a certificate for each ticket purchased; then you will get half fare on the return ticket.

2. Registration fee, $1.50. This is a reduction of 25% from the fee two years ago. It covers convention expenses, and includes a ticket to the convention banquet.

3. Hotel room at the New Hotel Tulsa, headquarters hotel, $1.75 per day per person, a reduction of 12½% from last convention rates.

4. The big evening meal together on the first four evenings of the convention, 75c per person. Other meals 35c to 50c per meal.

The chapter at Tulsa plans to send each delegation an advance hotel registration card to be made out and sent in before convention time. If you are to be on the road so that you may not receive the notice write to Prof. Carl Englund, University of Tulsa, and tell him how many will be in your delegation and how they are divided between men and women.

-----

WATCH US GROW

Last Membership issued No. 10883, Sam Joe Ruff, Millsaps College, Mississippi Alpha.

Last key issued No. 8158, Maurice Dreicer, General Chapter, Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida.

-----

SEE THEM AT TULSA—Continued

bers. For your information as to the official connection of these members, see our directory on front cover page. Note also the new student representatives on the National Council. Get acquainted with these your officers. May we assure you they are not as unapproachable as their offices might privilege them to be.
A BIT OF HISTORY
TULSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

IN one sense Tulsa is the newest of the new among great cities, for its whole life span is less than two score years. In 1900 its population was little over a thousand. And yet Tulsa has a history, partly legendary, which goes back more than a century. There was old Tulsa, the "Tulsey" of the Creek Indians who came here from the Old South, back in 1828. There was no town here then, but the Creeks often gathered to hold their councils at a spot which is now within the city limits, and the great oak under which their head men sat is still standing in the yard of a well known citizen.

In 1832 the first white man set his foot on what is now Tulsa's beautiful Irving Place. Washington Irving was the man, and in his book, "A Tour of the Prairies," he describes the spot "on which a great city will rise!" A monument stands in Irving Place to commemorate his prophecy which has so fully come true.

For many years the tiny Indian settlement existed; sometimes including the families of quite a number of tribesmen and at other times but a few scattered tepees. But no whites came except renegades, missionaries, teachers, adventurers, and traders, and practically none of these remained in the settlement.

It is known that for some reason it was called "Tulsey Town" for during the Civil War Col. Douglas Cooper, C. S. A., gave it that name in one of his military reports. Then no more was

(Continued on page 182)
George Washington
1732-1932

Washington has said: "My first wish is to see this plague (war) to mankind banished from the earth." You can carry on in the spirit of this great American and can foster new international attitudes in boys and girls, and thus build a stronger foundation for World Peace.

For two hundred years we have been careless in what we have said about George Washington. Now in this 200th anniversary of his birth we are to spend nine months in celebration of his life and achievements. During this period, new and significant facts will be made available, from which new evaluations will result and more permanent historic records kept. American history has always referred to Washington as "First in war, first in peace," but the emphasis has been distinctly on war. This emphasis continues in spite of our knowledge of his versatile achievement as scientific farmer, statesman, engineer, business man, citizen and home maker, as well as military man.

In their issue of Sunday, February twenty-first, "The World's Greatest Newspaper" gave a full page to the oft-quoted statement: "In time of peace prepare for war—avoid all foreign entanglements." This statement, taken apart from its context, has been given exaggerated and untrue meaning these many years. Another statement, which, so far as we know from evidence, internal or external, was made with equal emphasis by Washington concerning peace. This phase of Washington's many sided interest has not been given much of a hearing. Such hearing is long past due. Two brief quotations will suggest his concern on this problem. "My first wish is to see this plague (war) to mankind banished from the earth," he said. And again, "It is time for the age of knight-errantry and mad heroism to be at an end. Your young military men, who want to reap the harvest of laurels, do not care, I suppose, how many seeds of war are sown; but for the sake of humanity it is devoutly to be wished that the manly employment of agriculture and the humanizing benefits of commerce would supersede the waste of war and the
rage of conquest; that the swords might be turned into plow-shares, the spears into pruning hooks, and, as the scriptures express it, 'the nations learn war no more.'”—George Washington (from a letter to Marquis de Chastellux, April, 1788.)

Whatever else Washington may have written to the marquis at this time, the above statement seems clear and final. Do not the pacifists have quite as valid a claim on him who was “first in war, first in peace,” as has the militarist? A sincere study of the facts will convince us that Washington was whole heartedly neither. When the call for soldierly courage was sounded he answered that call with his whole heart. The great speech of Patrick Henry at the Virginia convention was not the only important speech made, for Washington said on that occasion, “I will raise a regiment and march on Boston myself.” This he later did, paying for the expedition out of his own private fortune. To back his faith in the cause of the colonists he placed on the altar of war $35,000.00 of his own and seven of the best years of his life. When peace came he was one of the first to turn his efforts toward peace time employment.

A BIT OF HISTORY—Continued

heard of “Tulsey Town” until the construction of an extension of the Frisco railroad from Vinita, Indian Territory, the former terminus, brought about the establishment of a white settlement here.

The tourist and convention visitor will find Tulsa’s accommodations to be everything the heart could desire. Its thirty principal hotels offer a range of service and prices to fit every purse, and the highways approaching Tulsa from every direction are bordered with beautiful tourist parks which are veritable jewels of careful arrangement and perfect sanitation. These parks line the highways in all directions, at distances of 2 to 8 miles from the city.

Of course the visitor will find no “blanket” Indians in Tulsa, as the old Indian Territory has been populated by the Five Civilized Tribes for 100 years, but the corner of the Osage Nation, the tribe to which fabulous sums have been paid in oil royalties, cuts into the corner of the city, and it is but a short drive to the spots where their tribal ceremonies are held. Elk and buffalo, however, are found only in parks.
WHEN the Pi Kappa Delta national convention met at Peoria, Illinois, in April, 1924, no group had as wild a story of adventure to relate as the delegation from Dakota Wesleyan University.

The party, consisting of Rose Hopfner, Agnes Hyde, Harvey Pinney, Vernon Kron, and W. H. Veatch, left Mitchell, South Dakota, on the morning of March 25. They traveled in Mr. Veatch’s Stearns-Knight sedan, and although the weather was uncertain, the debaters expected to make the trip with ease, and consequently gave little heed to a drizzling rain which had become a steady downpour when the car crossed the Minnesota line.

The roads in Minnesota were terrible; the deep ruts in the wet gravel threw the car from side to side. At a sudden turn the Stearns veered sharply to the right and stopped. The front wheel had broken and lay in the mud by the side of the car. Here the diary kept by one of the girls reads, “Marooned on a lonely prairie—dirty snow fields to right and left—deep mud before and behind—a few snowflakes begin to fall—the wind changes to the north.”

The debaters hailed passing cars and arrived in Worthington in three installments. Kron, the curly haired Swedish lad, had to ride into town with three boisterous Irishmen who charged him three dollars for the lift.

The necessary wheel spindle for the car did not arrive the next morning, and since three of the party had to debate at Lake Forrest, Illinois, they left on the train. At four o’clock in the afternoon of the following day the car was ready for travel, and the trip began again.

The Stearns Blows Up

Professor Veatch drove all night, and although the wet, rutted gravel delayed him, he expected to meet the debaters at Lake Forrest. But he reckoned without the god of Mischance who traveled with them.
The roads became worse. Garagemen along the trail declared that no cars had been through since December, but the car easily traversed the supposedly impassable roads. They changed to the north route, going through Rochester, where they were advised to make a detour of fourteen miles to reach Eyeota. For seven miles the Stearns plowed through deep, slippery mud, making the whole trip on low. They finally reached St. Charles.

“You’ve hit the good roads now,” the garagemen said. “You can make it easy from here.”

Two miles beyond the little town, the car started easily up a gradual slope. Suddenly there came a loud explosion and the sound of splintering wood. The engine stopped, and the car slid a few rods backward down the hill. The fly-wheel had blown up! Pieces of metal were scattered about for a hundred yards, the floor boards were in shreds, and the foot feed was wrapped about the steering wheel. The Stearns had taken its last journey. That night the two Wesleyanites took the train for Chicago.

At the Convention

The reunion of the party came at Wheaton where a second debate took place. The next morning the debaters traveled to Peoria, the Mecca of their wanderings. They were now carrying all the baggage which before had been stored in the car. The five people entered Peoria laden down with seven suitcases, two brief cases, one portable typewriter, one hat bag, and one raincoat. Their initial appearance in the city was not as imposing as they had hoped.

Monday morning a team left for Carthage to take part in a third debate. They reached Ferris, a town of fifty inhabitants, and found they had to wait five hours. Carthage was only four and a half miles distant, and the debaters walked the railroad ties to their destination.

At the convention, Wesleyan representatives entered the oratorical and extempore speaking contests, where they enjoyed the general peace and quiet after their strenuous journey. When the new officers were elected, Professor Veatch was chosen to serve as National first vice-president of Pi Kappa Delta.

Home in a Maxwell

While in Peoria, the South Dakotans invested in a secondhand Maxwell that had a defective fan belt and lacked power to
climb hills. In this car they traveled to Chicago where they spent the week-end. The last debate took place at Rockford the following Monday, and then began the long trip homeward.

Traveling in an open car proved to be much different from the luxury of the Stearns. The roads were muddy and hilly, and the new-old car had to be pushed up every incline. The first day the party made seventy-nine miles in thirteen hours. Six times, in a distance of thirteen miles, the “Good Maxwell” was stuck in the mud and the muddy passengers either shoveled themselves out or were helped by passing farmers.

The Iowa roads were more passable, and when the weary travelers stopped at Cedar Falls the next evening, they had covered a hundred twenty-five more miles. The following evening they reached Emmetsburg, and starting the next morning at five-thirty, they hoped to make Mitchell that night.

It was snowing and bitterly cold that last morning; the ride from Emmetsburg to Sheldon was the hardest of the whole trip. When the party reached the latter place, three members deserted and came home on the train. As the car turned down the main street of Mitchell that afternoon, the driver heard a wild hallooing, and the two in the old Maxwell allowed the deserters to ride with them the last few blocks of the journey.

