Professor Anonymons, M.S., Ph.D.

By RICHARD SMITH
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Lincoln, Nebraska

(This Oration Won the 1933 Interstate Oratorical Contest)

This discussion involves a paradox.

The first half of the paradox illustrates itself in a series of events which have become commonplace enough. The employees of a great commercial concern have been called to a meeting. The men are soberly entering the executive offices. They sit silently. Soon, the President comes from his private office to face them. No man is absent. Later they vote the voluntary cut. Among these men was an ex-university professor, a young chemist of national prominence in his field of research. He adjusted his budget to the ten per cent cut. But the fifteen per cent additional cut which followed was embarrassing, and his final dismissal was a financial tragedy. In less than a year, his need increased to desperation. Then from illness and poverty he brought forth his new code which said: “To Hell with society. If society will not pay me for the legitimate use of my ‘scientific’ skill and training, it will pay me for their illegitimate use.” And he did what any good chemist could do. Professor Anonymous, Chemical Engineer, Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy, became, for the sake of food and shelter, for wife and children, the local bootlegger.

Now, let’s forget the young chemist for the moment and look at the other half of the problem. The seriousness of this second phase is sharply revealed in an article which might have been called hara kiri. *Hara kiri* is the Japanese expression for hon-
orable death. The author urges that honorable death be legal-
ized and made an available means for ending human suffering. 
Here is revealed the stark face of disease so hopeless that an 
intelligent medical man can urge death as the civilized solution. 
The advocate of this program is no fanatic; he is Dr. Little, past 
president of the University of Michigan, and now director of 
the American Society for the Control of Cancer.

Here, this evening, we propose not to defend or to condemn 
the new code of ethics involved in the illegal use of scientific 
training, not that involved in the legalization of voluntary death. 
We do wish to focus attention upon the fact that the two merge 
to key a crucial issue. In a society where the head of the foun-
dation for the control of cancer can recommend only death as 
solution, for capable young scientists, potentially able to con-
trol disease, to be forced to illegitimate practices in order to live 
is a tragic paradox.

Nor is malignant cancer the only disease which defies medi-
cal science today. Certain fields for fundamental research are 
almost untouched; tuberculosis, arteriosclerosis, infantile par-
alysis, spinal meningitis, with a mortality of nearly one hundred 
per cent, epilepsy, pellagra, arthritis, diabetes, nephritis, ame-
biasis and many others. Amebiasis alone undermines the 
health of twelve million in the United States, and has, so far, 
had almost no investigation. Progress in the applied science 
of medicine is absolutely dependent on fundamental research. 
And science is out of work.

As Ortega Casset points out, the post war period has made 
the scientist a “social pariah.” This lack of concern for the 
welfare of science he regards as the most terrifying develop-
ment of our age. We are the beneficiaries of scientific re-
search, vaccines, anaesthetics, cauterizing knives; we accept 
these applied evidences as a matter of course, but we do not 
hold ourselves responsible for encouraging and supporting pure 
science from which these miracles come. Rather have we left 
the control of science and its support to business and to govern-
ment. Business, moreover, has been willing to accept science 
as his colleague because science pays. A millionaire says: “In 
my day fortunes were made by controlling natural resources, 
in your day they will be made by controlling chemical pro-
cesses.” Two hundred millions are spent each year on research; 
and it profits commercially ten to twenty times that much. And 
business is dissatisfied the moment investigation becomes too
fundamental to show immediate profit. Business dictates to science in terms of dollar decimals. This is particularly and peculiarly unfortunate in the field of fundamental research.

Governments have proved themselves quite as untrustworthy as business when undertaking the role of scientific Godfather. Federal patronage allows eight million dollars for investigating animal diseases, four million for the study of human ills. And the result is that the greatest piece of pioneer research credited to America is for the control of Texas Fever among cattle. Next door in Iowa the legislature has recently refused to increase the budget for the investigation of human tuberculosis from five thousand dollars to ten thousand, but at the same session passed an increase for bovine tuberculosis investigations from one hundred thousand to two hundred and fifty thousand. What are we? A government of the people, by the bureau, and for the cattle!

Governments have not only peeled budgets until valuable research has been impaired; they have in some cases positively interfered. Thirty-five years ago Roland Ross, unknown young scientist, was sweating from the terrific heat of India, as he cut, mounted and examined the gullets of mosquitoes. He was searching for malaria organisms. His first report, the English medical bureau dubbed "piffling experimentation," and transferred Ross from his work. He pleaded for a month's time in which to finish. The bureau threatened his salary. In two years Ross watched one million two hundred thousand Indians die from malaria alone. That's only about half the number of people in Chicago! When he returned to his work he completed his search in a single month. With bitterness he cries: "No, the man who can do is not allowed to do, because the man who cannot do is put in authority over him."

