WINNING INTERCOLLEGIATE
DEBATES AND ORATIONS

PI KAPPA DELTA
NATIONAL HONORARY
FORENSIC SOCIETY

VOLUME TWO
1928
PREFACE

The debates and orations contained in this volume are those which won honors in the national contests at the Seventh Biennial National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta, the honorary forensic society. The convention was held at Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio, with some of the preliminary contests at Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, and Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio, April 2-5, 1928. It brought together five hundred delegates from over one hundred different educational institutions.

In presenting these examples of winning speeches, it is the desire of Pi Kappa Delta to preserve an enduring record of what has been accomplished and to present to serious students of intercollegiate forensics examples of good form and successful achievement. This is the second volume in the series contemplated by the society.

The debates were prepared from the notes of the speakers. The extemporaneous speeches were taken down by a stenographer and corrected afterwards by the speakers. The orations were printed from the manuscripts presented by the orators.

The society wishes to thank the contestants, their coaches, and all others who assisted in preparing this volume.

ALFRED WESTFALL, National President,
Pi Kappa Delta National Honorary Forensic Society.

Fort Collins, Colorado.
June, 1928.
The debate tournaments of the Seventh National Biennial Pi Kappa Delta Convention were held at Heidelberg, Baldwin-Wallace, and Otterbein Colleges of Ohio, April 2 to 5, 1928. There were forty-six teams entered in the women's tournament, in a few cases, two of them from one institution.

The question debated was: Resolved, That the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands, except after formal declaration of war.

Each team had to be prepared to debate both sides of the question and an effort was made by those in charge to schedule each team on one side as much as on the other. A team had to be defeated twice to be eliminated. Each debater had a constructive speech of ten minutes and a refutation speech of five minutes. It took eight rounds to carry thru the tournament. The debates of the tournament were always open and contestants were not expected to refrain from listening to the debates of prospective opponents when it was possible for them to attend such debates.

The debate which follows was the final debate of the women's tournament.
BRIEF

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION.

I. This question of the method of protection of our foreign investments is of importance to all of us for
   A. Our citizens have over five billion dollars invested in Latin-America alone.
   B. The problems growing out of these investments effect the economic and political welfare of all of us.

PROOF.

The United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands for

I. Such a policy is imperialistic, for
   A. It led to the annexation of Hawaii.
   B. It led us to help Panama to break away from Colombia.
   C. It has led us to acquire concessions in Nicaragua over the protest of the Central American nations.

II. Such a policy is unjust, for
   A. It places our acquired property rights above the sovereignty of these states, for
      1. Under it we have dominated Santo Domingo, Haiti, Cuba, and Nicaragua, for
         a. We have put the protection of American property in these countries ahead of the governments there.
      B. Under it we have denied these nations their right to self-determination in government.
      C. It has led us to continue a state of illegal warfare.

III. Our policy of protection has earned for us the animosity of other nations, for
    A. Some Latin-American nations are now trying to boycott our goods.
    B. Their magazines and newspapers carry articles against us.
    C. European nations are objecting.

IV. We can afford to abandon our policy of protection, for
    A. These countries are becoming stable and able to care for themselves.
B. Investors should go in at their own risk.
C. At present it is only in Haiti and Nicaragua that we have to maintain armed force.

NEGATIVE

The United States should not cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign countries, for

I. Our policy on the whole is one of peace for
   A. We intervene only when the local government is unable to maintain order.

II. Our policy has been successful, for
   A. It has stabilized the local governments, for
      1. It has helped them to suppress the lawless elements.
      2. It has put them back on a sound financial basis.
   B. Our occasional use of armed force has brought social benefits to the countries in which we have intervened, for
      1. It led to a great educational program in Cuba.
   C. It has changed the attitude of the people, for
      1. When they see that our purpose is to help them they forget their religious and racial prejudices.

III. It is necessary to protect capital invested abroad, for
   A. International law sanctions it.
   B. It is not contrary to our policy of peace.
   C. It is not imperialistic.

IV. Armed intervention is necessary under certain conditions, for
   A. When revolutions have overthrown the local governments there is no other power to protect our investments, for
      1. In Nicaragua and Haiti there have been periods of continuous revolution which have made progress and stability impossible.
   B. We might have to protect the Panama Canal.
   C. Under the Monroe-Doctrine we have to protect these small Latin-American countries from the aggression of European nations.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

JEANETTE McCLEERY
Illinois Zeta—Monmouth College

Ladies and Gentlemen:
Resolved that the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands, except after formal declaration of war.

We are considering the policy that the United States government shall maintain toward her foreign investments, a problem of increasing importance when we realize that our foreign investments are increasing at the rate of approximately one billion dollars a year. According to the Foreign Policy Association, our holdings in Latin-America alone exceed five billion dollars.

When we realize the vital and far-reaching results of our attitude toward these foreign investments, we see that our question is of vital concern to every one of us. For, if we are to continue our present policy of armed protection, we must continue paying for it, every one of us American citizens, regardless of whether or not we have personal investments. If our present policy is continued and leads us into international difficulties, perhaps into a great world war, we are all going to have a part in the struggle. Certainly we cannot ignore the importance of our question.

Should the United States cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands? We of the affirmative have come to the conclusion that we should
cease using this method, and for your consideration we submit our objections to the present armed protection policy.

In the first place, we object because it is an imperialistic policy. By imperialism we mean the practice and policy of extending central authority and control, political and economic, over races and peoples beyond the nation's natural boundaries, especially when this control is exercised without giving those races and people any share in the central government. It is useless for us to deny the United States' guilt in promoting such a policy.

The first example we call to your attention is that of the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. In 1893, two-thirds of the capital invested in Hawaii was American capital, and in order to protect these investments we deemed it expedient to annex Hawaii to the United States. American interests in Hawaii organized into a Committee of Public Safety, and after consulting this organization, our foreign minister in Hawaii asked our State Department for armed vessels to protect American investments there.

In spite of the protests of the native governor and officials, the marines landed, and the next day, under their protection, a provisional government was set up, to be in effect until the terms of annexation of Hawaii to the United States should be completed. This took place several years later.
Another example is that of the Colombian state of Panama when we were contemplating the construction of the Panama Canal, a project in itself designed as a protective measure for our commercial and economic interests. In order to insure the successful rebellion of Panama from Colombian, American troops, in protection of property, the railroads, refused to allow the Colombian troops to land and put down the revolt. As a result only ten days after the revolution started, President Roosevelt recognized at Washington representatives from the so-called independent state of Panama. But we remember that a few years before that time, President Lincoln had refused to recognize this right of secession on the part of our southern states. Now, when it was advantageous to our economic interests, President Roosevelt recognized this right in regard to the Colombian state of Panama.

We turn now to Nicaragua whose internal affairs have been of world wide importance since 1910. Zelaya had been the governor since 1893 and had vigorously opposed the American interests. But the revolution going on at that time was favorable to our interests; hence we were backing it. Zelaya was driven out and our own candidate for president, General Estrada, was elected. But disorder and revolt continued and the American hold gradually tightened until by 1915 we had a new treaty ready for Nicaragua, a treaty giving Nicaragua three million dollars to be spent under our supervision and control. But we received, first, the financial oversight

and control of Nicaragua, a ninety-nine year lease to the Corn Islands, the right to a naval base on the bay of Fonseca, and the sole right to construct an inter-oceanic canal. When Nicaragua's neighbors and the Central American Court of Justice objected to these provisions, saying that they were an undue interference with their boundary rights, we simply ignored the decision. We ask the negative how it justifies these acts on the part of our government.

We notice that during the last decade our foreign investments have grown with great rapidity. We notice, too, that since 1906 our foreign intervention has become especially burdensome. As we observe this simultaneous growth, we recognize the significance of the statement made by Professor Shepherd of Columbia University:

"The growth of American intervention has been paralleled by the increase of American investment." Professor S. G. Inman, also of Columbia University, says: "It is only in countries where American interests are paramount that this tutelage is employed."

We object to this imperialism because it is an unjust policy, because it means taking by force from smaller weak nations that which we ourselves want without any regard for their wishes, rights and desires. It means taking the rights, authority, and even the territory that will make us stronger, richer, and more powerful. We believe this represents selfish grasping principles that are not in accord with truly American standards.
We object to this armed protection policy in the second place because it has placed the acquired rights of American capital above the sovereignty of those states. Professor Lawrence, of Cambridge, England, an authority on international affairs, says that “sovereignty exists when a state is not obedient to any earthly superior power.”

I realize that there may be disagreement when we come to define the rights of sovereignty, but certainly we must hold two rights to be inviolable: first, the right to existence as a sovereign state, and second, the right to supremacy over national territory. But as we review our acts in Latin-America we see that we have not respected these rights.

Santo Domingo was the first of the Caribbean countries to suffer American intervention and the practical establishment of a protectorate. The Republic of the Philippines has been actually destroyed. Theoretically, Cuba is a sovereign state, but we know that her economic and political life is controlled from Washington and New York. Nicaragua, forced to give over financial oversight, cannot be said to be independent. We have maintained the minority party in power there for years under the protection of our marine forces. In 1915 when the congress of Haiti refused to ratify the treaty we were trying to impose on that nation, we dissolved the congress, and it has not met to this day. We admitted undue interference in the case of Panama when in 1922 we paid Colombia an indemnity of twenty-five million dollars.

We see that it has been our policy and our practice to dominate the economic and political life of neighboring countries when such domination would be advantageous to our interests in those countries. Apparently these small weak nations have no rights which we as a great strong nation are bound to respect. And thus there has come about a conflict between the acquired rights of American capital and the sovereign rights of those states wherein our capital is invested. We believe that our foreign investments are threatened by some remote danger, and we go down there with armed force to protect those investments. But we must realize that if this were the universal practice, every nation would have a veto power on the legislature of every other nation in which its nationals had property that was affected. Of course the foreign acquisition of property would be discouraged, for as soon as a foreigner acquired property the state would immediately lose all jurisdiction and control over it. We would say it was an undue interference with the sovereign right of supremacy over national territory.

Our second objection, therefore, to the armed protection policy is that it has put the acquired rights of capital above the external sovereignty of the states. It has taken from those countries their rights to self-determination. It does not leave them to work out their own destinies.

Our third objection to the armed protection policy is that it has produced a continual state of indiscriminate and illegal warfare. Whenever we fancy our foreign
investments threatened by some imaginary danger, we call on our marine forces to go down and protect them. Fighting, bloodshed, and killing ensue. It is brought about in such a comparatively simple manner, by calling on our State Department, that it has resulted in a perpetual state of warfare. For, friends, we must call this a state of war. President Roosevelt said, “When our armed forces attack the chief seaport of a neighboring country, as we did in the case of Mexico and Haiti, and take it by violence, after conflicts in which scores of our own men and either scores or hundreds of our opponents are killed and wounded, the act is one of war, and each was waged without any Congressional action whatever.” The right to declare war is especially delegated to our Congress and not to our State Department, hence this state of war is illegal. But the hardships and sufferings caused to those native people and to American homes from which American boys have been taken is just as great as if war were actually declared. Thus, we object to armed protection of foreign investments in the third place because it is carried on by an illegal, unconstitutional kind of war, which is, nevertheless, as deadly and as full of suffering as any other. These, then, are our first three objections to the maintenance of our present policy.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The opposition has argued that we cease protection of our property in foreign countries by armed force because the policy is imperialistic. Honorable Judges, we would remind you that it has not given one word of evidence that will prove that the presence of armed forces is causing imperialism. And if our practice is imperialistic, which we do not admit, this is no reason that the plan itself should be discontinued. It is false to argue that because a system has evils connected with it the system itself should be abolished. Because the systems of the jury and the family have evils connected with them we do not abolish these systems. Thus we would challenge our opponents to prove that the imperialism which they contend exists is caused by the use of armed forces for the protection of property.

Now our method of protecting property today—the use of armed police force—should not be discontinued. This practice does not amount to a policy but rather an occasional deviation from a policy—dictated by necessity. Our policy is one of peace and good will. President Coolidge says: “It is the policy of the United States to promote peace. We are a peaceful nation given to the settlement of disputes by amicable means rather than by
force. We have believed that peace can best be secured by a strict observance on our part of the principles of international law, accompanied by patience and conciliation, and requiring of others a like treatment of ourselves.” Thus you see that we recognize our policy as one of peace. But we are also a people of common sense, and we have found through experience that there are certain conditions of government and circumstances of danger in which the use of peaceful means absolutely will not work. Then it is that we resort to armed police force as an emergency measure. When we have found it necessary to intervene in a country we have gone in, not against the people, not against the government, but against the disorderly element of that country who are making it impossible for the government and the nation as a whole to preserve order and protect property. Our troops are sent as an international police force to maintain order and justice against such disorderly elements.

Through the maintenance of order, against outlaws, bandits, etc. through cooperation with the government, we are giving the greatest assistance in the stabilization of government. When these governments become stable, they can maintain order, protect their own interests, and insure protection to foreign property.

When conditions of instability prevent protection of all interests, the United States uses common sense and deals with the problem in the most logical manner. The policy of any town, of any city is peace, yet when disorder occurs the city officials do not sit calmly by while property is destroyed, because their town is built on peaceful foundations. William R. Shepherd, Professor of History of Columbia, gives the United States in these words, “If conditions reach such a pass in any given republic that the lives and property of foreigners and nationals are wholly or even largely at the mercy of armed bands, then the United States would have to restore order.” Our purpose at such times is, as Philip Marshall Brown, Assistant Professor of International Law at Princeton, says: “to secure more stable conditions in Central America for the protection of all interests.”

This occasional resort to armed force as an emergency measure has been very successful in the past. It has been successful for three reasons: First, it has stabilized the governments. One of the greatest drawbacks to these governments was the unsettled political situation be-
cause of revolutions and corrupt politics. The thing that prevented the success of peaceful means in Haiti, for instance, was the internal struggle between warring elements. When the United States Marines landed in 1915 they restored order and peace to Haiti. According to Judge Otto Schoenrich, a Latin-American, the United States accomplished many things, but “above all peace and security were established.”

In unstable countries the government is corrupt, and elections unfair. The presence of our marines keeps down the opposing factions and makes possible free and peaceful elections. Judge Otto Schoenrich also says of Santo Domingo, that the marines landed and stayed until 1924 when Santo Domingo was thoroughly stable and no longer needed American troops but could insure protection of economic interests.

The other great factor of instability was the financial condition of the countries. Foreigners had made investments in the countries, and were trying to exact payment. Because of internal strife, finances were in a muddle and the Latin-American countries were threatened with ruination by their European creditors. The United States was interested in these countries to the extent of millions of dollars, and she saw the impending doom of her interests. In Santo Domingo we tried time and again to settle matters peacefully, by sending commissioners and using other diplomatic measures. When we did intervene and take over the supervision of Dominican finances, the results were tremendous. Our own interests were protected, the forty million dollar debt of the republic was reduced to nearly seventeen million; the Dominican credit with established on a high plane; and she was assured of enough revenue to maintain an orderly government. The case of Haiti is identical and in the words of James Dealey of Brown University, “In harmony with the policy of the Coolidge administration the native civil government under our financial supervision is once more functioning, enjoying the protection but not the dictation of the American marines.”

Secondly, our occasional use of armed intervention has brought great social benefits to the countries in which we have intervened. One of the most outstanding countries in which the United States has done so much, is Cuba. Under the supervision of the American Marines under General Wood, Cuba was freed from the dreaded yellow fever peril which had threatened her for so long. A great educational program was launched and today the schools of Cuba rank among the best in the new world. Then, one of the greatest things that the marines did was to train the local constabulary so that peace and order could be established—peace and order the first thing necessary for a stable government, which is the first thing necessary for permanent protection of property.

In the third place occasional resort to armed force as an emergency measure worked well in that it changed the entire attitude of the people. If they resented our presence at first which would be only natural, they soon saw that our purpose was one of cooperation for their
welfare and they realized that their development and future independence depended upon us. To say that armed intervention was the one cause of hostility is absurd when we see that there were so many other things to cause hostility. Differences of race, religion, language, social and political conditions had built up strong barriers of hate against the United States. But after our cooperative intervention in these countries this barrier was broken away and Roger W. Babson on touring the Latin-American countries reported, “We are on more friendly terms with these countries today than we have been since the days of Monroe.”

Thus, honorable judges, I have shown you specifically that our plan of protecting property by armed force has proved itself to have worked well in the past because, first, it has stabilized governments both politically and economically; secondly, it has raised the social standards of these peoples; and lastly it has changed the entire attitude of these peoples toward the United States. Thus, as an emergency measure used only where peaceful methods will not function, our practice of protecting property should not be discontinued.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our opponents have stated that we have argued illogically because we have spoken of the evils attached to the present policy instead of discussing whether or not we should cease protection. This morning we are discussing the policy of protection by armed force—whether we should cease or continue it. Now how can we judge a policy unless we consider what it does—what it leads to and what have been its results? It is after a consideration of the results of this policy that we find one of the greatest objections to it. We object to it because it does lead to imperialism for when we go in to protect investments we go further and take from those people some of the things that belong to them.

The negative has also spoken of our withdrawal from Santo Domingo and stated that certainly that was not imperialistic. But let us consider that case. We withdrew in 1924 after the government had signed a treaty, one provision of which stated that the new government ratify the 700 acts of the military government, three of which provided for loans—one in 1916, one in 1922, one in 1924. According to the arrangement the money for the interest and bonds is to be collected by the American financial adviser from the custom revenue before other expenses are paid. The Santo Dominicans cannot use their
custom revenue until the United States adviser takes his claims first. Let us also consider whether the United States was imperialistic with the Santo Dominicans in its other dealings. In 1916 when a treaty was suggested to the Santo Dominicans which gave the collection of custom duties to America, the appointment of an American financial adviser, and the establishment of a constabulary force officered by Americans—the President and Senate refused to ratify it saying it destroyed Dominican independence. However, Admiral Knapp of the United States navy entered and put Santo Domingo under the military administration of the United States. We also find that it is not only the people of Santo Domingo but Americans themselves who have not considered what we have done as right. When President Roosevelt presented to the Senate the Dominican convention which gave the United States charge of Santo Dominican custom revenues it was not ratified but was vigorously opposed, for our own senate stated that we had no right to go down there and tell them to manage their affairs in a certain way or we would step in and do it. Can we call our policy just and beneficial when it has done to other people such things as we have mentioned?

Our opponents have stated that we must continue our policy because it brings stability to other countries. If we are so anxious to stabilize the world why do we do our stabilizing only in certain little countries in which we have investments, when there are a great many other undeveloped uncivilized regions? We go only to those smaller countries where we can gain by our policy. The opposition has also stated that we must continue this policy because there are cases where the protection of capital is absolutely necessary, that capital needs protection. But history has shown us that capital will go without protection. We find that in 1850 the Panama Railroad Co., an American company employing American capital, built the Panama Railroad; that in 1880, the Sonora Railroad Co. and the Mexican Central Railroad Co. were organized in Massachusetts with American capital for constructing railways in Mexico; that in 1880 the New York and Honduras and Rosario Mining Co. incorporated in New York with a capital of $2,000,000; that in 1870 the owner of a mercantile house in New York City established houses in Peru and Chile. We also find that the Sinclair Oil Company has recently purchased a ferro manganese plant in the Caucasus region, a part of Russia, in which disturbances are frequent. This plant will take three years of development before it will produce anything.

Now, thus far in discussing the policy of protection by armed force of capital invested in foreign lands, the affirmative has pointed out that the United States should cease such action because it leads to imperialism; that the policy is unjust, because it places acquired rights above the external sovereignty of the state, and because it leads to illegal and indiscriminate warfare.