Such is the story the debaters told when they returned from their mud-plowing trip, but they know there are parts of the story they have never published, lest they lack a credulous audience.

The First Radio Coast-to-Coast Debate

In the first radio coast-to-coast debate in history, Harvard and Stanford clashed on the proposition, Resolved: That America needs a stronger central government. The debate was broadcast early in December over a national network by the Columbia Broadcasting System. The Harvard men spoke from WNAC in Boston; the Stanford representatives from KFRC in San Francisco. The chairman of the debate, Mr. Francis Bellamy, presided from station WABC in New York City.

This debate with others will appear soon in a collection to be published by Noble & Noble, Pi Kappa Delta publishers.
THE FINALISTS IN THE SIXTH INTERNATIONAL ORATORICAL CONTEST, WITH DIRECTOR-GENERAL RANDOLPH LEICH AND PRESIDENT HOOVER, IN FRONT OF THE WHITE HOUSE.
THE INTERNATIONAL ORATORICAL CONTEST

The International Oratorical Contest is sponsored by seventy prominent American newspapers. Contestants of high school rank are eligible to participate. Beginning as a national contest eight years ago its scope has been broadened to include foreign countries, of which last year, twenty-three participated.

To this oratorical contest has been added an extemporaneous element in keeping with present day practical speech needs. Randolph Leigh, national director-general of the contest, explains it as follows:

"I still think that the four minute extemporaneous feature is the most important development in the contest. At the conclusion of the delivery of his six minute prepared speech, the contestant is handed a slip of paper containing the topic which he is to discuss extemporaneously for not more than four minutes, as soon as the other set speeches have been delivered. With six speakers on the program, this allows each contestant about forty-five minutes to collect his thoughts before speaking extemporaneously. The judges are instructed to attach equal importance to each speech, in which, in turn, equal value is given to substance and delivery.

"Each speaker is allowed to leave the platform after the delivery of his prepared speech, to consider his extemporaneous topic, returning to the platform in time to give that speech. During that period of retirement and thought, contestants must not consult books or persons. In making the extemporaneous speech, the speaker must not use or have before him either notes or reference books.

"In selecting topics for the extemporaneous speeches, the primary object is to test the breadth and genuineness of the speaker's understanding of the subject of his prepared speech, by compelling a development of new or untouched phases thereof.

"A speaker using a platitudinous prepared speech will be given a topic rigorously particularizing on the basis of his generalities."
Records of International Oratorical Contest (High School) Finalists—First Five Years.

International Finalists ........................................ 30
Boys .................................................. 28
Girls .................................................. 2
Lawyers or aspirants to law .................................... 8
Publicists or aspirants to public life ......................... 7
Journalists or aspirants to journalism ....................... 5
Teachers or aspirants to teaching ............................. 4
Business men or aspirants to business ....................... 4
Miscellaneous .................................................. 2
Offered or received scholarships .............................. 28
Winners of college honors .................................... 24
Already used by their governments for important speaking assignments (other than mere delivery of their speeches) .................. 9

Record of National Finalists During the Eight Years of the National Oratorical Contest.

*Total number of finalists .................................... 57
Went to college or are going ................................ 54
Received or offered scholarships by one or more colleges 51
Colleges—grades above 85 .................................... 39
Led their college classes one year or more ................ 11
College debate or oratory teams ............................. 31
Made highest four-year rating in history of University of Oklahoma ............................................. 1
Lawyers or aspirants to law ................................... 20
Journalists or aspirants to journalism ...................... 10
Business men or aspirants to business ....................... 6
Doctors or aspirants to medicine ............................ 3
The arts ..................................................... 3
Married (all girls) .......................................... 7
Miscellaneous occupations .................................. 8
Boys—Finalists ............................................ 44
Girls—Finalists ............................................ 13

* 8 Finalists one year.

THAT VOLUME III

Volume III of “Winning Debates, Orations and Speeches,” is still available through our Pi Kappa Delta Publishers, Noble & Noble, 76 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Volumes I and II are available at the same address. To purchase these volumes will add great value to your forensic library, will encourage Noble to continue as our publishers, and will thereby greatly help Pi Kappa Delta.
AN ANALYSIS OF DEBATING

By EDWIN H. PAGET
North Carolina State College

"The vast amount of truly scientific and practical research which ought to be done on the numerous problems associated with the platform personality of the speaker really staggers anyone who considers them. There are veritable diamond mines of information in that one field alone which greatly need to be discovered, digged and presented to the world by means of the tools of research. The numerous elements which enter into that factor which we label "the audience" is another challenge to those with exploring minds who are equipped to do research. The almost countless number of elements in "the setting for the address" presents a well-nigh inexhaustible opportunity for significant research to one well grounded in psychology, physics, and—for certain problems—chemistry. It ought not to be possible for graduate students to leave the field of research in speech-making for the field of research in voice science and to tell us with significant inflections as they speak that "truly significant research is being done in the field of voice science; we are getting somewhere with our research in voice science."—From "In Strictest Confidence: a confidential letter to teachers of speech-making," by Howard H. Higgins in The Quarterly Journal of Speech, November, 1931.

What shall we say of debating? With thousands of debaters coached every year by teachers of speech, should we not have a more rapidly growing knowledge of principles and a more exact terminology? To stimulate such a formulation of opinion, I am sending you this questionnaire, with the confident hope that you will answer many or all of these questions in a detailed and original manner.

The answers to these questions will serve as the basis for a discussion at a meeting during the Pi Kappa Delta convention at Tulsa, Oklahoma, March 28-April 1, and as an important phase of the convention program of the third annual convention of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech, April 13-16, Asheville, North Carolina. It is hoped that the final conclusions may be published in article form in speech and forensic journals. You can help this questionnaire "make history." Let me have your answers (typed) soon.

I. Methods of Training the Debate Squad
   A. Aim of Debating
      1. Is there necessarily any fundamental conflict between effective teaching and the winning of debates? Are most "championship"
teams over-coached? May we not conclude that, in the long run, a good teacher will also be a winning coach?

2. Can you outline in detail a program which will permit the teacher of speech to develop in his students the best habits of clear thinking and effective speaking and yet produce expert debate teams?
   a. Describe the methods of the most effective debate coach you have ever known.
   b. How much criticism should the coach give the debate squad? Of what nature?
   c. How large a squad can he train effectively?
   d. What special devices of coaching have you found particularly effective? Illustrate their use.
   e. (For a discussion of winning versus training, see "A Question and Answer Free for All," Speech Bulletin, December, 1931.)

3. Do you require your debaters to take classroom work in speech? why?

4. Does participation in oratorical and extempore speaking contests, dramatics, and other speech performances help the debater? How? How hinder?

5. What special problems arise in training girl debaters? How are they met?

II. Debate Technique and Strategy

A. Define "strategy."
   1. To what extent are we justified in using special strategical methods? Explain. (Indeed, can we talk at all without using some strategical method, either good or poor, consciously or unconsciously used?)

   2. Is a team coached in the uses of the many methods listed below usually successful on the platform? Or should we concentrate solely on evidence, reasoning—the straight-forward, bone-crushing, rush-through-center strategy, with every move obvious from the beginning?

   3. Even if we do not believe in the use of certain strategical devices, should we not give our team defenses against them? Do we not find speakers and writers in the outside world constantly using such devices?

B. Strategy of the Constructive Case.
   1. How may we develop a case fundamental to the question, yet surprising to the opposition? Illustrate.

   2. What is the value of the Non-Refutable Attack? (See C. G. Miller, Argumentation and Debate, pp. 215-16. Scribners.)

   3. Do you favor the use of the Napoleonic Strategy? (See Speech Bulletin, December, 1930, pp. 15-18.)

   4. What should be the relative proportion of reasoning, citation of authority, statistics, humor, illustrations and local references?
5. What is your theory regarding the planning of the constructive case? What are the rival theories and what names would you give them? (as the Rockne and the Warner methods in football.) Or do you believe that we “shouldn’t bother about such things?”

6. Under what circumstances should a debate team “abandon” its constructive speeches in a debate? If so, how proceed?

C. Rebuttal Strategy.

NOTE: Any confusion in terminology in this questionnaire will only serve to illustrate the need of your aid in making this study a success. As yet, for the most part, we have not named our tools.

1. What advice do you give your debate team regarding what arguments to answer, in what order, and at what length?

2. How should the presentation of a single rebuttal point be organized or “pointed?” (See Miller, pp. 222 and Baird, “Public Discussion and Debate,” pp. 63-65.) How can we persuade debaters to use “pointing” during the heat of a debate?

3. How much preliminary rebuttal should be given by each speaker before beginning his constructive speech? What should this preliminary rebuttal accomplish? How? Do you advocate the Draw-Visible-Blood technique here?

4. Do you believe in the constant use of “Running Rebuttal?” (Adapting your constructive speech to what your opponent has already said.) How do you train debaters to use it? Does its use make memorized speeches impossible?

5. How do you train your debaters to “Follow the Ball?” “Follow the Enemy’s Retreat?” To answer thoroughly the fundamental contention of the opposition and to receive credit for so doing?


7. What meaning and what values, if any, do you attach to the following Special Strategical Techniques? And precisely what defense do you give your debaters against them?

a. Humorous thrusts.

b. “Boxing-In” the last negative rebuttal speaker by the last two affirmative speakers.

c. “Heavy Barrage” (many arguments rapidly given).

d. Surprise use of evidence, reasoning, or point of view, designated to weaken the morale of the opposition.

e. Dilemmas and leading questions.

f. Numerous questions.

g. Asking questions to be answered silently by the audience. (Rhetorical questions.)

h. “Reversal” and “Turning-Tables.”

i. Reduction of opponent’s case to a single, fundamental contention.

j. Ultra-conservative statements and concession technique.
k. Thoughtful, "judicial" presentation.
l. Appeal to impelling motives.
m. Appeal to local prejudices.
n. Questions summary for last negative in rebuttal.
o. Admitting and then "swallowing" the opponent's case.
p. "Feeding." (It has been said that the essence of strategy is to analyze the probable reactions of your opponents and lead them deeper and deeper into unfavorable territory.)
q. Polished, memorized rebuttals.
r. Stimulation technique. (See writings of G. B. Shaw and H. L. Mencken.)
s. Alternatives course always open. (See Aristotle.)
t. Great sincerity and earnestness in presentation.
u. Methods of hiding techniques used from both the opposition and the audience.

