

74
N 514

**A STUDY OF THE MODERN FAMILY AND THE
INTEGRATING INFLUENCE OF RELIGION IN THE HOME**

By

HUTH McKNIGHT NICHOL

A.B., Muskingum College

A Thesis

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
in
The Biblical Seminary in New York**

**New York, N. Y.
April 1933**

**BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
HATFIELD, PA.**

19574

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

A. The Purpose of the Study Page 1
B. Delimitation of the Field of Study 1
C. Method of Procedure 11

CHAPTER I

THE FAMILY AS A FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTION OF SOCIETY

A. Its History 2
 1. Its Origin 2
 2. Its Biblical History and Sanction 3
 a. The Old Testament Attitude Toward the Family . . 3
 b. Jesus' Attitude Toward the Family 4
 c. Paul's Attitude Toward the Family 5
 3. Its Forms 5
 a. In Its Origin 5
 b. In Early America 6
 c. In Later America 7
 d. In Modern Day 8
B. Its Functions 10
 1. A General Survey of What the Family Does 10
 2. The Primary Function of the Home According to a
 Number of Modern Authorities 12
C. Its Value 15
 1. As a Primary Group in Society 15
 2. As an Institution that Cannot be Replaced 16
D. Summary 18

MAY 19 1933 19200 Gift of the author

CHAPTER II

INFLUENCES TENDING TO DISINTEGRATE THE MODERN FAMILY

A. The Changing Family	21
1. The Naturalness of Change Within the Home	21
2. The Seriousness of Problems Aroused Today Within the Home	23
B. The Disintegrating Influences	24
1. Economic and Industrial Influences	25
a. Changes in Vocational and Industrial Fields	25
(1) The Trend of Industry from Within to Without the Home	25
(2) The Entrance of Women into Outside Vocations	26
b. The Urbanization and Mobility of the Modern Home	29
c. Changes in the Type of Dwelling for the Family	30
d. The Setting up of Difficult "Standards of Living"	31
e. The Effect of the Present Depression	32
2. Social Influences	33
a. Lag of the Family as Compared with Other Institutions	33
b. Educational Changes	34
(1) Increased Higher Education for Women	34
(2) Extended Educational Requirements for Vocations and Professions	36
c. Mingling of Races and Culture	37
d. Modern Courtship Difficulties	38
e. The Status of Husband, Wife, and Child	40
f. Increased Leisure and Recreational Oppor- tunities	43
g. The Popularization of Birth Control	46
h. The Breaking Up of Homes	48
(1) Through Domestic Discord	48
(2) Through Divorce	51
(3) Through Desertion	58
3. Moral and Religious Influences	59
a. Attitude Toward Authority	59
b. Attitude Toward the Institution of Marriage	60
c. Experimentation in Forms of Marriage	61
C. Summary	64

CHAPTER III

THE INTEGRATING INFLUENCE OF RELIGION IN THE MODERN HOME

A. Evidence of the Integrating Influence of Religion in the Home	67
1. As Revealed in the Hebrew Home	67
2. As Revealed in the Early American Home	68
3. As Revealed in the Christian Home Today	69
B. The Functioning of Religion in the Preservation of the Modern Home	70
1. As a Vital Factor in the Rediscovery of the Sanctity of the Home	71
a. Through the Building Up of a Religious Con- ception of Marriage	71
b. Through the Bringing About of a Regard for the Home as a Religious Institution	72
2. As an Impelling Force in the Stabilizing of the Family Group	73
a. Through the Fostering of Christian Attitudes toward Modern Marriage Problems	74
(1) Companionate Marriage Policies	74
(2) Divorce	77
(3) Birth Control	78
b. Through the Expression of Christian Virtues and Character in the Life of the Home	81
3. As an Agency in the Centralizing of Home Life	83
a. Through the Development of General Culture in the Home	83
b. Through the Promotion of Social Activities as a Family	85
c. Through the Sharing of Interests	86
4. As a Motivating Power in the Building of a Coopera- tive Form of Government in the Home	88
a. Through the Consideration of the Role of Parents	88
b. Through the Consideration of the Role of Children	90
c. Through Wholesome Parent-Child Relationships	90
5. As an Incentive to the Subordination of Material Inter- ests to the Spiritual Values of the Home	91
a. Through the Recognition of the Worth of the Individual	91
b. Through the Recognition of the Greatness of the Home Task	92

C.	The Role of Religion in the Life of the Modern Home	93
1.	In the Lives of Parents	94
2.	In the Character Training of the Child	95
3.	In the Adaptation of Certain Forms of Religious Expression	98
a.	Family Worship	98
b.	Substitutes for the Family Altar	102
c.	"The Ministry of the Table"	104
d.	Bedtime Prayer	106
e.	Sabbath Observance	108
4.	In the General Atmosphere of the Home	111
5.	In Cooperation with the Church	114
D.	Summary	118

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	121
------------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
--------------	-----

PREFACE

A. The Purpose of the Study.

It is almost a truism to state that the modern home is caught in a maelstrom of surging economic, social, and moral and religious influences which are causing it to undergo great changes and to struggle for its very existence. It is not the purpose of this study, however, to endeavor to evaluate, justify, or condemn these forces which are at work, but rather to face them squarely in order that the dilemma of the modern home may be understood. Therefore, in the light of these tensions and problems, this study will seek to show that religion is of inestimable value as a counteracting force against the disintegrating influences of modern social trends and that it has the inherent power to integrate the modern family. With the belief that the family is an essentially fundamental institution in the life of the church and of society in general, it is the writer's conviction that such an undertaking will be not a mere academic investigation but a matter of vital sociological and religious value.

B. Delimitation of the Field of Study.

The sociological study of the modern family will be confined to two particular phases, a preliminary consideration of the family as a fundamental institution of society, and a general survey of the economic, social, moral and religious forces which tend to have a disintegrating influence upon modern family life. Only those

forces which peculiarly concern the home of today will be considered and not those which imperil the home at any time, such as disease or death.

In attempting to show that religion is an integrating influence in the home, it is not presumed nor implied that religion is the only counteracting agency, for it is recognized that there are many factors which can and must contribute to the preservation of the home. The endeavor is simply to prove that family religion is basic, practical, and indispensable in this day for the true integration of the home. Undoubtedly, religion in all its aspects could be shown to be invaluable to the modern family, but attention in this study will be confined, in so far as possible, to religion as it can manifest itself in home life. Though at times the term religion will be used in the broad sense of the word, it will refer more generally to Protestant Christianity.

C. Method of Procedure.

The preliminary step in this study, as in any study, was to survey available authoritative source materials and to select from these those generally held to be of outstanding value. For the distinctly sociological part of the problem, material was gathered in the following manner: Bibliographies listed in books in the general field of sociology and the family were compared, and the texts most frequently mentioned were chosen for special study, together with certain books recommended by professors and in "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science" on the modern American family.

For the study of religion in the home in its relation to the perplexities of modern society, material was found to be very much more scarce. Reference to the United States Catalogue revealed very little upon the subject. Some scattered references were located in books on the family and Christian sociology. The Union Theological Seminary Library was consulted, and but two texts of value were discovered there, though many books were perused. A few articles pertinent to the problem were collected from varied sources in the Russell Sage Foundation Library. An interview was accorded the writer with Dr. L. Foster Wood, the Secretary of the Committee on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Some suggestive information was received from him, several texts were recommended, and the privilege of consulting the committee's library was graciously given. Furthermore, letters were sent to six leading representative denominations¹ and to The Religious Education Association² asking for suggestions published by them or considered by them to be relative to the subject. The replies were very courteous and manifested interest, but were rather meager in suggestions. Evidently, therefore, material dealing with family religion from the specific viewpoint of the problem as stated is very limited. Moreover, that

.

1. Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A.
United Lutheran Church in America.
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.
Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
Northern Baptist Convention.
Methodist Episcopal Church.
2. Chicago, Illinois.

which is available has been written very largely by those of a rather liberal position theologically. In using these writers as authorities, therefore, an endorsement of their theology is not necessarily implied.

From the sources indicated, then, as much data as possible will be gathered, analyzed, and studied. The exact procedure in which this is to be done will be brought out in the text of the discussion. The general results, however, will be presented in three main divisions, first, the family as a fundamental institution of society, second, a survey of the disintegrating influences of modern family life, and third, the integrating influence of religion in the modern home.

CHAPTER I

THE FAMILY AS A FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTION OF SOCIETY

CHAPTER I

THE FAMILY AS A FUNDAMENTAL INSTITUTION OF SOCIETY

A. Its History.

1. Its Origin.

The family is an institution of "universal occurrence."¹ Anthropologists have speculated much as to its origin, but they have been unable to agree upon or to discover its beginnings.² Two theories of the origin of the family have been popular in the past-- that of a pure monogamy from the beginning and that of promiscuity in group life.³ Goodsell says,

"The more the matter is investigated, the more questionable it becomes that primitive groups generally lived in a condition of absolute promiscuity, although great laxity in marital relations undoubtedly prevailed among them."⁴

Popenoe contends that the idea of mankind's living together merely as a "promiscuous horde" was the viewpoint of some earlier writers, but is today generally looked upon as without basis.⁵ It is concluded, then, that the family, in the sense of parents and children, is undoubtedly the oldest of social institutions in existence.⁶

.

1. M. Meads: Contrast and Comparisons from Primitive Society, The Annals, March 1932, p. 23.
2. Cf. T.G. Soares: The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 39, and E.R. Groves: Social Problems of the Family, p. 12.
3. E. Mowrer: The Family, p. 42.
4. W. Goodsell: A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution, p. 9.
5. Cf. P. Popenoe: The Conservation of the Family, p. 9.
6. Ibid., p. 8

That the family did not come about by chance, however, is evident even from the biological viewpoint alone. The conditions of life and not man have made it what it is.¹ Moreover, as the whole history of mankind is scanned, it becomes evident that the family is an institution of God, for the family has existed from all time and exists today everywhere, in lands of barbarism and of civilization alike.² Undoubtedly, it is part of the divine plan to set the "solitary in families."³

2. Its Biblical History and Sanction.

a. The Old Testament Attitude Toward the Family.

In the beginning of the Biblical history it is recorded, "And the Lord God said, It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." And again, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."⁴ Whether or not the patriarchal form of family life was the primitive type of family,⁵ the first stories of Hebrew family life given in the Old Testament are those in which the father held the position of supreme authority over the members, not only of his own household, but of a whole clan. It was over such families as these, which were really social organizations in them-

.....

1. Cf. C.A. Ellwood; *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, p. 87.
2. Cf. E. Schmiedder: *An Introductory Study of the Family*, p. ix, Editor's Introduction by John A. Lapp.
3. Cf. Psalms 68:6.
4. Genesis 2:18 and 24.
5. Cf. W. Goodsell, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 11, and T. G. Soares, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

selves, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were patriarchal heads.

Soares says,

"No Hebrew institution developed in a more healthy and socially efficient manner than the family. In comparison with other ancient peoples the Jew had a home life that was decidedly significant."¹

b. Jesus' Attitude Toward the Family.

Certainly, home life and the family were of fundamental importance to Jesus. He moved in and out of the homes of the people among whom He lived, as, for example, that of Mary and Martha. He built some of His most striking illustrations about the home, as the story of the Prodigal Son. He manifested His absolute belief in the unity and sanctity of the home when the Pharisees came to Him with the question of divorce. He quoted the scripture as it is given in the early part of Genesis, ". . . and they twain shall be one flesh",² and thereby put His stamp of approval on the monogamous form of marriage. By His attendance at the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee, He sanctioned the marriage rite and thus approved the Christian home. Again and again in His teaching He likened the spiritual kingdom of which He was the Head to one great family of God.³ Evidently in the human family Jesus found principles which He felt could be extended and sublimated in the building of a great Christian brotherhood.⁴ Thus He taught men of their relationship to God as Father⁵ and to one

.