Governments have not only interfered where they should not; they have refused to interfere where they should. The Supreme Court has recently held that false and misleading advertising cannot be reached under the Pure Food and Drug Act. One William J. A. Bailey cleared seventy-five thousand dollars on an automobile fraud. He was caught, convicted and fined. So he turned to something with more remuneration and less risk. He now preys on the epileptic. Again have we seen Norman Baker, eighth grade graduate, inventor of the calliope, operator of radio station KTNT in Muscatine, Iowa, assuming the title of doctor and concocting ground cobs into cancer cures which have
netted him profits of seventy-five thousand dollars per month.

Contrast with this pseudo-science the spirit of real research. In 1887 four thousand people died in New Orleans from yellow fever. In the same year Hiedeyo Noguchi was "a baby learning to walk in Japan." When he died in 1928, "yellow fever was as rare as a man like" Noguchi. He himself was victim of the disease he conquered. Stricken, he insisted that samples of his fever-polluted blood be taken to inoculate monkeys. He worked till the end saying: "I can't die till I find it." His sacrifice brought the last bit of yellow fever, that on the gold coast of Africa, under control.

Because of such heroic pioneers, the public has developed great respect for science; but it has not developed understanding. Consequently fraud has cloaked itself, unmolested, in scientific robes. And unintelligent faith in pseudo-science is developing what Dr. Hertzler calls "a new bigotry" so powerful in its "truth resisting force" as to constitute a menace. At this very moment Professor Anonymous and thousands like him, certified members of the American Chemical Society, are desperate for work.

But the Baileys and the Bakers are employed. The public will not take the trouble to distinguish between real science and its counterfeit. Pseudo-science makes its products so much more attractive, so much more sure of results. Listerine is advertised as the ninety-eight per cent effective antiseptic. But the American Medical Association points out that the only way Listerine can kill germs is by drowning them. In the depressed year of 1931 a poverty stricken public bought twenty-seven million jars of Vapo-Rub in the vain attempt to kill colds. Yet real science is baffled with the solution. This information is available to the public through Consumer's Research and through the publications of the A. M. A. Yet one person reads Hygeia to thirty-three who prefer True Story. Consequently the buying public spends nearly one-half a billion a year for useless drugs, never realizing that science needs that public support as much as the public needs science.

Is it any wonder that medical research, exploited by business, unprotected by legislation and cheapened by pseudo-science, has not been able to solve these vital medical problems? Is it any wonder that the enrollment in the science departments of our colleges and universities is showing a decrease disproportionate to the falling off in other fields? In my freshman class there
were ten who planned to major in chemistry. Now in senior year I work in the laboratory alone.

I am not trying to maintain that no progress has been made under the present system; Noguchi had support from the Rockefeller Foundation. Paul Ehrlich, the scientific clown, who made a circus out of chemistry, was, none the less, a scientific genius who loved his work in spite of hydrogen sulphide. Given freedom and financial protection, he worked fourteen years to give us salvarsan—the specific for syphilis. Great as these discoveries are, they are only isolated adventures in an unexplored scientific universe.

Yet in the face of the facts someone picks up his evening paper and reads of an unfortunate blown to bits by trinitroethylene, and says complacently: “Well, science should have slowed down.” That’s no uncommon argument! You’ve heard it.

Try being the brother or sister of someone who died within a month before the solution of malaria was discovered. It might have been under control two years sooner but for vicious governmental interference. Try being a woman who lives near us. Stand with her beside a high hospital crib and watch. Beautiful childish limbs can wither within a week form infantile paralysis. Hear her reiterate “Why can’t somebody do something?” Ask “Why hasn’t fundamental research been encouraged?” Then hear the doctor’s prayer:

“This little one who cannot play!
Lord, put into my hands today
Some skill beyond the healing art.”

Try being attacked by spinal meningitis tomorrow. There is no cure. Three years ago two basketball men were seized by spinal meningitis and died within three days. Another case was reported. My community was not alarmed; it was terrorized. Try having hypothyroid like Raymond Shipman, four feet seven, a collegian who goes to a school like this one. Go home with him to turn on your study lamp to search the medical journals for a new aid. Search knowing that scientists are unemployed; that your government is indifferent; that little fundamental research is being done and that the American people spend the support for that research on useless drugs. Search goaded by the knowledge that in a few months your bones will ossify and no help will avail. Then say: in society where the head of the foundation for the control of cancer can recommend only death as solution for dozens of diseases, for capable young scientists to be forced to illegal practices to live is a tragic paradox.
Rules For Convention Contests

NATIONAL PRESIDENT—H. DANA HOPKINS

Note: Each delegate attending the national convention must pay a registration fee of $1.50. This fee admits to all meetings and contests, including the final banquet.

ELIGIBILITY

Each contestant who represents a chapter shall be a bona fide undergraduate of the college he represents and shall be a member of Pi Kappa Delta or shall have filed his membership application with the national secretary, and sent in his initiation fees. This rule applies to all six contests.