8. What other methods should be added to the list already given? Explain and illustrate.

9. Is the use of military terms in such a book as Shaw's "The Art of Debate" stimulating and helpful or does it misplace the emphasis?

10. What current disputes in our political, economic, and social life illustrate the techniques discussed in 7.

11. Evaluate the truth and the strategical implications, if any, of the following statement: "No reform ever prospers in America unless it has a definitely moral smack. The American people, indeed, have a libido for virtue that is a great deal more powerful than their libido for either money or glory. They long to do good." (H. L. Mencken.)


D. Discuss in as much detail as possible the use of the various strategical techniques already listed, and others not listed but known to you, when the debate is to be decided by an audience-vote. Indicate practical methods of audience-analysis and state what psychological terms (such as stereotype, motive, rationalization, etc.) should be taught.

E. Indicate also how the occasion may influence the approach, the attack, and the defense.

F. Analyze the strategy of unusually successful debate teams. (A project for the Tulsa and Asheville conventions.)

G. Analyze the judges' testimony concerning what influenced them in voting. (Also a project for Tulsa and Asheville.)

H. In view of all the factors discussed from A to G, formulate a general theory of forensic strategy, not only for inter-school debating, but also for all discussion, written or spoken, of a controversial nature.
III. Winning Greater Public Support.

A. Do we need greater public interest in debating if debating is to continue to expand?

B. If so, indicate both old and new ways of increasing its popularity.
   1. Would the popularization of its technique (as done for football by syndicated newspaper articles and diagrams) arouse student and public interest? Will the public ever appreciate fully what they cannot understand?
   2. How can we achieve newspaper publicity as interest-arousing as that given athletics and yet beneficial to the academic standing of debate?
   3. Exactly how can we arouse school-wide interest in participating in debating, either club, inter-club, inter-class, or inter-school? Illustrate where successful.
   4. What definite, specific action should be taken by the following to arouse legitimate, nation-wide interest in debating:
      a. Pi Kappa Delta.
      b. Delta Sigma Rho.
      c. Tau Kappa Alpha.
      d. The National Forensic League.
      e. The National Association of Teachers of Speech.
      f. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech.
      g. The Western Association of Teachers of Speech.
      h. The State Associations.
      i. State debate leagues, and
      j. Other associations.

Is a unified program for all these organizations needed? If so, how shall it be formulated? When?

C. Are new methods of debating, similar to the innovations introduced several years ago in the “Oregon plan” and the “Oxford Union plan” helping in re-arousing interest in debating? Would you be interested in receiving the details concerning the proposed “Carolina plan” of debating? Would you be interested in seeing the Carolina plan demonstrated at the Tulsa and Asheville conventions?

IV. Revision of Questionnaire.

A. How shall this questionnaire be revised so that it may fulfill its purpose? Indicate any needed changes either in the fundamental attitude toward the problem or in the details of the questions.

“Speak not at all in any wise, till you have somewhat to speak; care not for the reward of your speaking, but simply and with undivided mind for the truth of your speaking.”

—Carlyle.
"The eloquence of Mr. Adams resembled his general character, and formed, indeed, a part of it. It was bold, manly, and energetic and such the crisis required.

"When public bodies are to be addressed on momentous occasions, when great interests are at stake and strong passions excited, nothing is valuable in speech further than it is connected with high intellectual and moral endowments. Clearness, force, and earnestness are the qualities that produce conviction. True eloquence, indeed, does not consist in speech. It cannot be brought from far. Labor and learning may toil for it, but they will toil in vain. Words and phrases may be marshalled in every way, but they cannot compass it. It must exist in the man, in the subject, and in the occasion.

"Affected passion, intense expression, the pomp of declamation, all may aspire after it—they cannot reach it. It comes, if it come at all, like the outbreaking of a fountain from the earth, or the bursting forth of volcanic fires, with spontaneous, original, native force. The graces taught in the schools, the costly ornaments, and studied contrivances of speech shock and disgust men, when their own lives, and the fate of their wives, their children, and their country hang on the decision of the hour. Then words have lost their power, rhetoric is vain, and all elaborate oratory contemptible.

"Even genius, itself, then feels rebuked and subdued, as in the presence of high qualities. Then, patriotism is eloquent; then self-devotion is eloquent. The clear conception, out-running the deductions of logic, the high purpose, the firm resolve, the dauntless spirit, speaking on the tongue, beaming from the eye, informing every feature, and urging the whole man onward, right ONWARD to his object—this, this is ELOQUENCE; or rather is something greater and higher than all eloquence—it is ACTION—NOBLE, SUBLIME, GOD-LIKE ACTION."
Action in Public Speaking—Another Point of View

“Action can have no effect upon reasonable minds. It may augment noise, but it never can enforce argument. If you speak to a dog, you use action; you hold up your hand thus, because he is a brute, and in proportion as men are removed from brutes, action will have less influence upon them.”—(Boswell’s “Life of Johnson, ii. 211.)

SPEECH COURSES AT CARROLL

Carroll College does not limit its speech opportunities to participants in intercollegiate contest. Eight different courses are offered in the speech department there exclusive of the dramatic courses. In these courses there were enrolled over 190 students last year.

They also have a speech clinic which has been successfully directed during the last two years by Mr. Utzinger, the head of the speech department. Last year over 400 treatments were given through private appointments to 35 patients, suffering from some kind of speech disorder. The clinic is also available to the people of the community and many take advantage of this in requests for advice and treatment.

Carroll’s extra-curricular activities in forensics included a total of 39 debates with 22 colleges in the middle west with a total of 20 students, men and women, participating. In oratory, Donald Kehl, president of the local chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, won first place in the State Oratorical contest at Beloit. He later represented Wisconsin in the Central Divisional contest of the Interstate Oratorical Association, where he won the right to compete at Northwestern University in the finals. Neil Glerum, a senior, prominent both in debate and oratory, won second place in the Wisconsin State contest at Beloit. Later, he won first place at the Province Convention of Pi Kappa Delta at Oshkosh.

Besides these activities the speech department sponsors a lyceum bureau which furnishes programs, readings, speeches, debates, vocal and instrumental music, to various organizations, providing a real community service as well as good training for those who participate.

As an additional feature of Carroll’s speech department activities, Prof. Utzinger has been giving a series of talks on practical public speaking over radio station WTMJ, in Milwaukee.
YOU CAN'T "CAN" PERSONALITY

As we listened recently to the inspiring addresses, made more enjoyable and effective by the presence of the personalities delivering them, while attending the annual convention of the International Lyceum and Chautauqua Association in session at Lakeside-on-Lake-Erie, we were impressed with the truth of the statement above.

YOU CAN'T "CAN" PERSONALITY

We borrowed this title from a publicity folder of William B. Feakins, Inc., Managers of Lecture and Concert Artists. Under this title appears the following comment:

"Every little while we are asked by some chairman of a committee, how the radio and 'talkies' are affecting the lecture and concert business. Two years ago we reprinted an editorial from the New York Times expressing faith of the editor that nothing ever would take the place of a real person on the platform.

"We feel more strongly than ever that this is so. The fact that our business has expanded since radio has been developed proves our point, and what more surely proves it to our mind, is the fact that the radio people have felt it necessary to form an organization for the booking of personalities in the flesh, because of the demand created for them when they are seen on the screen and heard over the air. How about television? We believe that will make a still greater demand for the person 'in the flesh.' You can ask a question of a person on a television screen, but how shall he answer you?"

Some one may dismiss this statement by saying: "That is merely advertising." But of course that opinion is not held alone by lecture and entertainment bureaus. In the New York Times referred to in the Feakins comment above, appeared the following editorial:

LYCEUM DAYS RETURN

"Exact statistics would probably confirm the general impression that seldom has the lecture platform, with us, been so busy as today. A distinguished Brit-
ish philosopher and mathematician has just departed. A distinguished German philosopher is touring the country. A German specialist in biography is a recent arrival. English lecturers of lesser note than Bertrand Russell are continually coming.

“Our own platform speakers and readers and poets attract less attention because, among other things, they have not the advantage of arriving by quarantine and encountering the ship reporters; but they are active all over the land. The art of joint debate has undergone an extraordinary revival.

“It is a development that could not have been predicted for the age of radio and ‘talking pictures’ and television. It is, in fact, a situation directly opposed to prophecies based on recent mechanical triumphs. If the pressing of a button or the throwing of a switch can deliver the voice and features of a speaker at any distance, it seemed obvious that the public would not bestir itself to seek out the speaker ‘in corpore’ or induce him to seek out the public. The book translators are on the alert for messages to the American people out of alien tongues. The picture supplements supply the personal detail, short of the person himself. But that is precisely the point. Mechanical agencies, instead of discouraging the appetite for personal contacts, seem only to stimulate it. Because public audiences are now able to see and hear anybody almost ‘in the flesh,’ they are apparently moved to insist on seeing him actually ‘in the flesh.’

“In the theatre the prediction of the victory of the machine over the personality has long been refuted. The moving picture that was to kill the spoken drama has done nothing of the kind. The metropolitan theatre has flourished, and outside of New York there seems to be under way a revival of ‘the road’ which the films were supposed to have permanently destroyed. Whatever radio may have done to the piano in the home, it certainly has not done away with the music stage. Opera is more popular than ever, concerts are everywhere, and symphony orchestras almost everywhere. If anything, it is the machine that would seem now to be on the defensive against the living entertainer and instructor.

“Plainly it will be many years, if ever, before an American audience will be educated to the sense of
‘meeting’ a celebrity on the screen or by radio. The living presence is demanded, both on the platform and, after the lecture, in a drawing room with a cup of tea and a sandwich. Small armies of lecturers, forums and ‘centres,’ joint debates, authors at the book-counters autographing their books for delighted customers—this is evidence that a living man is a living man for ‘a that.”