1. T. G. Soares, op. cit., p. 333.
2. Matt. 19:5
3. Cf. T.G. Soares: op. cit., p. 334.
4. Cf. Ibid., p. 334.
5. Matt. 6:9.

another as brethren.¹ Cooley enlarges upon this idea in these words,

"And Christianity, as a social system, is based upon the family, its ideals being traceable to the domestic circle of a Judean carpenter. God is a kind father; men and women are brothers and sisters; we are all members doing as we would be done by and referring all things to the rule of love. In so far as the church has departed from these principles it has proved transient; these endure because they are human."²

c. Paul's Attitude Toward the Family.

The viewpoint of the Apostle Paul upon marriage as revealed in the epistles of the New Testament has been much discussed. Many have felt that he encouraged asceticism and only admitted marriage as a concession.³ On the other hand, Paul spiritualized the estate of marriage in the loftiest terms and likened it to the relationship of Christ with His bride, the Church.⁴

A survey of all Scripture thus reveals the prominent place of the family in its record. In the very beginning and later in Hebrew history, it is presented as ordained of God and as a genuine social institution of high ethical standards. In the New Testament, it is further strengthened as an honorable relationship by the sanction of Jesus and the Apostle Paul.

3. Its Forms.

a. In Its Origin.

A discussion of the original form of family takes one again

.

1. Matt. 19:15, 35.
2. G. H. Cooley: Social Organization, p. 52.
3. Cf. I Cor. 7:2, and P. Popenoe; op. cit., p. 49.
4. Cf. E. Schmiedler: op. cit., pp. 31, 32, and Eph. 5:22-33.

into the field of conjecture, since information is lacking and sociologists have not been in agreement. Some have contended that a maternal form of family preceded the patriarchal form. Bachofen popularized this theory in his book on "Mutterrecht" which was published in 1861.¹ His claim was that relationships were reckoned through the maternal side of the family alone. Moreover, he points out, women had social and political dominance and constituted in reality a genuine matriarchy.² This theory is tied up with the idea of promiscuity, and, like it, has fallen into disrepute.³ Mrs. Bosanquet says that the acceptance of such a theory is altogether without sufficient ground. The patriarchal family may have been less highly organized at that time, but did not necessarily follow or parallel a matriarchal form of family.⁴ From the variance in ways of reckoning descent in savage tribes today, Groves asserts that he believes it is impossible to ascertain whether or not the matriarchy preceded the patriarchy.⁵ It is the simple statement of fact, however, that the family in which the father is the predominant figure is the one that has persisted through the ages.

b. In Early America.

The early American family bore the distinct marks of the European culture which it had brought to Western shores. Family life

.

1. Cf. H. Bosanquet: *The Family*, pp. 32-37.
2. Cf. C. A. Ellwood: *op. cit.*, p. 101.
3. Cf. H. Bosanquet: *op. cit.*, p. 36, and C. A. Ellwood; *op. cit.*, p. 94.
4. Cf. H. Bosanquet: *op. cit.*, p. 35.
5. Cf. E. R. Groves: *op. cit.*, p. 29.

was very largely, therefore, of the traditional patriarchal type. In New England, particularly, family life was patterned after the Jewish patriarchal home. Groves says,

"Family conditions were linked with the Scriptures until they appeared divinely sanctioned. The husband, of course, sat in the seat of power as the patriarch. It was the business of his spouse to demonstrate by obedience and subordination her piety and religious fervor."¹

c. In Later America.

Passing down through the years of our nation's history, we find the family at the beginning of the nineteenth century closely bound together as a real unit in society. Sentiment and law alike continued to vest the supreme power of the home in the father. The rights, privileges, and desires of the mother and children of the home were only considered in relationship to the dictates of the father. The vesting of this power in a single individual undoubtedly unified and strengthened the family group so that it was enabled to meet the great social changes of the latter half of the nineteenth century without suffering any radical changes in itself.² In the opening of the twentieth century, however, protest began to make itself evident against the confines of the patriarchal type of family. The right of the father to act in the role of dictator and king had begun to be seriously questioned and even rebelled against.

.

1. E. R. Groves: Social Problems of the Family, p. 34.
2. Cf. W. Goodsell: The American Family in the Nineteenth Century, The Annals, March 1932, p. 13.

d. In Modern Day.

Into a survey of the forms of family life today, then, we come to find the patriarchal family still existing, but facing severe difficulties and serious problems. Standing out in direct contrast with this persistence of the old form of family are those homes which are little more than families in name. Their whole life has become so individualized that unity seems only to exist in that their members claim the same headquarters. In discussing these newer forms of modern homes Mr. and Mrs. Gruenberg make the following classifications of families: (1) husband and wife both working and intending to have no children, (2) the one-child family with the mother occupied either in social or business pursuits, and (3) the family in which the father is away much of the time.¹ Mowrer describes the patterns in the modern home as paternal, maternal, equalitarian, and filiocentric. This is merely an arbitrary method of trying to characterize the dominant expression of modern forms, for it is readily recognized that families do not fall into any sort of rigid classification. Of these types suggested by Mowrer the first two are altogether familiar, whereas some explanation may be necessary for the two latter forms. The equalitarian form of family is usually small, and its members tend to have more or less of a feeling of equality in all things that concern the home. The small child of the home soon voices his opinions and desires with that of his

.

1. Cf. S.M. and B.C. Gruenberg: Education of Children for Family Life, The Annals, March 1932, p. 205.

parents. Activities outside the home generally keep this type of family occupied.¹ In the filiocentric type of home, the children, or frequently the one child, are the center of all concerns.

In reviewing the types of family through history, Schmiedeler mentions the patriarchal family of the past in which "the home was very much a man-ordered world, one of male superiority and dominance."² In contrast with this form of patriarchal home, he describes the "semi-patriarchal Christian type of family". In this type of home, the father and husband is still the head of the house, yet he is not domineering nor tyrannical, nor inconsiderate of the members of his whole household, because he realizes that they are one and all under the God to whom each individual is of supreme importance. When this system of home life has been preserved through the ages there has always been happiness, unity, and opportunity for the expression of the individual members of the home. Outward form of government is a matter that calls for little concern or attention.³ But with modern shifts and changes, some consider the form which the family assumes as a problem of primary interest and cause for attention. Robert S. Lynd says in an article entitled "Family Members as Consumers",

"For as the status and resulting role of each member of the family has become less a matter of traditional parental authority and filial obedience or of male dominance and wifely submission, and more a matter of the inscrutable

.

1. Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., pp. 110-13.
2. E. Schmiedeler: op. cit., p. 151.
3. Cf. E. Schmiedeler: op. cit., p. 153.

"personality rights of each individual, these family members constitute less of a 'unit' than in any former period in the history of the American family."¹

It would seem, therefore, that though the home of today varies in its forms very widely, as it no doubt always will, it is nevertheless characterized chiefly by its shift of preeminence of the father as head to a state of equality among its individual members.

B. Its Functions

1. A General Survey of What the Family Does.

The family has had in the past, as well as today, certain definite functions, whether or not it has been clearly conscious of them. The normal processes of social life and their contributions are frequently not recognized as such, nor do individuals always recognize their part in the making up of the whole network of society. In retrospect, or in viewing the situation as a whole, however, these functions or contributions are more clearly observed. It is when we view the stream of human society thus that we see what the family has done to bind together succeeding generations. Upon this point, Mowrer says,

"Family forms, while developing out of human nature, have also been a factor in the formation of human nature by virtue of the fact that social sanction has surrounded customary practices and preserved them for future generations. Thus the family is something more than a set of relations for the satisfaction of certain impulses of human nature; it is also an institution, a mechanism of control."²

.

1. R. S. Lynd: Family Members as Consumers, The Annals, March 1932, p. 86.
2. E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 64.

Nevertheless, Mowrer points out, in what he has said, that the family receives its social approval because of the fundamental needs of human nature which it supplies. The family is not altogether unique in meeting some of the needs which it does, yet no satisfactory type of organization has been found which can combine its functions.¹ These functions continue to be real and definite, though their expression has changed somewhat with the changing order. As Margaret Meads says,

"When modern writers say that the family among us has lost its functions, they mean merely that the Western European patriarchal family, which was once a social-economic and industrial unit of a high degree of self-sufficiency, is breaking down - that its disciplinary and educational functions have been taken over by the state and its industrial functions preempted by modern machine production . . ."²

Thus, according to different periods of time there has been a variance in the family's contribution in these channels, and yet its functioning has always been important. The phases of interdependence which have been and are satisfied in family life, Mowrer lists as follows - the biological, economic, emotional, and cultural. Popenoe claims that the family justifies its existence as the fundamental institution of society by providing for (1) the continuance of the race, (2) the stabilization of the state, (3) the contentment of the individual, (4) the instruction of members of society, and other general ways which enter into such realms as the religious, social, economic and esthetic.³ Mowrer summarizes the functions of the

.

1.Cf.E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 48
2. M. Meads: op. cit., p. 27
3.Cf.P. Popenoe: op. cit., p. 8

family according to three authorities - Ogburn, Reed, and Groves.¹

Ogburn lists the functions of the home of the "agricultural era" under six heads,

"(1) Affectional, (2) economic, (3) recreational, (4) protective, (5) religious, (6) educational."

Reed's headings of the family's activities are:

"(1) Race perpetuation, (2) socialization, (3) regulation and satisfaction of sexual needs, and (4) economic functions."

Groves presents the following as the chief functions of the family:

"(1) Protection and care of the young, (2) regulation and control of the sex impulse, (3) conservation and transmission of the social heritage, and (4) provision of opportunity for the most intimate contacts."

2. The Primary Function of the Home According to a Number of Modern Authorities.

Critics have differed in the past and in the present as to what they consider to be the primary purpose of the home, yet each has been justified to some extent, at least, in the claims which he has made. In presenting that which different groups have considered of chief importance in the family, Mrs. Bosanquet gives to us many of the major functions of the home. These include care of children, the preservation of the cult, the safe-guarding of private property for the right of inheritance, and the provision of an institution for religious and economic expression.² Ellwood places the biological function of the home as the most primary. He says that were the

.

1. E. Mowrer: p. 45.

2. Cf. H. Bosanquet: op. cit. p. 5

family to provide for nothing other than the propagation of the race and the care of the young it would continue to be the chiefest among all human institutions of society.¹ Popenoe also sets forth the fundamental value of the home in view of its biological functions. He claims that the question of the family is "primarily - though by no means exclusively - a biological question."²

Schmiedeler, a Catholic writer and thus one who in no degree minimizes the function of propagating the race, speaks of the socialization of the child as the primary function of the home. The home provides for the adjustment of one individual to another which is certainly an essential need for satisfactory and happy group life. In the past the home with its large families and home-centered activities certainly provided for this need. Schmiedeler suggests that the home's fulfillment of this task is more important than ever if individuals are to be agreeable members of the complex social group in which we live today.³ Manuel Conrad Elmer also takes the position that the family is shifting from economic and biological responsibilities to sociological concerns. He says that it was the home of yesterday that thought most specifically in terms of providing food and shelter for its children. He writes,

"The new role gives first importance to the problem of equipping the child with emotional balance and the ability to make social adjustments in a changing order."⁴

.

1. Cf. C. A. Ellwood: op. cit., p. 76
2. P. Popenoe: op. cit., pp. 3,4.
3. Cf. E. Schmiedeler: op. cit., p. 358.
4. M. C. Elmer: Family Adjustment and Social Change, p. v

He continues by saying that it is altogether too much of a generalization to say that the primary purpose of the home is to provide for the continuance of the race. In viewing family life as a whole, he maintains that the social contacts of the parents with children and with others in a healthy fashion is fully as important as a concern to see that children come into a home. The challenge for the home of today is to fulfil the task of the socialization of the child as effectively as that of the provision for his physical needs.

The importance of the socialization of the child as a fundamental function of home life may be at once deducted by observing that Schmiedler, Groves, Ellwood, Ross, Mowrer, Cooley, and Elmer all mention and discuss it.¹ The biological function was the family's chief function in the beginning, but is now only a part of the larger function or purpose which it has come to have. This larger function is social in nature, because the home affects society not only through the caring for the physical needs of its children, but through the influence it has upon them and the way it, as a group, moulds the individuality of its members. Groves says further,

"Thus the family has become of primary importance as an effective socializing agency . . . "2

Elmer, in expressing a similar point of view, shows that with progress

.