ORATORY

1. Contestants. Each Pi Kappa Delta chapter may enter one orator in the men's contest and one in the women's contest.
2. Entrance Fee. Each chapter shall pay an entrance fee of one dollar for each orator entered.
3. Orations. Orations shall not exceed 1500 words in length, and shall not contain more than 150 words of quotations. All quotations shall definitely appear as such in the delivery. Each contestant shall send a typewritten copy of his oration to the National Secretary together with an entrance fee of one dollar, not later than March 1, 1934.
4. Preliminary Contests. Preliminary contests shall be held simultaneously, the number of such contests being determined by the number of contestants entered, it being provided that not more than eight speakers shall appear on one program. The National Council shall determine the arrangement of schools in the preliminary contests.
5. Semi-final Contests. The twenty-one orators having the sum of their rankings in the first three rounds lowest shall enter the semi-finals.
6. Final Contests. The seven orators having the sum of their ranking in the first four rounds lowest shall enter the finals. The final winners shall be determined by taking the total of the rankings in all five rounds.
7. *Time of Contests.* The time for holding each contest shall be determined by the National Council and shall be announced in the printed program of the convention.

8. *Judges.* Each contest shall be decided by three or more disinterred judges to be chosen by the National Council.

9. *Method of Judging.* In giving ratings to the speakers each judge shall mark the speaker who, in his opinion, is the best with a grade of 95 and the poorest with a grade of 70, scaling the others between these limits. No judge shall tie two speakers for any place. Any orator ranked first by a majority of the judges shall be awarded first place. If no orator is thus ranked first, all the rankings of each orator shall be totaled and the orator having the lowest sum of ranks shall be awarded first and the orator having the next lowest sum of ranks shall be awarded second and the orator having the next lowest ranks shall be awarded third, etc. Ties shall be broken by re-ranking those concerned in the tie, disregarding the other speakers in the contest. If this fails, the tie shall be broken by using the perecentage markings.

10. *Prize.* Medals shall be awarded to the winners of first, second and third places in the final contest. The college represented by the winner of first place shall be awarded a silver trophy cup.

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

**EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING**

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

1. *Contestants.* Each Pi Kappa Delta chapter may enter a contestant in each contest.

2. *Entrance Fee.* Each chapter shall pay an entrance fee of one dollar for each contestant entered. Notice of intention to enter the contests, together with the fees, shall be sent to the National Secretary not later than March 12, 1934.

3. *Subjects.* At least two months before the Convention the National Council shall announce a general subject for each contest.

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

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

6. Semi-Final and Final Contests. The rules for the semifinal and final contests shall be the same as those for oratory.

7. Time of Contests. The time for holding each contest shall be determined by the National Council and shall be announced in the printed program of the convention.

8. Length of Speeches. Speeches shall not be less than six minutes nor more than eight minutes in length. Each speaker shall be given a warning by the time-keeper at the expiration of six minutes.

9. Notes and Quoted Matter. No speaker shall be permitted to take upon the platform more than one hundred words of notes. No speaker shall use more than two hundred words of quoted matter. Quotations may be either read or memorized.

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

11. Prizes. Prizes similar to the ones given in the oratorical contests shall be awarded to the winners of the first three places in each extempore contest and to the schools from which the winners of first place come.

As a part of the final extempore speaking contest for men, each speaker, as the contest proceeds, shall prepare a question to ask each opponent speaker on the topic discussed by that opponent speaker. In turn, each speaker shall answer a question on his or her topic asked by some opponent. Each speaker shall ask and answer but one question. A member of the National Council shall, before the time of the contest, determine the order of asking questions and giving answers. This order is to be kept secret from the contestants. Each speaker shall be limited to three minutes in which to answer the question.

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

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

1. Contestants. Each Pi Kappa Delta chapter may enter one team in each contest. A team may consist of either two or three persons, two of whom shall appear in each round.

2. Entrance Fee. Each chapter shall pay an entrance fee of one dollar for each team entered. Notice of intention to enter the contest, together with the fee, shall be sent to the National Secretary not later than March 12, 1934.

3. Question. The official Pi Kappa Delta question shall be used in all debates.

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

5. Elimination. All teams will take part in the first five rounds of debate. After the fifth round all teams having two or more defeats will be eliminated. No results will be announced until time for the sixth round. The arrangement of the debates in all of the contests shall be in charge of the National Council.

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

7. Judges. Each debate shall be judged by a competent judge or judges selected by the National Council.

8. Scouting. The tournament will be open. Debaters are not prohibited from attending other debates during the tournament.

9. Prizes. Prizes similar to the ones given in the Oratorical Contest will be awarded to the members of the winning teams of the first two places in each debating tournament and to the schools represented by the winners of the first place in each debating tournament.

All arrangements for the tournaments not governed by the above rules shall be in the hands of the National Council.
Topics for the extempore speaking contests:

**MEN:** Agriculture in America.

**WOMEN:** Woman's place in Modern Civilization.

In the October FORENSIC appeared a report of the achievements of the chapters in the contests at the national conventions. The following corrections should be made in that report:

Central College of Missouri was omitted from the list. It should have appeared as tied with two other chapters for eleventh place. Central Missouri State Teachers College, which was listed twice, as eleventh and forty-eighth, should appear as forty-eighth.