The opinion expressed in this editorial, as well as that of the Feakins Bureau, together with like opinion available elsewhere, should encourage those who are striving to perfect themselves for appearances later before larger audiences and more significant occasions. But remember that while the public wants to see as well as hear the performer it does insist upon more than mere performance. In the matter of speaking, particularly, the privilege of such engagements will go to those who are most thoroughly prepared to contribute something really significant. The public will continue to be interested in effectiveness in presentation, but increasingly the demand is that those who speak must hold an authoritative position based upon actual achievement. The mere “professional speaker,” as we have thought of him in the past, is passe.

BISHOP McCONNELL vs. GENERAL BUTLER DEBATE

College debaters are not the only speakers who affirm and negate, for note the following advertisement of a debate which was held in New York City.

Debate! SHALL WE DISARM?
Can Peace Be Assured by Reduction of Armaments?
BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL Says “YES!”

vs.

GENERAL SMEDLEY D. BUTLER Says “NO!”
Sat. Eve., Jan. 30th, 1932, at Mecca Temple on the eve of the Geneva Conference
Tickets: 75c, $1, $1.50, $2

The price of tickets indicates that this was expected to be a major occasion.

Every chapter of P. K. D. and every library in a P. K. D. institution should have copies of Volumes I, II and III, Pi Kappa Delta Debate Annuals. Each chapter should ask its library to order one or more. Individuals will want copies. Order now. The price is one dollar. All orders should be addressed to Noble & Noble, 76 Fifth Ave., New York City.
What is more pathetic than to see a man who has made a fortune in business, who has swung big deals, led hundreds of employes or accomplished wonders in industry, manufacturing or business, rise to his feet in a Kiwanis club and stammer like a school boy, leaving the impression that he is a drivelng idiot?

You have seen it happen in your club; it happens in every civic organization. You can cure stage fright in only one way and that is by making its victim understand that there is no difference between talking on your hind legs like a man or squatting on a chair like a frog.

The only way this lesson can be taught is by making the victim stand up and speak up often enough to overcome his inferiority complex. Nothing but practice will do it. One of the greatest of our literary lights was asked how one could learn to write. He answered in two words: “Do it!” This is equally true of speaking in public. It can only be learned by doing it.

That club president who makes it a rule to compel members to get up on their feet from time to time and say a few words does more for his membership than he knows.

Almost half the benefit of the big brains of any Kiwanis club is lost because of stage fright. Men who are wise in finance, in civics, in the knowledge of the town’s needs, sit dumb, while some man with the ability to express himself on his feet puts an inferior proposition across.

If all these men could be taught to speak on their feet, the club would have the benefit of their advice and counsel; now they are dumb from stage fright. We talk of developing Kiwanis leadership—this is the very best method possible.
THE WETS GIVE ME A PAIN IN THE NECK

By BURTON BRALEY

(Reprinted from FORUM and CENTURY—the non-partisan magazine of controversy—by special permission of the publishers and the author. It is used here as an example of clear, effective argumentation, enlivened by humor.)

THE wets give me a pain in the neck. Not personally—for some of my best friends are wets—but politically, economically, and socially. They give me the aforesaid pain because it seems to my narrow, intolerant, bigoted, and hypocritical dry mind that as soon as a wet begins to talk about prohibition—and usually he won't talk about anything else—his brain goes soggy.

My club is an example. Its roster is made up of names famous in professions that require the highest quality of direct, effective, and clear thinking. But fully half, perhaps even two-thirds, are wet.

"Aha!" comes the wringing comment, "this brilliant assemblage is made up of wets. Whaddyaeh mean a wet's brain doesn't function?"

I mean it doesn't function. I mean that if these men used the warped logic, the stale sentiments, the distorted memory in their professions that they use in discussing prohibition, they would be in the poorhouse. When prohibition comes up, they go ga-ga.

In my club I have heard discussions of nearly everything human and divine, and because the controversialists were using the same brains with which they achieved their success, these argumentes have been such as to dazzle, delight and educate.

Then somebody mentions prohibition! And things go haywire.

I don't want anybody to tell me about the narrowness, intolerance, and bigotry of the drys. Any time the wets get going in my club I can spot you a Carrie Nation, two Dr. Clarence True Wilsons, and any number of arid Methodist bishops, and still win the game of intolerance in two moves. I know because, being known as a dry in the club, I have no rest from persecution. Time was when I essayed reasonable argument, until I
found that I was not arguing with reason but only the same stale statements.

Then I tried avoidance. I would not argue. I would listen. I would even nod. But it isn’t enough that I admit that some dry propaganda is foolish, that there are too many speakeasies, that it’s too bad a gentleman can’t get a drink, that I’d like to have some good liquor myself. None of this suffices, not with these broad-minded Saharaphobes.

They won’t be content until I recant Volstead and all his works, and lift my voice to cry: “There is no King but Barleycorn!”

Let’s just try for a few minutes to apply simple high school logic to some of these wet arguments that are gravely put forward time and again. See if, by this test, you don’t get an ache in the cervical vertebrae yourself.

1. “The Eighteenth Amendment never came to a popular vote: therefore it is all wrong.”

Let’s assume that it would be desirable to amend the Constitution by a process of popular election, and I believe it would.

The very amendment providing for a plebiscite on amendments would have to be adopted in the same manner as the Eighteenth. And until the regular method of altering the Constitution—by which the Eighteenth and all other amendments have been added—is changed, all talk of referendums and all referendums themselves are futile and ridiculous in law and in fact.

There hasn’t been an argument offered against the manner of passing the Eighteenth Amendment which wouldn’t invalidate all the others. And I’m willing to wager that Mr. Darrow and any other of the distinguished lawyers who inveigh against prohibition would, if pinned down to the pure, cold logic of law, admit this perfectly obvious fact. Their attitude toward the Eighteenth Amendment is decidedly legalistic special pleading. This they realize, and that they don’t approach it as they would any other legal question is one of the reasons why the wets give me a pain in the neck.

**Foul! Foul!**

2. “It was ‘put over’ during the Great War and while our boys were in the trenches.”

“Put over” my eye! It was a pushover. The pushing had been done steadily for twenty-five years by the Anti-Saloon League, and if the wets were good sports, they would admit
that they had been beaten by hard, fair fighters. But the wets yell "Foul!" and claim they weren't looking. What did they have to do to defeat the passing of the amendment in Congress? Control half the state legislatures? No—only thirteen. How many did they control? Three!

Pushover is correct.

And since the Eighteenth Amendment, like all the others, is not subject to plebiscite, the boys in the trenches would have had little effect either way. There is, too, the thought that possibly those four million soldiers, sixty per cent of them from dry districts, would not have voted unanimously wet.

Congressmen are elected to represent their constituents. If they don't represent the general sentiment of their districts more or less habitually, they don't remain in Congress. And steadily the dry vote in Congress has grown. If Congress, personally wet or dry, is politically dry, it is the best indication in the world that the country is dry. Indeed, a Congressman who is personally wet but who votes dry is a surer barometer of the power of public opinion than the man whose own opinions happen to coincide with the sentiment of his district.

Congressmen Know What Can Defeat Them

The "tyranny" of the Anti-Saloon League over Congress is due to the political fact that Congressmen know that the League can defeat them if they vote wet. It is not the tyranny of a fanatic minority, but the tyranny of majorities in election booths. Add that up and you have your plebiscite—the only kind that means anything in this political arena of the United States.

3. "But the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act constitute sumptuary legislation, and you can't regulate people's habits by law."

Of all the statements delivered from the wet camp, this has always caused the most poignant ache in the vicinity of my Adam's apple. Of course the Volstead Act is sumptuary legislation! So is the drug act, the pure food act, housing laws, the Federal meat inspection law, anti-spitting ordinances, quarantine for infectious disease, traffic regulations, dog licenses, and just about every other statute that has been found necessary to regulate the habits and restrict the personal liberty of individuals for the sake of the rest of us.
Drinking isn’t a crime in the sense that burglary or murder are crimes. But neither is driving the wrong way through a one-way street, keeping chickens in an apartment, dumping garbage in the street, swimming in a reservoir, building a frame house in Manhattan, or keeping cold storage food in a New York grocery without a sign proclaiming the fact. None of these things is a real crime, as are theft and arson. But you can and will be arrested for doing them, and if it weren’t for this sort of sumptuary regulation of personal and business habits, life would be utterly impossible in communities of more than four persons. If prohibition is to be swept aside because it’s sumptuary, then all this body of protective legislation is due for the dump heap.

4. “Prohibition isn’t enforced.”

No, not very well. Neither is the law against murder. Since less than eight per cent of murderers are convicted, let’s abolish the law against murder. Think of the money we’d save. Or let’s license it—think of the revenue!

Just as logical as the wets’ talk of the unenforceability of prohibition.

Mayor Walker’s Speakeasies

Most of my wet friends at the club are always talking to me about New York’s 32,000 speakeasies.

This chatter adds to the pain around my collar. Perhaps there are 32,000 places in New York where liquor can occasionally be obtained. But if the wets mean that there are 32,000 places where the main business is selling booze, and which are even remotely comparable to the 12,000 saloons that dispensed it before prohibition, they are babbling bunk.

There were not less than twenty-five saloons within a radius of three city squares from my home in Manhattan in 1919. There may be twenty-five speakeasies within that same radius now. I haven’t been able to locate more than twelve that distantly resemble saloons in the amount that passes over the tables, but they may be there. I do know, however, that in this district in wet New York I don’t see one drunk where I used to see five. I don’t see—and I’m up late of nights often—one truck that could possibly be a liquor truck where I once saw ten. And if it’s delivered in passenger cars or by hand, it
would take some procession to come within a rivulet of the mighty flood that used to flow in these parts.

It's easy to say that people drink more since prohibition, but they don't. They can't, even in New York, because it isn't nearly so easy to get.

As to the wet's contention that it's a hard law to enforce, it's not a tenth as hard as the narcotics law—and very few wets want that abolished. You can pack enough heroin or morphine in your pockets to make a fortune, but to make any "important" money out of bootlegging or a speakeasy you have to have two things—customers and a source of supply. Now you know, and I know, and our wet friends know that if a speakeasy has enough customers to make business profitable, the cop on the beat is aware of it. He doesn't have to be very bright—he merely has to make his rounds and listen. The same goes for cooking alcohol or running a still big enough to count.

