



PRINCETON WON DEBATE.

Yale Excelled in Soundness of Argument—Princeton's Better Form.

The seventh Yale-Princeton debate took place in Alexander Hall at Princeton, Tuesday evening, May 8. The result was a victory for Princeton, the judges reaching their conclusion without long deliberation.

In spite of their failure to win the decision, the Yale debaters deserve great credit for the work they did. Princeton won because her tactics were better adapted to make that general impression which must figure in the decision of all debating contests. In form the two teams were well balanced, Princeton perhaps having a slight superiority. As for matter, in those points which Yale has always and will continue to consider of the most importance, that is in soundness of argument, definiteness and consistency in maintaining her position, and ability to answer the arguments of her opponents, Yale was to a marked degree superior. Princeton, with the weaker side of the question, adopted tactics somewhat new in intercollegiate debating. Instead of maintaining a definite line of attack, she shifted rapidly from one position to another, evaded instead of meeting arguments, and endeavored to obscure the real issue and to leave the impression that there was something wrong with the affirmative case, if not in one point, then in another. Considering the inherent weakness of the negative side, this was an effective course. Yale was able to meet all her opponent's arguments, but failed to meet, to the satisfaction of the judges, the evasions and assertions of Princeton. A brief review of the course of the debate will make clear the contrast in the two methods.

The question was: "Resolved, That the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty should be ratified in the form in which it was originally submitted to the Senate (it being understood that any change in the terms of the treaty or any action by the Senate affecting the treaty is not germane to the question at issue)."

YALE'S POSITION.

On the affirmative, Yale's first speaker was Charles W. Merriam, 1901 T.S. In the most finished speech of the evening, both in form and matter, he traced the history of the canal project and outlined Yale's position. His positive argument was, that, under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty with England, it is impossible for the United States to build a canal and that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty removed these obstacles. But the new treaty also provided for the neutralization of the canal. This he advocated because it was the best way to secure to the United States, in time of war, the strategic and commercial advantages of a canal, while to fortify it would not only be useless, but would make it a point of strategic weakness. Neutralization, he said, was in harmony with the demands of other nations, our historic policy, and our present position as a peace power. He then pointed out that the canal was an international affair and must not be considered from an exclusively national standpoint.

PRINCETON'S ANSWER.

In the opening speech for Princeton, Joseph H. Hill, 1900, began at once the negative tactics. Mr. Merriam, in argu-

ing the desire of other nations for neutralization, had instanced the treaties of other nations made with Nicaragua for the neutralization of any canal through that State, and said that if we chose that route these treaties would have to be dealt with, and if we chose any other we should encounter the same demands on the part of other nations. Mr. Hill at the start took issue with Yale on a point of fact. Yale, he said, had represented these treaties as an insurpassable barrier to a canal, whereas, by their terms, they could be revoked by Nicaragua on twelve months' notice. Thus he gave the impression that Yale had made a mistake: whereas the point he brought out was in no degree inconsistent with or an answer to the argument of the affirmative. Yale, perhaps, made a mistake in trusting to the audience to see this evasion for themselves. Mr. Hill went on to state the negative's position to be, that the treaty under debate was not the most satisfactory solution possible of the canal problem. In the first place, because Congress would never build a canal under its provisions, inasmuch as we were not given the right to defend the canal in time of war. This was the bulk of his argument and he went at some length into the expressions of national sentiment which would lead to this conclusion.

THE MEANING OF WORDS.

Franklin A. Lord, 1900 L.S., Yale's second speaker, met the preceding speaker's argument by pointing out that Congress had already passed a bill for canal construction, which had been amended so as to be in accord with the Hay-Pauncefote provisions for neutralization. Princeton, later, argued that this was not true, inasmuch as the Hepburn bill allowed the Secretary of War to protect the canal as he saw fit and that the word protect had been put in instead of defend, or fortify, as more diplomatic. To this, Yale answered that Congress did not consider in its action the effect of words on foreign nations and that the provision for protection was not contrary to the treaty, which allowed us to police the canal; that this provision was substituted for the original provision in the bill for fortification so as to make it possible for the canal to be neutralized. Princeton's only response to this was that two-thirds of the men who voted against the Hepburn bill were in favor of neutralization. Then, as if this proved it, she went on to the end calmly reasserting that Congress would never do the thing which Yale had shown the House had already done.

YALE'S ARGUMENTS.

After meeting the only attack Princeton had as yet made on the treaty, Mr. Lord went on to show that an enemy would not dare to use the canal in time of war, so there was no danger in having it neutralized. To fortify it would then be a useless expense. On the other hand, the one thing needed was to make sure that the canal should always be open to our ships and commerce in time of war. There are only two ways of defending it—fortification and neutralization. Fortifications could not prevent an enemy from blocking it. Neutralization was the only way to keep it open. The only method of securing the canal from attack was embodied in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Robert S. Steen, 1901, for the negative, dodged this argument by saying that Princeton was not arguing for fortification. Then, assuming the affirmative's arguments for neutrality,

[Continued on page 326.]

HARVARD WON GAMES.

The Result Not Unexpected at the Last, but the Margin a Surprise.

