

The Christian Sun.

BY ATKINSON & LAWRENCE.

IN ESSENTIALS, UNITY; IN NON-ESSENTIALS, LIBERTY; IN ALL THINGS, CHARITY.

\$1.50 THE YEAR

ESTABLISHED 1892

ELON COLLEGE, N. C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1902.

VOLUME LV : NUMBER 13

The Christian Sun

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

The Official Organ of the Southern Christian Convention.

CARDINAL PRINCIPLES.

1. The Lord Jesus is the only Head of the church.
2. The name Christian, to the exclusion of all party and sectarian names.
3. The Holy Bible, or the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, sufficient rule of faith and practice.
4. Christian character, or vital piety, the only test of fellowship or membership.
5. The right of private judgment, and the liberty of conscience, the privilege and duty of all.

CURRENT COMMENT.

The Annual Debate.

The annual debate at Elon College between the two male societies has come to have meaning and significance second only to the annual commencements in June. Many, in fact, enjoy the debate better than commencement. Certain it is that the interest in the events and issues of the debate is more intense and the speaking is certainly of a higher order both from an argumentative and oratorical point of view. The debate last Friday night—March 28,—was excellent and the interest was intense and was sustained throughout. The query was certainly a live one and in itself carries interest. Resolved that labor organizations are more beneficial than injurious.

Space here forbids even an adequate outline of the excellent speeches delivered by the speakers, R. C. Cox and W. T. Walters of the Philologist Society for the affirmative and H. E. Rountree and A. R. Eley for the negative, yet because the subject is practical and of public concern, at least a few points from each may be given.

R. C. Cox, first speaker for the affirmative, maintained that labor organizations have raised the laborer from a position of serfdom up through persecution and discouragements to the plane where he was able to demand his rights and to secure favorable legislation. They have kept thousands of families from applying for public assistance and retained thousands of dollars in public treasuries. They protect the trades from the evils of low prices and botch work, encourage a higher standard of skill, and place millions of dollars annually in the pockets of laborers. Strikes have been most numerous and most disastrous where there has been the least organization of labor. Only 40% of all strikes fail. A strike compels more study in economic wrongs than all the books and essays that have ever been written. Labor organizations foster education, uproot ignorance, shorten hours, lengthen life, raise wages, lower usury, create rights, abolish wrongs, cheer the homes and make the world better.

H. E. Rountree for the negative held that these associations have failed in their purpose, because, they have lost sight of the essentials for protection, the standard of their living. Instead of fostering and cultivating a solid relationship between labor and capital, they have allowed a spirit of antagonism to intervene.

This spirit of antagonism has become a menace to industry, dangerous to society and constitutes power that knows no limit to its demands. Strikes are regarded as inevitable and essential and are always used as their only weapon. The numberless strikes, have brought about a sacrifice of untold and inestimable wealth. They have set up an aristocracy by taking away the rights and privileges of men and by limiting trade. They lead to socialism. Only 6% of the world's laboring class are labor union men, and statistics show that this small percent has done very little in bringing about industrial reforms. They copy the vices they profess to condemn. When they become united and powerful, they tyrannize their employers of the worst sort of oppression. By their unscrupulous limitations and acts of violence they infringe upon and eliminate the rights of their fellow-man.

W. T. Walters for the affirmative held that if organizations are beneficial to the laboring classes alone, they are more beneficial than injurious. They increase morality by their restrictive laws. They shorten the hours of a day's work, thereby giving employment to more laborers, producing better work, and giving the laborers more time for recreation and intellectual advancement. They use their influence in passing laws that help the laborer. They raise wages, protect and advance the interests of child-hood and elevate woman-hood. They distribute prosperity, protect health, feed the poor, secure the privilege of franchise, restrict immigration, increase the wealth of manufacturers, and increase the laborer's wants by elevating him to a higher plane of living, thus increasing the demand for manufactured products.