I cheerfully assert that any police commissioner in the United States, or any mayor, could dry up his town in a week if he wanted to badly enough. He would need only to tell his force they were to close every known speakeasy in their districts, and keep them closed, or lose their jobs. It wouldn't mean spectacular raids; it wouldn't take a special force. It would take guts on the part of the officer at the head of the force. But if he stood fast until the first wet storm blew over, he'd be in line for the Presidency.

If there are 32,000 speakeasies in Jimmy Walker's city, it is Mr. Walker's fault—not that of the prohibition law.

5. "Prohibition brings lawlessness."

Ho hum, what a long gray beard that one has!

Now I'll tell one. When those twenty-five saloons that I mentioned earlier were flourishing, they were allowed to keep open sixteen hours a day, even though they were supposed to be closed on Sundays.

Such liberality ought to satisfy almost anybody. But not those dear, law-abiding old saloon keepers whom my wet friends are always lamenting. Of those twenty-five saloons at least fifteen were open (the side door, of course)—defying the law—on Sunday. And if I had two dollars for every time I've met a cop in those back rooms, I could afford to give this article away instead of selling it.
Lawlessness? Oh, Yeah?

Eheu! Fugaces—how a wet’s memory does forget! How he forgets that it was the inherent and incorrigible lawlessness of the saloon keeper, the brewer behind him, the distiller too, that made people decide to knock out the whole business. No intelligent dry expected that these lawless lads who observed no limitation, however reasonable, and who corrupted the police as a matter of ordinary business overhead, would suddenly become law-abiding and respectable. We’ve had, and will have for some time to come, a lawless time with prohibition. But the lawlessness began long before the Eighteenth Amendment—was, in fact, the reason for it.

6. “Well, of course we don’t want the saloon back, but—now, for instance, light wine and beer . . . .”

Talk about dry hypocrisy!

They do want the saloon back, ladies and gents. Hearken to the reminiscences of nights at Old Tim’s place, where they wouldn’t sell to a drunk and always obeyed the law. A rosy haze of sweetness and light they paint around the old swinging door. But not for argument or publication.

I could embrace a frank wet who would blurt forth a hope that the saloon should come back. Being by some particular chemistry of my interior one of those birds who really can take it or let it alone, the saloon never did me any personal harm. I have had some very delightful jingles in saloons. I have heard a lot of good talk—or maybe it just seemed good talk—in saloons. I saw them pass with personal regret, just as I’d watch the passing to the gallows of a boon companion who had chopped his wife into small bits. In each instance I feel that I’ve lost a pleasant acquaintance, but that I must acquiesce in the public policy which removed them.

Hence I can regard sympathetically the honesty of the wet who wants the saloon back because he and his friends enjoyed it, and to the devil with the other issues involved. I don’t agree, but I respect him. The rest want it, but they’re too hypocritical to say so.

As to light wines and beers, by personal observation I have found that:
81% of those who advocate them never drank wine when they could get it.
46% never drank beer at all.
92% drank champagne when somebody else paid for it, but bought cocktails or highballs when paying for their own.
8% drank light wines and beer in preference to hard liquor.
86% admitted that while abroad they specialized in cocktails.
100% were drinking gin while they talked of light wines.
In other words, my brethren, what the wets want is hooch, and don’t let ’em kid you.
Anyhow I’m curious to know how allowing beer and light wine is going to make it easier to prevent bootlegged hooch than now, when all alcoholic liquor is tabooed by law.

7. "But see what prohibition is doing to youth and to women!"

Well, well, what is it doing? Wild youth isn’t as wild as it’s painted; statistics show that juvenile delinquency is decreasing. A great many women of the upper classes who didn’t drink before prohibition drink now, but the Salvation Army can tell you that the women of the masses aren’t drinking as they did in the days of the Family Entrance. And there are more of the masses than of the classes.

Besides, this drinking among youth and women is not solely a prohibition phenomenon. The problem exists also in England and France. They’re fretting about it in Canada, too, where the noble experiment of putting the government in the saloon business hasn’t abolished either the bootlegger or the speakeasy.

When Drinkers Were Drinkers

And here again the wet’s memory goes conveniently hazy. Youth drank in my youth, even if the wets forget theirs. These student statistics on drinking in college have to be taken with a salt pretzel or two. Students who take a shot once a month when they can get it count themselves as drinkers. When I went to college you didn’t rank as a drinker unless you made a habit of sipping up a few daily and got edged once a month or oftener.

I might go on and tell you how, in my home town, at least ten of the young men of the best families went to moral wreckage or physical degeneration and death from habitual alcohol-
ism within ten years of their matriculation; but though it’s true, it might be doubted.

However, we’ll leave this subject with the query as to how, today, you are to reduce the drinking among young people by making hooch cheaper and easier to get.

8. “We have made ourselves the laughingstock of other nations.”

Yeah? Who’s leffink?

A few visitors who think that, because they’ve been regaled with drinks at smart houseparties and dinners among the rich, everybody drinks as much as ever under prohibition.

If you read the foreign papers, you won’t discover much laughter. What you will discover is an enormous amount of worrying about the Americanization of Europe: a fear of what the high-speed efficiency of America—which has accompanied, even if we assume that it hasn’t been caused by, the Noble Experiment—will do to European industrialism and trade.

As far as I’m concerned, Europe may laugh its head off at our “fool sumptuary law.” If countries that regulate most of the details of your daily life in a way that Americans wouldn’t tolerate for five minutes choose to laugh at our method of dealing with booze, that’s their privilege. They can laugh at my law while I laugh at theirs.

And while we’re both laughing I can chuckle over the fact that France, for example—the model that the beer-and-light wine advocates point to so gleefully—drinks more hard liquor than England does, or than we did in the days before prohibition. I can get a giggle—or could if it seemed funny to me, which it doesn’t—out of the intolerance of a country whose wine growers and distillers have just succeeded in barring from the schools any instruction whatsoever concerning the effects of alcohol on the human system. Well, er—unless that instruction has to do with wine as a tonic and health beverage for children. Maybe it is—I dunno—but those scrawny, pale-faced French kids are no ad for the vintner’s stuff.

(Continued on page 209)
Prof. Karl Erasmus Mundt, chairman of the Forensic Department of Eastern State Teachers' College of Madison, South Dakota, has recently accepted the editorship of the Education Department of the Platform World. He is also editor of the National Forensic League Bulletin.

Mr. Mundt has contributed a number of poems and articles to magazines within the past two years, among them "Outdoor America." He is state president of the Isaac Walton League of South Dakota, and a member of the board of directors of the national organization.

Last summer Mr. Mundt was selected to serve as program director for the Rocky Mountain Writers conference, which meets each summer at Boulder, Colorado, in connection with the University's summer session. This was Mr. Mundt's fourth summer at the Writers conference. He included, among the dignitaries appearing on his program such people as Robert Frost, Zona Gale, C. E. Scoggins, Ann Cameron, Willard Hawkins, William M. John, and Blanche Young McNeal. While in Colorado, Mr. Mundt also filled several paid speaking engagements before Kiwanis and Rotary clubs. He was the chief speaker at the district Rotary convention held in Denver.

ANENT THE DEBATE FACTORIES

Almost every high school and college debate coach is finding his mailbox cluttered up these days with an ever increasing flood of advertising material from bureaus, agencies, print shops, and what-have-you, offering to sell him at small cost "complete debates written out in full" on both sides of practically every debate question now being debated by any large number of institutions. This editorial is directed against these selling agencies and the editor believes that the selling of complete debates is a pernicious practice and should be condemned by every right-thinking forensic coach who is worthy of the name.
A large part of the value of debating comes from the mental stimulus and training derived from searching after evidence and preparing the logical development of a debate case. The purchase of these "canned debates" deprives the students of this valuable training and relegates debating to a mere recital of memorized speeches and makes a mockery of the true function of the greatest of all competitive forensic practices. By refusing to buy these "mail order debates" and by stressing the importance of extempore speaking, debate coaches and their debaters can do much to curb this growing evil of providing made-to-order debates at so much per word.—Karl Mundt in The National Forensic League Bulletin.

THE WETS GIVE ME A PAIN
(Continued from page 207)

Well, What Have You?

The greatest ache in my jugular region that I get from wet talk is the lack of any suggestion of a sensible substitute for prohibition. True, government control and dispensaries are working, after a fashion, in other countries. But they didn't work here—in South Carolina—and they're not working to exactly universal satisfaction in Norway, Sweden, or Canada.

These noble experiments in other countries are, granting every wet claim, not so brilliantly successful as to warrant substituting them for our own system. If after ten years the machinery of prohibition enforcement is still missing on three cylinders, how long might we expect it to be before government control would be even fifty per cent efficient? Why substitute the complexities of regulation, which failed for more than a hundred years, for the comparative simplicity of a policy that has had only ten years trial and is by no means—again granting every wet claim—a total flop?

The most naive confession of wet futility that I have run across appeared in the editorial columns of a New York wet paper of the highest respectability. I haven't the actual clipping before me, but this is the outline. A reader wrote as follows:

"I note that your paper smites the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act hip and thigh at every opportunity. But what have you to suggest as a workable substitute?"

To which the editor appended this reply:

"It is, perhaps, a weakness in the anti-prohibition movement that it has no reasonably satisfactory policy to substitute."

Probably that editor was fired for that confession, but for once a wet had inadvertently admitted the truth.
"CHARLEY" MARSH HAS MEN AND TO SPARE

We have heard of no school with a larger turn-out for forensics than U. C. L. A. where at the call of Prof. Chas. Marsh at the beginning of the season sixty-five men reported. In addition to this number eligible for varsity debating, there were many interested in freshman debates. As usual Prof. Marsh is not limiting participation to a chosen few.

* * * * *

In a debate with Gustavus-Adolphus, Ripon College was given the decision by a three-to-one vote. This is the first debate Gustavus has lost in twenty.

Ripon’s debate with Milwaukee State Teachers initiated a new method. Only main speeches were given. The purpose was to give the audience information. In this way a direct clash was avoided. This seemed to be desirable from the audience’s view point.