Western State College of Colorado should rank as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1928</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1932</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Richard Tatman and George Bickel of Colorado Teachers College hitch-hiked the seven hundred fifty miles to Winfield to take part in the tournament. Although the forensic budget of their college could not bear the expense of their trip, they were determined to share in the benefits of the Winfield gathering. One of them left Greeley Tuesday and followed the highways. Trucks and passenger cars got him to Winfield Thursday evening and he did very little walking. The other debater caught a freight train Wednesday and dropped off at Winfield within an hour of his teammate's arrival.

Four debaters representing as many Maine colleges met in a unique forum debate at Bates College, November 27. Bowdoin upheld the dictator form of government, Bates the presidential, Colby the parliamentary, and Maine the communistic. To open the debate each speaker gave a talk explaining the principles of the form of government he was defending and setting forth its advantages. The speakers then asked each other questions and answered arguments.—*The Bowdoin Orient*.

Kansas Theta, Teachers of Pittsburg, and the Aggies, gave a demonstration debate on the question of the British radio system before the Pittsburg high school.—*The Collegio*. 
Attractions At Lexington

Seldom will Pi Kappa Delta have the privilege of meeting in a convention city which offers so many attractions of interest as does Lexington, Kentucky—focus of the thought and planning of the society from now until April. To those of us who are looking forward with eager anticipation to our biennial convention those points of attraction may, I think, be grouped in four words—beauty, history, education, and horses.

Lexington is “The Heart of the Bluegrass,” that rolling part of Kentucky which produces the royal food for the thoroughbred horses and purebred stock and the acres of Burley Tobacco which make Lexington the leading tobacco market of the world. Good “pikes” lead in every direction through beautiful country. Not far from the city are the famous Kentucky River Palisades whose grandeur is said to rival that of the Hudson. Fifteen miles south of Lexington on the Dixie trail is a spot where the river cuts a canyon that is well worth the drive to see. You will like the countrysides—it is fresh and intriguing.

Our convention city is rich in historical significance. The city was named June 4, 1775, by a party of pioneer hunters camping over night who had just learned of the battle of Lexington, where was fired the shot “heard round the world” and selected this name for the future capital of the Blue Grass. Close to the south limits of the city is “Ashland,” the
beautiful home of Henry Clay, the eminent orator and statesman. That should be a fitting shrine for the hundreds of college speakers who will be competing there in seeking to emulate his platform achievements. Here, too, will be a fitting climax for you northerners who will be following the Lincoln trail through Illinois and end your journey—as did Abe many times—at the home of Mary Todd. In the Frankfort Cemetery, right on the trail along which many of you will come to Lexington, are the grave and monument of Daniel Boone, historic pioneer whose marks have been left throughout all of that territory. Old Fort Harrod State Park and Shakertown, one of the early communistic settlements, are other points of more than usual interest.

Transylvania College, our host chapter, was founded in 1780 and is the oldest permanent institution of higher learning west of the Alleghany Mountains. George Washington and John Adams were among the earliest contributors to its endowment fund. George Rogers Clark was one of the first trustees. Henry Clay was a professor of law in Transylvania from 1805 to 1807 and was a trustee until his death in 1852. It was through his efforts that a large part of the present campus was secured. Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, was educated at Transylvania. During the Civil War academic work was almost wholly disrupted by the conflict of loyalties which drew its students into the service of both North and South, and saw its campus used as a military hospital by the Federal Government.

Lexington is noted also for being the seat of the State University of Kentucky. Its excellent campus will be a source of interest and a popular attraction for the PKD delegates. The University has promised to cooperate fully in arrangements for the convention and will provide many of our judges and several audiences.

It is my guess that the several hundred students and faculty members who will assemble for the 1934 meeting will be most attracted by the show places of Lexington—the thoroughbred horse farms. They cannot be described adequately; they have to be seen to be appreciated. The Pi Kappa Deltan who goes home without seeing them will be very foolish, indeed. In mentioning some of the more familiar estates, it is fitting to start with Faraway Farms, the home of the King of Horses, Man o’ War. Others of general interest will be Dixians, the beautiful park-like farm of Charles T. Fisher, the two Whitney Farms, and Idie
Hour, the home of Col. E. R. Bradley, three-time winner of the Kentucky Derby. Here you will see Bubbling Over, Blue Larkspur, Black Toney, Burgoo King, and Broker's Tip, 1933 Derby winner. In Lexington, too, are famous race tracks, the Kentucky Trotting track and the Kentucky Association track, the oldest running race course in America, opened in 1826.