1. Cf. E. Schmiedler: op. cit., p. 358.
Cf. E. R. Groves: op. cit., p. 1.
Cf. C. A. Ellwood: op. cit., pp. 75, 76.
Cf. E. A. Ross: Principles of Sociology, p. 588.
Cf. C. H. Cooley: Social Organization, pp. 34-36.
Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 45.
Cf. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 29.
2. Cf. E. R. Groves: op. cit., p. 1.

along cultural and civic lines, the family has necessarily and naturally come to be responsible for more than the propagation of the race. It has come to be a primary unit for nurturing and developing the individual personality with respect to his needs in human society.¹

In summarizing, then, the home may be portrayed as an economic, educational and religious center, a unit which makes possible the socialization of the child, the perpetuation of the race, the transmission of culture from one generation to another and thus the conservation of the social order.

C. Its Value

1. As a Primary Group in Society.

With the realization of the family group as the "oldest institution in existence", the center of intimate human relationships ordained of God, the satisfier of so many human needs, it would seem to be logical to expect that the family should be considered as the most fundamental institution of society. This is indeed the position that many sociologists hold. Ellwood says of the family that it is the "simplest group capable of maintaining itself" and is therefore the "primary social structure."² In reality all other institutions of society have grown out of the family, for the family is a miniature embodiment of the fundamental principles of society as a whole.³ Ellwood contends that even in a day when the individual is being

.....

1. Cf. M. C. Elmer; op. cit., p. 29.
2. C. A. Ellwood; op. cit., p. 75.
3. Cf. E. Mowrer; op. cit., p. 56

made more and more the center of attention, nevertheless the family remains the primary unit in social relationships and other social concerns must be made in relation to it, at least in some measure. This is true, Ellwood continues, because the family is the producer of other organizations of society and is not produced by them. It is further true because it seems to precede these other forms, both from a point of view of time and of reason.¹ Moreover it is to be recognized that the family is more than just the sum of its individual members. Because of the primary family group with which the individual members of the home are aligned, their whole lives are affected within and without the home.² Mowrer is another who would agree with the authorities already mentioned that the family is the primary group and says very significantly, "It is in the family in which the individual becomes a person . . ."³ Thus it is clear that society is built upon the home and the family is basically a primary and fundamental unit of humanity which is of utmost value.

2. As an Institution that Cannot be Replaced.

The family, moreover, is so fundamentally a part of society that it is not only a primary group but an irreplaceable institution. Other forms in society must be considered in relation to it -- the state, industry, and the church. Ellwood claims that the family is so central in society that even industry and the state must subordi-

.

1. C. A. Ellwood: op. cit., p. 76.
2. Cf. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 29.
3. E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 125.

nate themselves to its interests.¹ Many of the functions of the family have been delegated by the modern home to outside agencies, yet the home must still stand, for it cannot be fully replaced. The community, for example, has not been able to assume the responsibility of transmitting culture from one generation to another. On the other hand, the more personal agency of the home provides a satisfactory link from generation to generation for giving to each new generation the folkways and mores of the years that have passed.² Thus the family is more than a convenience for the satisfaction of personal whims. It is a unity which must be preserved and not subjected to the selfish, unstable, passing fancies of speculators. If it is truly responsible for instilling into the child the necessary social traits of character, as Edward Alsworth Ross says, it should be regarded not merely as a personal but as a social institution of prime consideration. In Popenoe's introduction to "The Conservation of the Family," he discusses the vital value of the monogamous family and its functions. He concludes by saying that he believes that civilization cannot advance or progress without the continuation of the home. External changes in society in the passing generations have not removed the need of the family as an institution among humankind.³ Sidonie and Benjamin Gruenberg, too, have focused attention on the need and place of the home in modern life. They sum-

.

1. Cf. C. A. Ellwood; op. cit., p. 98.
2. Cf. E. Mowrer; op. cit., pp. 61, 62.
3. P. 8.

marize the claim that the family is a primary institution of society which cannot be replaced in these words,

"The rapid rearrangements of the various social and economic functions and the shifting of forces that have characterized our civilization for the past two generations have brought into bolder relief the underlying significance of the family as a system of dynamic relationships that determine the growth and development of personalities. Even the most objective analysis has shown that the home has something distinctive and superlative to offer in the rearing of children into civilized adulthood."¹

D. Summary

A general review of the history of the family thus shows that it is a fundamental institution of society. The beginnings of the family pattern cannot be exactly ascertained, but it is widely accepted that marriage originated as monogamy. According to Biblical history, the family is a unit of sacred relationships, planned for the well-being of men. Through the years, the forms of the family have varied, but the patriarchal form has persisted most prominently. Within recent years paternal dominance has been seriously questioned. Today the tendency is to make the home a place of equal rights, privileges, and opportunities.

The contention that the family is a fundamental institution of society is also supported by a survey of its unique functions and contributions. These have varied from generation to generation in the necessary adjustment to changing conditions. In general, however, the true family has biological, economic, educational, social, cul-

.

1. S.M. and B.C. Gruenberg: op. cit., p. 215.

tural, and religious functions to fulfil. Such are indicative of the need of the family group for the preservation of society.

Finally, the family is a basic institution in social relationships because of its inherent value and worth. The home is the primary unit out of which other social institutions take form and upon which they are dependent for continuance. Thus, the home is more than an agency for the satisfaction of personal phases of dependence; it is a social as well as a personal institution which is basic to the preservation of progressive society. In view of its history, its functions, and its genuine value, therefore, the family cannot be successfully supplanted nor replaced.

CHAPTER II

INFLUENCES TENDING TO DISINTEGRATE THE MODERN FAMILY

CHAPTER II

INFLUENCES TENDING TO DISINTEGRATE THE MODERN FAMILY

A. The Changing Family.

1. The Naturalness of Change Within the Home.

With the abandoning of many of the old restraints, the virtual defying of the once accepted mores, and the delegating of many of the functions of the home to outside agencies, the home of today is of necessity very different from the home of former days. It is not strange, however, that the home should be changing and readjusting, for it is in the midst of a changing economic and social order which is bringing about a new form of culture. As Elmer says, "Any society which is not static is undergoing a process of change."¹ In order to meet these changed conditions, change in the home is therefore essential and inevitable.² There are always, of course, extremists in regard to any fundamental adjustment. On the one hand, in this instance, there are those who insist that the modern home has lost its dignity and worth and seek to bring back to it the idealism and restraints of other days. On the other hand, there are those who claim that the sternness and strictness of the old home has failed and therefore insist that the home be revolutionized in form and purpose. Some would even go so far as to claim that it needs to be abolished altogether in order that the individual

.

1. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 92.
2. Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 256.

may not be hampered nor curbed, but may enjoy complete "freedom".¹
Thus to the conservative and revolutionary alike the family of today is a subject of interest.

That the family is changing is therefore generally agreed; what it is experiencing through the change is the question which provokes differences of opinion. It is certainly true, however, that as Mrs. Bosanquet says,

"It is so intimate a part of life, so inseparable from existence in all normal communities, that, like the air we breathe, it eludes observation, and we only notice it when something goes wrong."²

Mowrer and Elmer are outstanding authorities who hold an optimistic position in regard to what is taking place in the modern home. Mowrer considers the changes in the family of today as real but to be expected and accepted. Consternation or feeling that these changes are worse than in past generations grows out of the natural inclination to glorify the past, he feels. Similarly Elmer goes so far as to challenge the frequent usage of such terms as the "disintegration" or the "disorganization" of the home, or "the passing of the family." He contends that they connote an implication that the family as a cooperative agency is no longer practicable nor possible.³ The widespread pessimistic view of family conditions, he asserts, is brought about through the eyes of reformers, social workers, judges, and the like, who are doing most of their work with broken families,

.

1. Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 9.
2. H. Bosanquet; op. cit., p. 7.
3. Cf. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 198.

but who have very little to do with "the eighty per cent of successful families who do not come in contact with legal and welfare agencies."¹ Actually what we are experiencing, Elmer claims confidently, is the reorganization of the family. In his words,

"The family is not being disorganized. We are just entering a period of social development, when the family is being reorganized on a more wonderful basis than ever before. Families are being organized on the bases of mutual affection and sympathetic understanding. The old family was held together by economic necessity and biological convenience. The family of tomorrow will be as much better and purer and finer than that of yesterday, as our schools and cities excel those of yesterday, and as the aeroplane is superior to the ox cart."²

2. The Seriousness of Problems Aroused Today Within the Home.

However, if the changes which are coming about in the family are only a matter of the natural course of events, the question immediately arises as to whether or not society needs to concern itself. It must be recognized on this point that there are authorities who regard the changes in the home of today with grave seriousness. Charles A. Ellwood, for example, says that

"We find the family life at the beginning of the twentieth century in a more unstable condition than it has been at any time since the beginning of the Christian Era."³

Great instability of the family, he shows, arouses alarm and concern for the continuance of the principle of monogamy. Thus he says,

". . . the problem of the modern family is whether monogamy shall continue to exist or to be the standard in Western Civilization."⁴

.

1. M. C. Elmer; op. cit., p. 90.
2. Ibid., p. 90.
3. C. A. Ellwood; op. cit., p. 137.
4. Ibid., p. 137.

Moreover, if it is justifiable to consider the family as a fundamental institution of society, as has been concluded in the foregoing chapter from its history, its functions, and its intrinsic value, it is necessary and fitting that such a vital institution be made a matter of study and concern. Definite provision must be made for it to retain the best and for it to include in its life that which will help to make its work effective. Without assuming, then, either an ultra-optimistic or pessimistic position, the family situation may be regarded as critical. Social changes must be met, for there is no turning back.¹ Thus there is need that society seek to understand the home of today and to help in its readjustment program that it may be preserved as the fundamental institution of society.

B. The Disintegrating Influences.

Introduction.

Authorities may differ as to whether or not the home is being disintegrated, but there can be little dispute that disintegrating influences are at work upon it. In order to discover current opinions on this subject, certain writings of twelve eminent sociologists,² chosen from the texts selected for this study, were examined

.

1. Cf. E. R. Groves; Parent Education, The Annals, March 1932, p. 216.
2. H. Bosanquet: The Family.
C. H. Cooley: Social Organization
Social Process
C. A. Ellwood: Sociology and Modern Social Problems
M. C. Elmer: Family Adjustment and Social Change.
G. W. Fiske: The Changing Family.
W. Goodsell: A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution.
E. R. Groves: Social Problems of the Family.

with the purpose of discovering what factors each considered to be influential in changing the modern home. In addition, a special number of "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences" on the modern American family was studied.¹ The views presented were analyzed, and the factors set forth were listed and compared. As a result of this process, it was found that these may be classified under three main headings, (1) Economic and Industrial Influences, (2) Social Influences, and (3) Moral and Religious Influences.

1. Economic and Industrial Influences.

a. Changes in Vocational and Industrial Fields.

(1) The Trend of Industry from within to without the Home.

The roots of modern economic and industrial conditions, no doubt, go far back into the days of the Industrial Revolution. With the invention of machinery and the rise of the factory system, the unity and solidarity of the home were at once attacked and made more difficult. The home gradually ceased to be a self-supporting unit and has since become more and more dependent on outside agencies.

.

- R. Lindquist: The Family in the Present Social Order.
- E. Mowrer: The Family: Its Organization and Disorganization.
- P. Popenoe: The Conservation of the Family.
- E. Schmiedeler: An Introductory Study of the Family.
- E. A. Ross: Principles of Sociology.

.

1. March 1932.

Of this Viva Boothe says,

"Modern industrial processes have robbed the home of almost every vestige of its former economic function."¹

Again Dr. Bertha Hinkle points out that if one should judge by external forces modern marriage difficulties would be largely traceable to man's exodus from the home for work.² This change in the industrial order Goodsell mentions as one of the forces that "were sapping the roots of the old unified family life of colonial times."³

(2) The Entrance of Women into Outside Vocations.

