

THE ELON COLLEGE WEEKLY

Vol. IV. New Series.

Greensboro, N. C., Friday, April 4, 1913.
and Elon College, N. C.

No. 7

FRESHMAN—SOPHOMORE DEBATE. Lower Classmen Handle Live Subject Well.

On Monday evening at eight P. M. representatives of the Freshman and Sophomore classes met in the college chapel for debate, on the query: Resolved, that there is Need of a New Party. Mr. W. C. Morgan presided and did well although during his address of welcome the lights were cut off for a few moments, Mr. Morgan continued speaking like an old campaigner amid a downpouring of rain. His remarks were brief, fitting and to the point. Mr. J. C. Joyner acted as secretary which position he filled with proper demeanor.

The argument was well chosen and excellently presented by both sides, and the debate while going to the negative was decidedly close as the vote showed and as the audience thought tho' all seemed satisfied with the result. This was a decided improvement over that between the other two classes and it is to be hoped this mark will never be lowered by any set of debaters.

From an oratorical standpoint probably Mr. Lov made the best appearance while his colleague showed considerable ease and grace as a speaker. Mr. Purcell had more argument, doubtless than either of the others and received excellent support from Mr. Poythress who, despite the strenuous day acquitted himself well. The debate as a whole was clean, interesting, of a high order and thoroughly enjoyed by all.

The argument was somewhat as follows:

QUERY: Resolved, That there is need of the new party.

First speech on the affirmative:

Whereas, in the course of events, it behooves us as a progressive people to change as time demands. From the history of our political parties we find that as time has marched on they have changed to meet the growing demands of a growing people. And now the affirmative is firm of the fact that a change is needful and that it will prove beneficial to this great nation of ours. The platform of the new party is without doubt founded on solid principles. It is the platform our people have been needing and it is seen that they have been longing for it. Then shall we not as a progressive people uphold and sustain the third party?

W. D. Loy.

Mr. Purcell, first for the negative, contended, first that all the best forms of governments are based upon and operated by two adverse and contending forces; secondly, that in the government of the United States of America two such opposing and contending forces are represented, and have been represented throughout our national history by two opposing and contending political parties.

The first speaker establishes the first of these contentions by showing that it is true in all the laws of nature, and also in the government of men. The planets are

an example of this universal law of government by two opposing powers.

Then in the government of man. Nowhere in the history of our parties or in the history of our country has a new party come with new principles, and took the reigns of our government, or accomplished any result of consequence unless it simply superseded one of the two existing parties.

There are only two fundamental principles in our government on which a party can be based: the one to let the people rule, the other to have a strong central government.

Whenever a seeming new party has come, and accomplished anything, as the Republican party in 1861, it is nothing but the old party under a new name. Thus it is with the Progressive party. They are trying to stretch the Bull Moose hide over the Elephant and trot him in and make the people think it is a new party, when in reality it is the old Republican party under a new name.

In the best regulated monarchial and republican governments we have only two parties. For example, take England, France, Germany, and also the Dominion of Canada.

Why then should the United States, who claims to have the best representative government in the world, need more than two opposing parties?

The argument of Mr. Brown, last for the affirmative, outlined his argument briefly as follows, arguing:

1. That we need and want legislation for the aid of the many instead of legislation for the aid of the rich few.

2. Furthermore, a restriction of the privileges heretofore allowed to the few in the way of combinations and monopolies.

3. The control of governorship, state legislatures, congress and the presidency. He argued that the government is controlled by money and party machine bosses and not by the masses, also opposed the concentration of power in a central government; that the people are capable of governing themselves; that men need more latitude of choice than between those two conservative categories of collective opinion; that the power of the government should not go without division to either of those parties, and concluded with a masterly appeal for justice for all in the interest of all.

Mr. O. D. Poythress, the last speaker on the negative, spoke in part as follows:

On the foundation of the argument my colleague has produced I shall endeavor to prove to you: first, that we have two parties; second, that they are opposing parties; and third, that by being opposing parties, they make a stable equilibrium in our government. I shall argue that our country has had alone two opposing ideas, and these two opposing ideas are the respective centers about which each political party revolves.

He first discussed the fundamental nature of these two great ideas, showing that

one idea is represented by the Republican party and the other idea is represented by the Democratic party. The idea of conservatism or centralized government is the fundamental principle of the Republican party, and the idea of radicalism, or a government by the people, is the fundamental principle of the Democratic party.