It has been impossible to mention everything that will prove interesting and attractive to Pi Kappa Delta visitors. Your committee is conferring now with local convention officers and the Chamber of Commerce to arrange the best possible sightseeing tour for one afternoon of our stay there. Nothing else will be permitted on the program to interfere with that trip. The convention will close shop and go. To do otherwise would be an injustice. You will like Lexington and Kentucky and you will remember it long after you go back to your own colleges.

TRANSYLVANIA CHAPTER

Top row (left to right): Ralph Saunders, President; Omer Stubbs, Mary Ingle McGill, Lucy Marium Atkinson, Melvin Stubbbs, Vice President; Henderson Wagers, A. R. Robertson, Jr., T. J. Mattingly.
Bottom row: Prof. Troxel, Debate Coach; Prof. Payne, Local Convention Officer; Mary Edna Bruce, Sarah Thomas, Secretary; Prof. Saxon, Head of Expression Department; Prof. Shannon, History and Political Science.
American Men of Public Affairs
As College Debaters

CHAS. F. SPENCER
Oklahoma Eta
East Central State Teachers College

In Mr. Bryce's scholarly treatise on the American government, *The American Commonwealth*, there is a chapter entitled "Why Great Men Are Not Chosen President." He maintains that American presidents have not generally been as able as British prime ministers. This is debatable, but certainly a greater percentage of British prime ministers have been college-bred. Of the thirty-nine prime ministers, thirty-three were university graduates, and almost all of them were from Cambridge or Oxford. In general, they seem to have regarded their careers in the universities as definite preparation for lives of public service, and the average age at which they entered Parliament is about twenty-five years.

The prime ministers who attended Oxford in the last century were active members of the famous Oxford debating society, the Oxford Union. It was founded in 1823 and has a membership of several hundred. The hall, where its meetings are held weekly on Thursday evenings from eight-thirty to eleven-thirty, is modelled after the British House of Commons. The president of the Union sits in a massive, canopied chair; the benches are arranged facing each other across a broad aisle; and Government and Opposition benches are located to the right and left of the president's chair respectively. Officers and debaters appear in evening dress. Members who support the proposition for debate before the debate begins occupy the seats on the Government side of the hall, and those who oppose the proposition sit on the Opposition side. Visitors, admitted by tickets, sit in the galleries. There are two main speeches on each side, usually about fifteen minutes in length, though there is no definite limit and fifteen or twenty more speeches may be made after the main speeches have been finished. The members, to the right or left, who have been influenced to change their minds, pass out of the hall at a door on the side opposite the side where
they have been sitting, dropping their ballots in carved oak boxes darkened by age. They vote not on the merits of debaters, but on the merits of the question.

The busts of the prime ministers who were officers of the Union are found on the Government side of the hall—Lord Salisbury, Gladstone, and Lords Asquith and Oxford. Lord Rosebury was a member, but not an officer of the Union. Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Bryce, Lord Birkenhead, Lord Milner, Hilaire Belloc, Sir John Simon, and John Buchan are ex-presidents of the Union.

Gladstone prepared for entrance to Oxford at Eton. Here he belonged to a debating society, and he made his first speech affirming the proposition that the poor should be educated. At Oxford Gladstone was an active member of the Union, and during his last year, he made his famous speech against the Great Reform Bill, the purposes of which were to broaden the franchise and to correct some of the worst abuses of the "rotten borough" system. Gladstone spoke forty-five minutes, and there were altogether about twenty-eight speeches made, the debate lasting through three evenings. The Duke of Newcastle, hearing of Gladstone's speech, had him elected to Parliament from one of his "pocket" boroughs.

University debating thus appears to have been a very important part of the education of British statesmen, and the evidence tends to substantiate the claim of debate enthusiasts that debating is valuable training for college students who expect to enter public life. Investigation of the college careers of such American men of public affairs as have attended college discloses that they too were generally active in debating.

The benefits to be derived from debating make a strong appeal to the student that is interested in public affairs; and such an interest has been widespread in the United States, due at least partly to the democratic basis of our government. Debating gives the student practice in investigating problems and in thinking. The student learns how to use the resources of a library, how to analyse a question, and how to organize evidence to prove his case. John Stuart Mill says, "I have always dated from these conversations (in discussion groups) my own inauguration as an original and independent thinker." Debating teaches the student to be open-minded. In the words of Charles Darwin, "The truth will not penetrate a preoccupied mind." The debater sees that at least most questions have two sides; and quoting Mr. Mill further, "No man understands his own side
until he understands the other side.” Debating is also valuable because the questions are usually interesting and worthwhile, and knowledge and attitudes gained in this way are not soon lost. Mr. McAdoo, who spoke against the proposition “That Mormonism in the United States should be abolished,” in an annual debate between the two debating societies of the University of Tennessee, has said: “Many times in my life the memory of that Mormon debate of long ago has influenced my attitude on public questions . . . . I believe in complete liberty for conscience. . . . .” Debating gives excellent training in public speaking; and if properly conducted, it develops good sportsmanship—a much needed quality in any democracy. Finally, debating is valuable preparation for life. Alexander Meikeljohn, who is carrying on a significant experiment in American education, says: “As I look back upon my own experience of teaching and disciplining, I seem to see what these graduates mean (who say that certain activities meant more to them than the regular class-work) . . . . I see it most clearly when I try to single out from the long line of students one group which shall stand forth as intellectually best. . . . . It seems to me that stronger than any other group, tougher in intellectual fiber, keener in intellectual interest, better equipped to battle with coming problems, are the college debaters. . . . .”