The changed status of woman and her new freedom provoke attention in a consideration of economic changes. Woman has always contributed to society in an economic way; she has truly shared in carrying the necessary labors and work of everyday life, but heretofore she has carried this load almost exclusively through the family economic unit. Only in the sense that her work now takes her away from the home, can it be said, therefore, that she is emerging into economic life.⁴ The position which woman has attained in economic and vocational fields is far reaching and is of fundamental importance. As she continues to forge ahead, it will become more and more evident that her economic independence is the most radical change in the social order. Woman was just assumed to be dependent upon man,⁵ and now in these days,

.

1. V. Boothe: Gainfully Employed Women in the Family, The Annals, March 1932, p. 77.
2. Cf. B. M. Hinkle: Changing Marriage, a By-Product of Industrialism, Survey, Vol. LVII, Dec. 1, 1926, p. 286.
3. W. Goodsell: The American Family in the Nineteenth Century, The Annals, March 1932, p. 13.
4. M. C. Elmer, op. cit., p. 237.
5. Cf. E. R. Groves: op. cit., p. 74.

though there may be differences of opinion as to the price paid, woman has gained a position of independence that was never dreamed possible. Women are competing with men in nearly all trades and professions. In 1870 there were 14.7 per cent of woman in industry, the trades, and the professions, whereas in 1920 the percentage had increased to 24 per cent.¹ It is to be noted that ten per cent of the farmers of this country are women, fifteen per cent of the traders, fifteen per cent of the manufacturers and mechanical industrialists, and forty-seven per cent of those in professions.²

But what has been the reason for these new interests on the part of women? It has already been noted that the Industrial Revolution had indeed a revolutionizing effect upon women and their work. However, why has this continued through recent years and why has woman been drawn more and more out of the home? The explanation lies primarily in the circumstances of life with which woman has been faced. Her entrance into the industries and professional life has been the result of necessity far more than the gratification of personal desire or revolt against accepted customs.³ As evidence of this conclusion a report of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor may be cited. A survey of some 40,000 gainfully employed women was made in cities which were regarded as typically eastern, western, and southern, and the following facts were brought out as to their status.

.

1. Cf. R. Lindquist: *The Family in the Present Social Order*, p. 19.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Changing Family: Social and Religious Aspects of the Modern Family*, p. 87.
3. Cf. V. Boothe: *Gainfully Employed Women in the Family*, *The Annals*, March 1932, p. 78.

1. Many women are in business because of the economic pressure upon them.
2. More foreign-born and negro women are forced to become earners than native born.
3. Marriage frequently increases woman's need economically rather than decreases it.
4. Many women are not only burdened with home responsibilities but with its support as well.
5. This double responsibility tends to have a detrimental effect upon the health of women and upon the harmony of the home.
6. Many of the single women in business are carrying heavy home and financial responsibilities.
7. Frequently the employment of mothers brings about the neglect of the children.
8. The normal life of the home is upset by the mother's employment.
9. The insufficient income of the husband often makes the employment of the wife imperative.
10. Increased income for husbands would in many instances release wives and mothers.
11. Better provision through pension laws would enable many mothers to withdraw from work.
12. Women who are working from necessity should receive enough to support those dependent upon them.
13. These findings are typical of the average American community.
14. The problems of the wage-earning woman need to be considered

and met for they are a fundamental factor in the health of the nation.¹ With such conditions as these existent, it is readily seen that though society has released women from the home somewhat reluctantly, it will have to adjust its life and program in accord with the economic pressure there. This economic strain has tended toward economic independency for women and the results have been both beneficial and detrimental. Women have shared public responsibility by their pursuit of careers and benefited the livelihood of the family and all society thereby. Moreover, they have been given opportunity to realize their deep-set desire for self-expression. In so doing, however, the confines and restrictions of home life have loomed up very largely before them and domestic discontent has been fostered.² Some of these associated difficulties of the modern home shall be considered later under other heads.

b. The Urbanization and Mobility of the Modern Home.

Urbanization seems to have a decidedly disintegrating tendency upon the home. The explanation of this lies in part in the fact that in the city there is a greater divergency of custom and practice, and hence the home does not feel the restrictions and restraints that it does in the smaller community. This is true, moreover, of the individual; the city dweller does not experience the same feeling of community control upon him as does the rural individual. This is very largely due to the great number of con-

.

1. Cf. Bulletin of the Women's Bureau No. 41, p. 20.
2. Cf. C. H. Cooley: Social Organization, p. 362.

tacts which are possible in city life.¹ Mobility in city life and all that which is involved thereby, such as changes in contacts, situations, customs, and a general sense of emancipation from a controlling group, naturally bring about a broad sense of freedom.² Then again this disintegrating influence upon the home in the city is intensified by the crowded quarters in which so many city families live. It is an undisputed fact that the denser the population the greater the death rate.³ Moreover, the problems of social rivalry, recreation, and shifting social standards all make it difficult for the city home to maintain and keep its unity. The trend of the population is to mass itself in the city,⁴ and thus there is constituted a problem of prime concern if the homes founded in the city are to be preserved.

c. Changes in the Type of Dwelling for the Family.

Housing conditions are affecting the home everywhere. In the city, the proportion of families living in limited apartment house quarters is very great, as Fiske shows by percentages quoted from investigations made by the Bureau of Labor. To quote,

"The Bureau of Labor's investigations in 257 cities show that whereas 58.3 per cent of city families in 1921 lived in separate homes, and 17.3 per cent in two-family houses, in 1928 only 38.3 per cent were living in single, and 13.4 per cent in double houses; while the proportion living in apartments has doubled, rising from 24.4 per cent to 48.3 per cent in seven years."⁵

.

1. Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., p. 193.
2. Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., pp. 193, 194.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: op. cit., p. 64.
4. Cf. Ibid: p. 27.
5. Ibid., p. 65.

No longer do the children of the home have the opportunity of training for cooperation and help by the doing of the homely chores about the house that were common to the boy and girl of a number of years ago. Little coal has to be carried or wood brought in. Space is so limited that the mother generally prefers to do her own work in the kitchen rather than have her daughters get in her way.¹ Crowded home quarters moreover are conducive to immoral living. A coveting of more time for things outside the home and for selfish interests is frequently behind the desire for living in limited quarters, though often it is really fundamentally an economic circumstance. Not only in the city, however, has there come a change in the type of dwelling, but in the villages and country as well. The spacious home of colonial times is fast being replaced with houses more economically planned. There is not the interest in having abundance of space with guest rooms and extra rooms that there was in former days.² The inference is not that there should be a reverting to the former type; it is merely to point out an existing tendency and the disintegrating influence it has upon home unity.

d. The Setting up of Difficult "Standards of Living".

Certain arbitrary "standards of living" frequently have a negative effect upon the family unit. By standard of living is really meant "the gauge by which we most frequently measure the

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; op. cit., p. 37.
2. Cf. M. C. Elmer; op. cit., p. 306.

status of family life."¹ Families set up for themselves standards of living as influenced by such things as their community, their interests, and their needs. Often, however, standards of living are confused with scale of living which is the way a family actually lives and not how it would like to live.² It is often the case that the husband does not earn enough to meet the standards which his home and wife desire. The woman's going out of the home as a wage-earner is frequently the course followed and as already shown this imperils the home's solidarity -- justifiable or not as the case may be.³ The problem of the home, therefore, is to adjust its standards to a scale which is workable for its own needs; otherwise false and impossible standards can only mean unhappiness and the decadence of the home.

e. The Effect of the Present Depression.

In this year 1933, the family is experiencing the especial strain of a severe economic depression. Paul L. Benjamin tells us in an article entitled "The Family Society and the Depression"⁴ of the terrific strain that the family social agencies have had to bear in an effort to keep families together and to provide them with the fundamental necessities of life. The demoralizing effect of such a period of chaos upon the family unit and upon its members individually is very discouraging and pleads for help and relief. Mr. Benjamin

.

1. M. C. Elmer; op. cit., p. 265.
2. Cf. Ibid; pp. 265, 266.
3. Cf. V. Boothe; op. cit., p. 77.
4. The Annals, March 1932.

quotes from a report made by the Federal Children's Bureau which made special study of conditions in Racine, Wisconsin, and Springfield, Massachusetts, during the industrial depression of 1921 and 1922. The report shows that a lowering of the family morale is inevitable when the source of income is cut off or becomes irregular. Moreover, there is not only immediate suffering, but an extension of it into the years of the uncertain future that follow. The perspective is too close to make any definite estimate of what will be the outcome of this depression upon the home of the future. The families in acute distress must be reached and helped, however, else, as Mr. Benjamin suggests,

" . . . years hence we shall be paying the price in stupendous social costs for the folly and stupidity of letting men go hungry in a land of plenty. We shall be paying with charred and twisted personalities."¹

The disintegrating influences of modern family life in the economic and industrial realms, then, may be summarized as evidenced in vocational changes, urbanization and mobility, housing problems, the setting up of difficult "standards of living", and the present severe economic depression. None of these in itself may be said to be intrinsically responsible for a disintegrating influence upon home unity, yet in its widespread application, each is putting many a home to stringent tests.

2. Social Influences.

a. Leg. of the Family as Compared with Other Institutions.

In facing the social forces that have tended toward a dis-

.

1. P. L. Benjamin: op. cit., pp. 142-3.

integrating influences upon the modern home, we perhaps face first the cultural lag of the family as compared with the ever-progressing material changes. The patterns of home life have remained more or less fixed, while the social and economic circumstances about the home have been rapidly and radically changing. Young people have been called upon to enter this paradoxical situation. Naturally enough, the problems aroused have confused and baffled them. The result has been that this spirit of anxiety and confusion has become an altogether too dominant note in the modern home. The home of today cannot be expected to be conducted according to the patterns of yesterday without the making of certain adjustments. The materialistic advancement of the world must not be allowed, therefore, to permit a lag in the social and cultural development of society.¹

b. Educational Changes.

(1) Increased Higher Education for Women.

Wissler called America's attitude in education "the fundamental faith of America".² Certainly there has been progress along educational lines, and the nation is willing to invest extensively in schools for her children and youth. No part of the educational program, however, has caused as much interest, discussion, and reaction as that for girls and women. More girls than boys are now being graduated from high school.³ Women's colleges and co-education have become accepted forms. In the latter type of colleges and universi-

.

1. Cf. L. K. Frank: Social Change and the Family, The Annals, March 1932, p. 98 and M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 75.
2. E. Groves: Parent Education, The Annals, March 1932, p. 216.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: op. cit., p. 81.

ties, the women outnumber the men.¹

Considering simply the preservation and solidarity of the home, this extended educational advantage for women has had a decidedly disintegrating influence upon the home. Women who have pursued college and professional training have been unable to settle down into the founding of a home at the early age at which their grandmothers did. Many young women continue in school with little or no relationship with young men so that the natural contacts that would lead to the establishment of homes are not brought about. Then, too, many young women so absorb themselves in their educational pursuits that they ward off and stifle the most natural inborn instincts that normally long to find satisfaction in a home and children. Or else they manifest these desires after they have completed their educational training when it is less likely for them to really "fall in love" or be susceptible to the impulses which are natural to adolescents. In the homes of those who marry after long educational training, serious problems are faced. Adjustment of husband and wife is made more difficult since each is more mature and more rigidly set in habits and character expression. Then, too, the number of children in the home is likely to be very limited. From surveys that have been made, it has been found that the college woman's home is considerably smaller than that of the average.² The extended educational advantages of women have aroused a spirit of independence

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske: op. cit., p. 82.
2. Cf. P. Popenoe: op. cit., pp. 128-9, 131.

that is not satisfied with the confining of oneself to the homely duties of a house. Frequently, the college woman attempts to assume the heavy burdens of rearing a family and pursuing a career at the same time, and thus the limiting of the number of children in the home is a necessity. Because of these facts, the increased educational advantages for women are included with those forces that are having a disorganizing tendency in the modern home.