Let us note the effect this policy is having on other countries. The world is so closely united that a move
made by one nation is watched by practically every nation in the world. Since a large percentage of our investments are in Latin-America let us glance down there first. We find that a feeling of suspicion and distrust has gained foothold and is rapidly growing. Not only does the feeling exist but it is affecting the actions of the nations. The countries of the Pan American Union have recently tried to strengthen it, for it is their belief that only when they are united will they gain greater control of their affairs. We also find that the countries are turning from Washington to Geneva—no longer do they look to America as their protector. Every country but Mexico, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Brazil is at the present time a member of the League. We also find that the Union of Central and South America is advocating an all Latin-American boycott of American trade and that at a recent meeting of the Pan American Trade Union a threat was made to turn trade from America to Europe.

The animosity of these peoples is also reflected in their newspapers and magazines. The Salvadorian editors, denouncing the policy of the United States have petitioned their government to withdraw its recognition of Diaz in Nicaragua. The El Cosmo of Colombia, the Nation of Argentine, and other papers all carry bitter criticisms of the American policy.

We realize the importance of this criticism when we remember that at the Pan American Congress of Journalists held in Washington in May, 1926, where one hundred leading editors from South, Central and North America gathered, the thing stressed was the power of the press to help in forming good or bad international relations. The main resolution of the congress was the "We hold that every editor has it in his power to do his share toward stilling international distrust."

However, it is not only countries in which we have money invested but other countries as well that are watching our policy and not altogether favorably. The European press everywhere strikes the note of distrust against America's policy. The United States is uniting the world against her with a feeling of suspicion and animosity. Can she afford to do this when we realize that the psychological reaction may have political consequences affecting our security and economic consequences affecting our trade more far reaching than anything we might gain by our own policy of protection by armed force?

In the fifth place, we object to the policy of protection of capital by armed force because it is not in accord with America's desire and efforts for world peace. We hold conferences at Washington in which we seek to limit arms and find peaceful means of settling disputes, but as soon as a little trouble arises over our investments we immediately send down armed forces. How can we expect to find peaceful means of settling large disputes when we are using armed force for small ones? How much influence will America's stand for peace have if people think she is preaching one thing and practicing
another! Our policy of intervention is blocking America's progress toward the world goal of peace.

Thus we find many objections to our present policy of protection by armed force. It is imperialistic, it places acquired rights above the sovereignty of the state; it encourages illegal and indiscriminate warfare; it arouses ill will and suspicion against the United States; and it is not in accord with America's work for peace.

It is only natural when we are asking that the United States should cease one policy that we should suggest another. The affirmative stand on the attitude the United States should take toward capital is this: The countries in which we have money invested have made rapid progress in the last few years. They have virtually completed the stage which has been characterized by frequent revolutionary disturbances. They have progressed socially, economically, and financially. As W. C. Dunn, former Director General of Haiti and holder of other official positions in Central America said, "While sporadic flare-ups may yet occur even in countries which have been stable for many years, there is little likelihood of serious interference with trade and industry or of permanent impairment of public credit. It may be therefore confidently stated that the attitude of Latin-American governments toward public obligations has undergone a marked change for the better. Loans are now contracted with the intention of being met promptly." Even our opponents have stressed the increasing stability of those countries.

We believe that since this condition exists that it is an excellent time for the United States to cease the policy that she has been following since 1900. We believe that investors should go at their own risk. If they think the risk too great in one of the less stable countries, they can go some place else. As former Secretary of State Hughes has said, "There are always abundant opportunities for financial enterprise in our own country and in other parts of the world where investment is reasonably secure and returns are commensurate with risks."

However, the question of instability would not greatly bother us for the only two countries in which the United States feels it is necessary to use armed force at the present time are Haiti and Nicaragua and our investments there are only three-tenths of one percent of the whole of our investments. Should the United States maintain a policy containing all the objections of the present policy for so few investments, when history indicates that these investments would probably stay there anyway, and if they did not, they could be as profitably invested some place else?

If the United States adopted the policy of letting the investor go at his own risk, she could not be accused of imperialism, of having a dominating, grasping policy, of destroying the self-determination of nations, and she would be living up to her highest national ideals.
Ladies and Gentlemen:

The opposition has just advanced the proposal that the United States adopt the policy of non-protection of American capital invested abroad. My entire constructive speech will be devoted to showing the necessity of protecting our capital abroad. We shall also speak later of the duty of our government to protect such capital. Allow us at this time, to quote Justice Miller of the Supreme Court, who says:

"It is a privilege of the American citizen to demand the protection and care of the federal government over his life, liberty, and property, when within the jurisdiction of a foreign country."

The opposition has said that the use of force is not in accord with our desire for peace. Friends, we of the negative have recognized that the policy of the United States is a policy of peace, but we have shown already that in emergency cases, we must deviate from that policy and use force. We have shown that in emergency cases, force must be used, before peaceful means can operate. Even in the oft-quoted case of Honduras when peaceful means were used in 1924 in bringing order, force had to be used three or four times to lay the foundation so that peaceful means could function. Thus our plan instead of opposing peace is essential to carrying out a peaceful policy.

Then the opposition has asserted that force should not be used to protect property because it is imperialistic. Friends, in connection with this argument the opposition must clearly show by specific evidence that it is armed force for the protection of capital that breeds imperialism and then must show that that imperialism would be done away with were we to cease protecting capital by armed force. This it has not done.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, my colleague has shown that armed force as an emergency measure has worked well in the past. I shall show that armed force as an emergency measure is absolutely necessary under certain conditions. Of course, it is impossible for us to foresee all instances in which force as an emergency measure would be necessary; but looking back on history experience shows what some of them would be. Let us consider three situations that may be regarded as typical.

First, the situation wherein revolution, instability, corruption, division and chaos in foreign countries endangers United States property. It seems that revolution is a natural and important link in the present state of development of the Latin-American countries. Henry L. Stimson says that in Nicaragua sixty or eighty years before our intervention, revolution was constant. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica there were three hundred ninety-six presidents in Nicaragua in sixteen years, illustrative of the very unstable conditions in that place.
Now in these Latin-American countries of revolution and instability, United States has over four billion dollars invested. In time of revolution, this property is endangered. What should she do about it?

Now, our government had been faced with just such situations in the past. In Haiti, before our intervention of 1915, according to D.G. Munro, revolution had become so frequent and so disastrous that it was clear that stability could never come without the aid of outside help. American interests and lives were in constant danger. On July 15, 1915, all vestige of established authority disappeared after President Guillaumae had been torn to pieces by a mob. It was then that the United States by armed force took control of the situation, brought about order, stability, peace, and protection of our property interests. Is this the imperialism of the United States of which the opposition speak? Friends of the opposition, how would your plan of non-protection function in such an instance?

Again, preceding our intervention in Nicaragua, a revolution occurred from 1909 to 1910 which left that country in a condition of economic prostration and political demoralization. Many foreigners were clamoring for payment of losses suffered during the conflict. United States attempted to bring about agreement among the rival factions, but to no avail. The established government of Nicaragua expressed its willingness to protect our interests but its positive inability to do so, imploring us to come and aid it. It was then the United States intervened. Imperialism?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when the United States intervenes in a revolutionary country, she goes in not against the government in power but rather in cooperation with the government in power. Thus hostility does not result, but a spirit of friendship and good-will.

Moreover, when United States intervenes in a revolutionary country, she intervenes not as a preliminary step to military occupation but in the words of Charles Evans Hughes, "We come but to depart. We occupy but to retire. We arrive but to bring you your own law and order, when that has been brought to you we disappear."

Dr. Williams, financial advisor of Nicaragua, when asked what the one essential was in case of revolution in a country, said that the one thing needed in case of disorder and revolution was armed force. Armed force
must operate before progress, prosperity, stability, and permanent protection of property can be brought about.

Friends, in dealing with countries in which revolution is so frequent, it is absolutely necessary in emergency cases for force to be used to protect our property interests.

Then, a second situation arises where we must deviate from our policy of peace and use armed force as an emergency measure—the situation wherein our government investments must be protected, such as the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal represents an initial investment of three hundred sixty million dollars of United States money and with later additions, a total investment of over a billion dollars. The Canal is in a very strategic position. It controls the trade between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. It is the gateway to the Latin-American countries. Over 20,000 Chinese are now within the canal zone and Europe, especially Great Britain, is vitally interested in that region. So it becomes vital to our peace and security that we protect the canal by force. We are now protecting it by force. Shall we tear down our fortifications, disband our garrisons, remove our guns, battleships, and aeroplanes? To do so would be merely to invite the wrongdoing of various European powers over that region. We are now protecting the canal by twenty treaties, but in order to prevent them from becoming mere scraps of paper their protection by force is absolutely necessary. The canal is American capital invested in a foreign country. Panama is a foreign country, even the Canal Zone is not American soil, but belongs to Panama. According to the World’s Almanac for 1923, “United States did not receive by the Isthmian Canal Treaty of 1903 any territory in the republic of Panama.” This is a second situation in which force as an emergency measure is necessary to protect American capital invested abroad.

A third situation arises, making force as an emergency measure necessary—the situation wherein United States must uphold the sovereignty of the weaker, less stable governments against European and Asiatic aggressions. Friends, there have been times in our history when if the United States had not intervened by force of arms, there would have been a regular European bedlam on this continent and Latin-American sovereignty would have been destroyed.

Previous to our intervention in Haiti, France had thirty-eight claims against that country; Germany, fourteen; and Great Britain, six. French marines had already been landed to protect French interests there. The country was on the verge of complete and hopeless bankruptcy. “There was no question but that one or more European powers would sooner or later assume control of affairs if the United States took no action.” It was then we intervened by force of arms. Imperialism?

In 1904 in Santo Domingo the foreign debt was thirty-two million dollars. Foreign creditors were pressing the country for their claims and definitely preparing to enter Santo Domingo to secure their payment. Not
until the danger became imminent did the United States intervene. Order was restored; the sovereignty of Santo Domingo was preserved. How will the opposition's proposal of non-protection work when three to five foreign countries are preparing to come into revolution-ridden Latin-America and property interests are critically endangered? Through our sense of responsibility in protecting the unstable Latin-American governments, and thus our property interests, it is necessary for force to be used.

Friends, our nation maintains the right of a nation to protect the property of its nationals, wherever they may be; therefore we cannot deny to other nations that privilege. We have said, however, that no foreign nation can encroach on our Western Hemisphere; therefore, we of necessity, must protect the property of other foreigners in those countries. If we do not, they themselves will come in and the sovereignty of Latin-American countries will be destroyed.

Ladies and gentlemen, the opposition has proposed no protection of American capital invested in foreign lands. In the cases of danger to our property through revolution in unstable countries; in the case of protection of government property such as the Panama Canal; in the case of protection of our property through upholding the sovereignty of the Latin-American countries, friends of the opposition, in these three actual, concrete situations, how can your proposal of non-protection of property be justified?

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our opponents have admitted that many of the Latin-American countries are becoming stable, so why not withdraw protection from these countries? Honorable Judges, we have shown definitely that our practice deals with only those countries which are unstable, and that if a country is approaching stability and can protect our interests, we do not need armed forces in that country. But, if you will examine the countries in which our property is being protected today, you will see that it is the presence of our marines that is bringing about conditions of stability in the few countries in which troops are today stationed.

Our opponents have also said, "Let the investor go in at his own risk." We have proved that it is the first duty of our government to protect property and that as emergency measures armed force is the only sensible means of protection. Protecting the investors is not protecting just a few, because today the United States is so united that failure to our investors would mean failure to practically every citizen of the country.

Let us consider, now, the case of the opposition. It has advanced the argument in the first place that our present practice is imperialistic and has asked us to just-
ify our intervention in three cases that it used to prove its point. I shall give full justification for each of the three cases. Our annexation of Hawaii was not due to our intervention for the protection of property. The people of that island overthrew their queen and applied to the United States for annexation. Only after deliberation did we accept this request.

In the case of Colombia we use two things to justify our intervention. It was absolutely necessary as an emergency measure. A revolution had broken out in Panama endangering American railroad and force was the only means of protecting this property. And, then, Honorable Judges, our intervention produced beneficial results for all concerned. Colombia got the twenty-five million dollars that she asked for; the people of Panama got the canal; the world benefits; and the United States owns not one foot of soil in Panama, and sovereignty remains intact.

The last case—that of Nicaragua is attracting more attention today. We intervened in that country at the request of the government, and our intervention was not against the government, not against the people, but against the disorderly elements. Nicaragua is not stable today, but because of our helpful cooperation she can for the first time in her history see hopes for stability. The 1928 election supervised by American marines will be the first fair and free election in Nicaraguan history.

Our opponents argued that increased intervention paralleled increase of investments. If this be true, they are arguing not for no-intervention but for less investment.

In the second place the argument has been advanced that our practice places acquired rights of capital above external sovereignty of nations. This contention is not a logical argument but a logical fallacy. It consists of deserting the main proposition to argue on a related proposition. The question is whether we should cease to protect property by armed force, and the opposition is arguing whether the United States should extend political and economic domination. Our opponents must prove that our use of armed force in emergency measures is directly connected with what they term extended political and economic domination, and they must show that withdrawal of forces for protection of property will mean withdrawal of so-called imperialism. Until they do, their entire argument is quite beside the point.

They have said that if our present practice were universal every nation would have veto power over every other nation. But, Honorable Judges, we would remind you again that our practice is one of intervention in emergency cases against the disorderly elements of the country, and not against the government or people.

The argument in the third place has been advanced that our practice is producing a perpetual state of warfare. This argument is absurd when we realize today, that we have forces in only two countries, Haiti and Nicaragua: that we are at war with not one of the Latin-American countries or any other country; and that we
have intervened thirty-one times in Latin-American countries and have withdrawn twenty-nine times. To the idea that our actions are illegal warfare because war is delegated to Congress, not to the state department, allow me to quote from Thomas Jefferson, a constitutional authority, who interprets it thus, "In the case of actual physical attacks upon American citizens or their property, or the immediate danger of such attacks, the forces of the United States may be used for strictly protective purposes without the consent of Congress, which it is manifestly impossible to obtain in such cases."

Lastly, the argument has been advanced that the United States is doing more than protect property, that it is getting gains from these countries. We again challenge our opponents to show that armed intervention for protection of property is producing imperialistic evil results to these countries and the United States. We believe that in most cases protection of property by force is not necessary, but we have given examples of emergency cases where only force can succeed. We ask our opponents what they will do in revolutionary governments, in protecting the Panama Canal, and in performing our duty to European countries and upholding Latin-American sovereignty?

Our opponents have argued no protection but we have shown that it is the first duty of a sovereign government to protect. They have based their entire case on imperialism, but I have shown you, Honorable Judges, that such an argument is not a logical argument but a logical fallacy, and that they must show concretely that the presence of armed force for protection of capital causes imperialism, and that the withdrawal of such protection will bring about withdrawal of imperialism. Our opponents have not proved in a single case that marines caused the evil results of imperialism, extended power, invasion of sovereignty. Unless they do their case is lost.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

JEANETTE McCLEERY
Illinois Zeta—Monmouth College

Ladies and Gentlemen:
In our constructive case we have pointed out five objections to the present armed protection policy. In the first place we objected because it is imperialistic. We defined imperialism as the practice and policy of extending central authority and control over races and peoples beyond the nation's natural boundaries. As examples of this imperialism we cited the instances of Hawaii, Panama, and Nicaragua. Our opponents have challenged these examples, saying that in Hawaii there was a revolt and we were requested to enter and put it down. We have pointed out that at this time two-thirds of the capital invested in Hawaii was American capital, and for the protection of this capital we wished to annex Hawaii to the United States. We entered to protect the American cap-
ital and then stayed, following the intervention with annexation. Of course the great American interests were in favor of annexation. Admittedly the revolution was backed by American interests, and we object to the imperialistic tendencies resulting from our armed protection of these interests.

In regard to our intervention in Panama our opponents maintain that we have established no permanent hold, but we did intervene there to protect property and as a result according to the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, the “Republic of Panama granted the United States a canal zone, ten miles wide, to be United States territory.”

In Nicaragua we intervened to protect interests and we see how our hold has tightened. The negative has pointed out the fact that we have withdrawn from these countries many times, and hence we have not been imperialistic. Yes, we have withdrawn, but not until we secured what we wanted. We have left treaties and conditions for our own satisfaction. For example, we have the provisions of our treaty with Haiti whereby she can not enter any agreements with countries other than the United States, she can not cede territory to any other country, and has given over practically all control, political and economic.

Our second objection is that it has interfered with the sovereignty of those countries. We called to attention the examples of Santo Domingo, Cuba, the Philippines, Panama, and Haiti to show that we have interfered with their sovereign rights to existence as sovereign states, to self determination, and to working out their own destinies. In Santo Domingo, for example, on the refusal of that government to sign a new treaty enlarging the powers of the United States, we issued a proclamation declaring the Dominican republic to be under the military administration of the United States. Our military forces were not withdrawn until we had practically established a protectorate.

Our third objection is that a condition of illegal and indiscriminate warfare has been brought about. This perpetual state of fighting, killing, and bloodshed amounts to actual warfare. The fourth objection is that our policy has produced hatred and ill-feeling. The negative asserts that all this animosity is not caused by our armed protection policy. But my colleague has emphasized in our constructive case that a great deal of it is caused by our policy, and it is that animosity with which we are concerned.

Our fifth objection is that it is not in accord with our work for world peace. The negative says we intervene only against disorderly elements and that in some cases this action is necessary. My colleague showed that such an attitude taken by our government toward foreign investments is not in accord with our national principles for peace.

The negative has brought up the three cases wherein it says it is necessary to use armed force. It states in the first place that conditions arise when armed protection is the only effective protection possible. But in our
plan we are not advocating protection of any kind. We are saying, "let the investor go at his own risk." We will not use protective measures. Hence there could be no emergency of this kind.

Our opponents say in the second place that we must protect governmental investments such as the Panama Canal. But, friends, the Canal Zone is protected by permanent fortifications under the same general plan as our coast line defenses. Those very fortifications intimate that the ten-mile strip is regarded as United States territory. Furthermore, according to the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty that district is regarded as United States territory.

A third emergency they say is to prevent Europe's protecting her investments in Latin-American countries. But why not let Europe do her own protecting? She has done it in the past and withdrawn. In one case when France apparently wished to stay, at request of our state department, she withdrew. Besides, if Europe should insist on staying too long, it would be in violation of the original Monroe Doctrine, and any action we might then take would be in upholding that doctrine, and not for protection of property. Thus we see that the three emergencies emphasized by the negative will not exist as emergencies when we discontinue our armed protection policy.

The negative has expressly stated that in our foreign intervention our sole purpose is to bring peace, order, and stability to the countries where we have intervened. But is that our sole purpose? Who appointed us to be the policeman of the world? We find that when our investments have been threatened by danger, we have intervened with force to protect them. The great benefits of political and social nature that have come to these countries have been pointed out. The health programs and educational reform have been emphasized. But if our purpose in intervening in these countries has been to bring the benefits, why have we limited ourselves to this comparatively small part of the world in which we have investments? If our responsibility is of a missionary nature to civilize the world, why do we not go into the jungles of Africa or other uncivilized places to influence them for better things? Certainly we are not living up to our responsibility, if it is our duty to stabilize the world, when we limit ourselves to this small part of the world wherein we have great investments. We maintain that our motive has been not stabilization, but the protection of American and European dollars.
Ladies and Gentlemen:  

Briefly, let us consider the case of the opposition. It has said that the use of armed force to protect United States capital in foreign lands should cease because United States goes further than protecting property and makes further gains. We have shown, Honorable Judges, that we intervened in Latin-American countries thirty-one times and twenty-nine times we withdrew. We are now preparing to withdraw in the other two places. We made no gains. The opposition cannot point out a single case in which the United States gained territory by using armed force to protect capital interests.

Then, the opposition stated that Europe is growing hostile to us, due to our policy of armed intervention. We have shown, friends, that even if Europe were hostile toward us for using armed force, that she would be even more hostile were we not to use armed force in protecting our capital and hers. It was during our recent trouble with Nicaragua that the British ambassador wrote to the United States secretary of state saying that he begged to remind the United States government that His Majesty's Government looks to it to extend to British subjects the same measures of protection as it affords to United States citizens. Open hostility would have been the result of our failure to use armed force.