A. R. Eley's plea for the negative was that we are to prove that labor organizations are more injurious than beneficial; in that they violate and obstruct the pure laws of economics; that of demand and supply; that they are injurious to the capitalists: injurious to non-union men, injurious to governments and the public good: that not labor organizations, but perfect competition is the ideal condition of the working man. Secret oath bound labor organizations will overthrow civil liberty. If they ever did more good than evil it was the despotic lands of the old world: and concluding that all combinations of laborers to fix wages have failed in the end and are more injurious than beneficial.

The Judges of the debate were President McIver of the State Normal and Industrial College, Dr. Eben Alexander, chair of Greek, and Dr. Raper, chair of Economics and History, both of University of N. C. After deliberation these judges decided in favor of the affirmative.

After the decision was rendered the judges were called on for speeches, and each responded in fitting and felicitous remarks.

G. F. Whitley was President of the Debate and made an address of welcome, L. F. Johnson was secretary. The occasion was indeed a pleasant one and the large audience present seemed to enjoy it thoroughly. We believe that the debates at Elon will compare favorably with any held at any college in the State. There

were many visitors from a distance present. It was a pleasant and profitable occasion and one long to be remembered by all present.

Even the Rich and the Cultured Have Some Rights.

There are many ideas and notions we take for granted, because, if for no other reason, they have become popular. A poor man often takes it for granted that a rich man is above him and cares nothing about him. The ignorant often assume that the cultured and learned disdain their presence and person. The poorly dressed assume, without proof, that the well dressed want to shun and ignore them. Now, very often all this is sheer assumption without any foundation in fact. But it is popular to proceed in speech, thought and conduct on such assumption.

We have had recently, in the newspapers of the day, an example of this assumption on a grand scale. When Prince Henry visited Harvard the other day President Eliot had somewhat to say about Germany and her people, and in behalf of the University over which he (President Eliot) presides, conferred the degree of L. L. D. on the Prince. Immediately the storm began. One contemporary, with the spirit of all the rest said: "The froth and slobbering of President Eliot, and the conferring of L. L. D. on Prince Henry by Harvard University were in poor taste." Now, we submit that this is said on sheer assumption. President Eliot has been at the head of America's greatest university for more than a quarter of a century and we never heard of his "froth and slobbering" before. And we fail to find in the various reports where he did either on the occasion referred to. But this time he was talking to or about a Prince and then he is accused of that of which he is as a man incapable. Again, what if Harvard did confer a degree on the Prince. She confers some degrees every year. Will some of our assuming contemporaries show why a Prince should not as well as a pauper have a degree—if he deserves it? Mind you, of these papers have said that the Prince was not a scholar, a man of learning, acquainted with philosophy and law. The question has not even been discussed upon its merits. We say that if Prince Henry deserves a degree—and we know nothing to the contrary—he has the right to receive it and an institution has the right to confer it. It is a question of merit and attainment, not one of prince or pauper.

But this view of human character and conduct is common in this world.

You cannot always tell by the cost of a man's wardrobe or by the size of his head what is in his heart. It may be that the cultured, the rich, the high-lived have some real worth as well as the ignorant, the poor and low-lived. I have seen men as proud of their ignorance as others of their knowledge. And I have seen men as haughty and "stuck up" over their plain, unkept clothes as others over their costly and expensive ones. I have seen men as bigoted over their weather worn slouch hat as others over their ten dollar silk beaver. If the rich man is a right man he deserve your respect and really craves your in-

terest and friendship. If a Prince deserves a degree—has learning, scholarship, ability, attainment, merit—he should have it without heaping epithets and approbrium upon the institution that confers it. We are a thousand miles from becoming either, but we have a sort of idea that even the rich, the cultured, the high-lived have some rights.

The Movement Away From the Home.

A STUDY.

BY REV. M. T. MORRILL.

I submit the following outline as perhaps helpful to SUN readers in considering what seems to me a grave question. Nothing that is said here is assumed as final, but is intended to be stimulative.