(2) Extended Educational Requirements for Vocations and Professions.

Modern youth is convinced of the necessity of having a college education in order to enter into the world and have a real opportunity for finding a place of successful activity. This conclusion or assumption on his part is in the face of the most discouraging odds, for he sees all about him young men and young women, college trained, who are forced into positions where a college education seems to be altogether unneeded. In these days of 1933 depression, too, he sees many college graduates utterly helpless as far as finding work is concerned. Yet, in the face of all this, youth of today seeks college advantages,¹ and beyond that graduate study. Vocations and professions are extending their educational requirements more and more. Thus the young men of today who are interested in professional or vocational fields are frequently forced to delay the founding of a home till they can complete their training and establish themselves in such a way that they can undertake the responsi-

.

1.Cf. W. E. Thompson: College Youth Discusses Itself, View from a Classroom Window, The New Outlook, December 1932, pp. 41-43.

bilities of a home. For men, then, as well as for women, educational standards in America are forcing delay in marriage, and thus problems are brought about which tend to make difficult the founding of stabilized homes.

c. Mingling of Races and Culture.

The mingling of races and varying cultures is another social factor which tends to have a disintegrating influence upon the modern home. This is altogether a circumstance to be expected, for when groups of differing mores begin to merge there is inevitably some confusion and somewhat of a dilution of the standards of the different groups. This has evidenced itself in the laxness that has come about in American sex mores. The family is, of course, the primary institution affected and is the group that suffers most, for it is responsible for the social restraint and freedom of its members. The confusion in this regard today may be traced back to the high percentage of immigration from 1900 to 1920.¹ In fact the mobility of the family can be largely accounted for by the immigration of the past century. The necessitated change of social environment brought about through the giving up of home and customs and the coming to a new land are all a severe strain upon family life and a difficult problem of adjustment.² The immigrant experiences a constant tug between the culture and customs of his homeland and those of America. However, the children of the immigrant home are brought into even

.

1. Cf. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., pp. 9-11.
2. Cf. C. H. Cooley: Social Progress, p. 182.

more difficult conflicts, because they are torn between home, school, and the society about them. This social confusion continues through the youth of the second generation of the immigrant, for if he marries an American the overshadowing customs of the foreign home often cause serious confusion and unhappiness.¹

Social difficulties are created by the marriage of individuals of any two fundamentally different races, even when the individuals themselves are happy. Utter tragedy is brought about if the marriage is between races of different color, because of the stigma placed upon the children of the union. Inter-marriage among dissimilar groups leads to disintegration in the same way that similarity is conducive to integration. However, the fusing of races has been taking place through the ages. In fact, ethnologists say that there are no longer any pure races.² It is to be noted, though, that the social processes of life are only made increasingly variable by the crossing of types which do not differ too radically, biologically or culturally. The home is thus endangered by the venture to fuse that which is too dissimilar, and a high type of home life cannot result.³ The intermixture of those from different social backgrounds thus constitutes a grave social problem for America.⁴

d. Modern Courtship Difficulties.

Perhaps there is no more fundamental nor serious problem

.

1. Cf. E. Schmiedler; op. cit., pp. 167-9.
2. Cf. C. A. Ellwood; op. cit., p. 198.
3. Ibid. p. 198.
4. Cf. E. Schmiedler; ibid., pp. 105-6.

in modern group life than the difficulties faced in the desire to found a home. The most normal and natural courtship practices of the past are stemmed or made difficult in the social and economic world of today. According to Niles Carpenter, courtship fulfils four functions in Western society. It provides for the selection of a mate, a period of comradeship to discover the prospects of compatibility, and a period in which to endeavor to become adjusted to another's personality. It soberizes and matures youth for the responsibilities of adulthood. It is an essential, though varying prerequisite to marriage.¹ The fulfilling of these functions in a changing society is clearly a real problem.

Many of the forces which have a disintegrating influence in general upon the family constitute very specific problems in the development of a home. The effect of higher education and extended education in relation to marriage has already been discussed. One can readily see the paradox in which it places young people in the years when courtship is a natural part of life. Urbanization brings about difficulties in this regard also. The sex structure of the city differs from that of the rural community. In the average American city there is greater chance for the man to have the opportunity for selection than for the woman. However, since there are more young people per square mile on an average in the city than in the rural communities, both young men and young women have an increased opportunity for choice in the city.² Together with this must be

.

1. Cf. N. Carpenter: Courtship Practices and Contemporary Social Change in America, The Annals, March 1932, p. 38.
2. Cf. N. Carpenter: *ibid.*, p. 39.

considered such offsetting factors of city life as the difficulty of becoming acquainted because of the lack of neighborhood feeling, the tendency for much mobility, and the practical anonymity which one may continue to have in such a large group.

Another modern circumstance that makes courtship difficult is included under mention of the changed type of dwelling today. With small homes, privacy is almost impossible and the young people are forced without the home. Oftentimes this brings about much unwholesomeness. The automobile has frequently been sought as a refuge or opportunity to provide the needed quiet and seclusion. It has frequently provided the desired isolation, but with it has too often given an opportunity for sexual vice.¹ The young people of the working classes have suffered particularly in the difficulties of wholesome courtship. Their homes and their circumstances have driven them to the frequenting of undesirable places of amusement and diversion. Courtship carried on under such conditions of life cannot be consummated in stable and sound homes.

e. The Status of Husband, Wife, and Child.

If the family is truly as Burgess has said, a "unity of mutually interacting personalities",² a consideration of the status of those who compose the family group cannot but be included in connection with our study. Lawrence K. Frank aptly writes,

.

1. Cf. N. Carpenter: op. cit., p. 41, and E.R. Groves, op. cit., p. 106.
2. Cf. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 22.

"If we are to understand the rather bewildering situation in family life today, we shall have to go behind the social and economic situation and attempt to reveal what is happening to men and women. It is not enough to repeat the catalogue of economic and industrial changes if we do not go further and ask what they imply for the conduct of men and women generally, and more especially in the association we call marriage."¹

The most revolutionary change has been in the status of women. With the idea of "New Freedom" in these days of democracy, the idea of the "New Woman" is almost synonymous. Womankind, of course, has not yet come to share alike in this liberation from former restraints, but the notion is widespread and is broadly felt. Woman is considered a personality and an individual with a similar right of expression to that accorded man. Her pursuit of higher education and the acceptance of it as her right has already been noted. In the political and legal world, woman has been accorded the rights and privileges that were formerly restricted to men.² The tendency for woman to enjoy social and economic equality is fast coming to be recognized. The results of this releasing of woman from certain conventional restrictions and the granting of opportunities for fuller expression are both beneficial and perplexing. They have proved to be conducive to domestic discontent in many instances and thus to endanger the strength of the home.³ Lynd speaks of the insecurity of the modern woman. Her role of mother and housewife established her status in former days, but now it is a question of winning and re-winning through her own personal attractiveness and personality. This is evidenced, he claims, through the

.

1. L. K. Frank: op. cit., The Annals, p. 94.
2. Cf. E. Schmiedler: op. cit., pp. 153-156.
3. Cf. C. H. Cooley: op. cit., p. 302.

increased use of "beautifiers" on the market today.¹ It is altogether a normal and natural result of her new position that woman is making increased demands and claims upon man both before and after marriage that exceed by far those of simple provision which a woman was offered and was grateful for in the old days. In so far as this raises the moral standards of the home, the result is beneficial. In provoking unreasonableness and discontent, however, it flings before young men and women perplexing problems.²

Naturally enough the changed status of woman has affected the status of the other members of the family group. With woman's opportunity for independence of expression, man can no longer continue to hold a domineering position in family life. That he is less frequently the dictator and potentate of the home of modern life has been shown in referring to the types of homes of today. The husband of the modern home, thus, must satisfy the desires of a wife who now approximates his equal socially, politically, and often economically. He must be more than ever a comrade who continues to share with his wife the romanticism that was formerly more or less prone to be confined to the courtship period.³ Again, it is to be realized that this is the tendency of modern society but not yet the rule.

Much is heard today of parent-child conflicts and problems. In part, at least, this is occasioned by the new position of the

.

1. Cf. R. S. Lynd: Family Members as Consumers, The Annals, March 1932, pp. 91, 92.
2. Cf. C. H. Cooley: Social Organization, p. 363.
3. Cf. E. Schmiedeler: op. cit., pp. 161-163.

child in the home. With the tendency today for families to become more or less individualized in nature the child soon finds his place and voices his opinion in a way that years ago was unheard of. The sentiment of the age does not necessitate the child's acceding to the wishes and experience of his elders. Spoiled children in America are common and yet the process which has brought about their spoiling is one that has made an unusually close relationship between parents and children in America.¹ In the difficulties that have arisen in parent-child relationships in recent years there has been the realization that education for modern parenthood is an absolute need and essential. Thus more and more parent education agencies and courses are being fostered and encouraged that better adjustment may be made between parents and children in this day of bewildering difficulties.² Living is a difficult task filled with many problems for the boy or girl of the 1930's. Modern parenthood, moreover, is a complex and bewildering responsibility.

f. Increased Leisure and Recreational Opportunities.

The commercialization of amusement is one of the most fundamental factors that tends to decentralize the home. Again looking back into the "glorious past", amusement and diversion centered within the home or the small community. Today the limited size of the home makes it veritably little more than a place in which to sleep and perhaps to eat. In comparatively few instances is it a

.....

1. Cf. C. H. Cooley; Social Organization, p. 361.
2. Cf. E. R. Groves; Parent Education, The Annals, March 1932, pp. 216-222, and H. M. Lynd; Parent Education and the Colleges, The Annals, March 1932, pp. 197-204.

place in which to entertain or be entertained. Quite naturally, therefore, the members of the home go outside for their diversion and amusement. Then, too, with the lifting of domestic burdens from the home through modern conveniences and the use of electrical applicances, time for leisure has been increased and the confines of the home cannot satisfy. Thus there is the subsequent seeking for recreation. This is so not only on the part of the rich but of the more middle class people as well, for as Groves says,

"It has been the democratizing of leisure rather than its mere increase that has elevated the problem of recreation to the position it now holds in public attention."¹

With this increase of leisure and need of finding recreation outside the home, a commercialization of recreation has taken place. In the words of Groves, ". . . recreation has become a business."² Much of the sympathy and enjoyment which the members of the family experienced through playing and planning for play together has been lost and given over to commercial interests. Through this very situation, there have been brought about distinct influences upon character and conduct.

The moving picture, undoubtedly, is one of the best examples of commercialized amusement. Films have been taken into almost every part of the world, and they are said to have become "the most nearly universal public entertainment."³ Much real entertainment has been provided by the "movies", but a great deal of unwholesome and unclean

.

1. E. R. Groves, op. cit., p. 241.
2. Ibid., p. 241.
3. Ibid., p. 242.

thinking has been aroused by what has been portrayed on the screen. Efforts have been made by the state to censor films so that plays of demoralizing influence shall not reach the public but rather that the finer and better type shall be offered to them.¹

Another means of diversion and opportunity for getting away from the confines of the smaller home has been found in the automobile. It, too, has brought with it not only many benefits, but many problems as well. For example, it has enabled the whole family to enjoy outings together, on the one hand, while on the other, it has given opportunity for immoralities and misconduct.²

Perhaps the gravest disintegrating influences have been brought about in the homes of the poorer class because young men and young women from crowded, limited homes, especially in our cities, have frequented the commercial dance-hall, cheap movie houses, and places where gambling and drinking are carried on. This has tended toward absolute degeneracy in the lives of the young people and the communities from which they come. It is readily understood that these young people seek to satisfy what is the natural desire of youth and in so doing are frequently caught in commercialized pitfalls. Cooley in referring to these commercialized vice centers as organizations and in explaining the entrance of these young people into such things, says,

*It owes its strength no more to gross passions than to the absence of alternatives that enables it to pervert to base

.....