College debating, like most other activities, has its critics. Theodore Roosevelt, in his Autobiography, says: “I had . . . . (while a student in Harvard) no idea of going into public life, and I never studied elocution or practiced debating. . . . Personally I have not the slightest sympathy with debating contests in which each side is arbitrarily assigned a given proposition and told to maintain it without the least reference to whether those maintaining it believe it or not. . . . I am sorry I did not study elocution in college; but I am exceedingly glad I did not take part in this type of debate. . . . .” Although some college debating may deserve this criticism, it would be unjust to apply it to all college debates. All questions have, or at least should have, two sides; otherwise they would not be debatable. Generally, students do not have well-founded opinions on questions that are debated, and they have a right to an opinion only after they have studied both sides of a question.

Until quite recently, American men of affairs who have attended college usually did their preparatory work in academies. Even in the colonial period an important part of their curricula
was elocution and public speaking. This was also true of the curricula of our early colleges, and debating societies were also common. Aaron Burr was an active member of the Clio-Sophic Society at Princeton just before the Revolution, and James Madison organized the Old Whig Society at Princeton in 1769. Each of these societies has had a long and honorable history.

Of the triumvirate Webster, Calhoun and Clay, the two first were college graduates. Although Webster was unable to rise from his seat when his turn came to give a declamation at Exeter Academy, he later became the best debater in Dartmouth College. There were two debating societies, and Webster became the most active member of the one to which he belonged—the United Fraternity. So successful was he in public speaking that as a junior in college he was invited to give the principal address at the Fourth-of-July celebration in Hanover. Calhoun entered the junior class at Yale in 1802. When the other boys ridiculed him for studying so hard, he replied: “I am forced to make the most of my time, that I may acquit myself credibly in Congress.” He said that if he felt that he could not reach Congress within three years he would leave college at once. He became very proficient as a speaker; and one day in class when President Dwight asked him a question, he spoke so well that the president said that Calhoun had enough “talent to be President of the United States.” Although Mr. Clay did not go to college, as a young man he joined a debating society in Lexington, Kentucky, where the Transylvania Seminary was located, and became a very effective debater.

Many of the American men of public affairs of the latter half of the nineteenth century were college-bred, and had opportunities to participate in college debating. James A. Garfield, representative of this group, had his first experience as a debater in a small academy; and one of his first debates was on the proposition “Resolved, That Christians have no right to participate in human government.” He became a follower of Alexander Campbell, preached some, and had a debate with a spiritualist. Garfield finally entered Williams College, of which Mark Hopkins was president. He became president of one of the two leading literary societies, and developed into an outstanding debater. Soon after leaving school, Garfield became president of Hiram Institute; and while holding this position, he debated the subject of the “creation of man” with a spiritualist.

The American statesmen of the first third of the twentieth century were in college when the debating society was at its
best. Practically all of those who attended college were active in debating, notwithstanding Mr. Roosevelt’s lack of interest in it.

Mr. Taft, when he was a student at Yale, helped to reorganize the famous Linonian Society, founded in 1753; and Walter Hines Page took a leading part in the miniature parliament, the Franklin Debating Society, at Randolph Macon College, in Ashland, Virginia. Albert J. Beveridge, as a mere lad, attended a debating society in a country school house; and at DePauw University he became a leader of one of the factions of the Platonian Literary Society. James E. Watson was the leader of the opposing faction. Beveridge’s first debate in the society was on the question of protective tariff; and although he forgot the speech he had memorized, he delivered a powerful extemporaneous argument and won. He won several oratorical contests.

William Jennings Bryan became one of America’s finest orators, and he received a large part of his training in Whipple Academy and Illinois College. He won several prizes for oratory and with a $50 prize won in his senior year, he bought a wedding ring. Mary Baird had been dismissed from the Presbyterian Academy because she had been seen too much in “Will’s” company, and Bryan went home with her to talk to her father. “Mr. Baird,” he said, “I have been reading Proverbs a good deal lately and find that Solomon says ‘Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing and obtaineth favor with the Lord’.” “Yes . . .,” replied Mr. Baird, “but Paul suggests that he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better.” Bryan, displaying his ability at refutation, rejoined: “Solomon would be the best authority on this point, because Paul was never married while Solomon had a number of wives.” He won. The class historian wrote of Bryan: “Law and politics are his friends and he intends to court them as soon as other things permit.”