* * * * *

DRAKE SEEKS REAL AUDIENCE SITUATIONS

Of the debates held at Drake University recently, some have served as programs for the Junior Chamber of Commerce, for church audiences, for the East Des Moines Club, the Kiwanis Club, and Cosmopolitan Club.

* * * * *

WESLEYAN AND AUGUSTANA WIN IN S. D. MEET

The South Dakota Intercollegiate Forensic Association held their annual contests at South Dakota State College on February 20th. The events of participation were extemporaneous speaking, peace oratory, women’s oratory and old line oratory. First place honors went to Dakota Wesleyan, second to Augustana.
OUR INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATERS

Intercollegiate debating season was launched successfully last Thursday before a fairly large audience. The support given to our debaters must have been gratifying to them. But they deserved it. If you consider the work Intercollegiate debating entails, you will see that you owe them no less.

For the past three months our debating team has spent long hours at work. They spent tedious hours on research work. Long after the campus is deserted you find them bending over books in the library. All unselfishly you find them devoting their every spare moment to a study of the subject. The personal glory they obtain is incidental to their true purpose: the bringing of glory to Southwestern. It is their duty to represent as capably as possible our institution in a battle of wits. It is an assignment, and they deserve the utmost support of which we are capable.—From an editorial appearing in the campus paper of Southwestern College, Lafayette, Louisiana.

* * * * *

MICHIGAN ZETA BROADCASTS

The speech department of the College of the City of Detroit broadcasts weekly from 7:00 to 7:30 eastern standard time, over Station WEXL at Royal Oak, Michigan. The programs have featured talks by the department members, readings by students in interpretation, men's and women's debate teams, and last year's orators who hold the state and interstate oratory titles for 1931. This year's orators are to be heard soon.

Garnet Garrison, president of Michigan Zeta chapter, is a regular announcer at the station. Prof. P. H. Scott is head of the department.

Oratory at the College of the City of Detroit, according to the Collegian, campus paper, was, at the time of its beginning five or six years ago, a small affair indeed, with only a handful of listeners. The audience which gathered to hear the oratorical contest recently was one of the largest ever to attend a college function, the judges were men of city-wide renown . . . . the oratorical contests have become an event. Also the scope of the contests, were are told, has greatly widened, students outside of speech classes now being eligible. Also women now have a contest all their own and prizes of $75 are available for women, as well as a like amount for the men.
Henrik Ibsen's "Peer Gynt" is the unusual theatrical offering to be staged at Yankton College this year. Yankton, the home of South Dakota Gamma, is known in the state not only for its forensic excellence but also for superior dramatic achievement. "Peer Gynt," a drama in five acts and a cast of 75, has been in preparation for four months to perfect it for what is said to be its first production in South Dakota.

* * * * *

ARTHUR LARSON IS RHODES SCHOLAR

L. Arthur Larson '31 of Augustana College, S. D., winner of second place in oratory at the Wichita tournament, who tied for second honors in the finals of the 1930 National Intercollegiate Oratorical contest, and winner of many forensic honors in high school and college, is now winner of that much coveted honor, the Rhodes scholarship, which will provide the privilege of study at Oxford University the next three years. The scholarship carries a stipend of $2,000.00 per year. Mr. Larson will leave for England next summer. He will specialize in law.

* * * * *

BEWARE OF THESE AT TULSA

Reports are not available on many of the state contest winners as this issue of the Forensic goes to press. Here are a few. Better beware of these at Tulsa.

Harold LeVander of Gustavus, first place in the fortieth annual State Intercollegiate contest of Minnesota. His oration, "Date Kernels," won third place in our national essay-oratorical contest, reported in the October, 1931 Forensic.

Margaret Patterson, representing Michigan State College, took first in a nine-college statewide extempore contest in which seven men and two women participated. Homer Yinger of Albion, non-P. K. D. school, won second.

Gordon Fischer, also of Michigan State, won first place and the prize of $60 in the State Peace Oratorical contest. And again, an Albion representative, Merrill Wahls, took second honors with its accompanying $40 honorarium.

Lowell Ditzen, representing William Jewell in the Missouri Intercollegiate Peace Oratorical, won first honors and the $60 award. We do not have the information on second place winner.

The invitational speech tournament held at Linfield College resulted in a most interesting meet in which thirteen colleges of Oregon, Washington, Idaho and California participated. Various delegations report a great time and compliment Linfield on the success of the tournament. The forensic department at Linfield now anticipates such a contest annually. Linfield, with Willamette College, carried off the lion’s share of honors. Minnie Heseman and Dorothy Dirks took a 2 to 1 decision in the finals of the women’s debate, in competition with Eunice Ewer and Margaret Griffin representing the College of Idaho. Lucile Beswick of Linfield placed first in women’s oratory, and Minnie Heseman was given second in women’s extempore.

John Shultz and Carroll Arnold, representing Sioux Falls College, won the state debate tournament held in connection with the South Dakota Intercollegiate Forensic Association held at State College February 19 and 20. They will see you at Tulsa.

May we digress to comment that we expected nothing less than this achievement from the S. F. C. boys, for note that Sioux Falls College is the Alma Mater of J. D. Coon, national counsel of Pi Kappa Delta.

* * * * *

TULSA TEAM MAY MAKE TROUBLE

It looks like the Tulsa chapter of P. K. D. may do more than provide us with a forensic battle ground. Sam Brodsky and Carl Wiedman as freshman and sophomore, respectively, won second in men’s debate in their province a year ago. These local warriors may make trouble for the “foreign” invaders.

* * * * *

The College of Emporia conducted an invitation junior college debate tournament February 19 and 20. Nine colleges were represented with one or more teams. Hutchinson Junior College took first honors.
WHY DEBATE IS WORTH WHILE

Is debate worth while? What part does debate play in the development of the student’s capabilities? Is the value equal to the sacrifice of time from regular studies? Is one justified in taking time from studies for debate?

These questions arise in the minds of many students, and perhaps a discussion of or enumeration of values to the student would prove helpful in the search for a solution to them. Debate requires time, study, and thought, but its returns are large.

Do you, who wish these questions answered, remember the enumerated requirements of a scholar as given by a noted psychologist, published in the October 3 issue of the Highland Echo? They were:

1. Understanding and appreciation of other races and cultures contemporary or remote.
2. Ability and disposition to weigh evidence in controversial matters.
3. Ability and disposition to mentally project an undertaking through its successive steps before undertaking it.
4. Skill in explanation and prediction.
5. Ability and disposition to look beneath the surface of things before passing judgment.
6. Ability to do reflective thinking.
7. Disposition toward continued study and intellectual cultivation.
8. Critical and questioning attitude toward traditional sanctions.
9. Clarity in definition.
10. Discrimination in values in reacting to environment, social and physical.
11. Analytical approach to propositions leading to the detection of fallacies and contradictions.
12. Ability and disposition to observe accurately and systematically.
13. Understanding and skill in the use of processes of induction, deduction, and generalization.

(Continued on next page)
TULSA UNIVERSITY WELCOMES PI KAPPA DELTA

To the Officers and Members of Pi Kappa Delta:

The University of Tulsa wishes most heartily to welcome the officers and members of Pi Kappa Delta to the campus of the university and the city of Tulsa. We hope that your visit will prove to be most enjoyable and profitable, and that you will carry away most kindly impressions gained through your sojourn among us.

Cordially yours,

JOHN D. FINLAYSON,
Chancellor.

John D. Finlayson, Chancellor
University of Tulsa

WHY DEBATE IS WORTH WHILE
(Continued from page 214)

14. The ability to see relationships, and accuracy in their interpretation.

15. A freshness of interest with respect to the developments of knowledge.

All the requirements, with the possible exception of the first, eighth, and tenth, are the characteristics of the sincere debater. In the consideration of particular questions of debate, the remaining three points could also be acquired characteristics. If one phase of the intellectual development of college life can give such reward as this, is not debate worth while? What do you think of it?—Tenn. Alpha.
WAS "THE NEW SOUTH" IMPROMPTU?

GEORGE McCARTY

It is believed to be typically American to want our heroes to be self-made; to want them to arrive at heroic esteem through personal effort. The idea that anyone can become president of the nation fits in with the democratic ideal. In contrast with this idea and quite as often, apparently, we like to think that the heroic attain their heroism, their greatness, through no effort of their own; the smaller the effort the greater the credit for achievement. Perhaps this is a sort of hang-over from our pre-American ancestral days of the monarchial ideal, under which the menial slaved for the kingly. At any rate the idea is extant. For the propagation of this latter conception, biographers have sometimes been responsible. Biography relates many instances of those, who quite unexpectedly, even to themselves, have attained great distinction.

In oratory as in other arts, according to biography, success just came, descending like a magic mantle upon the surprised shoulders of its elect. We read from one of Lincoln’s biographers of how he delivered his Gettysburg Address with practically no preparation, having jotted down a few hasty notes on an old envelope that forenoon as he travelled to Gettysburg. Imagine Lincoln, who all his life had followed the path of effort, on this great occasion, one of the most significant of his career, trusting to the hands of chance the possibility of making a bad impression, at a time when a good impression on the part of an already misunderstood president, would mean so much. Lincoln’s whole life is an argument against any such belief. As a bit of meagre evidence that the president prepared very seriously for the occasion we have the word of Mr. Hay, his secretary, that “Mr. Lincoln remained up until a late hour, probably preparing his speech.”

Webster’s “Reply to Hayne” is another classic example of great effectiveness in address which came “on the spur of the moment,” as if the speaker merely opened his mouth and somehow the colorful, meaningful, words came of their own volition. On the matter of such spontaneity Webster himself said: “There is no such thing as extemporaneous acquisition.” Mr. Winans
states, (1) "When great speeches have been made with apparently little preparation (as in Webster’s Reply to Hayne) they have really sprung from years of study, discussion and experience in which materials have been amassed. Not only have materials been amassed, but, they have been formulated over and over again, and in different ways."

