

# THE TAR HEEL.

Vol. 12,

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, N. C., THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1904.

No. 25.

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

## CAROLINA WINS DEBATE.

### North Carolina, After an Interesting and Spirited Intellectual Struggle, Defeats the University of Georgia.

On Friday night Gerrard Hall was filled to its capacity with anxious Tar Heels, eager to know the outcome of a contest that was to decide the debating supremacy between two of the South's greatest universities. Both Georgia and Carolina had had wonderful success in defeating other Southern colleges, but so far had divided honors. This seventh annual debate was to break the tie. Both sides were ably represented, Carolina by Messrs. I. C. Wright and A. H. Johnston, and Georgia by Messrs. A. G. Golucke and W. W. Patterson. The query for debate was: Resolved, That labor unions are inimical to our industrial development. Carolina had the affirmative. The debate was presided over by Judge James C. MacRae, with Mr. J. W. Winborne acting as secretary. The judges were Rev. W. T. D. Moss, of Chapel Hill; Mr. Joseph G. Brown, of Raleigh; and Mr. J. Van Lindley, of Greensboro. After the debate a reception was given the speakers, officers and judges by Dr. Venable.

The victory of Carolina may be attributed to the superior development of her speakers' argument. The two speeches fitted together perfectly and formed one systematic, organic whole. From the time Wright began his exposition of the law of relativity, which he laid down as the law of progress, to the time when Johnston finished showing the effects of unionism on our industries, the argument for the affirmative showed but one idea: that labor unions were not conforming to the universal law that develops industries. The speeches of the Georgians showed careful study and a wide knowledge of the subjects. They advanced many strong points, and in a graceful way. The speakers were such as any university might be proud of. Their only faults were a rather too frequent use of statistics and a want of an organic argument.

It is impossible for us to give the speeches in full, so we can print but an outline of the argument.

Mr. Wright, first speaker for Carolina on the affirmative spoke in substance as follows:

This age is the reign of law. Every action and reaction in the animate or inanimate world is the result of some absolute law. Modern knowledge has laid down laws for everything, and among others it has established relativity as the universal law of progress; that every individual is a part of a greater unit, and for progress must work not selfishly but for the good of that unit. This unselfishness, this respect for one's fellowmen's rights is the source of all morality, the basis of all civilization and govern-

ment. For a government is but the outward manifestation of this inner unity which binds the citizens of a nation together. And for progress every part of government must work for the common good. And it is this law of progress that has brought us as a nation to what we are. It is the spirit of all our internal improvements. The individual must work for the common good; and where he refuses, the judiciary forces him to recognize the rights of others. At this point he gave illustrations to establish his argument, the law of eminent domain and others.

Continuing, Mr. Wright said that our government has carried this law into our business life as well. This is shown by our charter regulations, that force every corporation to recognize the rights of others, and to work in harmony with this law of progress. And when they disregard this law the government takes their charter away—says they can not even exist. But the labor unions will not recognize the rights of others, nor will they be made responsible by a charter. They even have before Congress an Anti-Injunction bill, trying to remove the last restraint we have upon them. And warmly concluding this part, Mr. Wright said: "They defy this law of industrial progress."

Turning to a slightly different phase of the question, he continued. Our industries are a matter of business, and all business is production. But production is dependent upon consumption, and so, for progress the agents of production must recognize the rights of each other, and also of their consuming public. Industrial development is the great unit, and if we are to have progress every part must put aside selfishness and work for the good of that unit. True it is the laborer's duty to develop themselves, but it is more so their duty to respect the rights of others. And if the unions do not do this, and here he referred to his colleague, saying that he would show that they didn't, then according to this universal law of progress they are inimical to our industrial development.

Mr. Golucke, for Georgia, spoke first for the negative. He began by giving a practical illustration of what Industrial Development was. He analyzed it into two factors: Capital and Labor, and subdivided capital into the employer, machinery used in production and the processes used in production.

He said to develop an industry either the factor capital, as he analyzed it, or the factor labor, should be increased in efficiency.