The home and family are behind all that we call society, nation, government; in fact they are the first social unit. From a Christian standpoint it is not hard to see why heathen and pagan nations are so unstable, for it would seem that no nation can long endure in tranquility or prosperity, unless its homes are preserved pure, inviolate, felicitous, for they are the starting point of everything that goes to make or unmake the nation. Domesticity is conducive to happiness, and its destruction will subtract from happiness.

I. And yet there seems to be a movement away from the home, until with many folks it is now only a place for eating and sleeping. It cannot be denied that many a home should not be dignified by that name, and it is no wonder that the inmates do not enjoy staying there. But what causes such a state of affairs in those homes? The answer will be found in drink, gambling, idleness, incapacity, and other causes that will readily occur to the mind. But there is a movement, apparently, not to be accounted for in this way; and if a movement, then signs and symptoms of it, some of which may be enumerated as follows:

1. Decay of the family, and removal of many occupations away from it and the home.

(a) In some sections families are growing smaller, that is, the number of children is steadily less. In 1890 New Mexico, Oklahoma, New Hampshire and Vermont led the union in this respect.

Old families or branches of them are running out, becoming extinct, for the reason just cited, through disease and causes that may readily occur to readers.

Possibly there is an increase in the number of unmarried persons.

Certainly there has been a large increase of hotel, boarding, lodging, apartment and tenement house population. Under this head must be noted the cramped conditions and small liberties and privileges even to families domiciled in such quarters, which naturally drive people to parks and places of entertainment. To be sure, this evil is not so observable in country districts and smaller cities.

There is aversion among some classes to making and maintaining homes. While visiting in a famous shoe city of New England, I had this fact called to my notice by my host, who said, in substance, that many of the young women employed in the shoe shops of that city would

not marry because they did not wish to keep house or make a home. Undoubtedly they thought of abridged liberties, their own unfitness for homemaking as a result of years in shops. And again, probably the desire to begin about where there parents left off has caused many to put off marriage until late in life, and perhaps too late.

(b) Because of conditions to be named under following heads, there is not the sharing in pleasures and responsibilities attendant upon home and family that would produce the best results.

(c) Social and family life is being displaced by the club, fraternal orders and societies, and associations of every description, by which members of the family are separated more and more, and may even share a larger part of their social life with neighbors and friends than with the family. There is more than a grain of truth in the following dialogue, taken from a current periodical:

"John, I would like to invite my friend, Mrs. Smalley, this evening. Will you be able to be in?"

"No, my dear; I must attend the meeting of the Ancient Order of Forresters tonight."

"Well, tomorrow evening."

"I have the Royal Arcanum, and you know—"

"What about Wednesday evening?"

"Oh, the Odd Fellows meet that night; on Thursday I have a meeting of the Knights of Labor to attend; on Friday the Royal Templars of Temperance; on Saturday there's a special meeting of the Masonic Lodge, and I couldn't miss that; and then Sunday night—let me see—what is there on Sunday night, my dear?"

"The Grand and Ancient Order of Christian Fellowship."

"Why, I had forgotten. Am I a member of that? Let me see—"

"But you had forgotten another society, John, of which you were once a member."

"What's that?"

"Your wife's."

Since beginning the writing of this article I have had the point enforced by the case of a young woman who is out every night, half the time in discharge of her duties in a mercantile establishment, the other half in attendance upon meetings of various societies. And she is one who sadly needs the quiet and rest of home.

(d) The scenes of recreation and amusement have been quite largely transferred from the home to the park, field, street, theatre, hall, lecture, concert, social, soiree, and so on. Hence parents and children are separated too much, and children lack wholesome parental direction and restraint. Chancing to be in a great manufacturing city visiting relatives, I was asked to go down street in the evening to see the sights, which "sights" consisted of thousands of people, almost the whole factory population, promenading the principal thoroughfares until a late hour.

(e) The bringing up and education of children is largely consigned to nurses, governesses, and school teachers. The child is in school at the age of five years (sometimes just to get him out of the way) and from that onward until he strikes out for himself. Parental supervision is reduced, often purposely,

(Continued on 4th page.)