"Now to prove that these two parties are opposing parties go with me back to the very beginning of the history of the parties, and we shall find that there were revealed two opposing ideas in drafting the Constitution. One of these is the opposition between a unified or centralized and a federalized government. The former is the watchword of the Republican party, the latter the watchword of the Democratic party.

The other opposition, though it goes deeper and is more pervasive, is the opposition between the tendency which makes some men prize the freedom of the individual as the first of social goods, and that which disposes others to insist on checking and regulating the impulses. The former is advocated by the Democratic party, the latter by the Republican party.

By being opposing parties they make a stable equilibrium in our government; because they hold a check and balance on each other. Examples: our government is founded on checks and balances. This was the eighteenth century ideal of good government. And these two opposing forces went hand in hand in working out this great idea. There was no third force there; doubtless if there had been, that great piece of human art, namely, the Constitution, would never have been completed. In a bank we have two sets of officers, the board of directors and the cashier. If each keeps a watch upon the other, the bank is successful and prospers. Just so it is with our two great parties. The party in power is, as it were, the cashier in the bank. As the responsibilities are upon the cashier, so the responsibilities of the government rest upon the party in power, etc. As no bank needs more than one set of directors to hold the cashier in check, so there is no need of two parties to hold the party in power in check. If each party keeps a watch upon the other, each balancing the other's authority in power, our government prospers and is successful. No third party can materially assist in this work, and therefore no third party has ever been needed or can ever be needed.

One fact in proof of this we see the Progressive party (so-called) is really advocating principles already advocated. They got their platform from the Democratic platform and the Republican platform, showed this to be true by comparing the platforms of all three parties, which was condensed in parallel form by a Progressive. (Holds up pamphlet before the judges). From this pamphlet we see that the shrewd Progressive party simply trimmed a few principles from the Democratic platform, then over to the Republican platform for a few principles, back again to

the Democratic platform for another coveted principle, continuing this process until they had succeeded in compiling with shears and paste something which they termed a "Progressive" platform. Ah it was a shrewd trick.

Hon. Judges, these are plain facts, taken from the pen of a Progressive. There is not a principle advocated by the Progressive party which cannot be found either in word or in implication in the platform of one of the other two parties. On this point alone, had we made no other arguments, we could with confidence rest that there are but two parties needed.

Marshals for the occasion were:

Sophomore: J. L. Farmer, Chief, Miss Pattie Preston, Miss Beatrice Mason.

Freshman: W. T. Searloro, Chief, Miss Madge Moffitt, Miss Gertrude Mason.

The decision committee consisted of Hon. E. S. W. Dameron of Burlington, Rev. P. H. Fleming, D. D., of High Point, and Prof. S. B. Lindsey, Superintendent of Schools of Graham, N. C. Vote: One, affirmative and two, negative.

WITH THE CLIOS FRIDAY EVENING.

Owing to the fact that there have been so many entertainments held in the Auditorium recently, and also many basket ball games played, it has been impossible for us to have a meeting for quite awhile. However the meeting of last Friday evening was very good. Although it was not up to the standard.

The items most worthy of mention were the life of Edgar Allen Poe, and the debate. Mr. V. P. Heatwole gave a very interesting sketch of Poe's life, which we hope will be remembered by all.

The debate for the evening was interesting. The question resolved itself thus: "That educational restrictions should be placed on the right to vote." There was very good argument produced on both, the affirmative and negative sides; but there was no going around the argument produced on the affirmative. Hence it was the winning side.

Best speaker on the affirmative was C. W. Rountree. The best on the negative was C. B. Riddle; oratorically. W. J. Cotten, Dendron, Virginia.

Cor. Sect.

Favorite Fiction.—"Old Chap, You Haven't Changed a Bit in Thirty Years!"

"Dear Maria: I Eagerly Seize the First Opportunity to Write to You."

"Universally Pronounced by Press and Public to Be the Greatest of Modern Times."

"Mr. Chairman, I Rise with the Greatest Reluctance, but—"

"I Don't Know Whether You Owe Us Anything or Not, Mr. Smith, but I See."

"George, I Wouldn't Say a Word to Hurt Your Feelings for the World."

"I Admire Your Nerve!"—Chicago Tribune.