He next showed that labor unions had appeared in only three of the great branches of our industry—manufacturing, mining and transportation. He said that this explained the reason why about 18 per cent of the entire class of laborers are members of unions; as a matter

of fact in those trades that are unionized between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of the laborers employed are members of unions.

He said that as a rule employers in those trades in which unions have appeared, are kindly disposed toward their work people; but competition with their brother employers progressively demanded that they lower their cost of production. This they might do by increasing the efficiency of the machinery used, or by securing a more efficient process of production, or by exacting more work from the laborers for less pay.

The supply of labor is greater than the demand. This forces the laborer into a dependent position and he is forced to accept whatever terms or conditions that the employer may offer. He then stated the negative's interpretation of the question as follows: "In these three great branches there can be no perfectly healthy condition for the development of our industries, because of the employer's necessity to lower the cost of production and the laborers' necessity to accept whatever terms the employer offers. Now if labor unions result permanently in less healthy conditions than would exist if there were no unions, then they are inimical and should be condemned. On the other hand, if labor unions result permanently in more healthy conditions for the increasing of our industrial efficiency than would exist if there were no unions, then unions are not inimical, but are a positive benefit and should be approved.

He quoted Prof. Ely, of the University of Wisconsin, the report of the Industrial Commission, Chairman Interstate Commerce Commission, and writers in magazines, all at great length, showing the unhealthy condition before labor organized.

He concluded his speech by showing the effect of these conditions on our industrial development.

Mr. Johnston, second speaker for Carolina for the affirmative, first surveyed the ground covered by Mr. Wright and then proceeded to show that the labor unions of today do not act in accordance with this universal law of all progress. On the contrary "they manifest a spirit of caste; they disregard the rights of all agents of production and make unionism paramount to industry." He then showed what the rights are upon which industry depends, and showed that the unions disregard all of them. "Society for the sake of industry has granted to the employers and laborers certain fundamental rights upon which industry depends. Society declares that every employer has a right to hire whom he pleases when they seek employment; that he has a right to buy his material where he pleases. And above all that he has a right to possess his property and to use it in any legitimate way."

To the laborer society grants the

right of personal security, which includes the right to work undisturbed. It grants him the right to work, where employed, subject only to the rules which the welfare of society may require.

The speaker then showed by the acts of the union, by statistics and by the Industrial Commission that all these rights are disregarded by the unions. He reached the logical conclusion that unions from their very nature set themselves in opposition to the welfare of industry.

He then noticed union effects on certain industries. He showed that our ship building industry and the steel industry have both suffered severely by unions and drew a practical lesson from the coal strike. "It may have benefited the laborer, but to pay for his advance we lost the supply of coal to English coaling stations throughout the Atlantic, \$125,000,000 was wrung from an innocent and suffering public, want and hunger threatened every home and destruction stared every industry in the face." And yet the unions are not satisfied.

He then made a hasty but graphic summary of the off-argument, and concluded by saying: "In the face of such effects the labor union cannot be listed among the friends of industrial development."

Mr. Patterson, for Georgia, second speaker on the negative, dealt with the permanent effect of labor unions upon our producing factors—Capital and Labor. Unions have increased the efficiency of those factors. Unions have increased the efficiency of capital by bringing about first, the natural selection of the most efficient employers; second, the use of new machinery and new processes of manufacture; third, a strong industrial organization; fourth, the natural selection of the most efficient laborers. Unions have increased the efficiency of labor by bettering the condition of laborers generally. This raising of the standard life of the laboring classes rests upon the industrial development in increasing their efficiency and wants. This results in increased efficiency and production on the part of capital. Unions have better laborers economically. Unions have raised wages. This is especially seen in the bituminous coal mining industry, and in the clothing trades increased wages have brought increased output, but have not brought higher priced articles. Unions have better laborers physically. They have shortened the work day and have thereby lengthened trade life. The eight hour law, brought about by unions, has increased efficiency and output. This is especially seen in the coal mines. Unions have done away with the sweat shop system, and have brought safe and sanitary conditions of employment.

Unions have better laborers so-

(Continued on 8d page.)