The case of Henry W. Grady provides another example for our purpose here. Clark Howell says of his address, “The New South,” delivered before the New England Society, in 1886, “I believe he prepared an outline for that speech before he left for New York, but it was entirely different from the speech as he delivered it.” (2)

Mr. Howell generalizes, furthermore, by stating that Grady’s speeches were all spontaneous, that the same sort of preparation, or lack of it, characterized his Dallas speech on the race question. This speech was written and in type before Grady left Atlanta. When delivered it was so different that Mr. Grady wired back “Suppress speech it has been entirely changed.” The same is true of the Boston address according to this biographer, who states further, (3) “Magnificent as were his prepared speeches, the ‘impromptu’ speech stood out by comparison, for the fire of the genius of oratory was in them.”

Nevertheless would we not be more accurate to say that both his Dallas and Boston speeches were extemporaneous rather than impromptu since he prepared for both, regardless of his holding strictly to his outline. On both occasions he used the same subject, that of the race question. He had doubtless spoken and written much on these subjects before either occasion.

Joel Chandler Harris in his “Life of Grady” states that Grady’s address on “The New South” was “an impromptu effort from beginning to end,—a creature of the imagination.” Does Mr. Harris mean extemporaneous or does he really mean impromptu? While we perhaps cannot disprove Mr. Harris’ statement, one cannot on any ground reasonably accept it.

First of all, Henry W. Grady was not like that, if we are to believe his biographers, for all seem to agree that “he possessed a brilliant mind and best of all a firm and resolute determination to acquire knowledge.” (4)

(1) Winans: Public Speaking, p. 90.
Furthermore, at least two years prior to this time, with the election of Cleveland in 1884, he must have felt his responsibility as a possible spokesman for the South. Before 1884 he was keenly interested in the reconciliation of North and South, bitterly estranged by the Civil War. The privilege of speaking before this northern organization,—an important occasion at any time, especially so, for him a young man, and a guest in the North’s greatest metropolis, the first Southerner since the Civil War to be given that honor,—presented an unusual opportunity for him to appeal for greater understanding between the two sections of his country. The role of peace-maker was not a new one to him and obviously he would not go into the experience unprepared.

We are not sure of the time elapsing between the invitation to address the occasion and the occasion itself. One authority, at least, states that it was six months. The New England Society of New York had for many years made their annual banquet a notable occasion. Says Lee, “A company of higher character or broader intelligence, does not meet in this country—To touch the body of gentlemen composing that club was to touch American thought.” (1)

Among the notables present on this occasion were William Tecumseh Sherman and other national figures. Such a group might be expected to invite as their speakers only those of some considerable renown, and it is only reasonable to suppose that they would, both as a matter of courtesy to the guest speaker as well as a safeguard to the success of their program, inform the speaker of the occasion in time for his adequate preparation. Certainly no one would suppose that Henry Grady under such circumstances would wait, depending upon an impromptu effort.

Even though he had no more time for preparation than the time required for his trip from Atlanta—his home at this time—to New York City, his effort could hardly be called impromptu. For ten or more years before this date, his interest, and his work as editor and writer, had prepared him in a general way for his address at this time. He had written much along the same line before. It is entirely possible that some of his exact phraseology had been previously used. It is reasonable to believe that would be true. Furthermore, in the matter of effective self-expression, it should be remembered that his success on this occasion was not due to impromptu efforts. Eighteen

(1) Henry W. Grady, Editor, Orator and Man; Arena, June, 1890, Vol. 2. p. 9-23.
years before “The New South” was delivered Grady had won a local reputation as a brilliant orator and debater. Later he pursued graduate study at the University of Virginia in journalism and oratory. Doubtless throughout all the intervening years he was developing his ability in simple, clear and effective expression. This, by way of further evidence that he would not go carelessly unprepared.

Perhaps Mr. Harris was misled by Mr. Grady’s own comment concerning the occasion. He is said to have remarked, “When I found myself on my feet, every nerve in my body was strung as tight as a fiddle string, and all tingling. I knew then that I had a message for that assemblage, and as soon as I opened my mouth it came rushing out.” Are we to understand from this remark that the speaker had no thought to express until he arose to speak?

Let us examine the speech itself. There are only four or five sentences—those referring to Dr. Talmage’s speech and those referring to his toast—that give any reasonable excuse for the statement that the speech was impromptu. He begins with a quotation which there is no reason to assume grew out of the immediate occasion. The reference to Mr. Hill and his speech delivered in Tammany Hall in 1866, in the same city, looks like a sensible well-thought-out beginning. His address deals with the subject which doubtless the New England Society would expect him to discuss, and he could have been in no doubt on this point from the time he first received the invitation to speak. Knowing of his work as an outstanding southern editor, they selected him as a truly southern representative who would in his address do what he had been doing already in the South—make a plea for a broader brotherhood, for mutual understanding and a united country. His “New South” therefore was very reasonably not impromptu, and more the honor to him for his preparation for an occasion which demanded his best.

A CORRECTION

We are sorry for our failure to report in the January Forensic the winners of the Southwestern Debate tournament. Page 148 of that issue should have carried the additional information that first in men’s debate was won by the Southwestern College team composed of Blake Cochran and Wayne Henderson. Second honors went to McPherson College. In women’s debate Hastings College won first, and Northwest State Teachers (Okla.) won second.
MICHIGAN EPSILON PREPARES DIRECTORY FOR “TIN” ANNIVERSARY

We have before us a copy of the Pi Kappa Delta directory as prepared by the Michigan Epsilon chapter and sent to their various members last May. In a chapter letter, which accompanies the directory, the information is carried that the directory was prepared as a means of “helping us all to appreciate our ten years of history.” The letter and directory were sent out to their entire membership, past and present, as a reminder of their forth-coming annual banquet.

The directory includes the names of all members of this chapter, from the charter member list of 1921 by years to the present time. The membership roll contains 166 names.

This chapter reminds their members of their interest in securing a good representation of all classes and particularly the “21’ers” at their annual banquet. A roll call for the various years was to be a feature of the banquet. National President Pflaum was to be their guest speaker.

We have had no later report on the banquet referred to but we are impressed with the thought that the activity of this chapter in gathering the necessary data for and printing of the directory is a very necessary and valuable piece of work. We wonder if other chapters may not want to follow the lead of Michigan Epsilon in order that local chapter history may be thus preserved? Why not try this as an impetus toward stimulating interest in your next annual banquet, whether it is your “tin” anniversary or not?

—LOCAL OBJECTIVES—

As suggested by Tau Kappa Alpha.

1. Adequate entertainment for visiting teams by a general “get together.”

2. Intramural debates between schools, colleges, fraternities, literary societies, or other parts of a college or university.

3. Carrying the forensic program into the high schools by sponsoring contests, acting as judges, and counseling students.

4. Maintaining a speakers’ bureau to give members additional experience in appearing before off-campus groups.

5. Sponsoring intersectional and international debates, providing addresses by individuals, and entertainment of other forms.
THE OREGON PLAN OF DEBATE

We were interested in the use of the Oregon plan of debate as revised at the Miami University. On inquiry, Prof. H. H. Higgins, of Miami's Department of Speech, gives us the following information:

“The original Oregon plan called for only two speakers and with the cross-examination period hedged about with all sorts of rules and regulations. We have hit upon a three speaker plan with all rules and regulations thrown to the winds, in an attempt to make debating in school the same type of thing that one gets into elsewhere. Under our plan the second speaker on each team may ask all the questions or as few questions as he wishes. To state our plan in another way, it is simply this: That the purpose of each speaker is to get as many people as possible to agree with him on the subject under discussion. He is at liberty to use any method he desires in order to get people to believe him, just as is true of any speaker in the situations of daily life.

“All of our intercollegiate debates are upon this plan this year and most of them have been for some two or three years. Certainly it affords an opportunity for training in the technique of effective persuasion which was not possible under the old type of debate, with its many traditions and rules of procedure which were supposed to be rules of effective speaking but which as a matter of fact, were really rules for ineffective speaking.”

The Miami Revision of the Oregon Plan

The Oregon plan of debate is a thoroughly practical type of debate. The conditions surrounding this type of debate are those which surround discussions in the workaday world.

It differs radically in purpose from the old, formal type of scholastic debates. Instead of trying to convince three judges (or a single, critic judge) that they have piled up more evidence on their side and have destroyed more of their opponents’ arguments than opponents have of theirs, the speakers in the revised Oregon plan attempt to get the people in their audiences to believe on the question under discussion as the debaters believe. For this reason there are no “official judges” who determine who “wins” or “loses” the debate. Neither side “loses” under the revised Oregon plan; neither side is concerned about “winning” or “losing.” The debaters are interested only in affecting
their hearers' beliefs on the question rather than their beliefs "regarding the comparative ability in debate shown by the contestants."

In all of our debates we should like to have an expression of the opinions of the members of the audience on the question both before and after the debate. The ballot which we like to have used if agreeable with our opponents also provides spaces for the criticism of the individual speakers. We have found these ballots to be of great value in helping debaters to become more effective speakers. The results of the votes on these ballots do not constitute decisions on the debates; the results are not made public. They are for the use of the debaters and the department of public speaking.

In the revised Oregon plan the first speaker has an allotted time in which to attempt to get his hearers to agree with him on the question under discussion. This first speaker on each side of the question should introduce all arguments which his team expects to use in the discussion; in other words, the first speaker on each team "presents the entire case" upon his side of the question.

The second speaker on each team then cross examines his opponents. He stands wherever he prefers to stand and directs questions at his opponents which they answer immediately. The one who does the questioning is in complete charge of the discussion during the time which he is allowed; he may interrupt or stop any other speaker. He may direct his questions at the opposing team or at individual members of the team. An individual who is asked a question may indicate another member of his team as the one to answer the question. In other words, during the cross examination period anything is fair that anyone can "get away with"—just as is true in such situations in real life.

The third speaker on each team has a limited time in which to make a final plea or to "summarize the debate."

This type of debate is much more interesting to both the debaters and to the hearers. It gives much better training for speaking under conditions which prevail after college debate days are over. It makes necessary a straight-forward, honest discussion of the topic under consideration.