Finally, the opposition said that the use of armed force to protect capital is not in accord with our desire for peace. We have consistently maintained throughout the debate that armed force would be used only as an emergency measure and we showed how its occasional use is a necessary prerequisite to peace. Thus armed force as an emergency measure is not against a peaceful policy, but rather is essential for the carrying out of that peaceful policy.

Now, one speaker of the opposition has maintained that the Panama Canal, being virtually territory of the United States, does not apply to our discussion of protection of capital invested abroad. Friends, listen to the report of the Foreign Policy Association Information Service, the most reliable authority obtainable:

"The Panamanians maintain that the Canal Zone has never been sold, ceded or conveyed in fee simple by the Republic of Panama to the United States." Also,

"Article III of the Convention of 1903 states specifically that 'the Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned—which the United States would possess and exercise as if it were the sovereign of the territory.' ...This is clear: sovereignty remains in Panama." (This report was issued January 20, 1928).

Obviously, ladies and gentlemen, Panama and the Canal Zone are not possessions of the United States. They represent investment of United States capital abroad. The case is, thus, vitally connected with our discussion this
morning. The friends of the affirmative must show in this case, where the protection of the Panama Canal is concerned, how they justify their policy of non-protection.

Briefly, let us contrast the cases of the affirmative and the negative. We have said: first, that force as an emergency has worked well. Against this the opposition has advanced one main argument—the argument that it creates imperialism. Friends, we have taken up the specific cases cited by the opposition as examples of imperialism; we have justified our interventions in each case and have shown how they in no way could be cited as cases of imperialism. We have shown that imperialism could not exist for of our thirty-one interventions we have withdrawn twenty-nine times and are preparing to do so in the other cases. Moreover, the opposition has not shown a single instance where we have acquired territory through our armed intervention to protect capital. We do not agree that we are imperialistic; but if we were, the opposition has yet to show that it is armed force for the protection of capital that is the cause for such imperialism. Furthermore, if we were imperialistic and if armed force for protection of capital were the cause of it, the opposition has yet to show how the discontinuance of armed force merely for protecting capital would do away with imperialism. All of this it must prove before its argument of imperialism will be of any avail.

We have said in the second place that force as an emergency measure is absolutely necessary under certain circumstances. The opposition has not touched upon the three cases mentioned. We remind the affirmative that it is in the present we are living and not in some far away Utopia. Its policy of non-protection of American capital abroad may work sometime in the distant future, but in the present how can it justify this plan of non-protection under such circumstances as these:

First, the revolution in Honduras. Three of four million dollars worth of property of American citizens was destroyed in 1924. In such a case, how would you justify the policy of non-protection?

Second, suppose various European powers have broken their treaties with us concerning the Panama Canal and were destroying our billion dollars’ worth of improvements there. In such a case, how would you justify your policy of non-protection?

Third, suppose three or five European nations are clamoring to come into Haiti to gain payments due them, as they were in Haiti in 1915. French troops were already on the soil. American property interests along with Haitian sovereignty were about to be destroyed. In such a case, worthy opponents, how can you justify your plan of non-protection? Friends, in none of these three cases has the opposition attempted to show how the use of force was not necessary.

In these three cases, we have shown the utter necessity of protection by force of arms in emergency cases. Moreover, ladies and gentlemen, it is the solemn duty of
the United States government to protect capital abroad. According to the Robinson resolution passed by our Congress in 1927,

"By virtue of sovereignty, the duty devolves upon the government to protect the lives and property of its Nationals in foreign countries."

According to a decision of the Supreme Court of this country, "Under our system of government, the citizen abroad is as much entitled to protection as a citizen at home."

Friends, in the light of the verdict of its Congress, in the light of the decision of its Supreme Court, how can the opposition justify its policy of non-protection of American capital abroad?

Finally, the opposition has yet to show in the light of the three cases where we showed the absolute necessity of protecting by force, how it can justify its policy of non-protection.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our opponents have asked us what we will do with the investments that have gone into foreign countries under our present policy. We would do just as the United States did when the Eighteenth amendment was adopted. The government had always protected the property and investments of the brewer, just the same as it did all other property, but when it decided it was for its good that this business cease, it told the people engaged in it that they must stop operating within six months. Thus the government not only did not protect them but it destroyed the whole industry. Just so, if the United States decides that it is for its best interests that this policy be discontinued it can give the investor warning and if he desires to change, he can, but as history has pointed out the investments would probably remain.

The negative has stated that the United States must continue this policy because it is the duty of the government to protect capital invested and has quoted a statement by Justice Miller of the Supreme Court which it asserts makes it the duty of the government to protect. However, the Senate and administration of the United States have not interpreted the words of this man as do our opponents. Several different presidents and Senators who have studied conditions and the principles of govern-
ment have not considered protection a duty. If it was our duty to protect, why in 1915 when a New York banking firm asked President Wilson if protection would be guaranteed to a loan in Mexico, did he reply that the United States would not guarantee protection? Again in March, 1927, when property was destroyed at Nanking in China, and England, France and Japan asked the United States about forcing the claims to be settled, why did the United States refuse? Again when on the Sakolin Island of the Pacific Ocean, Russia took an oil concession belonging to United States investors and gave it to Japan, why did the government do nothing about it? According to Phillip Oppenheim, an international law authority, there is no duty incumbent upon a nation to protect the foreign property of its citizens.

The opposition has stated that since we are objecting to this policy because it is imperialistic, we must show that it is armed intervention which leads to imperialism and that should this policy stop all imperialism would cease. We are not arguing that all the imperialism comes from protection and should we cease this policy that all imperialism would cease. We are concerned with that imperialism which has come out of our present policy and have pointed out that armed intervention lead to imperialism in Haiti and Santo Domingo. It is because it does lead to imperialism that the affirmative believes it should cease and with it will go the accompanying evils.

Our opponents have stated that we do not have permanent intervention, that our marines do not remain for-
those other countries could if they desire protect their investments as they have in the past, without injuring the sovereignty of these people?

Now, the negative has just admitted that those countries are attaining stability. That is our contention and that is one of the reasons why we believe the United States should cease this policy. Conditions are making it unnecessary. These countries have come to the time when they can practically protect the money invested there. Why should the United States continue a policy of protection which the increasing stability is making unnecessary. She certainly ought not to follow a policy containing all the objections of the present one, when she could let the investor go at his own risk, a thing which history has shown he would undoubtedly do even in the relatively unstable countries. However, if he should think the risk too great, he could invest just as profitably some place else. Therefore, we feel that the United States should cease its policy of protection.
The debate tournaments of the Seventh National Biennial Pi Kappa Delta Convention were held at Heidelberg, Baldwin-Wallace, and Otterbein Colleges of Ohio, April 2 to 5, 1928. There were eighty-four teams entered in the men's tournament; in a few cases, two of them from one institution.

The question debated was: Resolved, That the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands, except after formal declaration of war.

Each team had to be prepared to debate both sides of the question and an effort was made by those in charge to schedule each team on one side as much as on the other. A team had to be defeated twice to be eliminated. Each debater had a constructive speech of ten minutes and a refutation speech of five minutes. It took eleven rounds to carry thru the tournament. The debates of the tournaments were always open and contestants were not expected to refrain from listening to the debates of prospective opponents when it was possible for them to attend such debates.

The debate which follows was the final debate of the men's tournament.

The winning teams engaged in the following debates in reaching the finals:

Hastings College, Hastings, Nebraska:
- Negative won from Illinois State Normal University
- Affirmative won from Baldwin-Wallace College
- Negative won from Northern State Teachers College of South Dakota
- Affirmative won from Augustana College
- Negative won from University of Redlands
- Affirmative lost to South Dakota State College
- Affirmative won from Missouri Wesleyan College
- Negative won from Oklahoma City University
- Affirmative won from Nebraska Wesleyan University
- Affirmative won from South Dakota State College

College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota
- Affirmative lost to Illinois State Normal University
- Negative won from Jamestown College
- Affirmative won from Parsons College
- Affirmative won from Cotner College.
- Negative won from North Texas State Normal School
- Negative won from Municipal University of Wichita
- Affirmative won from Culver-Stockton College
- Negative won from South Dakota State College
- Affirmative won from Augustana College
BRIEF

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION:
I. The affirmative is not advocating war for the protection of our foreign investments, for
   A. It is possible to protect them without the use of armed force.

PROOF:
Our policy of using armed force to protect capital is not satisfactory, for
I. It has not given the essentials for stability, for
   A. It has failed to obtain railroads or schools because of evils arising from the use of armed force, for
      1. Armed intervention has been used as a means of exploitation by some American bankers.
   B. It sets aside the sovereignty of these nations and treats them as dependencies or colonies, for
      1. American Marines invade these sovereign nations.
   C. It engenders animosity, for
      1. The Latin-American nations resent the use of armed force to protect the capital which exploits them.
      2. They resent the killing of their citizens by the American Marines.
      3. They resent the ignoring of their sovereignty.
   D. It is non-constructive.

II. It does not protect capital, for
   A. Intervention follows rather than precedes the destruction of property, for
      1. We cannot send Marines to Latin-America for petty squabbles.
      2. We cannot keep Marines there all of the time.
   B. Damage is done in spite of all the guaranteeing of protection we may give.
   C. Marines are not able to afford protection since damage is done in spite of them.
   D. The employing of armed force provides the cause for the destruction of property.
   E. It aggravates the situation and doubly endangers capital invested in these nations.

III. We need a different program, for
   A. A constructive diplomacy is necessary, for
      1. We must supervise loans.
      2. We should advise investors and countries desiring loans.
   B. We must develop better business relations.
   C. We must establish joint claims commissions.

NEGATIVE

We should not cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign countries, for
I. Our present policy has protected our investments in unstable countries, safeguarded the Monroe Doctrine, and aided backward nations to develop their natural resources, for
   A. We have already invested three billion dollars in the Caribbean countries.
   B. These countries have so many revolutions that without some assurance of protection investments would not be made in them.
   C. It has enabled us to produce stable conditions in the countries close to the Panama Canal.
   D. It has enabled us to help these countries develop resources of benefit to the whole world.
E. It makes use of all peaceful means of settling international troubles and resorts to force only when the governments of these small nations have disappeared in continuous revolutions.

II. The continuance of our present policy is necessary for the development of these nations, for

A. Political stability depends upon economic stability, for
   1. As nations advance their governments become more stable.

B. For the nations of Latin-America must depend upon the United States for capital.

C. Our investors will not send their capital to the most backward of these nations without some assurance of protection from our government, for
   1. The local governments cannot guarantee such protection.

D. It will develop them so that they can maintain governments able to guarantee protection to property, for
   1. It has already enabled them to reduce their public debts.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Edward S. Betz
Nebraska Delta—Hastings College

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The question for debate is: Resolved: That the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands except after formal declaration of war. We of the affirmative do not advocate war as a means of protecting capital, for we believe that armed force should not be used as a means of protection for capital. The issues of this debate are: First, Is the present policy of protecting capital by the use of armed force satisfactory; and second, can capital be protected without the use of armed force?

We of the affirmative maintain that our policy of using armed force to protect capital is not satisfactory, for it has not given the essentials, the very foundations of stability. In particular has our policy failed to obtain railroads, a prime necessity in Latin-America. Colonel Stimson, the president’s representative to Nicaragua, says that the lack of railroads makes the prolonged difficulty there possible. Ladies and gentlemen, there are actually three miles less of railroads in Nicaragua today than there were when we first intervened; there are twenty-three miles less in Santo Domingo than there were in 1915; in Haiti there are ten miles more of railroads than there were in 1915, and these ten miles were not built because of our twelve years of continuous occupation. Intervention has not built a single school in all
Central America, and there is little if any communication facilities in most of these nations. My authorities for these facts are the Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for February, 1926, and the International Year Book for 1912, 1915, and 1927.

The present policy does not cause instability, but by failure to obtain railroads, communication, and schools, maintains an instability that was always there. The failure to obtain these essentials is due to several evils arising from the use of armed force. The first one of these is exploitation by American bankers of those nations in which we have interviewed. At the outset we would make it clear that we do not condemn the United States as Imperialistic. By exploitation we mean the practice of certain bankers taking advantage of those Central American nations, by taking advantage of the armed protection given to American interests abroad. It is not a national policy that has exploited these countries but the policy of a few selfish men. As Woodrow Wilson has said at Mobile October 27, 1913: “The Latin-Americans have had harder bargains driven with them in the matter of loans than any other people in the world.” And as Mr. Edwin M. Borchard, Professor of International Law at Yale, speaking before the Conference on Foreign Relations says: “Large loans are contracted for at amazing discounts in price and at exceedingly high interest rates for which the debtor country realizes but little. For example the bulk of Honduras’ debt was contracted for railroads, and today the country has but a few short streaks of rust to show for it.”

As I have already said this practice uses, infamously perhaps, American Marines as a means of protecting the interests of the banker—the exploiter. The evil effects of such exploitation are doing much to counter—act any good that may have been done by otherwise uncupulous persons or corporations.

Furthermore our policy is undesirable because it deliberately sets aside the sovereignty of these nations and treats them as dependencies—or worse yet, as colonies. American marines invade those sovereign nations, carry on a virtual war, often ignoring and even destroying the sovereignty of countries populated by proud, sensitive, haughty people.

The inevitable result of such a policy is the engendering of animosity. Those proud people resent the fact
that armed force protects capital that exploits them, they resent the fact that American Marines are killing their citizens, they resent the ignoring of their sovereignty. The failure of the Havana Conference, according to the most reliable sources, was due largely to an undercurrent of hostility against the United States. On one or two occasions this undercurrent came to the surface and was manifested in vivid denunciations of the American policy of intervention. Our policy in Latin-America has also been criticised severely because of its non-constructiveness. It is as Manuel Ugarte, writing in the Current History for September, 1927, has said: "If we criticise the United States, it is not because we reject an influence that may be beneficial to both sides, but because we understand that the influence manifests itself in a form that is harmful to our national life, and which offers no practical solution for our future existence."

Such a condition of animosity can do nothing but bring about a lack of co-operation and balk at every step anything constructive which might be attempted. It also furthers a condition of instability and thus doubles the work of the United States.

We of the affirmative deplore the use of armed force because of these evils which we have shown you do exist, but regardless of these we find that armed force is undesirable and unnecessary because actually it does not protect capital. In the first place armed force goes in only as damage is being done or after that damage has been done. We can't send Marines to Latin-Amer-
ica every time there is a little squabble down there. We can't keep Marines in those turbulent nations all the time, that would be a policy of mischief and disaster. So in view of these facts it is evident that some damage will be done before our protection can be given to American interests there. This capital most assuredly will not be protected. Furthermore we find that damage is done in spite of all the guaranteeing of protection we may do. It was only a few days ago that we read in the newspapers of how Sandino had evaded United States Marines and destroyed valuable German property. In many other instances also we find that Marines really do not guarantee protection since damage is done in spite of them. In the fourth place armed force does not really protect capital because the employing of armed force provides the cause for the destruction of property; and that cause is animosity. A general may commandeer supplies for his army, but he does not destroy property wholesale unless he has a hatred for that property or its owner, and as I have shown you intervention provides the hatred and thus fosters the destruction of more property. The World Peace Foundations finds the following in regard to the revolution of 1912 in Nicaragua, "The policy of intervention caused far more destruction of lives and property than the ordinary Central American revolution." In regard to the recent disturbance in Nicaragua it is interesting to note that Sandino destroyed, or even threatened destruction of very little property prior to our intervention in his nation. The greatest amount of dam-
age done by him has been done since our intervention, and he says that he will not cease fighting as long as one square foot of Nicaraguan soil is held by the American Marines. And finally armed force does not protect capital because it aggravates the situations and doubly endangers capital invested in a nation during a revolutionary disturbance. That is, the policy causes the opposing forces to band together, and thus makes the revolution of greater moment. We have a very good example of this in the case of Cuba in 1906. There was a revolution in progress and American troops were landed to suppress it—almost parallel with the present case in Nicaragua. As a result of our intervention some 1,500 men of the Cuban army deserted to the rebel army in order to fight the American invader. It is interesting to note that some $5,000,000 worth of property was destroyed, almost all of it after our intervention.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, you can plainly see that the present policy does not protect capital in the first place, because it has not made for stability; and in the second place, because even under the existing situations it does not protect capital.

In these discussions it is customary for the affirmative to offer some plan for the protection of capital. We propose the abolition of the use of armed force in order that these nations may be made stable, for we realize that a condition of stability is the only sound protection for capital. My colleague will take up the plan in more detail and show how by adopting more constructive means of diplomacy and business methods and a joint claims commission to settle disputes of a pecuniary nature we shall be able to stabilize these nations and make the use of armed force unnecessary as well as undesirable. For these two reasons then, we of the affirmative maintain that we should cease to protect by the use of armed force capital invested in foreign lands.
WINNING DEBATES

FIRST NEGATIVE

FLOYD KEOGAN
Minnesota Epsilon—College of St. Thomas

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before entering into a discussion of what we conceive to be the principal issues of this debate, let us consider briefly some of the arguments advanced by the preceding speaker.

He has alleged that there is the evil of exploitation in our present policy, contending that American investors have demanded excessive rates of interest on loans. Permit me to point out that in the case of foreign loans rates of interest demanded depend upon the risks involved. Now does it not seem reasonable that if we abandon our present policy of protection, risks will be increased and that as a consequence rates of interest demanded will increase? This, it seems, will not be in the interest of either our own investment service or the borrowing nations. The latter will pay the penalty of any change of policy.

We do not deny that that in times past there may have been some instances of over-reaching, perhaps some incidental abuses in the administrative features of the policy, but we firmly insist that on the whole, and in its ultimate results, our policy has not been imperialistic. During the past thirty years we have intervened perhaps thirty times; yet today there is not a single nation in the Caribbean region whose government is not in the hands
of the native people; not a foot of territory has been appropriated by the United States as a result of conquest by this country during this period. If our policy were imperialistic as claimed such a situation would not exist. But the facts cannot be challenged. They speak for themselves. We have not been imperialistic.

Further, the speaker contended that property is really not protected under the present policy. He based this argument on the ground that intervention always follows rather than precedes the destruction of property. It is true of course that intervention may not be invoked until some destruction of property has occurred; certainly to follow any other course would mean that we would be obliged to maintain a small standing army in these chronically revolutionary countries. But this is a difficulty inherent in the situation and in itself not a fundamental objection. Respect for the sovereignty of these countries demands that until they have shown their inability to give adequate protection, intervention should not be resorted to. It is not always possible to prevent all damage to property even after intervention has begun, especially in such a situation as we now confront in Nicaragua, where Sandino has a roving band of native soldiers who make raids on some of the towns despite the vigilance of our Marines. Certainly it would be difficult to show that by withdrawing our troops in such cases the property of our citizens would be thereby rendered immediately safe. To argue thus would be to say that because there are still

some burglaries and robberies we should disband our police forces in our cities, a manifest absurdity.

Now we contend that the affirmative cannot establish its case in the debate by merely reciting cases of occasional abuses incidental to the administration of the present policy of giving armed protection to the property of our citizens abroad, but they must show that this policy is failing to accomplish its purposes, and that the evils complained of are inherent in the policy and cannot be removed or avoided except by the abandonment of the policy itself. Our present policy has been adopted to secure certain definite objects:

1. To afford protection to the property and investments of our citizens in weak and unstable countries.
2. To safeguard our national security by the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine.
3. To increase our foreign trade by aiding in the development of the natural resources of weak and backward countries.

We contend that our present policy has successfully promoted these objects in the past, and that it is a necessary factor in the accomplishment of these objects in the future.