1. Cf. E. R. Groves: *op.cit.*, p. 242.
2. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 242.

"uses the finer impulses, those calling for companionship, recreation, cheerful and unconstraining surroundings."¹

Thus it is to be seen that commercialized amusement, wholesome or not as it may be in itself, must be classified as having a disintegrating tendency in regard to the unity of the family of today.

g. The Popularization of Birth Control.

In order to carry on the family pattern the family must have children. If it does not, it is doomed as far as its physical continuance is concerned. In the face of the realization of these facts therefore the decreasing birth-rate in America is faced with concern. No longer is the rearing of a large family regarded as a coveted goal in the founding of a home. Even the family of four or five is rapidly being replaced by that of one or two. A number of factors enter into an explanation of the development of this situation. The general pressure of circumstances of our times must be realized in contrast to the conditions of fifty years or so ago. Important among the modern influences that have tended to decrease the birth-rate is the popularization of birth control or voluntary parenthood as some have termed it. Birth control as a practice has been carried on since very early times. Contraceptive methods seem to have been known even among the most primitive peoples, and some method of limiting the size of families was not at all uncommon.² It was not until after the Great War, however, that any sort of birth control movement of widespread note took place in society.

.

1. C. H. Cooley: Social Process, p. 194.

2. C. N. E. Himes: Birth Control in Historical and Clinical Perspective, The Annals, March 1932, p. 49.

In America the popularization of the practice of birth control was met with decided apprehension on the part of many. It was opposed by medical authorities and considered as a moral issue by religious sects. The trend in public opinion in regard to the movement has been rapidly changing in recent years, however, until now, significantly enough, the United States has more birth control clinics than Great Britain.¹ Medical authorities are more and more giving their cooperation in clinical work and dealing with it more openly in their private practices. In church circles noticeable changes in attitude have occurred, as is evidenced by the recent expression of approval of birth control by a committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and by a board of the United Churches of Canada.² The Catholic church, however, has stood out uncompromisingly in opposition to the practice. Schmiedler for example says that the popularization of it in modern life finds its roots chiefly in pure selfishness and the gratification of lustful desire, and not in the consideration of health or of economic necessity.³

Notwithstanding the voices of disapproval, modern society is faced with the fact that birth control advocates are widely disseminating their teaching and that the practice rightly or wrongly used is being followed extensively in many modern homes. Literature upon the subject is of a higher and more acceptable tone than ever

.

1. Cf. N. E. Himes; op. cit., p. 55.
2. Cf. News Article, The New York Times, December 8, 1932, and Christianity Today, October 1932, p. 22.
3. Cf. E. Schmiedler; op. cit., pp. 173-7.

before,¹ and the reputable are sanctioning it even though some of their colleagues continue to dissent upon the point. Legal sanction has been very slow in coming but the advocates are constantly seeking to gain state and government approval.² In 1929 some fifty-five clinics were in existence in America and about ten thousand physicians were said to be assisting with the advancement of the program.³ By the end of 1931 eighty-five clinics in which contraceptive guidance was freely given had come into existence throughout the country. The fact that more than half of these clinics were in hospitals indicates the respectable and accepted status the movement has attained.⁴

h. The Breaking Up of Homes.

Upon first thought it may seem illogical to include as a social disintegrating influence that which has already disintegrated, namely homes broken through domestic discord, divorce, and desertion. However, it is readily realized that such disorganization has a most unstabilizing influence upon the unity of homes in general and creates undesirable attitudes about the home in the minds of many youth in regard to the permanency of the marriage relation. For these fundamental reasons, therefore, consideration is given to the subject.

(1) Through Domestic Discord.

Domestic discord of variant kinds shares responsibility in

.....

1. Cf. N. E. Himes; op. cit., p. 63.
2. Ibid., p. 63.
3. Cf. J. C. Colcord; Remedial Agencies Dealing with the American Family, The Annals, March 1932, p. 127.
4. Cf. R. P. Bridgman; Guidance for Marriage and Family Life, The Annals, March 1932, p. 154.

breaking up the institution of the family. Schmiedeler in his book entitled "An Introductory Study of the Family" devotes a whole chapter to the discussion of this subject under the heading, "Family Tensions." A classification of these factors which are disintegrating in their influence has been worked out by Merony under the following heads and subheads:¹

I. Economic Factors

- (1) Poverty
- (2) Financial Reverse
- (3) Economic Independence of Wife
- (4) Occupational Conditions
 - (a) Employment of Both Husband and Wife
 - (b) Mobility of Occupation
 - (c) Stability of Occupation
 - (d) Occupational Standards
 - (e) Sex Contacts Required by Occupation

II. Health Factors

- (1) Sickness and Disease
- (2) Physical Deformity
- (3) Physiological Changes Due to Age
- (4) Psychopathic Conditions

III. Personal Factors

- (1) Temperament
- (2) Appetites and Habits
- (3) Sex Attitudes
- (4) Age Variance
- (5) Philosophy of Life
- (6) Personal Behavior Patterns

IV. Social Factors

- (1) Race
- (2) Social Class
- (3) Religion
- (4) Status
- (5) Child-Complexes
- (6) Social Control of the Family Group
- (7) Relatives

.....

1. Cf. Merony: The Town Church and the Modern Family, p. 77, quoted by E. Schmiedeler; op. cit., p. 134.

A more recent and less elaborate classification has been made by Krueger.¹ It is as follows:

- (1) Economic
- (2) Occupation
- (3) Response (Sex)
- (4) Control (Positional Relationship of Members to Each Other)
- (5) Status (Positional Relationship of Family in Social Participation)
- (6) Culture
- (7) Philosophy of Life
- (8) Temperament
- (9) Health
- (10) Individual Capacities and Abilities
- (11) Appetites and Habits
- (12) Personal Behavior Pattern
- (13) Age

These headings need little explanation. The term "cultural" as used might be said to include race, recreation, religious, and general background mores. While the disorganization of a family may not be diagnosed under one heading exclusively, the predominant source of domestic difficulty may be thus characterized.

Many of the subjects listed in the outlines above include tensions which have always existed in marriage, but the whirl of modern life has intensified them each one. However, Schmiedeler speaks of the cultural, sex incompatibility, and economic tensions as those which predominate in causing the disorganization of modern families. In the complexity of life today the development of high strung nerves and quick dispositions has seemed to have been inevitable, especially in city life. Therefore, any occasion for dif-

.

1. Cf. E. T. Krueger; "A Study of Marriage Incompatibility", The Family, April 1928, p. 54.

ference or tension seems to be exaggerated in the homes of today, and to bring about disorganization more easily. The extent of the disorganization of families is incomputable, for divorce and desertion statistics cannot be considered to give by any means a complete indication of the number of homes that have failed. That the succumbing to one or another of these family tensions is widespread today, however, is faced as fact, and therefore homes broken through domestic discord are included as being disintegrating influences upon modern family life.

(2) Through Divorce.

Formerly studies of divorce were confined more or less to the statistical and factual side of the subject. Important as this phase is, it can only prove to be valuable when these facts are considered in their relationships and in view of their significance as to what is happening in the lives of men and women. That which has occasioned the dissolving of the marriage relationship must be sought out and an attempt to understand what is taking place in society in general must be regarded. Attitudes toward divorce are widely divergent. To some, the fact that the United States has more divorces than all the rest of the world together¹ is indicative of what is interpreted to be the absolute disintegration of the home, while to others it is merely a more complete legal record than in former days of those marriages which have been unsuccessful. Acceptance of either position cannot be mutually exclusive, for the latter represents a

.

1. Cf. E. Schmiedeler: op. cit., p. 203.

statement of an existing condition. Fred S. Hall, in an article entitled "Marriage and the Law", says,

" . . . every divorce represents a failure of the most important social institution in this world -- the institution of marriage."¹

This circumstance is disintegrating in influence even if not to the extent that some would have us believe. It cannot be rightly said that divorce disorganizes a home; divorce is only the climax of a home already broken. It is the outward, legal expression that a marriage is considered unsuccessful, and may only come long after the real disintegration has taken place. And yet, though divorce may not be considered in itself as disintegrating, its disintegrating influence is undeniable.

In 1887 there was one divorce to every seventeen marriages, while in 1930 there was one to about every six.² Thus in 1887 there were 0.47 divorces to every thousand population, while in 1930 there were 1.56 to every thousand.³ The reasons for this increase in the divorce rate are numerous and varied, and are closely related and connected with the general trends in economic, social, and religious life. In recent years there have been the abnormal breaking of immigrant ties, and increase of economic freedom. A greater number of grounds are included on statute books for the granting of divorce. The statutory grounds upon which divorce may be obtained today are chiefly adultery, cruelty, desertion, drunkenness, and neglect to

.

1. The Annals, March 1932, p. 111.
2. Cf. M. C. Elmer; op. cit., pp. 159, 160.
3. Cf. Ibid., Table 19, pp. 158, 159.

provide. Other minor groups for which some states grant divorce are gross neglect, vagrancy, conviction of crime, separation, bigamy, incompatibility, false representation, and misconduct.¹ Then, too, attitudes toward divorced people have changed considerably till the ostracism that was once prevalent has been very largely broken down. Further, woman's economic independence, as well as the higher standards accepted in general for women, are seriously connected with the causes for divorce.²

Thus modern youth is placed in a dilemma; marriage offers for it increased opportunities for personal happiness and yet at the same time a difficult relationship that because of the pressures and conflicts of our rushing civilization is subjected to temporariness of nature and existence. This accounts for the fact that along with an increased divorce rate there is an increased marriage rate in the United States. It is this side of the picture that Elmer would not have us forget. He claims that it is a common error to consider only the change of the percentage of divorce in relation to marriage. To follow this through consistently dark gloom is all that lies ahead, for with a continued increase in the divorce rate, marriages and divorces would soon counteract each other in number. However, the fact must be recognized that marriages have been increasing in recent years as well as divorce. Elmer tells us that the increase in every thousand marriages of those who get married and stay married per 1,000 population is relatively the same and has been so for the past fifty

.

1. Cf. M. G. Elmer; op. cit., pp. 152, 153.
2. Cf. Ibid., pp. 152, 153.

years.¹ Elmer is avowedly an optimist; Ray H. Abrams of the University of Pennsylvania in reviewing his book, "Family Adjustment and Social Change", questions his use of divorce statistics², but his presentation of this fundamental problem in society of today is of value and interest because of the very note of optimism which he does sound.

Another underlying occasion for divorce in modern society has been found in the increased mobility of families, which has already been shown to be a disintegrating factor in family life. Mowrer tells us of a thousand divorce cases which were studied to ascertain whether or not mobility was closely associated with divorce. Changes of address previous to separation in these thousand divorce cases were followed up and the conclusions reached verified the assumption that the mobility of city life shares frequently as a causal factor in divorce.³ Thus, mobility, together with problems aroused by immigration, the increase in economic freedom, legal leniency, changed social attitudes, and woman's emancipation may be cited as phases of modern life which explain in part the rise of the number of divorces in our country.

A disintegrating influence upon the home is not only brought about through divorce as the climax of "tragedies in human experience"⁴, but through the great number of individuals who are affected by the act of divorce. Adjustment after divorce has taken place is most com-

.

1. Cf. M. C. Elmer; op. cit., pp. 159-177.
2. Cf. Book Department, The Annals, March 1932, p. 231.
3. Cf. E. Mowrer; op. cit., pp. 194, 205, 206.
4. J. P. Lichtenberger: Divorce Legislation, The Annals, March 1932, p. 120.

plex and difficult, and because it may fail or may not be complete, the effect on society is most certainly imperiling and a cause for concern. In spite of the fact that public attitude is now more inclined to condone divorces than in former years, nevertheless American culture is such that divorced individuals meet with difficulties which they would not otherwise confront. Of course, the social strain varies somewhat according to geographical location. In the West where divorce is more frequent and the rate higher, divorce is considered more complacently than in the more conservative parts of the East.¹ Naturally enough, too, divorce in the city brings about less criticism than in a rural community. Outside opposition aside, however, the strain upon the personalities involved in a divorce procedure is such that Mowrer says that there are few crises comparable to it in the life span of an individual.² Oftentimes the burden is more severely felt by one partner than by the other. In the same article Mowrer discusses the following problems as aroused by divorce -- sexual adjustment, emotional expression, social relationships, remarriage, and the adjustment of children.³ Each of these is a complex matter for attention. The need for sex adjustment which is brought about by divorce often occasions sex irregularities and habits that not only demoralize those who become guilty of them, but the community in which the individuals are a part. Moreover, after two people have lived together and have become emotionally dependent

.....