1. The ballot referred to is that devised by Prof. H. S. Woodward, of Western Reserve University, Cleveland Ohio.
The order of speaking and suggested time limits are:
First affirmative, 12 minutes; first negative, 12 minutes;
second negative, 12 minutes; second affirmative, 12 minutes;
third negative, 8 minutes; third affirmative, 8 minutes.

The Woodward Ballot

TO THE AUDIENCE:

The speakers will appreciate your interest and help if you will, both
before and after the debate, indicate on this sheet your personal opinion
on the topic of the debate. Kindly mark the ballot in accordance with your
attitude on the relative merits of the two teams. This ballot has nothing
to do with determining which team has done the better debating.

When the debate is finished, opportunity will be given you to question
the debaters on any question that pertains to the topic under discussion.

BEFORE THE DEBATE

☐ I believe in the affirmative of the resolution to be debated.
☐ I am undecided.
☐ I believe in the negative of the resolution to be debated.

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

Date
Place
This blank is filled by a
(---) man (---) woman, whose age is

AFTER THE DEBATE

☐ I have heard the entire discussion, and now

☐ I believe much more strongly in the affirmative of the resolution than
  I did.
☐ I believe in the affirmative of the resolution.
☐ I am undecided.
☐ I believe in the negative of the resolution.
☐ I believe much more strongly in the negative of the resolution than
  I did.

THE REASONS FOR MY OPINION ARE:

(If you wish to vote on the merits of the debating, indicate your vote here)

When I disregard my attitude upon the topic under discussion, I believe
that the better debating has been done by the
THE CRITIC-JUDGE SYSTEM OF DECIDING DEBATES

PROF. MARTIN J. HOLCOMB, Bethany College

In the first place, the writer desires to express his sincere appreciation to the directors of debate at the institutions having chapters of Pi Kappa Delta for their splendid cooperation in this investigation of the critic-judge system of deciding debates. This article will contain only a brief summary of the conclusions reached concerning the several phases of the critic-judge system that were investigated. A more detailed discussion of this investigation will appear in The Quarterly Journal of Speech.

The method used in this investigation was suggested by Professor C. C. Cunningham, Director of Debate, Northwestern University. The writer wishes to give him due recognition for his many helpful suggestions. In order to make this investigation as comprehensive as possible, a detailed questionnaire was sent to three hundred and twelve directors of debate, including the directors at the universities of the Western Conference Debating League and all universities and colleges having chapters of Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Kappa Delta, and Tau Kappa Alpha. Replies were received from thirty-nine different states, and included one hundred and forty-nine questionnaires that had been filled out and seventeen replies to the effect that the critic-judge system is not used in their institutions.

The questionnaire used in this investigation was formulated in such a manner as to secure information concerning the following phases of the critic-judge system: the present extent of use of the critic-judge system; who the critic-judge should be; how the critic-judge decision is received; and how the critic-judge system compares with other methods. This article will include a short summary of the conclusions reached relative to each of these phases.

As regards the present extent of use of the critic-judge system, the investigation made evident that the strength of the critic-judge system is found in the states of the Middle West;
that it has some supporters in the Far West; and that other sys-
tems of judging are used more extensively in the South and East. In fact, the critic-judge system is seldom used in the East.

In order to have some basis for definite conclusions concern-
ing who the critic-judge should be, each director of debate to
whom a questionnaire was sent was asked to submit his defini-
tion of a critic-judge. Most of the definitions submitted had a
number of characteristics in common. For instance, ninety-nine
of those submitting definitions pointed out that the critic-judge
should be an individual who knows debate theory and practice
thoroughly and who can evaluate skill in debating; fifty-six stat-
ed that he should be an individual who has had considerable ex-
perience in debate work; and a considerable number mentioned
that the critic-judge should have the ability to give an effective
oral criticism of the debate and should be capable of giving con-
structive criticism. The writer wishes to submit the following
definition of the critic-judge, based upon the definitions submit-
ted in the questionnaire investigation: "An efficient critic-
judge is an impartial individual who knows theory and practice
thoroughly, who has analytical ability, who has had considerable
experience in debate work, and who has the ability to give an
effective oral constructive criticism of the debate." In connec-
tion with this matter of who the critic-judge should be, an in-
vestigation was also made as to which profession furnishes the
most efficient critic-judge. Undoubtedly the debate coach is the
most efficient critic-judge as is evidenced by the fact that he
received first rank from one hundred and nine while the total
number of first places to all others was only twenty-four.

The investigation of how the critic-judge reaches his de-
cision revealed, in the first place, that a large majority of the
critic-judges take rather detailed notes during the debate and
that many judges make it a practice to follow through the argu-
ments as far as possible during the debate. This investigation
further showed that a considerable number of the critic-judges
employ somewhat definite standards as the basis for their deci-
sions but that there is considerable difference of opinion as re-
gards the practical standards that should be used in evaluating
debate teams. Especially do critic-judges differ much in regard
to the approximate weight that should be given to the various
factors that might be considered in a critic-decision. The inves-
tigation also indicated, to a certain extent, the prevailing opin-
ion among critic-judges concerning some of the matters that
arise during the progress of the debate. In some instances, there is a fair agreement among the critic-judges concerning those matters; in other instances, there is considerable divergence of opinion in regard to some of the problems that arise during the debate.

Since a criticism of the debate by the judge is an integral part of the critic-judge system, a detailed investigation was made of how the critic-judge gives his decision. Concerning this matter, the following facts became evident: first, it is almost a universal practice among critic-judges to give a criticism of the debate and a large number of the judges give a general criticism before the audience, and later, a more specific criticism before the debaters; second, practically all of the critic-judges announce the decision at the close of the criticism, but a considerable majority of the judges make no special effort to conceal the outcome of the debate until the announcement of the decision; third, a large majority of the critic-judges have rather a systematic plan for the public criticism, and this plan usually includes the standards that were used as the basis for the decision; fourth, critic-judges do not consistently use any particular type of introduction for their public criticism; fifth, the large majority of critic-judges do not make a special effort to use humor in their criticism; sixth, as regards the plan of the public criticism, a statement of the system or points considered is usually presented first; seventh, it is almost a universal practice among critic-judges to indicate the merits and weaknesses of each team; eighth, a considerable majority of the critic-judges analyze the specific arguments presented in the debate, and an even larger majority render the decision on the relative advantage of the respective teams on the arguments presented, and most of the critic-judges show how specific arguments may be strengthened; and ninth, most of the critic-judges also give criticisms of the individual speaker, but the more personal matters are not mentioned in public but are reserved for private conference.

Naturally the final test of any system of judging debates is the manner in which it works. Therefore the writer attempted to obtain the available facts relative to how the critic-judge decision is received. The facts obtained in the investigation concerning this matter might be summarized as follows: first, it has been observed that the critic-judge gives evidence of rather a systematic method in reaching his decision; second, a considerable majority of the debate coaches believe that critic-judges
are not influenced in their decisions by their personal convictions on the question; third, a large majority of debate coaches, debaters and audiences are satisfied with most of the decisions rendered by critic-judges; fourth, a large majority of the debate coaches believe that critic-judges attempt to conceal the outcome of the debate until the conclusion of the criticism, which is contrary to their expressed opinions relative to their own practice; fifth, it has been observed that most of the critic-judges have a definite plan for their public criticism; sixth, likewise it has been observed that most of the critic-judges justify their decisions; seventh, a strong majority of the debate coaches believe that the critic-judges usually give individual criticisms and constructive criticisms; eighth, a large majority of the debate coaches believe that their debaters are benefited by the criticisms of the critic-judge, and that the public criticism of the debate by the critic-judge is of special interest or of benefit to the audience; and ninth, a large number of those who filled out questionnaires personally favor the critic-judge system.

The final matter that was given consideration in this questionnaire survey was how the critic-judge system compares with other methods of judging debates. The facts obtained from the questionnaires indicate quite conclusively that the critic-judge system is used more extensively than any other method of judging debates and that this system is more satisfactory to a larger number of those having a personal interest in the decision as is indicated by the statement of preference as regards debate coaches, the debaters and the audience.

Even though the facts obtained from the questionnaire survey indicate that the success of the critic-judge system is commensurate with its extensive use, the conclusion is not warranted that the critic-judge system is entirely satisfactory as it functions today. Considerable dissatisfaction with the system was expressed in the replies to the questionnaires by several coaches. Even though these men belong to the minority group, their statements, which are the result of several years' experience with the system, tend to indicate that there are some major criticisms that might be directed against the critic-judge system. From a careful reading of the replies to the questionnaires, the writer gleaned at least two major criticisms of the critic-judge system as it functions today.

In the first place, it is evident that there are a considerable number of almost inexplicable decisions rendered by critic-judges that tend to cast a reflection upon the system. Perhaps
the solution to this problem, as suggested by several of the coaches, is to insist upon a more careful selection of critic-judges and to refuse to use such judges as have indicated by their previous decisions that they are not qualified to serve as critic-judges.

This investigation revealed another major criticism against the critic-judge system as it functions today—namely, that there is no general understanding among the critic-judges as regards the factors that should be considered as the basis for the decisions, and especially no agreement as regards the approximate value that should be given to each of those factors. Perhaps this matter also would be improved through a more careful selection of the critic-judges, especially since several coaches indicated in their replies to the questionnaire that there is considerably more uniformity in the relative weight given to the factors considered in the decision by those judges who are qualified to serve as critic-judges. It is natural that should be the case as those who are more thoroughly trained and experienced in debate have become familiar with those factors that should serve as a satisfactory basis in evaluating debating skill.

The final conclusion of the writer in regard to this investigation of the critic-judge system of deciding debates is that the system undoubtedly justified itself, but that it also has certain weaknesses that perhaps would be diminished through a more careful selection of the individuals who are asked to serve as critic-judges.

VOLUMES I, II and III, P. K. D. DEBATE ANNUAL

Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations, volumes I, II and III are now on sale. Vol. III was published during the summer. In it appears the debates, orations, and extempore speeches which won the national contests at Wichita. Every chapter of P. K. D. and every library in a P. K. D. institution should have a copy. Each chapter should ask its library to order one or more. Individuals will want copies. Order now. The price is one dollar. All orders should be addressed to Noble & Noble, 76 Fifth Ave., New York City.