It should be recognized as a fundamental consideration in the discussion of this question, that the foreign policies of a nation are not based on mere abstractions or theories, but are formulated to meet actual conditions and serve vital national needs. Now just what are the actual conditions which the United States faces in the countries
of the Caribbean area? First, we have already invested in the countries bordering on the Caribbean over THREE BILLIONS of dollars of our people's money. This money is there. Whatever may be said about the wisdom of giving protection to investments which may be made in the future, this immense sum of money is there and it went there under the implied, and in some cases, with the express, understanding that in the event of danger or damage our government would extend necessary protection.

Here is still another consideration, that is the actual economic and political conditions existing in these countries. The nations of this area are small island republics, weak and unstable, politically and economically, populated for the most part by a race wholly lacking in the sense of political organization, possessing rich natural resources but with neither the capital or directive ability to develop them, either to meet the needs of the outside world or to promote their own advancement. Chas. Hackett Wilson of the University of Texas is authority for the statement that there were ten revolutions in Haiti between 1909 and 1915, nineteen revolutions in Nicaragua in a period of ten years preceding 1911, and nineteen in Santo Domingo between 1900 and 1915. In Honduras there were thirty-three revolutions in a period of three years.

Further we must consider that these countries lie right at our very front door. They lie at the entrance to the Panama Canal and in the track of the great trade routes which pass through it. Our national security is affected when they are unable to give protection to property, whether that of our own citizens or that of Europeans.

Then we need the products of these countries to meet the needs of our people. No fundamental rights of these nations are infringed when we and other civilized nations of the world demand that the natural resources of this area be developed. The world today is too inter-dependent to acquiesce in the theory that any section of the globe may ignore its obligations to contribute what it can to the advancement of the general welfare of mankind.

Now these are the facts and conditions which must be faced by the United States in formulating or selecting its policy in dealing with these countries. To meet the situations thereby presented the affirmative proposes arbitration, and in the event this fails, the economic boycott. We submit that these are ineffective to meet the difficulties of the situation confronting us. To show the inadequacy of such measures to accomplish the vital purposes of a sound policy, let me review some actual instances where we have intervened. Let me first point out that the phrase in the resolution, "to protect property," includes recovery of compensation for damage already done, and also the prevention of damage threatened, as a result of revolution or rebellion. It also includes, and I wish to stress the importance of this point, not only protection from actual destruction and confiscation, but protection from the indirect damage and injury due to the interruption of trade and commerce and business and in-
terference with production, which result from disorder and the weakness of government.

Now as to arbitration and the economic boycott we insist that these are part of the present policy, to be used as far as they may be effective, but we contend that they can be used only in certain cases and up to a certain point; beyond that they are quite useless. Armed protection as a last resort, when these other means fail, is what we are insisting on, and we propose that for such extreme cases the right to employ such protection must be preserved. Consider the situation in Honduras in 1924. There was a three-cornered revolution in progress, three different men fighting for the control of the government; the recklessness of the combatants had already led to the destruction of some of the property of our citizens and threatened to destroy more. There was no established government which could be dealt with. Immediate action was necessary. What could arbitration do in such a case? Arbitration presupposes a responsible government able to act as the constituted authority of the nation and give assurance that any award would be paid. There was no such government. No such assurance could be given. The only logical thing to do was to intervene and give the protection which could not be had from the local authorities.

Take the situation presented in Haiti in 1915. This small nation was bankrupt, it owed over thirty millions of dollars as a government, loans which had been made largely by our citizens and those of England and France.
we cannot consistently demand that these nations respect the Monroe Doctrine unless we assume the duty to protect their citizens and their rights. Again and again European nations have inquired of our government whether it intended to give the reasonable degree of protection to the property of their citizens when threatened by the disorderly elements of the Caribbean countries, and intimating that unless we did so they would. Now, we don't want Europe in the Caribbean. Modern implements of war are such that a foothold there on the part of any foreign nation would be dangerous to our peace and safety. The surest, cheapest way to insure our safety from such complications is to give the protection they have a right to demand and will insist upon under international law.

WINNING DEBATES

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

ROLAND PRORST
Nebraska Delta—Hastings College

Ladies and Gentlemen:
My colleague has demonstrated to you that our policy of using armed force to protect capital is not satisfactory for it has not given the essentials, the very foundations of stability. Our policy has lead to certain evils, which cannot be eliminated until armed force is done away with. Further, armed force does not protect capital.

My honorable opponent has made the statement that there are three billion dollars of American property in the countries bordering on the Caribbean, and that this must be protected. This we wish to agree to as the very fundamental basis of the affirmative contention. My colleague has shown you that stability is the only real protection of capital, and stability can only come about through the abolition of protecting capital by armed force. Stability is the only real protection of this three billion dollars there, and that stability will not come as long as animosity is engendered by our policy of protecting our capitalists.

The statement was also made that we must protect the property of Europe that is in these countries, and that to do this we must have protection by armed force. But again we must insist that stability protects capital, whether it is our capital or the capital of Europe. Stability gives the protection that is lasting and sure. There
will be no cause for intervention on the part of Europe if its capital is not endangered by the revolutionary armies of Latin-America.

We recognize that certain conditions have existed in the past which made armed force necessary. My honorable opponent has mentioned the case of Haiti in 1915. These conditions were bad, but we challenge our opponents to prove that such conditions can arise in the future, under the plan of the affirmative. The condition or Central and South American countries have changed rapidly in the last ten years. Nearly every country there is a member of the League of Nations, and has a sovereignty of which it is proud, as my colleague has demonstrated to you. The sovereignty, and the recognized status of these countries by the League of Nations is a guarantee that such conditions will not happen in the future, cannot happen, as in Haiti in 1915. On the other hand, the affirmative contends that our policy of using armed force is retarding this very development, that we are hindering the stabilizing of these countries, violating their sovereignty, and that the only way that we can get full stability is to withdraw the protection of capital by armed force.

To remedy the existing evils, and give stability, the only real protection of capital we of the affirmative are advancing a program, as a direct corollary to the abolition of armed force. The first phase of the policy is constructive diplomacy. At the present time our state department, according to state department documents, has been developing just such a program. The supervision of loans as a constructive policy will do much to alleviate the evils of our present system. According to the American Economic Association for 1923, "Constructive diplomacy discards force and substitutes for the exercise of coercive measures to protect ill-advised adventurers, supervision over the terms and conditions of investments before they are made." Also from the Christian Science Monitor for February 1, 1928: "Mexico is on the threshold of a business and industrial revival in which the new diplomatic relations between that country and the United States will play an important part in cementing and extending commercial interests between the two nations. The recent investigation of the expert committee concerning a large loan to Mexico has proved an immediate success and its report has been approved and accepted."

The next phase of this constructive diplomacy will
be advice to investors and advice to countries desiring loans. In this way it will be possible for investors desiring a place for investments, and worthy countries which need capital, to get together and be mutually advantageous.

The important consideration is that these things cannot work as long as capital is protected by armed force. As we have shown, the protection of capital, the giving to investors of greater rights than their competitors enjoy, gives rise to animosity against the United States and this policy of protection. Our constructive policy can only work if there is cooperation, friendship, mutual trust, between Latin-American countries and the United States.

The second phase of our policy is good business methods. The United Fruit Company, which has centered its business methods in Costa Rica has, through good business methods, built up a relation that has made it unnecessary for that company to ever call on the United States for the protection of her property. This policy has led to the building up of the country of Costa Rica, as well as being good business for the United Fruit Co. In contrast to this are the activities of the Augamel Fruit Co. that has exploited for its own selfish ends, and has had to call repeatedly on the United States for protection, as well as causing much animosity, both against itself, and against the United States. Victor M. Cutter, President of the United Fruit Company, in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences for July, 1927, states: "Aroused consciousness of reputable United States firms as to the folly and pernicious effects of inequitable business transactions, realization of necessity for square dealing, rendering of service, and development without exploitation, make certain mutual gain from business relations with Latin-America."

The third phase is a joint claims commission, backed up by a court for the settlement of pecuniary claims. Edwin M. Borchard, in the American Journal of International Law, 1926, said: "Armed force should by agreement absolutely be excluded in the collection of pecuniary claims of any character. Every claim should, if not settled diplomatically, be submitted by convention to an international court." Prof. Robertson of the University of Illinois, in his Hispanic American Relations, states, "On behalf of the United States, General Porter presented to the Hague Conference a proposition that when there were contractual debts owing from one nation to the citizen of another nation, the powers represented would agree, 'not to have recourse to armed force for the collection of such debts.'" The United States and the majority of the Latin-American states signed this agreement. In Nicaragua we developed a joint claims commission. We were also a member of the Central American Court of Justice, which has been said to have been the most complete international court in existence. It was destroyed because the United States would not abide by its decision, in a three-cornered dispute with Nicaragua and Honduras. We sent in our Marines and took Fonseca Bay against the decision of the
court. In other words, the use of armed force makes impossible any constructive policy. We must first abolish armed force for the protection of capital; then it will be possible for the constructive policy.

This then is the affirmative plan, to abolish the evils that are the result of our present system of protecting capital by armed force by actually abolishing armed force. Then there will follow, as an inevitable corollary, a constructive program, which can only work with understanding and good-will between the United States and the Latin-American countries. This constructive program, has as its first phase, the establishment of constructive diplomacy, through the cooperation of the State Department of the United States and the investors on the one hand, and the State Department and the countries of Latin-America on the other. The second phase is good business methods, which are carried on under the principle of trust and good will, and exemplified by the United Fruit Co. in Costa Rica. The third phase is the joint claims commission, backed up by a court for the settlement of pecuniary claims. This will function in settlements that now require the intervention of armed force.

Because there are evils arising from our use of armed force in protecting capital; because armed force does not protect capital; and since there is a program that will get stability, the only real protection of capital, that can work only with armed force removed, we of the affirmative believe that the United States should cease to protect by armed force, capital invested in foreign lands, except after formal declaration of war.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The program which the affirmative proposes for the present policy in dealing with the foreign investment problem is now before you. It includes the somewhat vague feature of “constructive diplomacy,” which appears to embrace supervision by our state department of loans and investments made by our citizens in foreign countries, advice to our investors and to foreign governments seeking loans.

The second feature of the affirmative program is that of using improved business methods in dealing with the native people. The third is the establishment of permanent joint claims commissions. Now it seems to me that there is nothing in these new methods which is inconsistent with the claim we of the negative make that, while all peaceful means should be used as fully as possible, yet the special difficulties of the situation in the case of these weak countries demand the retention of the right to use armed force as a factor of any successful policy.

The wisdom of reserving this right is generally recognized by the leading advocates of the very methods which the affirmative proposes. In the very same article by Victor Cutter, quoted by the last speaker, in which
he urged the improvement of our business practices in these foreign nations, he declares that no nation should abandon the right to give full military protection to the property of its citizens in foreign lands. Prof. Borchard of Yale, also quoted as an authority by the affirmative, says that American investors will not send their capital into these weak countries unless assured the protection of their home government. Even the Porter Doctrine proposing the abolition of the use of armed force in the collection of debts of foreign governments, as explained by our opponents, still includes the resort to armed force as an essential part of its procedure where the government affected refuses to pay the award made by a board of arbitration. Nor does the Porter Doctrine even propose the abandonment of armed force for the protection of private property in any case where the safety of the same is in question as a result of revolution or the impotency of government. So we see that in the last analysis every authority and every argument offered by the affirmative leave untouched our claim that the factor of armed protection is essential for any sound and practical policy.

Now in opening this debate for the negative side my colleague pointed out that any successful policy in respect to foreign investments must have a three-fold purpose: First, it must protect property, both from direct damage and indirect damage; second, it must safeguard our national security. As a direct result of this of course it will encourage development of the natural resources of these countries, increase our trade, and eventually stabilize these nations economically and politically. He outlined the exact conditions with which we are confronted in the Caribbean as a result of the unstable economic and political conditions there, of the relations of these small nations to the Panama Canal and the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, and of the implications of that Doctrine where we do not intend to allow other nations to protect their nationals. He further demonstrated, I think, that the methods and policy suggested by the affirmative, arbitration and economic boycott, are wholly inadequate to meet the actual situations which are constantly arising down there, and showed that the use of force is occasionally necessary to give the degree of protection called for by the conditions which are created by revolution and financial instability.

Now we agree with the gentlemen that arbitration, compulsory and otherwise, supervision of loans, diplomacy, joint claims commissions, and other peaceful means of settlement are desirable. We would include them in any general policy of dealing with the different situations that arise. These methods are already functioning under the present plan. Our opponents have not explained how any of these methods would have met the situation in Honduras in 1924, or the conditions in Haiti in 1915. In Haiti France had already landed troops, and withdrew only when the United States promised to give protection to her nationals. Europe won’t wait for the slow processes of arbitration and the economic boycott to supply the
needled protection. If we intend to insist on the observance of the Monroe Doctrine we must accept the logical consequences of the policy. We dare not stand by and see the property destroyed with the expectation of collecting damages under an arbitral award. This would be like allowing our house to burn in the hope that we might collect the loss in the form of insurance. Then what would arbitration amount to unless we had the right to use force to back it up?

But let us get down to the fundamentals of this problem. It is a basic fact that political stability depends upon economic stability. Now of course the ultimate purpose of any sound policy is to bring about, through practical methods, the economic and political stability of those nations, so that their economic development may proceed under the protection of adequate and stable home governments. But economic stability must precede political stability and economic stability depends upon the development of the national resources of these countries. This in turn depends upon a generous supply of outside capital, for there is none to be had from a domestic source. The United States is the natural and adequate source of supply of such capital. But it has been demonstrated time and again that our investors will not send their funds to those countries, no matter how attractive the terms, unless assured of protection from our government in times of revolution and the breaking up of government. This is forcibly shown by the following telegram from our minister to Haiti in 1917: “A study in-

icates that the American bankers will not make a loan unless assured of the establishment of law and order for the life of the loan.” Again, Prof. Borchard of Yale University tell us: “The American people will not invest in revolutionary countries without the protection of the home government.” Hence we can see how the economic development of those countries, on which their political stability depends, requires the continuance of the present policy so as to secure the necessary amount of capital at reasonable terms for the needs of their development.

Where the present policy has been consistently maintained over a sufficient period of time to test its results, it has succeeded in the establishment of the desired stability. Consider the case of Cuba. There since 1900 we have guaranteed and secured protection to property and in 1928 President Michado of Cuba was able to state: “We have succeeded in creating our administrative departments; our judicial machinery; our representation in foreign countries. Our people are happy, our cities are healthy, we have a formidable industry; our foreign commerce per capita is the second largest in the world.” We offer the example of Cuba as proof of the constructive value of the present policy.

Next we wish to point out that we have greatly reduced the public debts of those countries. With our cooperation Haiti has reduced her debt from thirty-six million dollars to practically nothing. Santo Domingo, during our supervision of her finances, has paid off over
thirty-three millions of indebtedness and is today practically out of debt, a rare and happy condition for any country, new or old. The Nicaraguan debt, under similar methods, has been cut from thirty million to six millions. There is no greater proof of the attainment of economic and political stability, nor any greater aid to that end, than the wiping out of the national debt of a nation. These countries will prosper if law and order are maintained. Capital will flow in, trade and commerce will increase, employment will be steady and remunerative, taxes will flow into the treasury of the nation, and definite progress toward permanent order and stable government can be made. Yet this clearly depends on the maintenance of the present policy of assuring to capital which seeks investment in these countries full, continuous and prompt protection.

Reverting to the subject of arbitration again, let me draw an analogy: An agreement after arbitration is nothing more or less than a contract between nations. In our own highly civilized country we have judicial machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Now suppose there was nothing behind the decrees and awards of these tribunals, other than moral force, what would they amount to, even here in our own civilized United States? They would amount to nothing. The necessity of an executive power backed in turn, if need be, by all the military power of the nation, is what gives force and effect to the decrees of our tribunals. So it is in the inter-

national field; force, or the threat of force, is essential to make awards effective.

I will sum up the case. We have pointed out that our policy has a three-fold purpose: to protect property; to safeguard national interests, and to stabilize those weak governments. We have shown that the present policy is carrying out these objects, and that it is the only one that will carry them out, because of the nature of the problem we are obliged to face in the Caribbean. We believe we have satisfied you that the proposed substitute plan of the affirmative, including arbitration, constructive diplomacy and other so-called peaceful methods cannot meet the special difficulties of the situation and therefore will fail to secure the objects our nation must seek. We submit, therefore, that we have proved that the United States should not abandon the plan of extending armed protection to private capital invested in these weak countries.
FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

FLOYD KEOGAN
Minnesota Epsilon—College of St. Thomas

The affirmative speakers have questioned the benefits of the present policy, but the benefits we have shown are substantial indeed. The reduction of government indebtedness is a most striking example of the good results which have been achieved as a direct result of the present policy. Haiti, Cuba, Domingo and Nicaragua have all gained the remarkable advantage of practically clearing off all debts of their governments. No other plan that has ever been offered could have secured such favorable results. Through the establishment of peace and order business and commerce have flourished, property has increased and the internal and customs revenues of these nations have doubled and redoubled. An honest administration of the financial affairs of the republics named, a rare thing in the Caribbean, has secured the application of these large revenues to the payment of the foreign debt, with the happy result, as we have seen, that these four governments are now practically free from all debt. This makes for stability of government and is a long step toward the final goal of rendering these weak governments able to function adequately and efficiently under international law so that interventions may be avoided.

We have previously called attention to the fact the opposition cannot establish its case by reciting a few cases of abuses in the administration of this policy. They have admitted the existence of a problem by proposing various plans for its solution. Unless it is shown that the evils complained of are inherent in the policy as we now have it, they have not made out a case, for in view of the admission they have made it would seem far better under the circumstances to improve the present policy than to abandon it and inaugurate a new one. Besides, we have shown that no policy other than one involving the use of force, or at least the threat of force, can be made effective in the fact of the conditions we must face.

The chief problem is restoring and maintaining order so that business may proceed, that production may not be stopped, that property may be made safe so that the needed capital may flow in and be made available for development.

I call attention also to the fact that the present policy is being improved. Loans now proposed to be made to any of these governments must be referred to the State Department for approval of their terms and purposes before they receive any assurance that protection will be extended. Financial and economic experts are now stationed in these weak countries to advise our government as to their needs, to see to it that loans are applied to the purposes intended, and that concessions are awarded on terms favorable to the native people. This shows an effort on the part of our government to eliminate all abuses which may have characterized some of the earlier transactions, and should put at rest the assertion that our
government is a party to any schemes for exploitation or imperialism. The public opinion of the nation is being centered on our policy and actions in this region and we know our people will not approve anything savoring of over-reaching or injustice. Our present policy was never in so favorable a place to secure the utmost good with a minimum of evil as it is at the present time. It is certain to be used in the future only where the need is apparent, and for such cases it certainly should be preserved.

What the opponents have not seemed to grasp clearly or face squarely in this discussion is that all peaceful means of solving our difficulties with Latin-America, especially those countries of which we have been speaking, are a part of our present policy. The retention of the right to use force is not inconsistent with the use of other means which may be available and effective in the particular case. Our government is using arbitration every day, it has had a joint claims commission for the settlement of disputes with Mexico. It uses its diplomatic service to bring about the adjustment of claims wherever and whenever possible. But there remains a class of cases to which none of these methods will apply. It is where through administrative or financial weakness or from revolution the existing government has abdicated or lost its authority and ability to protect property or establish order; it is where there remains no responsible authority to deal with or look to for redress that we need protection. This situation has happened frequently in

the past and quite likely will happen again. For such situations there is but one means of securing the rights of our citizens and preserving our own safety, and that is the use of armed force. Then, too, the so-called peaceful means for securing our rights are effective mainly because the threat of force, which may be made actual, is behind these measures. Without the preservation of the right to use force these measures would lose most of their potency. So we see that in the final analysis we must accept the conclusion that the right of the nation to employ armed force must be fully preserved.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

EDWARD BEZT
Nebraska Delta—Hastings College

In attacking the affirmative case this morning our opponents have denied that the United States has been imperialistic and challenge us to give some examples and proof. We heartily agree with the gentlemen, the United States is not imperialistic, and we regret that they have misinterpreted our stand on this point. We have maintained that certain factions or parties have been exploiting the countries of Central America for their own profits. This has been done under a system whereby the banker takes advantage of the age old custom of protecting capital invested in foreign lands. We would make it plain
however that it is not the United States government that it is doing the exploiting but certain bankers. Our opponents ask for proof. In the Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for February, 1926, we find that some $30,000,000 have been loaned to build a railroad in Nicaragua by New York bankers, whereby those bankers obtained control of the Nicaraguan National Bank and Railroad. The railroad has never been built. The same bankers sold their holdings in the bank and railroad back for a profit of $500,000.00 on the bank and $750,000.00 on the railroad. During the time that these bankers held the road its value depreciated over forty percent. New York bankers are known to have obtained bonds from Haiti to the extent of $40,000,000.00 for which Haiti received absolutely nothing. W. E. Dunn formerly the reclamations Commissioner of Haiti tells us that loans to Haiti and Santo Domingo calling for seventy-five per cent interests are not uncommon. That is what we mean by exploitation.