Woodrow Wilson began his career as a debater when he was a small boy. He and his friends organized the Lightfoot Club, and its meetings were held in his father’s barn loft. Wilson, who many years later was to make a covenant for the family of nations, made a rudimentary constitution for the club. It debated, and its proceedings were conducted according to rules of order.

At the age of about seventeen years Wilson enrolled in Davidson College, near Charlotte, North Carolina. Two of the three buildings were devoted to the two debating societies. Wilson
became a member of the Eumenean Society, and although he made only an average record in the regular school work, he became a proficient debater. In 1916 he visited Davidson College; and in the little brick building where he had attended the meetings of the Eumenean Scoeity, he said: “I once tried to make a speech in this room but couldn’t.”

Wilson entered Princeton in September, 1875. He joined the Old Whig Society, which, as has been said, was organized by James Madison more than a century before. Wilson became the speaker, or presiding officer, of the society; and he gained the reputation of being its best debater. Desiring a laboratory in which he might test the system of cabinet government, he organized the Liberal Debating Club, in which the officers were required to resign upon losing the “confidence” of the club. Wilson became its prime minister. At Princeton his interest in politics is shown by a remark often made to his friends: “When I meet you in the Senate, I’ll argue that out with you.” In his senior year he refused to try out in the contest among the members of the Old Whig Society to see who should represent the society in the Lynde prize debate. He had drawn the side of protective tariffs, and he refused to debate rather than to debate on the side in which he did not believe. Of the little group of debaters at Princeton, one became Attorney-General of New Jersey, another Justice of the United States Supreme Court, another United States Representative, and one Governor of New Jersey and President of the United States.

In the year in which he graduated from Princeton, Wilson entered the University of Virginia to study law. His motive is explained by a statement which he made later: “The profession I chose was politics; the profession I entered was the law. I entered the one because I thought it would lead to the other.” Wilson did not like the study of law, but he entered with enthusiasm into the activities of the Jefferson Debating Society. When he delivered his address on John Bright before this society, ladys were permitted to attend for the first time, in order to hear him. The most interesting event in Wilson’s career at the University of Virginia was the debate in which he spoke against the proposition “Is the Roman Catholic element in the United States a menace to American institutions?” The judges, unable to decide who had won first place, decided to award two medals, one to Wilson for being the best orator and one to his chief opponent for being the best debater. Wilson became president of
the Jefferson Debating Society, and helped to revise its constitution.

Within a little more than a year after he entered the law school, Wilson was forced to withdraw on account of his health. For a year and a half he lived with his father, who was a Presbyterian minister in Wilmington, North Carolina, and studied law at home.

In the spring of 1882 Wilson hung out his shingle in Atlanta, Georgia. His law practice required little of his time, and in January, 1883, he organized a branch of the Free Trade Club of New York. It met every two weeks, and developed into a general debating club, a "Georgia House of Commons," as he wrote a friend.

Disillusioned with the practice of the law, Wilson decided in 1883 to go to Johns Hopkins University, then only seven years old, to continue his studies in political science. He wrote to his future wife, Ellen Axson: "In a word, my ambition could not be fulfilled at the bar . . . A professorship was the only feasible place for me . . . True . . . professors could not participate actively in public affairs . . . Indeed, I knew very well that a man without independent fortune must in any event content himself with becoming an outside force in politics . . . ."

In another letter to Ellen Axson, written after he had begun his work at Johns Hopkins, Wilson said: "My chief interest is in politics, in history as it furnishes object-lessons for the present —the University professor's chief interest is in the accurate details of history—in the precise day of the month on which Cicero cut his eye teeth—in past society for its own sake." At Johns Hopkins Wilson displayed again his interest in debate. This was an activity in which he could use his knowledge of history for purposes other than "its own sake"—an activity that would aid him in becoming "an outside force in politics." Through his influence the Hopkins literary society was converted into the Hopkins House of Commons; and Wilson wrote its constitution, incorporating in it the principle of cabinet government.

After teaching three years at Bryn Mawr, Wilson went to teach in Wesleyan College, in Middleton, Connecticut. He called a meeting of the student body and proposed that the lifeless debating society then in existence be replaced by a Wesleyan House of Commons. He said to the students: "To initiate the House of Representatives would be patriotic but not interesting. The House of Representatives does not do its own debating, but
refers most of its business to standing committees. So we shall imitate the British House of Commons.” The plan was adopted, and the activities of the new organization aroused great interest among the student body.

In 1890 Wilson became professor of political science at Princeton, his Alma Mater. The debating societies were still active, and he assisted in coaching several of the intercollegiate teams. Wilson became president of Princeton in 1902; and in 1910 Boss "Jim" Smith, of New Jersey, badly in need of a respectable facade for a corrupt and discredited political edifice, secured for Wilson the gubernatorial nomination. His chief biographer, Mr. Baker, says of him: "Fifty-four years of his life he spent in preparation, ten in living, and three in dying." Certainly Wilson’s experience as a college debater was no small part of his preparation.