1. Cf. E. Schmiedeler; op. cit., pp. 206, 207.
2. Cf. E. R. Mowrer; Divorce and Readjustment, The Annals, March 1932, p. 191.
3. Cf. Ibid., pp. 194-196.

upon one another, their separation is likely to bring about an emotional upheaval. If the marriage was consummated in late adolescence and if it was the first, the partners find their emotional lives have become mutual and deeply rooted and entwined. Sometimes after divorce the suppression or sublimation of emotional expression is found to be very difficult and sometimes apparently impossible.

In social relationships innumerable problems arise. A woman is frequently forced into economic independence and is faced with the making of adjustments that are more commonly made earlier in life. As already mentioned both man and woman face social criticism and may meet embarrassment in relation to the former friends which they have had in common. Natural feelings of pride and jealousy are frequently real roots of torment and discomfort, emphatically so if one mate remarries. Remarriage viewed objectively might seem at first the very purpose of divorce and thus the satisfying of desire so that an individual might find the happiness for which he was searching. The contrary is often found to be true. An investigation has shown that divorcees do not remarry any more quickly than do widows or widowers.¹ In remarriage it is difficult to avoid constant comparisons, to refrain from idealizing the past, to keep from being remorseful about it, and thus developing a supercritical or faultfinding attitude toward the new situation and relationship. Remarriage in a community in which sentiment is strongly in opposition to divorce may keep alive a sense of uneasiness or guilt about that which has been done and a feeling of

.

1. J. P. Lichtenberger: op. cit., The Annals, March 1932, p. 116.

illegality about the present relationship. Perfect readjustment is most certainly impossible with such an uneasiness of mind and spirit. If there were children by the first marriage, they frequently provoke problems in remarriage. Any strong resemblances to the divorced parent in the child are apt to keep kindled some feeling or desire for the one from whom estranged. As far as the children are concerned, almost insurmountable problems confront them, unless they are very young when the separation takes place. Especially is it difficult for the child if he spends part of his time with each parent, for his home life and sex life cannot be normal under such conditions. If the parent with whom the child lives is remarried, difficulties with the foster parent may arise. The presence of the child in the home may be resented, or the child may resent the foster parent's being there. A disillusioning and skeptical attitude toward marriage may develop within the child so that his own marriage in later years may result in disunion. Thus an inclination for divorce may run from generation to generation. However, in all these problems of readjustment after divorce, it must be remembered as Mowrer reminds us¹ that the way individuals become adjusted or fail to become adjusted is dependent upon two factors, first, the individual personality and his background, and second, the general situation and the conditions at the time and after the divorce.

In modern life, then, divorce has become a force of con-

.....

1. Cf. E. R. Mowrer: Divorce and Readjustment, The Annals, March 1932, p. 196.

siderable strength. In some particulars the strains of current situations and impacts may explain if not excuse its prevalence. Yet if the American home is to be safeguarded the increasing condonation of divorce as a mere escape from a relationship of responsibility must be checked, so that youth may not be led to view marriage as a more or less temporary or experimental relationship which may be broken if circumstances arise which provoke difficulties or discomfort. Recognition is made again of the truth that divorce is not in itself the force of disorganization of the family but rather the result or outcome of a home already disorganized by one of the causes referred to above. And yet with this admission, it has been observed above also that homes broken as the result of divorce have a disintegrating influence upon home life in society in general.

(3) Through Desertion.

Money is a necessity in bringing about the dissolution of marriage through divorce. For this reason desertion has been called "the poor man's divorce".¹ Moreover, desertion is more frequent among the poorer classes because of their lack of social position and their lack of knowledge of the intricacies of the court. Desertion has not been studied as systematically or as widely as divorce, but it is generally recognized that it is much more common than in past decades.² The causes for the breaking up of homes through desertion are much the same as those which occasion divorce. Poverty, however, is closely connected with desertion; many a poor father

.

1. Cf. E. Schmiedeler: op. cit., p. 213.

2. Cf. Ibid., p. 213.

deserts his home and children because he cannot meet their needs. Desertion among the poorer classes does not bring about the problems of social stigma or difficulties which arise with divorce among the rich, but the problems of readjustment for the partners and the children are very similar and equally as difficult. The poorer groups are a large part of our American society and the stability of their homes is as essential as that of the upper strata. Desertion among these groups therefore is included as a force which is disorganizing in its influence and effect.

3. Moral and Religious Influences.

a. Attitude toward Authority.

Economic and industrial influences which tend to have a disintegrating influence upon modern family life have been surveyed as well as some of the outstanding social forces which are prevalent in our modern society. From these we now turn to those forces and attitudes which strike most deeply into the hearts of men and women -- the moral and the religious. The rise of individualism and the revolt against authority has evidenced itself very plainly in the general change in attitude toward the church and religion. Through the growing spirit of independence men and women have no longer been content to believe and do, just because "the Bible or the church says so." The development of a scientific attitude has emphasized the desire to try, to prove, and to experience. Guided toward the right ends and led in the right channels this spirit is the one of highest intelligence and reasonableness, but when expressed simply as a selfish

mood of revolt against what has come down through the ages and been proved by time to be worthwhile and good and eternal, it is pernicious in its effect and provokes a difficult problem with which to cope. Materialistic teaching has become rampant in American colleges and universities. The sovereignty of God is displaced by the sovereignty of man in many of the popular magazines and books of the land. Conflicts in ethics and ideals are necessarily brought about in days of shifting social standards. Nowhere has this been felt more keenly than in the home and family life.¹ In the light of such circumstances and attitudes, many men and women have felt little restraint about regarding lightly the marriage relationship, for a selfish individualism has been allowed to control their lives and to cast aside the authoritative restraints of the church, the Bible, the community, and the larger society in general.

b. Attitude toward the Institution of Marriage.

The attitudes that have developed about marriage in recent years have become almost revolutionary. In earlier days marriage was a matter of families and interests. Marriage for mere romantic concern was viewed askance and regarded as the gratification of whimsical ideas. The marriage on grounds of "convenience", however, is increasingly an idea of the past. It is no longer a matter of necessity, but of voluntary choice and desire. Mutual affection of a type promising to abide is more and more coming to be accepted as the basis for the

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; op. cit., pp. 130, 131.

founding of the modern home. This philosophy of marriage is typically reflected in J. P. Lichtenberger's definition of marriage,

"Marriage ideally is a life mateship of a man and a woman based upon mutually and continued choice and affection."¹

The concept of marriage as an institution ordained of God and sanctioned of Him fails to be included in this or similar definitions. The romantic element of marriage has become one of the most predominant notes in connection with the relationship. Youth, too frequently today, view marriage as a romantic adventure, a sentimental, emotional experience. They too often fail to face its seriousness, responsibilities, and permanency. E. W. Burgess points out in an article entitled "The Romantic Impulse and Family Disorganization" that a home built upon romance alone is altogether too fleeting. "Romance, comradeship, and mutuality of interest" must enter in due and perhaps changing proportions into the founding of a home that will abide.² With the development of such a philosophy about marriage, overemphasizing the romantic element and neglecting its sacredness, the marriage relationship has become wrapped in questionable garments that cannot prove to be durable.

c. Experimentation in Forms of Marriage.

With a changed attitude toward authority in modern life and a decidedly weakened and lighter regard toward the institution of marriage, experimentation in the forms of marriage is a logical result.

.

1. Op. cit., The Annals, March 1932, p. 116.
2. The Survey, Vol. LVII, pp. 290-294.

In recent years this has manifested itself most strikingly. Free love, companionate, trial marriage, and such terms have become common and familiar expressions as well as experiments among many in modern life. Free love is in reality the outcome of the widespread emphasis upon the romantic impulses of life. It is the endeavor for individuals to share and enjoy each other's companionship without the formality or restraint of the marriage bond. It does not necessarily anticipate formal marriage eventually, though that may be the outcome. It is a "free" arrangement whereby the parties may part when their "love" for each other has cooled, or love for another comes to them. Experiments are repeatedly proving dissatisfying. Children are not planned for, and yet many times are born, bringing difficult and embarrassing problems. Trial marriage "dignifies" itself from free love in that it is entered upon with a view to permanent conventional marriage. It is an endeavor to seek to ascertain the possibilities of sexual adjustment and compatibility. Prevention of conception is of necessity fundamental to this experiment. The very experimenting in these relationships is indisputably disrupting to home life and their further popularization can only have disastrous results.

A few years ago society was aroused by discussions of what was termed "companionate marriage." The term was first introduced by Dr. M. M. Knight of Barnard College in an article which he wrote for the Journal of Social Hygiene of May, 1924. He used it as descriptive of the modern type of home established merely for the sake of

companionship and without the intent of having children.¹ The phrase was soon adopted by those interested in the welfare of the family. It has become most directly associated, however, with Judge Ben Lindsey, who has been the chief propagandist of the movement. He advocated it as a solution to the sex problems of youth and as a safeguard against their temptations. He would give legal sanction to trial marriage and provide for a dissolution of the relationship if it should prove to be undesirable or unsuccessful. Mowrer summarizes the essentials of Lindsey's program under the following points: (1) the usual marriage ceremony, (2) birth control sanctioned by law, (3) the granting of divorce if mutually agreed and approved by a special agency which endeavors to foster reconciliation, (4) change in the usual custom of granting by law support and alimony to the wife, (5) the fostering of instruction for both the married and the unmarried. It can be little doubted that in practice many of these suggestions of Lindsey's are being carried out, though not sanctioned by law.² Some sociologists can justify, or at least explain, each point in the program. Those most critical of it find in it a lure for youth which is dangerous. They consider it a partnership which "seizes all privileges but denies responsibilities"³ of the true family. It has been termed by many⁴ an "arrested family", because its interests are restricted to the two partners alone and

.

1. Cf. E. Groves: op. cit., p. 89.
2. Cf. E. Mowrer: op. cit., pp. 263, 264.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: op. cit., p. 115.
4. Cf. E. R. Groves: op. cit., p. 89, and G. W. Fiske; op. cit., p. 115.

children are mutually excluded. It is thus in its ordinary execution sanctioned selfishness. The fact that children are postponed is not a matter of criticism, but rather that they are excluded altogether. Companionate marriage concerns itself with the two contracting parties and fails to recognize that every marriage is a matter of community interest and concern. Its main emphasis is upon sex, and it therefore fails to recognize the whole nobleness of the marriage relationship. Finally it is not truly "marriage" in the historical sense of the word; rather is it a substitute for marriage, and thus should more properly be termed "the companionate" rather than "companionate marriage".¹ The open willingness to defy convention as is proved by individuals who are experimenting with new forms of marriage or substitutes for it, evidences the complexity of modern life. The prevalence of loose marriage relationships is sapping the very heart of the institution; society is challenged to avoid any suggestion of sanctioning that which will tear down family life and the home. The drift away from moral restraints and ethical securities basically rocks the stability of the American home, situated as it is in the midst of a bewildering society.

C. Summary

From a survey of the disintegrating influences of modern family life as evidenced in the economic, social, moral and religious realms, the difficult position of the home is most certainly recognized.

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; op. cit., p. 103.

Many adjustments and changes are forced upon the family unit of America whether it wills it or not. Others are entered upon in keeping with the general spirit and circumstances of the times. Economic, social, and religious forces have been considered as disintegrating, not necessarily because of any inherent unwholesomeness of nature, but rather because of the outcome or effect produced. Thus with the surge of new economic forces, the rise of baffling social conditions, and the arising tendencies in moral and religious attitudes, it is perhaps more to be wondered that the home exists at all, rather than that it is experiencing a struggle against disintegration or radical revolution.