Our opponents have admitted that there is some animosity against the United States but they challenge us to prove that it is the result of intervention in Central America by the United States. They say that it is partly due to unfair tariff rates between our nation and the countries of Latin-America. During the Havana Conference Argentina proposed that the tariff rates between the United States and Latin-America be changed. In the ensuing vote the proposition was voted down twenty to one. On the other hand we have the demonstrations at the Conference made by eight countries in particular, largely from Central America, against the occupation of Nicaragua by American troops. It is plainly evident that the tariff problem is of the greatest insignificance as compared with the one of intervention.

The gentlemen of the negative have failed entirely to attack our point that armed force does not protect capital. We have shown you the inadequacy of the present means of protection and the resultant evils. So far this portion of the affirmative case stands unchallenged.

Furthermore our opponents have as yet failed in their attack on the plan which we have advanced for the true and perfect protection of capital, that of stabilizing the countries of Latin-America. They have told you that arbitration will not work but they have not shown that a stabilizing force will not work.

Our opponents have told you that there are certain cases when armed force must of necessity be used. They mention the fact that Great Britain sent a warship to the waters of Nicaragua and it was necessary for the United States to intervene to protect British interests and keep the British out. I hold in my hand a copy of the message sent to the Secretary of State from the British department of foreign affairs concerning the battleship that was sent to Nicaragua. It reads: "His majesty's government feels that the presence of a vessel would be a base of refuge for British subjects. It is, of course, not intended to land forces and the commanding officer will be instructed accordingly." So you see that the bugaboo
of British interference was more apparent than real, and it really was not necessary to send troops to Nicaragua to keep the British out.

Then they tell you we could have arbitrated with Honduras in the case of the three cornered revolution. We agree that we could not have and we do not maintain that we could have. But in the future such a revolution would most probably not arise, for we find that the reason the turmoil started was because there was a debt of some $425,000,000 which could not be paid. This economic unrest is the primary cause for a good many of the major upheavels in Central America, and we of the affirmative maintain that we should get at the root of the situation and not leave the problem unsolved, getting at the surface only of the situation. Much of this debt of Honduras according to Edwin M. Borchard was due to excessive interest rates on debts and a policy of exploiting the country’s resources. The affirmative plan will do away with these evils and substitute good business administration of those countries.

Then our opponents tell us of this case in Haiti where the French landed troops—to do what? To collect debts, to collect debts caused by poor administration and high interest rates. Here again we see that the case will not occur again in the future under the affirmative plan because these debts would be taken care of by better business methods. It is interesting to note that practically every time the European countries have intervened in Central America it has been to collect debts—that is the sole cause for active intervention by Europe, and this will be taken care of by the affirmative plan, so that danger is not to be encountered.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, since we have ably demonstrated to you the evils of the present policy of intervening with the use of armed force to protect capital, and since armed force does not protect capital and because there is a better means of protection for capital, we maintain that we should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Daniel McLaughlin
Minnesota Epsilon—College of St. Thomas

Let me recall to your attention that we of the negative are just as much in favor of arbitration and other so-called peaceful means of dealing with the Caribbean situation as is the other side of this debate. These methods are part and parcel of the present policy and are used whenever applicable and effective. Again let me remind you that we do not propose “bigger and better” interventions; we propose armed force as a last resort, to be used only when other methods fail or are patently useless. There are such situations in the Caribbean; they may arise any time. Merely advocating arbitration may be a popular thing but problems of this area are real problems
and respond only to treatment calculated to meet the precise difficulties presented.

Again, we have pointed out that the proposal of the affirmative does not look alone to the future investments which may be made in this area but will apply to those already made. Now these have been made with the understanding that protection of the home government will be given whenever conditions arise such as have come up before. It is impossible to change our policy and not betray our citizens who have done what they have done frequently at the request of the government and always with the assurance that protection would be extended when through local disorder property interests are endangered or damaged. It will be small comfort to them to know that our government has decided to use arbitration or diplomacy when the local government becomes powerless and banditry and outlawry run rampant through the country.

Our opponents have stressed the point that even under the policy as now pursued some property is destroyed. But why permit such destruction to go on, if it is so likely to result in permanent loss, if it requires action to prevent loss in order to give adequate protection? If under the present plan there is destruction of property what might well result if we abandoned force and trusted to settlements to be made after the revolution had run its length, or financial weakness had resulted in complete demoralization of government?

As to certain abuses which have been referred to, it is to be noted that the affirmative has been content to recite these without showing any causal relationship between them and the maintenance of the present policy. Without such supplementary proof the argument is worthless as proof of their case. We on the contrary have shown that these abuses, such as there have been, are administrative only, that they are being removed, have in fact for the most part been corrected, and there is no serious danger of their recurrence anywhere. Government approval of loans, expert advice from specialists on the ground, experience in dealing with the native peoples, and the steady play of public opinion on our acts and proceedings must remove the danger of abuses and secure the maximum benefits from the present policy.

But in our case we have also directed attention to the constructive features of this policy. A definite objective is in the minds of the officers of our government in following out the present course of action. We desire to emphasize again this important feature of the policy of intervention. That the ultimate purpose in any sound policy must be to aid those countries to acquire permanent political stability is clearly recognized. The indispensable condition of such a result is the development of economic stability through the development of the natural resources of these countries. Roads and railroads must be built, fields cultivated, mines and forests utilized, commerce and trade stimulated; this will enable the governments of these countries to secure the necessary taxes to maintain
themselves in power to perform their functions. Only stable, productive industry can pay taxes, only established foreign trade will yield benefits. All this development and progress must be realized in an economic sense before schools, newspapers, political intelligence, and an understanding of popular government can come. Now all these desirable results depend on the supply of capital, and with it, directive ability to employ it to the best advantage. America can furnish both in abundance and is willing to do so, but property must be rendered safe, trade must be allowed to continue without interruption, capital must earn a return, and only by the assurance that we shall meet the situations which threaten property and destroy capital can we be assured that the desired capital will be available. To realize the full benefit of the constructive features of our present policy toward these nations the right to use armed force must be preserved.

The affirmative meets our arguments in favor of preserving the use of the right to use armed force in certain circumstances by stating that the peculiar difficulties will not arise again. This is altogether too violent an assumption to make to form any adequate reply. It is begging the question and is a virtual admission of our point. The connection between the claimed animosity of the people and instability of governments cannot be established on mere assertion. No competent authority has ever said that the revolutions which curse these countries and render life and property unsafe can be traced to animosity toward Americans or to any of their policies.

To sum up: We have indicated the objects of a sound policy. We have shown that to secure these objects arbitration and other suggested means and methods are ineffective. The special difficulties of the situation in the Caribbean cannot be met by such measures, all of which we propose shall be used as far as they are useful, but full protection for property, national safety and the stabilizing of those governments involves a continuance of the present policy. Besides its defensive features it is also a constructive policy, and through it the ultimate objects of stability and prosperity can be attained.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

ROLAND PROBST
Nebraska Delta—Hastings College

Ladies and gentlemen:

The debate has narrowed down to the issues of animosity, and true protection of capital through the stability of the countries in which capital is invested. Our opponents have repeatedly asked us to show that animosity exists as a result of our use of force to protect capital. They have admitted that there is some animosity in these countries of Latin-America, but deny that it is being caused by the policy of protection by armed force. I hold in my hands some fifty cards, each one of them dealing with the animosity that exists in Latin-America towards the United States, and the bulk of the sentiment of these cards is against the policy of protection of
capital by armed force. The recent Havana Conference was split over just this policy. There was complete harmony towards the United States until she refused to give up her intervention policy. The nations of Latin-America were willing to make any kinds of agreements if the United States would not maintain her policy of the protection of capital by armed force. That they were unable to present a substitute to the proposal of Mr. Hughes asking for some substitute for armed force does not prove that the animosity against its use did not exist.

So the point that there is animosity against our policy of armed intervention stands.

In the next place, the point that stability, the only real protection of capital, can be brought about only through financial and economic improvements in these countries stands. We have shown that the development of these countries is absolutely dependent upon capital. That this capital must come from the United States will be admitted, and that they need capital our opponents have admitted. But they need capital that will work for the economic rehabilitation of the country, not capital that is there for its own ends, and exploits the country for its own gain. If there is no protection of capital sent in there from this country more than the protection that the country itself gives to its own capital, then foreign capital cannot exploit and drain the country for its own ends.

Furthermore this capital cannot work effectively as long as there is this animosity against our policy of pro-

tection. In other words, the removal of the animosity must come first, that the economic and financial rehabilitation can be accomplished. The only way we can remove that animosity is to remove the protection of capital by armed force.

So is it clear that the case of the affirmative stands; namely, that the animosity is directed against our policy of protecting by armed force, and that to remove that animosity, and get the stability of the country it is necessary to remove protection by armed force. Stability, further, is desired, because our opponents themselves admitted stability is the true protection of capital.

The negative has spent much time saying that arbitration will not work. We admit that in the past there have been cases when arbitration would not have worked. But we say that such cases will not arise in the future under our program. With our program there will come an economic stability, and that economic stability will give rise to a political stability, such as exists in Costa Rica, where we have never had intervention, or in Salvador, where it has not been necessary that we intervene. The situations, as my colleague has pointed out, where armed force has been necessary in the past could not arise under the policy of the affirmative, because the policy of the affirmative, by getting capital into these countries that will work for the interests of these countries, getting a feeling of friendship and good-will that will allow business relations to develop and increase, gives political stability, and every case where we had to intervene in the past was because of political instability.
Further, our opponents have absolutely failed to show us that armed force could really protect capital. My colleague has shown you four reasons why armed force does not protect capital, and these the negative has absolutely failed to meet.

So, because our policy has led to certain evils, those of exploitation, ignoring of the sovereignty of the Latin-American countries, causing animosity and the loss of life; and because that policy of armed force does not protect capital, we advocated a new policy. This policy is the abolition of armed force. As an absolutely necessary corollary to the abolition of armed force to protect capital, we submit the following economic program which has as its ultimate result the protection of capital, because it brings political stability, and political stability protects capital. The economic program is, first, constructive diplomacy; second, good business methods; and third, joint claims commissions backed up by a court for the settlement of pecuniary claims. With this program in force, capital can go into the country, work with the country, develop it economically, improve education, build communication and transportation, thereby giving it political stability, the only real protection of capital. Because this real protection of capital can only come about with the removal of animosity and the substitution of friendship and cooperation for the use of armed force as at present, we the affirmative submit that the United States should cease to protect by armed force capital invested in foreign lands except after a formal declaration of war.
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MEN'S ORATORICAL CONTEST

Forty-six orators, each representing a different college, entered the men's oratorical contest. The orations consisted of original productions of not more than fifteen hundred words without restriction as to subject matter. There were two rounds of preliminary contests, with eight sections in the first and four in the second, and a semi-final contests of two sections leading up to the finals.

THE COST OF WAR
(First)

WALTER UPTON
Iowa Delta—Morningside College, Sioux City
THE COST OF WAR

WALTER H. UPTON

Iowa Delta—Morningside College, Sioux City

HISTORY is a veritable bath of blood. Force has
held over and dominated all reason. Greed, pride,
gold, women, slaves and adventure were the mo-
tives of ancient and medieval wars. We have tried to
deceive ourselves into thinking that our wars of modern
times are different, that they have had a loftier motive.

Many believed that the last war was to end
forever all war. Our boys in khaki were told
that if they would win, we would give them a
new world. This was to be the last war. It was
a sort of Holy Crusade, a semi-divine crucifi-
xion of humanity to save the world. We sent
away our fair young manhood, keeping step
with the roll of the stirring drum and the
trumpet which sang of fame. Our hearts
swelled with pride as we thought of those
boys who were to bring!
in this new epoch—the reign of peace! But we failed and we failed miserably! The world must recognize that nations no less than individuals are surely subject to God's immutable moral laws. Long ago we in this nation outlawed duelling. We knew it was wrong for one man to take the life of another in hand to hand conflict, and so we must come to realize that it is just as wrong to deliberately plan and to carry out the wholesale slaughter of masses in times of war.

The first indictment which I bring against war, is its financial cost. To say nothing of what it cost the other nations of the globe to prepare for war, it cost our own nation untold millions before the actual fighting began. An expenditure of twenty-eight million dollars was required to build, equip and maintain the North Dakota, a battleship with barely half the initial cost of the celebrated Colorado. The life of this vessel cannot possibly exceed twenty years—and yet at the end of that time, what then? The junk heap! What could we do with twenty-eight million dollars if directed into other channels? We could build a library twice the size of the Congressional Library in Washington, D. C., the finest building of its kind in the world. Forty Y. M. C. A. buildings, eight stories in height and sufficient for a city of two hundred thousand inhabitants could be built and equipped throughout for the cost of one battleship. A college education for fourteen thousand young men and women at five hundred dollars each per year for four years time could be financed with the money it would take for one such man-of-war.

In November of 1925, eighteen wooden vessels, which during the war were built expressly for the shipping board, were lashed together in the harbor of Quantico, Virginia, and set on fire, as evidence that their days of usefulness had passed. Eighteen million dollars went up in smoke! It cost the world approximately five million dollars an hour to carry on the last war! This was fifteen times as much as was spent during all the other wars of the world for one hundred seventeen years previous to that time. Statistics show that in 1920 the average per capita tax in the United States alone was $43.64. Of this amount 92.6 percent was claimed for past and future wars. With the remaining 7.4 percent we cared for our civil departments, public works, research laboratories, public health and educational development. No sane man opposes adequate national defense, but we do oppose expenditures required only to gratify personal or national ambition. It is high time that governments of the world should find a way of replacing dominance and force by reason and law, that the wealth of the world might be used for productive, humane and enlightening purposes instead of being squandered on ruinous and provocative preparations for war.

The second indictment which I bring against war is its cost in human life. Now in order to satisfy the demands of war, flesh and blood have always been necessary. As the first element in the cost of human life, con-
horrors should so grip us that we shall cry out in protest against such a repetition. Who knows but what a Raphael, a Luther, a Lincoln, a Florence Nightingale or perhaps even a Frances Willard may have been sacrificed during the last great war? War utterly destroys a nation's ability to beget such men and women.

Still a greater charge against war is its cost in the morals of the human race. Sir Harry Lauder, the noted Scotch comedian, gave his only son in the last war. Mr. Lauder says: “I saw those boys a-marchin' away with their boots a-crashin' on the pavement and their bayonets a-gleamin' in the sun. I saw some of those boys return in that same triumphant manner, but my boy was not with them. His body lies buried today in marble-shafted Flanders Field where poppies grow! It’s all wrong I tell you, it’s all wrong! Oh, I wish I could foster in every American boy a spirit, not of ambition for the battlefield, but of brotherly love. War breeds hatred, envy, bitterness and malice even after the fighting has ceased.”

A home down in southern Kansas gave as its quota an only son. He came back from France, but like many others had little to say about the war. When rebuked by his own father for his silence he said: “Father, there is just one thing I will tell you: One night when I was on patrol in No-man's Land, I suddenly came face to face with a German boy about my own age. It was a question of his life or mine. We fought together like wild beasts. When I came back to the front lines that night I was covered from head to foot with the blood and brains of that Ger-
man boy. He did not want to kill me any more than I wanted to kill him—but father, that is war!” As we review the harrowing visions of past wars, who can fail to insist vigorously that to enter upon another is but to crucify afresh the Saviour of the world. To do so will be to make of every arsenal a Sanhedrin, every cantonment a Gethsemane, every battle-line a Golgotha and every conflict a Cross! Warring nations have made positive denial of every fundamental principle which is basically Christian; they have transgressed God’s laws and trampled them under foot. They have gone forth to war under the sign of the Cross, but for the victory have relied upon the sword.

World powers today are standing upon the very threshold of a golden opportunity. We reflect with thankful hearts upon the peaceful settlement of our recent dispute with Mexico. In the same peaceful manner we must quell the troubled waters now engulfing China and Nicaragua. From east to west, from north to south, today sounds forth this ringing challenge and appeal. To this end, that the world rest in peace, we can and we must lay aside whatever misunderstandings we may have had in the past and unite all our forces against the greatest of all our common enemies. And that common enemy is not England—it is not France—nor Germany. That common enemy is war! Citizens of the United States? Why certainly! But also citizens of that United World to which we owe as Lincoln has expressed it, “our last full measure of devotion!” Too idealistic, do you say?

Is it too idealistic just to use common sense? Is it too idealistic to promote good will through the world? Or shall we spend our millions for gunboats and submarines? Every step we take toward aggressive armament for the settlement of our international disputes draws us that much farther away from our position of leadership toward world peace!

My friends, I submit to you tonight two convictions relative to the solution of this problem. First, we can never hope for permanent and enduring peace until our government shall erect the structure of peace, and that time will never come until we have a brotherhood of nations determined to outlaw war; Second, permanent peace is impossible without an intelligent public opinion in hearty accord with the peace program, backed by consistent action. When we have reached that common ground, in the interests of that common cause; when we have given it our irrevocable sanction, our unaltering service and universal endorsement, the big task of securing a state of Christian brotherhood in a warless world will have been done. No longer need our eyes behold such ghastly scenes as have been depicted to us by the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse; no longer mothers rearing children for the poisonous gas, the dreaded disease germ, or the cannon’s slaughter—no longer daughters for disgrace and murder! Brother will reach out and clasp the hand of brother, the world around! Nations will then hail with gladness and delight the presence of the Spirit of the Christ, and that prophecy shall be fulfilled in
which is as said, "They shall beat their swords into plow-shares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

THE AGE OF CONFUSION
(Second)

HENRY CHRISTOFFERSON
Wisconsin Alpha—Ripon College, Ripon
THE AGE OF CONFUSION

HENRY CHRISTOFFERSON
Wisconsin Alpha—Ripon College

MAN is a spiritual being. It is the soul of man that
distinguishes him from the animals. The experi-
ences of life determine the character of the soul.
Today these experiences have become so many and varied,
and yet so unorganized, that they are like stones collected
but not assembled into the beautiful temple for which
they were intended.

Especially confus-
ing are the experiences
of life to the youth of
today. We are con-
fronted with mechani-
cal forces which we
know not how to use.
In whatever field of
knowledge we search
we are met with a
maze of facts and con-
flicting ideas. On every
hand there appears to
be a mental disorder
consisting in the most
dissimilar ideas, the
most contradictory principles of life
and knowledge.
Modern civilization is rapidly outdistancing many a sacred institution. Parental influences and home discipline have become less capable and enduring. The church has lost much of its former authority. The Bible is no longer sanctioned as the final source of authority in moral problems. In the vast sweep of history, morality seems to be a thing of time and place and not a thing permanent and changeless.

Ours is an age of confusion. It is an age of secession and separation from the old and well tried. It is an age of speeding up and splitting up. The general tendency in all the subjects of learning is towards particularization. Life is not seen as a whole. There is disintegration where we need integration; there is analysis where we need synthesis in the intellectual and moral world.