Several changes have occurred in college debating in recent years. The time-honored debating society has declined, because perhaps of other activities that have absorbed the interest and the energy of college students. Regular courses in argumentation and debate are being offered. Formal intercollegiate contest debating has become widespread, beginning with the Harvard-Yale contest in 1892. Finally in 1921 international debating between colleges had its beginning, and British influences are being felt in American collegiate debating. But regardless of the changes that have occurred, or the changes that may occur, an activity that has had such an honorable part in the preparation of our men of public affairs deserves to be encouraged.

---

**Squad Contest at Redlands**

The University of Redlands and the University of Southern California tied for both the individual team and the squad championships in the Practice Tournament held at the University of Redlands December 8 and 9. There were 74 men’s teams entered and 24 women’s teams. In addition contests in Men’s and Women’s Extempore Speaking and Oratory were held. The University of Redlands won the women’s oratory and took second in Men’s Oratory and Extempore. Tempe, Arizona, won the Men’s Oratory and Occidental College the Men’s Extempore. College of the Pacific won the Women’s Debate with U. S. C.
second. Los Angeles Junior College won the Women’s Extempore.

This is the first squad contest in a tournament on record. The rules called for colleges under 500 to enter three teams, Colleges over 500 and under 1000 to enter four teams, and colleges over 1000 to enter five teams in order to compete. U. S. C. and Redlands with five and four teams respectively won 75 per cent of their debates in the first four rounds upon which the squad championship had been staked. A squad championship can also be figured on the performance of all the teams in the entire tournament. On this basis Redlands would have won as it had three teams left in competition when all of U. S. C.’s were retired but one. The individual championship will be played off in January. Redlands entered the tenth round undefeated but fell before the U. S. C. team. The hour was too late and the teams too tired to finish the tournament, all contests having been compressed into two days.

Two colleges in Utah and three in Arizona sent teams and squads in addition to the California colleges, most of whom were represented.

The tournament was managed by Professor Baccus, assisted by Professor Nichols and Mrs. Baccus and one of the women debaters from the Redlands squad, Miss Helen Ary.

---

The annual convention of the Western Association of Teachers of Speech was held at Portland, Oregon, during the Thanksgiving vacation.

The convention was preceded by a debate tournament at Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon, about fifty miles from Portland. This meet was attended by about sixteen debate teams representing Linfield, Oregon State, College of Puget Sound, Washington State, Pacific University, Albany College, and the University of Redlands. The latter institution sent two debate teams north via automobile with their coach, Professor Nichols, who was chosen President of the Western Association for the coming year. The next convention of the Western Teachers will be held at Salt Lake City, Utah, during the Thanksgiving holidays.

President Nichols hopes to have this convention preceded by a practice debate tournament at Utah University.
Student Returns As Coach

To debate in more than 150 debates in four years and lose just 23 out of that number is quite a record—and in the case of Glen Capp, 1933 graduate of Oklahoma Baptist University, it brought a reward.

When school was ready to open in September, Norman W. Mattis, coach of debate at the university last year, was granted a leave of absence to succeed Dr. Samuel Howell in the speech department at Harvard University. With school just a week off, it was necessary to get in touch with someone to coach debate and teach argumentation. University officials selected Capp. The contract was signed and Glen Capp returned to his alma mater where he had debated for four years to take over the duties of debate coach. Capp will have Porter Routh, his colleague for three years, and a group of other promising young orators around whom he can build the team he plans to take to the national convention at Lexington.

It looks to the Californians as if the College of the Pacific women’s team which won the Redlands Tournament is going to make someone step at Lexington to outdistance it.

Dr. J. Thompson Baker, the genial director of the great Winfield debate tournaments, was president of The College of the Ozarks from 1905-6, leaving to take the presidency of Frank Hughes College. He has also been a Lyceum lecturer. He has also been an extension lecturer for the University of Virginia. He received his Ph. D. degree from the University of Chicago.—The Mountain Eagle.
“Then you should say what you mean,” the March Hare went on.

“I do,” Alice hastily replied; “at least—at least I mean what I say—that’s the same thing, you know.”

“Not the same thing a bit,” said the Hatter. “Why, you might just as well say that ‘I see what I eat’ is the same as ‘I eat what I see’!”—Alice in Wonderland.

Love is the greatest force of persuasion. Men will do more for love than for reason. It is hard to influence those whom we despise or those who despise us. A polite word or a kind deed is frequently the most eloquent argument we can employ. Lincoln, who was one of America’s greatest speakers, never said a word which was discourteous to opponents or listeners.

“Whatever we conceive well we express clearly, and words follow with ease.”—Boileau, L’Art Poetique.

Things you will need at the national convention:

A stiff shirt for the final banquet—to get the autographs of the people you dine with.

An extra necktie. Your coach will probably borrow your best one.

A Southern accent to make a hit with the local judges.

Suspenders—to keep your shirt on after adverse decisions.

Golden slippers—to tread on the clouds when you win.