Harvard defeated Yale on the track at Soldier's Field, Cambridge, last Saturday afternoon, in the first contest for the new cup offered by graduates of the two Universities. Out of the thirteen events, Harvard secured 7 first places, 8½ second places, and 10½ thirds; Yale, 6 firsts, 4½ seconds and 10½ thirds. Harvard's total score on the basis of 5 points for first, 2 for second and 1 for third was 62½; Yale's 41½.

Yale's defeat was not a surprise to those who were thoroughly familiar with the two teams, as they entered the meet, but it was not expected that Harvard would win by so large a margin. A conservative estimate two weeks ago pointed to a Yale victory, but the failure of a number of veterans—Fincke, Blount, Dupee, Gleason, Luce, Thomas and Brennan—who had been held back by sickness, sprains and conditions, to round into form at the expected time, lessened the chances materially, and the final calculations showed that Yale's athletes would have to secure almost all the doubtful points to win the meet.

First places in the two most uncertain events were divided, Richards of Yale winning the hundred yards dash, and Boal of Harvard the hammer-throw. Smith's defeat in the half-mile run was the greatest surprise of the day, though not discreditable, as he had been forced hard in the mile earlier in the afternoon. This, combined with the disappointing work of Yale's second strings, clinched Harvard's victory.

The day would have been an ideal one for a track meet had it not been for the wind blowing down the stretch, but this objection was obviated by reversing the direction of the course for the sprints and hurdles. The program afforded an afternoon of excellent sport, as all the races were closely contested and a number of creditable marks recorded.

HUNDRED AND TWENTY YARDS HURDLE.

The trial heats in the 120-yards hurdles, the first event contested, brought Yale a disappointment. Fincke, Yale, and Hallowell and Abercrombie, Harvard, went to the mark in the first heat. The first two ran evenly, until the seventh flight was reached, when Fincke tripped and losing his stride completely, staggered through the next hurdle. Hallowell, running easily, finished in 16½ seconds and Abercrombie took advantage of Fincke's mishap and, making up the two or three yards which had separated him from the leading pair, came home an easy second. Fincke had been on the track but a week, owing to conditions, and Hallowell had been conceded the event, though the Yale man had been counted on for second or third. Thomas, the Yale Freshman, finished a close second to Willis, Harvard, in the second heat, with several yards to spare over Webb, Harvard, and qualified for the event. Hallowell ran beautifully in the finals, finishing in 15½ seconds, which equals the Dual record. Thomas and Willis fought hard for second place, Thomas having a slight advantage at the tape, but Willis was disqualified for running around a hurdle, and Abercrombie was placed third.

HUNDRED YARDS DASH.

Richards and Gleason, Yale, and Haigh, Harris and Sprague, Harvard, went to the mark in the first heat of the 100-yards dash. Harvard worked a clever trick in this event, as the last two men took but a few strides each and while Richards and Gleason were striving to come in within the qualifying three, Haigh loafed over the distance, assured of his position. Richards ran in 10½, a yard and a half ahead of Gleason. The other preliminary heats brought out a pretty race between Butler of Harvard and Blount of Yale, which was won by the former, in the same time that Richards had made. A battle royal was in store when the qualified men came out for the finals. Haigh and Butler were away first, but at 70 yards Richards caught Haigh, who was leading and Blount was close after Butler. Richards and Haigh were absolutely together as they approached the finish, but the Yale man, with a magnificent effort, threw himself at the line and won by a fraction of an inch. He caught his foot in one of the lines used to mark the lane, after finishing and fell heavily, but escaped with a badly skinned arm. Butler, less than a foot behind the winner, secured third place by a narrow margin over Blount. Richards' time was a fast 10½ seconds, equalling the Yale-Harvard record. He has been on the track team for the past two years, but not until about two weeks ago did he give evidence of the sprinting powers which won the race. Blount has been nursing a lame leg all Spring, and the necessary irregularity of his training has prevented him from attaining his old form.

MILE RUN.

Williams of Harvard led his college mates, Knowles, Clark and Swan in a vain effort to run the Yale competitors, Smith, Speer and Weston, off their feet during the first two laps of the mile. The Yale men, however, remained in a bunch some fifteen yards to the rear, until the fourth lap, when Speer caught up with the last Harvard runner. He only held his place for a short time, for Smith and Weston passed him on the back stretch and then raced in turn each of the exhausted Harvard men. Some 150 yards from home, Smith sprinted by Knowles, who, ran second until the middle of the stretch, when Weston headed him and finished in second place, Smith winning in 4 minutes 36½ seconds. Smith was to have been saved for the half this year, but it was doubtless a wise move to start him in the mile, as it is questionable whether Weston, who is a Freshman, could have beaten out Knowles without a veteran to guide him in this paced race.

QUARTER-MILE RUN.

The quarter-mile run, the next event, proved to be one of the most exciting races of the day. Clerk, Harvard, closely followed by Dean, also Harvard, started off at a terrific pace and at the end of the first turn had left Boardman, Yale, who led the other starters, some yards to the rear. Clerk maintained his speed down the back stretch and at half distance, where Boardman passed Dean, had some eight yards on the Yale runner. Boardman, who had been saving himself, evidently began to fear Clerk at this point and started in pursuit of him, cutting down the lead to about four yards as they reached the turn. This interval had been reduced by half as the men swung into the stretch, and Boardman passed Clerk after covering