Such a partial view of the confused stream of life in which the youth of today finds himself. He is caught up in this whirl of ideas with all their cross currents, eddies and undertows. Study of history and philosophy reveals to him new authorities whose teachings conflict with each other and with the safe precepts of childhood—those days when he was mercifully protected from the buffet of the waves, safely stowed in some authoritative boat, parental, clerical or other. For the most part his was the good ship "Christianity," and he acquiesced in the course others steered for him. But now he struggles with his religious faith and tries to climb aboard the good old scow again; but new ideas pour through the gaping seams of its hull, and it sinks under his weight. Thus his naive faith deserts him, and with it his former standard of values. For the moment life is all confusion, a meaningless chaos.

As the welling tides of new ideas, cynicism and doubt wash over his head, he hears the voice of exhortation:

"Strike out for yourself! Swim!"

"But how?" gasps the much bewildered adventurer.

"Where?"

There is an ominous silence on the shore. Except for a rare person here and there no one seems to be able to tell him. Most people, he learns, are not swimmers in the stream of life, but only tadpoles sunning themselves in some quiet backwash. Thrown upon his own responsibility, with only an occasional word of help, the youth of today may begin to get his bearings. He may be able to coordinate his mental movements and to strike out on a course of his own choosing. But not all are so fortunate, as the record of twenty-six suicides in American colleges and secondary schools in 1927 testifies. These youths were not able to rescue themselves in the sea of confusion.

Nor is suicide the only symptom of a state of chaos. Physically, mentally and spiritually we are in an age of confusion. Physicians in our leading colleges agree that to an alarming degree there is a warping of personality through twistings and perversions of all varieties, both mental and emotional. At one university there were thirty-four cases of insanity in the last college year. Not
only from our colleges and universities but from every walk of life, our asylums and hospitals are being crowded with physical and mental wrecks—examples of youth afflicted with neurosis and premature exhaustion. They speak emphatically of the muddle of intellect, the bankruptcy of the spirit, and the poverty of the soul.

The remedy for such a condition is difficult to formulate. The problems of youth are to a great extent personal problems—problems of sex, problems of religious faith, problems of social adjustment, problems in determining life’s values. Wise parents and teachers skilled in psychology and understanding of youth may save many a life from drowning. Better teaching of hygiene in the schools, the extension of athletics to include in its benefits the many rather than the few, the enlarging of the wholesome social life of the student—all these means can play their part to ameliorate the suffering in an age of confusion.

But primarily ours is a philosophic problem calling for a new integration and synthesis to give meaning and direction to the maze of facts and ideas and to our newly acquired possession of inanimate powers. To meet this the student report at Harvard suggested that a new course in philosophy be organized and required of all students in order to give them the necessary intellectual orientation in life as a whole. Here the student would be introduced to the most important interpretations of life with the sole purpose of offering to him a sound basis upon which to build his own philosophy. Such a course would include the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Kant, James, Dewey and others. The committee also recommended the innovation of including the philosophy of Christianity in the work of the course.

The great problem of modern education is to teach philosophy so as to make it a complement of science. Science has endowed us with the power of a superman. Philosophy must use that power to enrich the soul. In our power to interpret the discoveries of science our minds are still all too human. In the field of science with all its acquisition of inanimate energy we are still like paupers come into a fortune. We are given a new command of time and space, a physical mastery of unknown forces, an entrance into untried fields. But our souls draw back without the power of spiritual mastery. In the face of the mysteries of nature as science reveals them we secretly shrink and openly bluster. We lack confidence in our spiritual powers. Our souls are afraid of their own shadows.

Modern science should enable the philosopher to teach incomparably better the meaning of the universe and our relation to it all. For wherever science has explored it has found the manifestation of a coordinating principle. Scientific knowledge can leave no escape to the philosophic mind that back of everything there is a definite guiding principle, which leads from chaos to cosmos. Every discovery of science but strengthens the innate feeling of a philosopher that a definite Intelligence is back of everything.
But in our educational system we have thought of science merely as a means of material advancement. We have thought that the purpose of scientific discovery is to increase wealth and comfort. These things certainly are blessings but not the greatest blessing. We shall eventually discover that the greatest blessing of science is its power to enrich the soul. "If science does not assist me," says Dr. Pupin, the distinguished scientist, "to give myself and others a better religion, a better understanding of the Creator, and a better personal relationship with Him; if science does not assist me in carrying out the Divine purpose, then I am a failure as a scientist."

In the absence of an adequate philosophy, advancing with the discoveries of science we have witnessed the waning of religion, the falling off in morality, the growth of materialism, in short, the age of confusion. With the spread of a personal philosophy, interpreting the age and generation, will come a higher and wider conception of the dignity of human life.

The great lack of the age is an ideal, expressed in sufficient concreteness to be like a vision, beckoning. This ideal can rest on no other thought than that the human soul is the highest purpose of God's creative energy. It is in the soul of man, in that great world within us, that Divinity dwells. All art, all science, all literature, all philosophy must proclaim this beauty of the soul, this dignity of human life. With this ideal will come the clearing of the horizon of pessimism and doubt. With this ideal will come the cultivation of good will so that we shall wish and work and dream that not only ourselves but everybody may be healthy and happy. With this ideal we shall foster the habit of doing things and making things well for the joy of the work and the pleasure of achievement, rather than for the material gains they may bring us. With this ideal we can make human life more serene and beautiful, not just a breathless, confused, visionless scramble from birth to death—a night without a star.
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In the New York Times for January 8th, Henry Ford made a pertinent statement: "There is too much of tradition in all human activity." In those ten words he characterized the spirit of our age. We are living in a period of tradition-analysis; in every field of thought and action the accepted certainties are giving way before twentieth century criticism. The example of the mechanical world—discarding the old T-model and constructing the new—is typical of this balloon-pricking process.

The youth of today, particularly, questions the authority of tradition. The new ways of thinking have shattered the old stabilities. He questions education because educational theories change over night. The flagrant violation of law,
especially of the famous Eighteenth Amendment, causes him to question the supremacy of law. Due to early economic independence, the wide use of the motor-car and the adventure of going to college, the function of the home is minimized. The result is the serious questioning of parental authority. The wide spread of biological knowledge, coupled with modern divorce proceedings and talk of companionate marriage, has engendered a sinister uncertainty regarding moral relationships. Youth goes so far today as to question the very idea of God. A young factory laborer was recently asked why he did not go to church. "Because I don't believe in God or hell any more anyway," he promptly replied. His brother in the University joins the Association for the Advancement of Atheism—old absolutes destroyed—emotions chaotic—ideas in confusion—ideals doubtful! Youth stands at the cross-roads sorely perplexed. The old guide-posts of certainty, battered and twisted, stand like mute, distorted fingers grotesquely pointing into the uncertain future. This is our world of freedom!

Obviously it has not always been thus. There was a time when life was sharply outlined and indexed with absolute certainties. That span of years known as the Middle Ages emphasized the doctrine of "one lasting, supreme authority to which the civilized world owed obedience." This authority was the Church and State. To question any of the established certainties was to invite burning at the stake by the church or banishment by the government. All the fields of knowledge were closed to any further investigation. The idea of certainty permeated life. A thousand years of this life raised a mighty tradition of certainties and this tradition shackled people.

Then came the Renaissance and Reformation setting free the individuality of man. Ever since, the growth of Democracy and Protestantism has put increasing premium on individual initiative and expression. With freedom came courage. With courage came new discoveries in all the sciences—physical, social, political and philosophical. The consequence was a widespread movement to overthrow the archaic. Allegiance to the old certainties waned. So rapid was this decline that today even the certainties—life has meaning, the moral law counts, there is a God—receive only the most dispassionate attention. In fact there has developed a craze to overthrow all tradition. As a great German professor said recently, "We are resolved to question everything." Thus we see that the pendulum has swung from one extreme of absolute certainties to the other extreme of no certainties. Whereas yesterday tradition shackled the people, today people shackle tradition. We see this spirit reflected in people everywhere. This yearning to inquire and know has created a demand for popularized knowledge. So today history, philosophy, religion, and science have abandoned the old abstract and technical verbiage and adopted the idiom of John Doe's conversation. Durant's "Story of Philosophy," Wiggam's "The Next Generation," Fosdick's "Modern Use of
the Bible,” Dorsey’s “Why We Behave Like Human Beings,” Slosson’s “Science Remaking the World”; all these books ring true to the popular appeal. They emphasize the fluidity of life, not life passive, static, changeless. They present life as it really is: a constant series of changes. Therefore, the sensitive mind of man, accustomed to the idea of certainties, is now in a perplexing period of transition and readjustment. The youth of today particularly finds it hard to reconcile opposing views, and, as a result, follows the course of indecision. In the words of a noted college professor and religious leader “Youth throws away that which he never possessed and denies that which he never knew.”

Why doubt that life has meaning? Seemingly because we are more interested in the means of life than in its meaning. We see life only in parts—in the laboratory. A student said the other day, “Life is a prolonged laboratory period.” Dissecting animal bodies, resolving light rays, breaking up the elements, penetrating matter, we are under the delusion that to know life is to know life’s ingredients. But life is more than a mastery of knowledge. Life is art. Life is like a huge mosaic portrait and we are fixing our gaze with focal intensity upon the infinitesimal bits of mosaic that go into the making of that portrait. But life, like the complete mosaic, calls for interpretation.

How shall we interpret life? “When confronted with a great question,” said John Ruskin, “we should summon the judgment of the Company of the Great.” Look-

ing across the centuries and peering as best we can into the lives of great men and women we are moved to say with the poet, they “saw life steadily and saw it whole.” To them life had meaning, and ultimate purpose; and that conviction became the spiritual adrenal gland that endowed them with almost super-human strength. We call it ambition. Not that ambition for mercenary gain which is always prevalent. “Ambition is made of sterner stuff.” It is the ambition of a Lincoln, a Pasteur, a Burbank, the ambition to comprehend life. The names of these men are memorable because they linked their lives to this certainty:

“He most lives
Who thinks the most, feels the noblest,
Acts the best.”

Why doubt the moral law? It is conceivable that one should at times doubt moral standards, because moral standards change with the times. But underneath all definitions and mental formulae concerning moral law there is a foundation of immutable certainty.

Consider the matter of moral relationships. In a day when sex is cheap conversation and the gist of “College Humor,” it is well to recall that compromise with the moral law means the inevitable cheapening of character. The prudery of the older generation with the idea that all sex is sin was not right, nor is the idea that sex is trivial amusement. One thing is certain. Over in Cincinnati in “hock-shop” windows hang second-hand suits of
clothing bearing this sign “slightly soiled — greatly reduced in price.” The youth who breaks faith with the moral law must bear that sign on his character. The moral law counts. There is another certainty in our world of freedom.

Why doubt a God? Just because many old traditions are thrown overboard as no longer worthy of perpetuation, why blame God? Man himself made those mechanical certainties. Doubt man—not God! We have heard it said “Better a few stars with God than all the stars in the world without God.” But the question is: why should more stars minimize God? The greatness of God is magnified with every increase in the power of the microscope and telescope. Again, it is true that anthropology is destroying some of our theology. Let it destroy. This is only separating the wheat from the chaff. Some of our theology is hand-made and must eventually be abandoned. Anthropology is hastening the process, but all the anthropology in the world can never destroy God! In all history from primitive man down to the greatest living scientist who speaks of the First Cause—God is a certainty.

Life has meaning, the moral law counts, there is a God—these are at least three of the certainties to which we can link our lives. For the moment we are suffering from the delusion that where there is freedom there is no certainty. Hence, we shall see yet for a while some cynical despondency and the Association for the Advancement of Atheism will occasionally pick up a few recruits.

But the rank and file of people have the fundamental hunger for Certainty, and re-assuringly the knowledge comes that what the mass of common folk yearn for must eventually triumph. Not that possession of these certainties is ever final. They cannot be emblazoned on bronze tablets, nor are they so manifest that we can carry them about like a boy carries marbles. If you possess them today their only promise is the possibility of struggle tomorrow—but a struggle that ennobles and enriches life because the unfolding of truth gives range to the spirit.

“It is a great time to be alive. The world is breaking up.—winter is past; spring has come; the thaw is on. We are going out into a new generation, plastic, pliable, fluid. What takes possession of it, what directs its course, what spirit informs it, will determine human destiny for generations.” So when we say farewell to the past, let us not say farewell to the eternal verities, life, character, God,—

These are the certainties in our world of freedom.
ORATORY

WOMEN
WOMEN'S ORATORICAL CONTEST

Twenty-two orators, each representing a different college, entered the women's oratorical contest. The orations consisted of original productions of not more than fifteen hundred words without restriction as to subject matter. There were four preliminary and two semi-final contests leading up to the finals.
BENEATH AMERICAN ROOFS

Genevieve Temple
California Epsilon—University of California at Los Angeles

BENEATH American roofs is a time worn institution, The Home; an institution that has brought forth noble men and women who in this age have made of our country one of the greatest nations of all time. But as a usual thing we Americans of today think little of our homes—we take them for granted. The general opinion is that too much has already been said of the home — let the matter rest for a while. But, ladies and gentlemen, should we let the matter of our homes rest at a time when influences are at work that are tending to break up, to dissolve our homes? It appears that there are two influences which are seeking the destruction of the American home. There is today in our country a group of individuals who have named the home an obsolete establishment, who are seeking to in-
still in the minds of the people of this country the principles of a so-called New Dawn, an institutional, homeless dawn when cubistic formulas of the sex relationship will supplant the marriage contract—when Soviet commissaries will shepherd the new generation into vast communistic nurseries and asylums where the state will supplant parents, the close relationship of family and God. This is one of the influences that is seeking to disrupt our homes. And when the facts confront us that certain groups in this country have already accepted this indictment of the home, it is high time for sensible men and women to take steps to see that our American home remains an institution wherein the close relationship of the family and God will create and develop true-blooded American citizens.

Still more alarming than the situation I have just mentioned, is the increasing number of divorces among our people, especially among the people of the so-called middle class of this country. And divorce results in a break-up of the home. Statistics of the U. S. Census Bureau show that divorce has increased from one for every thirteen marriages in 1890 to one divorce for every six and seven-tenths marriages in 1925—that is an increase of 120% in thirty-four years. The question confronts us—what is the cause of this increased rate? One cause surely is the fact that there is today a lack of a sense of proportion within the home. We fail to emphasize the really important things in life—too often rate appearances above comfort, happiness, true content. Too often we find one hundred dollar dresses on the wives of

three-thousand dollars-a-year husbands, oriental rugs in a room where there is not a single human touch. Men and women become dissatisfied with this materialistic show, with the impersonal rooms that are called a home, and divorce follows. Every man has the instinct for a home, for a real home. A real home is not made of the materialistic luxuries and pleasures of this world. Home is the love which is in it, the love between children—between parents, between parents and children. Home may be a small which house with green shutters, half covered with vines, set back from the village street among trees and flowers; home may be a somber hued apartment house facing the city street; home may be a marble palace—but whether it is home or not depends upon the happiness and love within it. How much more happiness there would be in this country, if we American people could but remember it matters little the houses we have erected, the railroads we have built—these may survive or fail after we have gone. But what matters is this; to build castles of truth, of beauty, of love. That which the hands build may disintegrate and decay—that which the heart and mind builds is eternal. The real home is not built of riches and splendor—it is built of truth, of happiness, of love. As Edgar Guest has said:

"Home ain't a place that gold can buy or get up in a minute,
Afore it's home, there's got to be a heap o' livin' in it."
Possibly men and women of today forget their marriage ties and the importance of a home so easily because so few men and women own their homes. Only four hundred sixty-five families out of every one thousand families in the United States own the homes in which they live. As renters many of them live a more or less nomadic existence—they do not stay in one place long enough to strike roots; and roots, strong deep roots are the very base of the home. Five-eighths of the divorces granted in this country are to people who have not established permanent homes.

Not only are divorces granted to childless couples, but to people with children. Divorce, when it breaks up the home vitally affects the children of the home. When there is a break in the home there is a break in the supervision and control of the children. Thus, the broken home has proven a factor in producing delinquency among children; from forty to seventy percent of the child delinquents of this country come from such homes. A majority of the children suffering with conduct difficulties come from such homes. The broken home cannot develop and direct the desires and aspirations of childhood. A home is needed in which both parents are working together to control the experiences of the children. Formerly it was the home that taught the child the right and wrong—that sought to teach to him the ideals of Christianity and of good citizenship. Now, when the home is disrupted by divorce, the father often goes his way, the mother must earn the livelihood for the family; so it is that the moral instruction of the child is often left to the school. The children are left more or less to “live their own lives.” And what have these lives been? Within one month thirty-two students in this country committed suicide because there was nothing more to live for. High school students are robbing banks and committing highway robberies. Youthful Hickmans are murdering innocent children for no reason at all. All we need to do is to open the daily newspapers and before us is an account of some new atrocity. Are the boys and girls who commit these deeds receiving the proper training? No, statistics show that nearly ninety percent of the youthful criminals of this country come from broken or undesirable homes. What we need is an American home where-in the Father and Mother unite to train the childhood of the country in the principles of right, of good citizenship.

The responsibility rests upon the students of this country—the young men and women who in a few years will be home-makers—to use every effort to banish from the minds of the American people the idea of free love, of a homeless existence; it is our responsibility, fellow students, to eliminate the causes which bring divorce—divorce which breaks up the home and thus fosters delinquency and crime among our youth. It is our task to remove these influences if we are to keep the American home secure and wholesome. Our homes should offer a stronghold against the evils of the world. The whole hope of the future is inclosed in the walls of the home; the whole legacy of the past trusts in its security. You
and I, the coming homemakers of this country, must do our part in the building of the home by removing the present unwholesome influences that are invading the home today and endangering its peace, security, stability.

The home has been the foundation of our civilization, of our country. America was conceived by homemakers who invaded an unknown wilderness. America was developed by homemakers who chopped a way thru that wilderness clear across the continent. And the home is not a new institution—it had its beginning in some forgotten cave untold centuries ago. Since that time mankind has been pressing forward; building up civilizations, conquering the powers of the earth and looking upon the very heavens for new worlds to encompass. From the waters under the earth, from the firmament above, the pride of man has sought new conquests. What the race of men and women will do in the centuries to come none can say. What it has done in the centuries past is a matter of record. But thru all the successions, achievements, annihilations of man in the centuries past there has remained one unconquerable and distinguished triumph—the Home. Like-wise, ladies and gentlemen, thru the successes, victories, failures of man in times to come, our American home must still stand triumphant. For as our soldier poet Joyce Kilmer has said:

"The only reason a road is good, as every wanderer knows, is just because of the homes, the homes, the homes to which it goes.

They say that life is a highway, and the milestones are the years.
And now and then there's a toll-gate where you pay your way with tears:
It's a rough road, and a steep road, and it stretches broad and far,
But at last it comes to a golden Town where golden Houses are."
THE WINGS OF YOUTH

SECOND

GENEVIEVE BRAYTON

Illinois Yona—North Central College, Naperville
"WINGS OF YOUTH"

Genevieve Brayton

Illinois Iota—North Central College, Naperville

A dense fog—a low fuel reserve—a faulty compass. A forced landing in the surf. Some might call it luck and others Providence. Dangers were anticipated but adventure beckoned. Captain Byrd and his comrades realized the risks but they were unafraid. Youth today is flying high and far. Young people seem to have caught the spirit of aviation. They are exploring new fields, asking question, finding the answers for themselves. With high resolve and anxious for new achievements they have embarked on an adventure—a quest for truth. Youth is confident. It is joyous, almost reckless in its flight. It is free to express itself. No longer restrained it can direct its own course. Failure never occurs to youth, for the youth of all
ages has ever been optimistic. A wonderful spirit! A glorious adventure! But like all glorious adventures it has its dangers. A dense fog—a low fuel reserve—a faulty compass. Crashes, wrecks, oblivion.

Youth flies in the field of religion surrounded by fog. The way is obscure—doubt and darkness are in every direction. Just what does youth believe today?—about the Bible, about Jesus Christ, about the Church? Our young men and women are seeking the truth. For them religion must be rational. It must square with the facts learned in the laboratory and class room. Finding that some of the teachings they have received at home or in Sunday School meet with contradiction in the courses of science, they question religion rather than science. This circumstance applies not only to our college students, but that great group of young people in our business and industrial world are faced with equally serious religious difficulties. How can they work ten hours a day, six days a week, for an existence wage or less—and still believe that God is Good? The college youth struggles with religious problems that touch his intellectual life. The youth who must work for his living is confronted with religious problems in even his physical life. Deprived of the necessities as well as the luxuries of life his viewpoints reflect doubt and a feeling of injustice. The church has no solution for their problem. It does not change conditions. If Christianity were practiced in business and industry, such circumstances would not exist. “Take no thought for your life, what ye shall put on”—contains little comfort for the young man or woman who has only drudgery ahead of him.

Fog surrounds our youth in his flight to religious fields. It seems impenetrable. A few of our college young people have found a way out. Conferences and conventions, such as those held in Milwaukee last year and Detroit this year, represent an effort to reach some definite decisions. Young people attending these conferences comprise a pitifully small majority of all the youth of this country. That great mass who cannot take advantage of such opportunities must continue their adventure of life in the fog.

A low fuel reserve means just as serious a difficulty. It indicates almost certain disaster. Only a small group of our youth have to cope with such a situation in their flight, yet we usually are informed of every case in the daily newspapers. The majority of our young people very wisely start out on their adventure fortified with a fuel reserve. If they fly discreetly and carefully, they are prepared to meet most emergencies. Though fog may surround them they still have a chance to fly beyond the clouds. The young men and women who foolishly burn up their fuel supply usually come from that group whose parents have lavished upon them every advantage that money could buy. They have no idea of the meaning of work and their lives are one round of frivolity and gaiety. George Ade ironically describes these young men and women as “society queens of seventeen looking up rest cures, and world weary men of eighteen who wonder what
else there is to live for since they have seen all." George Ade is a humorist but frequently he speaks more truth than humor. Too late they realize their mistake. There is no turning back. Some try to conserve their remaining few gallons and try carefully but it is only a matter of time before the last drop is consumed and their motor ceases. Others recognize the futility of flying farther. They haven't the courage to await impending disaster and they finish their reckless flight with one last characteristic flourish—a deliberate nose dive into the unknown depths. The increasing number of suicides among our young people can be attributed to just such a condition. They exhaust their resources early in life but are not men and women enough to face the world and await results. Nothing short of murder can give them a "kick out of life." They have experienced all other thrills. Though this group is comparatively small, yet this represents one of the greatest dangers to youth in its adventure of life.

But if youth finds itself in a fog and with fuel supply running low, there is yet one chance that it may reach its goal. Is the compass true? The compass indicates to the young aviator his exact position. There is the possibility of his landing on some island for repairs or to replenish his gasoline tank. But if the compass is faulty there is little hope for success. Youth's compass is its ideals. The ability of youth to meet emergencies is determined by these ideals. To many it seems that youth has lost its ideals or else they are very low. One member of the clergy characterizes our young people as

“bobbed haired, lipsticked, cigarette-smoking shebas, and slick headed, jazz crazy, irresponsible sheiks.” Billy Sunday tells glibly of the 750,000 prostitutes in this country with an average age of twenty-five. A noted New York judge says: “Our vicious criminals here—our forgers, burglars, hold-up men, murderers—are young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-three. Eighty percent of our criminals are under twenty years of age.” These are stern facts but we cannot hesitate to face them.

The great mistake made by the American people today is that they put all our youth in one class. Our press capitalizes the exceptional cases of delinquency to make sensational news stories. The public, reading only these from day to day, gets the impression that all youth is flippant and irresponsible. It forgets that down under the sham affected by the younger generation there beats a youthful heart filled with enthusiasm and idealism that longs for expression. Unless our young people receive encouragement and understanding these finer qualities may result in indifference or radicalism. Unless our youth is equipped with the ability to right its compass, it will lose its sense of direction. It must be trained to adjust its compass to meet emergencies before starting on the great adventure of life.

From only one source can the youth of today secure this training—from the youth of yesterday. The youth of yesterday embarked upon a similar adventure not many decades ago. Altho they may not have flown so high nor so far, yet there were times when they, too, encount-
ered fogs and had to conserve their fuel supply. They are the transition between the sham and hypocrisy of yesterday and the frankness and square shooting of today. Better than anyone else can they understand the restlessness of youth—the desire for freedom and expression. Better than anyone else can they equip youth with the knowledge of how to adjust its compass. But oh, how cautiously must this knowledge be imparted! For the youth of today is very self-sufficient. He invites no admonition or exhortation from his elders—in fact, he resents dictation. He wants to find out for himself whether the paint sign on life is genuine. He will take the word of no one for all the intoxicating possibilities that the world has to offer him. Only through a shared life will the youth of today absorb the deepest faiths of the youth of yesterday. Out of the tumult and discipline of family life will the youth of today glean the best. Through constant human contact will the social attitudes and the sense of values be acquired. The youth of today is unconscious of its receiving, but the youth of yesterday is ever conscious of its giving. The youth of yesterday gets no vacation in its task. It is ever equipping the youth of today with the ability to adjust its compass in time of emergency. Possessing this knowledge the youth of today can fly on to a glorious victory. But if the youth of yesterday fails, the modern youth will fly on to certain disaster—in a dense fog, with low fuel reserve, and a faulty compass.
THE NEW PIONEER

MARY K. MAYNARD
Iowa Delta—Morningside College, Sioux City

WO years ago twelve young sculptors set about to chisel in marble their conception of the American Pioneer. The chosen favorite for their work is the "Woman With the Sunbonnet." You may be familiar with the statue or its picture. The figure is of a woman whose poise is fearless, whose progress is sure. In one hand she carries her Bible, with the other she guides her little son, heir of her hopes and dreams. Her sunbonnet, thrown back, reveals a face of gentle courage and lofty purpose. She has broadened her horizon, and her vision is of a country where knowledge is freer, friendship truer, God nearer.

Today there is a new pioneer whom you all know well. She wears comfortable clothing, skirts that are sensibly shortened---she

MARY MAYNARD
Iowa Delta, Morningside
s free breathing, frank, confident, natural—this modern college girl. She, too, is on the trail, blazing her way through the complexity of modern civilization. Walking the great high road of Youth's pioneering spirit, she sees about her the foolish young adventurers who have been lured by the experimental by-paths which tempt modern youth.

You have often listened to the popular stigma attached to the college girl. You have often heard the criticism, "What is this generation coming to?" I wish to ask your patience this evening in listening to the story from another angle—from that of the modern college girl—a new pioneer, searching for Knowledge, Friendship, and God.

In her search for knowledge, the quip, "Beautiful but dumb," has been hurled at the modern girl. Yet today there are in American colleges and universities a quarter million of these young pioneers—enough to stretch hand in hand more than twice across the continent, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It has also been suggested that the modern girl comes to college primarily to find a husband who did not live in the old home town. But of the four thousand Phi Beta Kappa keys given in 1926, college women won two thousand. And of the one hundred thirty-seven doctor's degrees given at the University of Chicago last year, women claimed forty-two percent.

In this day when our colleges are becoming training schools for business and the professions, where men are specializing in economics and business administration—it remains for the college girl to weigh the truths of philosophy; to absorb the beauty of the old classics.

It is a practical application of the arts and sciences that will enable her to probe the mysteries of life. Through her courses in heredity and practical eugenics she is securing a life insurance policy for the children that are to be hers. She will be content no longer to bear children whose crippled bodies and defective minds give pitiful testimony of parental ignorance and neglect. The mortality of children under one year of age has been reduced one-half since the days of the Sunbonnet Woman. From thirty percent the number has decreased to fifteen percent in the last fifty years. There still remains this fifteen percent—one hundred thousand children under one year of age, whom we must save!

In the heart of the New Pioneer culture and knowledge must serve in the realization of her brightest dream. Her college training must find its practical application in her home. It is true that the modern girl will no longer inherit her grandmother's chair, her cook-book, or her knitting. She will be more concerned about the budget and the balanced meal. Although she may not bake her own bread, nor knit her children's woolen stockings, she will still be directly responsible for the price of baker's bread, and the quality of ready-made clothing. The adornment of the child-mind will be more important to her than the adornment of bath-towels; the construction of
character will be more vital to her than the construction of
clothes.

My friends, all our child labor-reforms, all our mar-
riage and divorce laws, all our building and health codes
will aid little in solving America's problem until one-half
the human race—the mother half—is taught to know and
perform its real duty!

Not only is the college girl pioneering in the field
of knowledge, but she is searching for wider friendships
than traditionally have been hers. Critics of the modern
girl have said that the caste system of India is rivaled on-
ly by the sorority system of America. Again, the college
girl, as a class, has been condemned for the snobbishness
of a few. Deliberate judgment, however, is that she is
gaining ground in her conception and practice of Democ-
racy. Mary Antin, the little Russian Jewess from Dover
street, discovered this fact when she entered the Boston
Latin School where most of the students were from the
aristocratic families of Back Bay. She writes: "They
teased and admired me by turns for learning the foot-
notes of the Latin grammar by heart, but I am sure they
did not smile at my faded calico dress, and rusty sailor
hat, even when my back was turned. I was rated by my
scholarship, and not by my father's occupation. So when
I parted from my companions on the steps of the school-
house, it was in mutual respect—they guiltless of snob-
blishness, I innocent of envy. It was a gracingly Amer-
ican relation."

WINNING ORATIONS

This "graciously American" spirit was also shown
at the Inter-collegiate Conference held in December, 1926,
at Milwaukee. There hundreds of under-graduates
pledged to avail themselves of no social privileges on their
respective campuses which were denied to students of any
other race. Would this action have been possible a gen-
eration ago? Does it not prove that new land has been
possessed?

There is being created among the youth of the world
a friendship that transcends the boundaries of nations and
race. Toward this land of understanding, the modern girl
advances with unflagging step. Within her memory there
linger thoughts of the holocaust that has passed. Within
her soul there is fixed the firm resolve that her sons
shall not feel the scourge of war! Within her mind and
heart there lies the practical solution for international
peace—World Friendships, invested in a league of youth!

But greater than the college girl's thirst for knowl-
edge, greater than her quest for friendship, is her search
for God. Her grandmother was content to accept the
dictum of religious authority as final. The Bible as in-
terpreted by the clergy, was an all-sufficient guide for
conduct in the life that now is, and assurance of the
life that is to be. Science to the old pioneer was either
a closed door, or its findings were accepted only so far as
they did not conflict with established orthodoxy.

The girl of today is being accused of irreverence—
of skepticism. Is her disregard of the religious conven-
tions a manifestation of degeneracy, or is she prompted
by an inner urge that is driving her from the sterile ground of religious cant to the fertile fields of social service? She does not acknowledge certain orthodox teachings about God, the Bible, and the Soul which so often become a preparation for future skepticism. She does not revere the burning cross of creedal exclusiveness. She does not worship the sort of deity some theologians depict. She believes in the God of World Justice and World Peace, as revealed by Christ! The ideals inseparably related to Him are her soul's meat and drink. In a new light, shining out of the darkness, she has seen a figure, eternally young, ready to guide her young Womanhood.—It is Christ, the Light of the World!

With this guidance, the New Pioneer is keeping faith with the old—is keeping faith with that voice from out the past which echoes, "Whither goest thou?" For her reply is,

"To lift Today above the Past.
To make Tomorrow sure and fast,
To call God's colors to the mast!"

And the voice of the Past makes the answer,

"Then God go with you, Greatheart!"

And in that day when the knowledge of the Dick pioneer shall have dethroned ignorance, when the people, democracy shall have become the heritage of the modern girl, and hypocrisy, posterity shall acclaim the peer of all pioneers!
MEN'S EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING
CONTEST

Forty-one speakers, representing as many institutions, were entered in the extemporaneous speaking contest. One hour before the contest each speaker drew a topic dealing with some phase of a general topic which had been selected some weeks before. He spoke not less than eight nor more than ten minutes in developing his topic. At the end of his speech he was asked a question on his topic by one of the other contestants and had two minutes in which to answer it. There were two preliminary rounds of eight and four sections, and semifinals of two sections, preceding the finals.

"The Influence of the Press," was the general topic for discussion in the men's contests.

WHAT DUTIES DOES A NEWSPAPER OWE THE PUBLIC?
(First)

Alden Russell
Missouri Delta—William Jewell, Liberty
WHAT DUTIES DOES A NEWSPAPER OWE THE PUBLIC?

F. ALDEN RUSSELL
Missouri Delta—William Jewell College, Liberty

Ladies and Gentlemen:

After the discussion to which you have been listening this evening, I believe that you are all going home to read the paper with a new meaning. We are having the newspaper on trial tonight, and, in the light of the remarks of the preceding speakers, it seems altogether fitting and proper that at this time I should have the pleasure of discussing the duties of the newspaper to the public. The other speakers have enumerated the various uses of the newspaper. Mr. Beedon showed the effects upon the government of partisan newspapers; Mr. Young told of the deleterious effects of murder stories as used in many newspapers; Mr. White, the great good of the Lindbergh pub-
licity; and Mr. Werner, the place of the cartoon in the modern press.

It is true that the most vital element in the formation of human society is communication. Society can be good only in so far as it makes this life a pleasant experience for those of which it is composed. Happiness may not be the whole end of life but at least it is the aim of society. And that aim is only culminated in the complete harmony which comes from a more perfect understanding. Complete progress has no room for provincialism. Nations and people within nations must understand each other, and this understanding can come only through communication. This can come only through the press. We can see the great importance then that the press plays in the world today and in direct proportion to that lies the duties of the press.

In a large sense the newspapers are not shirking this responsibility. In 1918 it was the New York Evening Post that exposed the New Jersey prison system. The articles of Harold Littledale, reporter, led to needed reforms. This gives you an example of the concrete aid that the press is making to society. It is enlightening them. The Loeb and Leopold case was exposed because a reporter for the Chicago Daily News found who was responsible for that deed. In 1921 the Boston Post exposed the famous get-rich-quick Ponzi. In 1922 the New York World tore the mask from the Ku Klux Klan. Our own Kansas City Journal-Post exposed the quack doctor, diploma mill in Missouri. Then in 1926

Don R. Mellett, editor of the Daily News, Canton, Ohio, was assassinated because he had been staging a fight for cleaning dirty politics. These contributions were made in the fulfilling of the duties these newspapers owe to the public.

The newspaper has a duty to the educated class. It furnishes information to this class upon which it can mold ideas and intelligent public opinion. It furnishes information by which the people can live in a better, higher, and more progressive way. To the uneducated class the newspaper is novel, story, history. It is the university of the uneducated—having in its curriculum, life with all its multitudinous problems. It helps them to see and to understand this great cosmopolitan life.

The newspaper has a two-fold duty, to defend and to challenge. It is the duty of the newspaper to defend those things that make for greater progress in the country. It must defend activities which make for the betterment of life. It must stand for those ideals and conceptions of honesty and liberty that make people feel a little better when they have read their paper. It is the duty of the newspaper to challenge all that is bad, that is not clean and above board. It must challenge questionable schemes, political corruption and social evils. It is the duty of the newspaper to challenge as well as to defend.

My friends who have already spoken here tonight have shown you that some are fulfilling these duties and that some are not. But one thing is true: we can all
consider what kind of newspaper we are going to demand in the future. It is the fearless newspaper, the one that is willing to come out and stand for what it believes to be right, that is willing to challenge all that is wrong and defend all that is right. That is the one that is going to do the most for the world.

What is to be done? We, the young people of today, the citizens of tomorrow, must choose. It is not only our opportunity but also our duty to defend the fearless publishers. They are the ones who are performing their duties and redeeming their obligations to the public. It is in our hands to support them for the duty of the newspaper to the public is the duty of every individual to the other members of society.

Mr. White: May I ask, in the light of your discrimination between the appeal of the newspaper to the educated and to the uneducated, would you advocate separate newspapers for each class?

Mr. Russell: John and Willie were twins in school. One morning Johnny got into trouble. The teacher offered an alternative to the customary whipping in the form of three questions which Johnny must answer on the following day. The next morning the lad came to school and the teacher said:

“All right. How deep is the ocean fourteen miles east of Honolulu?”

“A stone’s throw,” was the response.

“Correct. And how far can light travel in a day?” continued the teacher.

“Once around the earth,” he said with a smile.

“Now, I have one. Tell me of what I am thinking?”

After a moment’s hesitation the lad’s face brightened.

“You are thinking that I am Johnny, but I am not; I’m Willie.”

After my discrimination between the appeal made by the newspaper to the two classes you may be thinking that I would advocate separate publications for the various classes of society. But not so. The present paper has the sport page for those interested in sports, the fashion page for women, the market page for the financial interests, and so on,—yes, even the Chap-eron column for the love-lorn who are willing to trust their weep problems into the hands of some rushed reporter. It is the paper today that has a mes-ter-dep for all. And it must have, for if we are ever to hold these two groups into one, if we are ever to make one set of ideas and ideals—one set of principles apply satisfactorily to all, we must do so by this gradual educational process—this means by which we coalesce and coordinate the diversified standards of the two classes until that complete harmony is obtained which comes from an appreciative understanding.

We must have one newspaper with one appeal, challenging all that is wrong and defending all that is right, informing the educated, enlightening the uneducated. Then shall we have an understanding nation of people working harmoniously toward the great goal of progressive happiness.
THE PLACE OF THE CARTOON IN THE MODERN NEWSPAPER

FRANTZ A. WERNER
Minnesota Beta—St. Olaf College, Northfield

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In order that you and I may obtain a clear conception and preliminary foundation for our discussion, I am going to request your assistance in the performance of two simple experiments, the proper performance of which will enable us to better understand the power of the cartoon.

First, I am going to ask you to visualize a tall, slender man, nearly bald, with a very long nose, and practically no chin. Before I can supply the answer I have heard it whispered from the audience before me — Andy Gump. Our next subject is a very different type of individual. Concentrate your imag-
inative powers for a moment and bring to view an aggressive chin, gold-rimmed glasses, a campaign hat of 1898, and strong, very prominent teeth, set in a winning but all conquering grin. Those above the age of forty have already answered—it is Teddy Roosevelt. We might continue this laboratory all evening, and in every instance a majority of the audience would recognize the subject of the experiment before I had proceeded with the test thirty seconds. Such is the power of the cartoon.

For three days I have listened to able and intelligent young men engaged in the interesting and entertaining pastime of damning the Press of the United States. I am startled to hear that the Press has been engaged in the fiendish activity of wrecking the moral, economic, social, governmental and religious foundations of this country, and that unless drastic steps are taken to turn the tide, we are about to view the flaming ruins of a great civilization, with vulture journalists flying overhead. There is much truth, I am sure, to what has been said about the American press, but as one who has decided to make it his life work (despite the fact that I have had actual experience), I do not believe that the press is a total evil. My topic gives me a welcome opportunity to defend the greatest influence in modern American life.

The man who would dare to attempt a review of an entire phase of our American life in ten minutes would be very bold indeed, and I hardly feel it necessary to offer an apology if I only touch upon three or four rather distinct influences of the cartoon. And with the characteristic impartiality of a journalist, I shall try to present sidelights varied enough to appeal to every type of listener.

Suppose that we retrace our steps to Andy Gump. The adventures of Andy, Min, little Chester, and the wealthy uncle Bim are familiar to half of America, and typical of three-fourths of it. It has amused us daily, and if you wish definite proof of its beneficial influence in American life—may I suggest that thousands of wives have seen in Andy Gump a picture of their own bragging, foolish but kindly husbands, and have derived therefrom a smiling tolerance.

George McManus created "Bringing Up Father" because he knew very intimately the "doormat" life of the average American father, and from his famous series the family heads of this country derive secret but knowing satisfaction.

The pranks of the Katzenjammer Kids may have furnished ideas to our youngsters that have not always been exactly beneficial, but everyone in this audience can recall with keen pleasure the fun of seeing what these kids could devise in the way of trouble, and remember—the moral lesson was always there. Each trick ended with a spanking.

So much for the influence of the cartoon in the family. Now let us turn to a broader field—the political cartoon. Here we discover a tremendously powerful factor in our life.
Millions of Americans never see the men who conduct the affairs of this nation, and millions more never take the time to read the reams of information and misinformation written about them and their objectives. Most of us would have no idea as to how our statesmen looked if the cartoon did not give us vivid impressions, and the aims and errors of the same men are graphically depicted by the artist. We are all willing to look, and what we see we can as a rule remember, but only a few read enough to gain the same knowledge. The cartoon, whether opposed or favorable to its subject, is our chief source of enlightenment concerning men and problems.

Cartoons have been a vital force since the earliest times. The caves of France bear striking evidence that man from the earliest days has recognized the power of a picture to convey an idea not only for the immediate, but for the future. When Smith was drawing Old Doc Yak, the Pittsburgh Press had to run extras for four hours one day, because Doc was wondering whether Harry Thaw was really crazy. Thousands fought to get a little four by four cartoon, caring nothing for the countless columns of court room testimony. That is a modern instance which has been duplicated a thousand times.

In conclusion, may I say without qualification that the cartoon is one of the greatest single influences in America today. Be it said to the credit of American journalism—the Press of the United States has given to this nation the great torch of enlightenment—the modern cartoon.

Mr. Seaton: Do you think that political cartoons should be abolished?

Mr. Werner: No, I do not think that they should. In my opinion, the political cartoon is the best contribution of the American press to the life of America, and one of the most potent factors in keeping honest our men in charge of the ship of state.

In my main talk, I tried to bring to you a visual conception of Theodore Roosevelt, and my brief and perhaps vague sketch brought an instant response from most of you, which illustrates very accurately my contention that the cartoon is chief factor in shaping the political contour of this republic. Ninety percent of the American people never see the men in charge of government, and know nothing of the methods and means employed in conducting the affairs of state. The political cartoon, caricature as it is, not only gives us knowledge as to the appearance of our leaders, but carries with it a vivid presentation of character delineation. The very fact that it is always drawn from a prejudiced viewpoint, to bring out a glaring defect in the man and his views, or the very opposite, makes it educational to the highest point.

The political cartoon not only brings us our knowledge of the statesman’s appearance, but also portrays public events in a way that makes a lucid and permanent impression. The publicity given the recent dam disaster in California was capitalized by one artist as an analogy to the oil scandal, and his picture of the flood of corruption bursting forth upon the public scene gives the reader a
sensation of disgust that can never be duplicated by the
reams of Washington correspondence.

In conclusion, I whole-heartedly endorse the political
cartoon. It is the most effective means devised by man
to carry a quick, lucid, and appealing message, and is the
greatest influence in keeping governmental acts and prob-
lems before the people. Best of all, it is the one phase
of modern journalism which cannot be attacked, and
whose virtue can be easily defended.

HAS THE PRESS HELPED
EDUCATION?
(Third)

FRED SEATON
Kansas Gamma—Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan
HAS THE PRESS HELPED EDUCATION?

Fred Seaton

Ladies and Gentlemen:

If ALL the subjects which I might have chosen for discussion this evening, the one which I most wanted is this one. Because I have had a little experience in newspaper work, I have tried to uphold the press whenever the opportunity presented itself; and talking on this subject of “Has the Press Helped Education?” I now have a wonderful opportunity to defend the press of America, and of the world.

Has the press helped education? is the question. There is only one answer—yes. The press has always been the greatest single force working toward the ultimate education of all.

Let us go back into history for a few minutes. It is not commonly known that even in the days of the Egyptians and the Babylonians, there
were newspapers. To be sure, they were not printed in ink and on paper as they now are, and they hardly resembled the great papers of today. But still, they were newspapers. Remnants of the news sheets of the time have been found in the tombs of Egyptian mummies, and it is common to find clay disk newspapers in old Babylonian ruins. Without the press as it existed in those days, we would not now have any authentic written information of the history of those peoples and those lands.

The Romans and the Greeks had their newspapers. They were, it is true, more pamphlets than news sheets, but still they were the newspapers of the time.

But up until 1544, when the patron saint of journalism, Gutenberg, invented movable type, the press as we know it today had not come into existence. But with the genius of the German inventor, almost overnight there sprang into existence the forerunner of the great publications of today. Gutenberg made it possible to print a vast number of copies. He made it possible to issue newspapers within the space of comparatively few hours, or perhaps, even minutes. To him belongs the glory for whatever is achieved by the press today.

Because of his invention, the old, painstaking methods of printing Bibles and books by hand, with hand-painted and illuminated letters, were done away with; and for the first time, books became cheap enough that the common people might afford them. Small newspapers were published, and the people were given their first great incentive to learn to read. They wanted to know first hand what the news was. And because of that desire, and because of the cheapness of the papers, they did learn. And the world took a long step forward.

During the period before the American revolution, and during the war of revolution itself, it was the press which assumed the offensive in the struggle against British control. It was the infant press of the colonies which goaded the American people to rebellion against the mother country. Many newspapers were suppressed by the royal authorities, but those that were left carried on their never tiring attack against England. Thomas Paine's "Common Sense" was nothing more nor less than a newspaper. True, editorials were in preponderance; but there was included news of new oppressions and new acts of tyranny on the part of the British. It was this paper which served perhaps more than anything else, to hold the weak and scattered colonies together in unified resistance to the rule of King George. So, ladies and gentlemen, you see that we have the press to thank, to some degree at least, for our present independence.

The agitation against slavery was likewise greatly aided by the influence and power of the abolition press. These members of newspaperdom, printing attacks daily as they did against the institution of slavery, going to the public day after day with their news and their arguments and their editorials, greatly aided in influencing sentiment against slavery. Garrison's newspaper establishment was burned and he was mobbed; but his fel-
The press provided the incentive for the Pony Express. Great newspapers, desiring to get the news from one end of the continent to the other, demanded more rapid means of communication. The press helped to build the great transcontinental railroads. Editorials were written, influencing public sentiment, which asked for those railroads. Always, the press has demanded better means of communication and transportation. And communication and transportation are the means of education. Education cannot be achieved without communication and transportation.

Today, the press of America presents to us each day—several times each day, if you so desire—a complete record of the happenings of the day, the history of the past, and the forecasts for the future. You are provided with news, with entertainment, with editorial opinion, and with illustrations. In short, for a price which ranges from a cent to five cents, you are given each day information which would have been worth dollars to the people of a hundred years ago. Each day there comes to you in the newspaper, more education than medieval peoples received in a lifetime.

Let us begin with the front page—not of the metropolitan newspaper, with which only a few of us in this audience are familiar, but of the country newspaper of your own city or town. On the front page we find the news of the community and of the world. Inside, there is editorial opinion on the happenings of the day. There is a society and local news column printed for the women. There is a sport page for the men—and for the younger generation of boys and girls, who enjoy the sports almost as much as do their fathers. There are cartoons, which give emphasis to the most important events of the time. All these bring education to you. They are constantly increasing your vocabulary. They are telling you “how the other half of the world lives.” They make you wonder about and study about conditions in Europe, Asia, Africa. They give you the truth about politics and about your government. They tell you what your governor and your representative and your senator are doing.

The press of today is the greatest single force working for education. It is constantly striving for better conditions, for better government, for better knowledge. It is your business to look over the papers you read, and observe their attitude. If they are not attempting to better conditions, if they are not following a constructive education policy, then they are not worth the time you spend reading them. Cut them out of your list—they are doomed anyway. The press of America and of the world realizes that to hold its place of influence, its prestige, it must be far superior to any other source of information. And because of this very realization, the press of today has become and will continue to be the greatest agency of
enlightenment of the people, the greatest factor of general education, if you please, that the world has ever known.

Read the newspapers, and enjoy them. For while you read, and while you enjoy, they bring you a fuller, a broader, a more complete education.

EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

WOMEN
WOMEN'S EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING
CONTEST

Twenty-two contestants, representing as many institutions, entered the women's extemporaneous speaking contest. One hour before the contest each speaker drew a topic dealing with some phase of a general topic which had been selected some weeks before. She spoke not less than eight nor more than ten minutes in developing her topic. At the end of her speech she was asked a question on her topic by one of the other contestants and had two minutes in which to answer it. There were four contests in the preliminaries, and two in the semi-finals preceding the final contest.

"The American Home" was the general topic for discussion in the women's contests.
THE AMERICAN HOME IN THE SMALL TOWN

VIOLET JOHNSON

Minneapolis Delta—Hamline University

Ladies and Gentlemen:

When we think of home, we realize that it is mighty hard to tell just what we mean by the term. To each of us home brings a different picture, but I believe that most of us think first of a house and a well-kept yard, and these characteristics are found only in the small town. I will admit that the house and yard are mere physical things. They may seem trivial but these tangible, materialistic factors present spiritual opportunities.

Let us consider the first distinctive feature of the home in the small town, the yard. In the country the yard is frequently neglected, in the city it is too often absent. In the small town a family has some place, even though it be only three feet wide, to enjoy watching things grow. There are wonderful opportunities in the
yard. The yard gives the husband something to do to keep him home in the evenings. It gives each member of the family an active interest in the home. The yard provides for the expression of what we might call the creative instinct. We do not mind being scratched by our own rosebushes. The lilacs which one member of the family has planted are going to present a feature of interest in the home to him as nothing else will. The yard presents another spiritual possibility in that it fosters companionship between the various members of the family. While father is mowing the lawn, someone can be watering the geraniums, someone else trimming the hedge, while perhaps from the porch steps comes the kind of aid we get from the back-seat driver. The whole family is together; their interests have one center.

Then the yard presents the chance for talking to neighbors over the back fence. One never can get acquainted with anybody as well in any other way, and I believe this neighborliness is part of the atmosphere of the American home, which has already been so admirably described this evening.

The small town house, too, though materialistic in itself, has great spiritual significance. It differs from the house in the city in that it is usually bigger by at least two rooms. It is not an apartment, it is a man’s castle, a home. It is different from the country house, too, which has not the facilities of the small town such as plumbing or lighting. In the homes in the small town there is usually far more comfort than in the rural home.

The house itself, materialistic, tangible property that it is, yields an intangible influence on the home. In the city home there is so little space that the various members of the family get on each other’s nerves. In the small town the house is large enough to have a room where one member of the family can go to cool off when he becomes irritable. In the small town house there is room for children; in the city apartment there is not. In the small town we still have the old fashioned spare bedroom for guests, and this is an important factor in the hospitality of the home. We have heard tonight that in the ideal American home every member of the family feels free to ask his friends to share its atmosphere. This cannot be done where there is lack of space. Some of us girls are enjoying the hospitality of private homes here in Tiffin. Were this convention being held in St. Paul all the delegates would find comfortable hotel accommodations, but few would have the privilege we enjoy of being taken into people’s homes, and not because St. Paul is less hospitable but because the majority of homes there would not be large enough.

Another thing we have in the small town which is lacking in the city is the neighborhood. You get to know people in the small town but you don’t in the city. The man in the flat across the hall may die and you won’t even know he has been sick until the moving van comes to take away his furniture. In the small town people know each other. You have an opportunity to investigate the homes of your children’s playmates and to find
whether or not those children are the kind with whom you want yours to associate. Husbands have a chance to become acquainted with their wives' friends, and wives with their husbands'. Mutual friends, like all mutual interests, give rise to increasing sympathy among the members of the family.

Still another important feature of the small town home is the mutual dependence that exists as yet in the home. Not so in the city. For example, if the hot water is cold or a fuse is burned out, the small town woman finds a husband very useful. The city woman calls the janitor. Then if the small town husband finds a button off, he expects his wife to sew it on, while the city man curses the laundry. You may say that a needle and thread is a pretty flimsy bond, and I will admit that it alone will not hold a family together, but every tie of every kind between members of the family strengthens the home spirit.

In the small town there is less opportunity for a woman to earn her living outside the home, and also less chance for a man to find a boarding place. This creates a feeling of mutual dependence in the family. Someone has said that it is a great thing to be able to feel that at least one institution depends upon you, and certainly nothing is more satisfying than to feel that you are important to someone else, that other people are interested in you and that somebody's welfare depends upon you. The mother in the small town can feel that she is of vital importance to her family, and the father knows he is indispensable because the house and yard could not be taken care of without him. This feeling makes for real home life. When people work together and each feels necessary to the rest, we have a united family. We have a chance to develop common interests because all the family are together in many activities, and they have a chance to know each other better by means of dishwater conversations than they ever would otherwise.

In the big city people move around, there are no old associations to become attached to. In the town home there is the house and yard with all the memories of a family being together, strong bonds of mutual interest, and the satisfaction of feeling that one is important to someone else. There is a spirit of real hospitality, the opportunity for family friends and mutual sympathy among the family. All people cannot live in the small town, of course, but those who do have a rare opportunity.

**Miss Stevens**: Do you believe that the advantages of living in a small town would counter-balance the educational and cultural advantages in the large city?

**Miss Johnson**: There are a number of cultural advantages in the city that are not in the small town. The small town has some, too. In the small town there is more of a tendency to individual attention in the schools. When children get older, there might be some advantage in the city, and yet even though the small town children may have to go away from home to get a higher education, the influence of their homes will exert a larger influence in their lives.
MODERN SCIENCE AND THE AMERICAN HOME

MILDRED HICKMAN

Iowa Delta—Morningide College, Sioux City
MODERN SCIENCE AND THE AMERICAN HOME

MILDRED HICKMAN
Iowa Delta—Morningside College, Sioux City

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is 6:30 in the morning. The alarm clock says so. The American home has already come under the influence of modern science—the alarm clock. Father presses a button and the electric light comes on—another use of science in the home. Mother gets breakfast; she uses her scientific knowledge in giving the proper ration to the family and the proper number of calories. The preparation of breakfast itself is a chemical process. Later in the morning, when most of the family has gone little Johnny refuses to wash his face. In the first place, it feels better when it is dirty. In the second place, he doesn't want to wash it. Mother doesn't spank him. Oh, no, that is passe. She persuades him by reasoning that his face doesn't feel better when it is dirty. He finally decides to wash it.

LOIS HICKMAN
Iowa Delta, Morningside
During the morning she uses the vacuum cleaner, a scientific agency for cleaning. At noon she uses chemistry in preparing lunch for her loved ones. In the afternoon sister Mary comes home with a headache; first aid is applied. At night the family listens to the radio, another scientific invention. By the way, I think that the radio is one of the integrating forces of the home. All members of the family have a common interest in it—it is integrating the family. When it is time for Johnny to go to bed he doesn't want to go in the dark. There are hobgoblins there. Mother and Dad explain that there are no hobgoblins, thus doing away with childish fears which might, according to psycho-analysts, cause abnormalities in future life.

This is just part of the many uses that modern science plays in the modern home. It would take a long time to enumerate every instance. Using psychology for instance, mother knows how to decide whether daughter's acts arise from obstinacy or not. Chemistry helps her to give her family better meals. As far as physics goes, the most outstanding use in the home is thru electricity, and there are many electrical appliances in the modern home.

It seems to me, however, that too many American homes seem to be built on the idea that home can be built on scientific methods alone. So much stress has been placed on modern science that we often feel that that is the most important part. I believe there has been too much emphasis on this. While these are necessary—they add a great deal of organization to a home—yet there must be spiritual understanding, friendship, and cooperation. There must be more than scientific knowledge; there must be that intangible something that ties the members of the family together, and makes them realize the great importance of the home. It can never be gained by mere modern science, important as that modern science may be.

Long years ago King Solomon built a temple in which there was a magnificent arch. Only beautiful stones were placed in it and the builders measured each stone to be sure it was perfectly square. As they were building one worker came across a stone that did not measure up with his square. It was somewhat rounding at the top. The builder threw it away. It would not fit. They continued to build until they came to the middle of the arch. The stone that went there would either make or break the durability of the arch. The stones which they had measured so carefully would not fit. One man remembered the stone that had been so carelessly tossed aside. Picking it up he found that this was indeed the keystone. It was the one which made the arch strong, enduring, and lasting. Let us consider the American home as this arch. Modern science helps build that home, but spiritual understanding is the keystone of the home. Some have believed that this spiritual understanding does not measure up with modern science, and have carelessly tossed it aside. But we can never make the home lasting and enduring by using only the stones of science. Modern science helps build the home but we must have the
keystone of spiritual understanding and friendship to really make the home.

Miss Johnson: Do you consider that any woman has the right to take unto herself the responsibility of a home and a husband if she is not scientifically trained?

Miss Hickman: She has the right to take the responsibilities of a home if she is not scientifically trained. But she should become so as rapidly as possible. I believe that if a woman had understanding and could get it across to her family, her home would be all right. I believe she would be much wiser after she knew something about science. Some scientific knowledge and training would enable her to make her home much better. Such knowledge is easy to get in this day and age.
Ladies and Gentlemen:

Very one of you has sometime or other in your life had a wonderful ideal, a mother. What is a home without a mother? Can you imagine your home without your mother? From the beginning of time in a mother has played a very vital part in the history of the home. Two centuries ago, on American soil, we find our first American home and in it the historic pioneer mother. We discover a staunch and sturdy woman working with a staunch and sturdy man. It is their mutual interest in life not only to rear a family but to teach its members the problems that they are some day bound to meet. That bond held the husband and wife together and these marriages of our pioneer mothers and fathers were both satisfactory and permanent. The mother had
a vital part to play in that pioneer home. She explained the little Bible stories, taught the children how to read and write, taught them arithmetic and spelling. This was the pioneer mother, the foundation of the pioneer home. In those days it was said that the mother's hand was the one that rocked the cradle, but it was found some time later that the hand that rocked the cradle could now rock the whole world.

From this age of most primitive life we made the tremendous step in two centuries into an age of intense industrialism. The father of the American home was sent to the factory. The greatest and most tragic problem brought by this age of industrialism was that the father in industry left sitting by the fireside the mother with idle hands. What was the cause of the idle hands during this period? Labor saving devices in the home. The wife had plenty of leisure time on her hands. It fostered the feeling of irresponsibility and the natural result was that the wife went into the professional and business world; she even followed her husband into industry. Woman has realized her new self.

What is the result of this age? The long school period has meant postponement of marriage; sometimes no marriage at all; often childless marriages and divorce. These, we know, are characteristics of this modern age of ours. We lay these faults at the feet of the modern American mother. Does she deserve this blame? We do not wish to condemn the American mother of today so much as we wish to say that our modern mother has far greater opportunities for developing an influential home than her pioneer ancestor. She has a chance to develop a dynamic home, to show children all the rudiments of life, to show them the pathway that is not perhaps the easiest, but the one which will lead them to a more comprehensive life. She must realize that even though she cannot spend all of her time in the home with the children that her influence must stay there.

She must work shoulder to shoulder with the father of this family; she must keep in the minds of the younger generation a fine ideal of marriage, of home relationship; she must make them realize an ideal in herself, that she is the greatest mother in the world—a personality. This is her greatest problem today. She must think, act, live, and then perhaps she can say with Eddie Guest, "After all, it takes a heap of living in a house to make a home." Just being a mother is the most wonderful business in the world—a real mother in this modern age of ours.

Miss Buswell: Do you not feel that the modern mother will be more successful than the pioneer mother when the novelty of the advantages has worn off?

Miss Dendel: I believe that the mother of today will have a far greater chance to meet the wider situations than the pioneer mother had. We are the products of a broader conception of life. Our pioneer fathers were products of the soil. The ideal of the modern American wife is broader.
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