CHAPTER III

THE INTEGRATING INFLUENCE OF RELIGION IN THE MODERN HOME

CHAPTER III

THE INTEGRATING INFLUENCE OF RELIGION IN THE MODERN HOME

A. Evidence of the Integrating Influence of Religion in the Home.

1. As Revealed in the Hebrew Home.

In a discussion of family life, modern authorities very frequently refer to the home life of the Hebrew with recognition of its superiority over that of other ancient peoples.¹ The fundamental explanation for this high type of family life, it is pointed out, lies to a great extent in the fact that the Jews were a religious people. Moreover, their religion was a religion that centered in the home. The father presided over the household as priest, and the important religious observances, such as the passover, were largely family rites.² Motherhood and the birth of children were honored and held sacred, probably due in later days, at least, to the expectancy of the Messiah.³ In addition, the need for the training of the children in the ways of Jehovah God was emphasized from very early times in such words as are found repeated in Deuteronomy,

.

1. Cf. C.A.Ellwood: Reconstruction of Religion, p. 81; W. Goodsell: The Family, pp. 53-54; T.G.Scoates: The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, pp. 39-46, 58-62, 333-334; R.P.Kreitler: Eugenics, in Honest Liberty in the Church, pp. 204-5; Delaware Study Conference Reports, 1931: The Changing Standards of the Family, p. 5; W.W.Moore: Religion in the Home, pp. 8-10; H.F. Cope: Religious Education in the Family, pp. 39-41.
2. Cf. W.Goodsell: op. cit., p. 53.
3. Cf. H.F.Cope: op. cit., pp. 39-40.

"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up . . . and thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates."¹

This religious instruction in the home, Soares asserts, accounts more largely than any other one factor for the preservation of the Jew in history.² Loyalty, stability, and unity, thus, were the inevitable outcomes in the family life of a people who nurtured their children in the atmosphere of vital religion.

2. As Revealed in the Early American Home.

The homes of the pioneers of America were founded for the most part by religious men, and religion was given a prominent place in the family organization. Comment is frequently made upon the sternness and severity of the type of religion manifest in the homes of the New England Puritans. However, one must not fail to consider the seriousness of mind of the whole colonial period; religious expression was simply in keeping with the general severity of attitude in all matters. But most important of all, it must be realized that the religious faith of these early homes gave them power and courage and faith. Religion in the home was for them not only a unifying and stabilizing power, but a matter of such vital necessity that it was their prime interest in life. It kept them together as families and gave leaven to the future nation.³

.

1. Deuteronomy 6:6,7,9.
2. Cf. T.G.Soaress; op. cit., p. 62.
3. Cf. G.W.Fiske; The Changing Family, pp. 39-40.

3. As Revealed in the Christian Home of Today.

Religion in the modern home manifests itself far less than in earlier periods of our country's history¹, and yet even in its weakened expression it bears testimony to the power of Christ to preserve home life and to produce men and women of honorable, law-abiding character. The divorce ratio is, undoubtedly, a negative consideration, yet it may be cited as indicative of proof of this assertion. While the ratio of divorce in the United States has reached about one in every seven marriages², it has been estimated that the ratio of divorce in religious families is about one in fifty. Thus the Christian home is said to have about seven times more likelihood of permanency than non-religious homes.³ Further testimony to the work of the Christian home is found in the strikingly significant statement of Dr. Frank L. Christian, superintendent of the New York State Reformatory at Elmira, to the effect that few criminals come from Christian homes.⁴ Admittedly, no adequate nor accurate measure of the influence of religion in the home can be given or made, and yet such external facts as have been indicated are most certainly contributive to the belief that Christianity can and does integrate home life even in the whirl of mighty disrupting forces in the society of today.

.

1. Cf. W. Goodsell: op. cit., p. 398; cf., also, Recent Social Trends in the United States, p. 662.
2. Cf. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., pp. 159, 160, quoted p. 52 of this thesis.
3. Cf. G.W.Fiske: The Christian Family, pp. 33-34.
4. Cf. F.L.Christian, in The Chapel Bell, quoted by J.C.White; Child Welfare and the Church, p. 37.

From the foregoing, it is evident that the Hebrew home owes its singular survival to the plan of religious organization upon which it was built. Moreover, the early American home survived severe testings chiefly because of the attitudes of sacredness which were built about it, and the prominent place which religion was given within it. Furthermore, Christian homes of today prove the preserving power of Christ through their ability to withstand the almost crushing pressure of modern social trends. From these brief references, it would seem that it is justifiable to conclude that there is an inherent power in religion to bind together, to unify, and to stabilize home life even in the most diverse and difficult circumstances.

B. The Functioning of Religion in the Preservation of the Modern Home.

Introduction.

In the preceding chapter, we have endeavored to show that certain economic, social, moral and religious influences tend to provoke difficult problems in the modern home. With recognition of the impact of these forces against the home, therefore, an attempt has been made to discover its basic needs from a Christian viewpoint. This was done through a study of the selected texts on Christian sociology and Christian family life. A summary of the vital concerns of the family, presented by these authorities, is as follows: First, there is need of a rediscovery of the sanctity of the home and the sacredness of the marriage relationship. Second, the modern home is severely in need of stabilization. Third, family life of today must become more unified and centralized. Fourth, the modern family needs

a cooperative form of government. Fifth, the modern home must be released from a materialistic emphasis. Claims made by the selected authorities for the way in which religion may function in meeting these needs were listed in chart form for analysis and comparison. The following discussion represents the result of this study. Some repetition has been unavoidable, since religion does not manifest itself in a mutually exclusive fashion in respect to any one of the points of consideration.

1. As a Vital Factor in the Rediscovery of the Sanctity of the Home.
 - a. Through the Building Up of a Religious Conception of Marriage.

In connection with our discussion in a previous chapter upon the changed views that have arisen in regard to marriage, the decided tendency of recent years to think of marriage very largely in terms of convenience or sentimental romanticism was pointed out. These conceptions are wholly inadequate, and the Christian ideal of marriage must be made to transcend them. The Christian interpretation transforms every phase of the union and makes even the most physical part of it sacramental in nature. The relationship is spiritualized and soul becomes united with soul for the glory of Christ.¹ Thus, in contrast with the fleeting and unstable conception of romantic love, Christian love is capable of growth and unselfish sacrifice, so that it becomes a true fusion of personalities.²

.

1. Cf. H. Holt: Building Family Foundations, pp. 72-74.
2. Cf. F. R. Barry: Christianity and the New World, p. 213.

F. R. Barry has beautifully expressed this thought in these words,

"If Man is indeed made in the image of God, if in communion with his God and Father he attains the real fulfilment of his being, then love, as a self-giving of the whole man, is lifted into the eternal order and becomes shared communion in the Spirit. This is the Christian ideal of marriage."¹

A desire for such a union does not protest against the monogamous, enduring standard which Christ sanctioned as the Christian expression of marriage, but rather finds in it a basis for noble confidence and permanence.

b. Through the Bringing About of a Regard for the Home as a Religious Institution.

A Christian concept of marriage is basic to the rediscovery of the sanctity of the home, but it must be supplemented by a genuine conviction that the family itself is a divine institution. A regard for it simply as a primary unit in human relationships or the product of man's ingenuity fails to take into account its true origin.²

Frederic C. Spurr in a sermon entitled "The Preservation of Family Life" challenges with this statement. He says,

"Society can never be what it should be until it recognises that the roots of family life lie in God. . . Allied with God the idea of the family is transfigured. Delivered from all grossness of conception, it appears in all its splendour as the most beautiful thing in life."³

But in this ganglion of new attitudes provoked by the economic and social pressure of society, the admonition to regard the sanctity of

.....

1. F. R. Barry: Christianity and the New World, p. 212.
2. Cf. J. E. C. Weldon et al: Religion and Reconstruction, pp. 80-81.
3. J. E. C. Weldon et al: Religion and Reconstruction, p. 81.

the home is received scarcely with toleration. Men and women, then, must become assured that the ethical ideals of Christianity for the home are still practicable. In other words, the church must not only teach that family relationships are sacred, but it must help young men and women to be convinced of this truth by helping them to rediscover in this age the justifiability of the "sanctity of the home."¹ In the building up of these genuinely Christian attitudes, it will then be realized, as Barry says,

" . . . the Christian home is not a mere synonym for a commonplace, virtuous domesticity. It is, as the Christian Church claims, a sacrament of human relationships in their ideal at once the symbol and instrument of redemption through the Love Divine."²

Many agencies may recognize the need of restoring an attitude of sanctity toward marriage and the home. The very nature of the need, however, demands that religion function as a vital factor in bringing this about. Through the development of a religious conception of marriage, therefore, and the building up of a regard for the home as a religious institution, the sanctity of the home may not only be rediscovered, but a definite safeguard set about it as an institution worthy of preservation in society.

2. As an Impelling Force in the Stabilizing of the Family Group.

The modern home is in a state of flux and is thus in grave need of stabilization. The disintegrating influences of home life make it difficult to maintain unity even in homes which vitally con-

.

1. Cf. F. R. Barry: op. cit., pp. 202-203.
2. Ibid., p. 218.

cern themselves with the problem. Social agencies have been very beneficial in their efforts to readjust and aid in the rehabilitation of families, but in so fundamental and serious a consideration a force more basic and more effective must be allowed to work. This force can be none other than pure and undefiled religion functioning actively in the lives of those within the home of today.¹ This stabilizing effect of religion, it is contended, may be definitely brought about through the fostering of Christian attitudes toward modern marriage problems and through the expression of Christian virtues and character in the life of the home.

a. Through the Fostering of Christian Attitudes toward Modern Marriage Problems.

(1) Companionate Marriage Policies.

Synonymous with disregard for the religious concept of marriage is the tendency to experiment in various substitutes for the marriage of a sacramental nature. The more frequent forms of experimentation have been surveyed in the preceding chapter. Our problem here is to consider what the Christian's attitude should be in respect to trial marriage and the companionate, or other so-called forms of marriage.

The idea of the companionate and trial marriage has been set forth, it is claimed, in an attempt to meet certain very definite problems.² It has been suggested for the relief of sex strains upon

.....

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; The Christian Family, pp. 31-32.
2. Cf. Ibid., p. 28.

youth entering marriage while still in educational pursuits or bound down by economic responsibilities and thus unable to assume the obligations of the conventional type of home. Further, it obviously relates itself to the problems presented by woman's changed position and to the general desire for greater freedom without sacrifice of home privileges. There is serious doubt, however, that such substitutes as the companionate would or could accomplish the purpose that its advocates claim for them. Youth of an indulgent type would scarcely be content with the restraints of the companionate. Moreover, extremely early marriage seems rather in need of discouragement than encouragement. The justifiability of deferring children is recognized under present economic pressure and particular circumstances, yet there is real danger in failing to have children in the years of greatest vigor and vitality.¹

George Walter Fiske in referring to the companionate speaks of it as a "brazen sort of concubinage", and claims that, when analyzed, it is simply "trial marriage plus race suicide."² The most pernicious element about it, he declares, is that it considers marriage as a contract which may be entered upon and dissolved as a matter of concern to only two individuals. This is "superlative selfishness" and self-indulgence, and thus absolutely out of harmony with the true concept of marriage.³ Further, it is psychologically un-

.

1. Cf. Committee on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; *Ideals of Love and Marriage*, p. 16.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske; *The Christian Family*, p. 28.
3. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

sound in that it places before youth a temporary, unstable outlook toward a relationship which Christian ideals set as a partnership for life. In addition, the sad state and distinct disadvantage of the discarded wife at the termination of the relationship, through its easy divorce policy, is distinctly undesirable and unchristian.¹ The chief danger of this marriage substitute, according to the Committee on Marriage and the Home, of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, is the undue emphasis upon sex without moral control. It fails to provide for the sublimation of sex as a spiritual experience.² In view of these unwholesome factors, George Walter Fiske and the Committee on Marriage and the Home are representative of those who stand in open opposition to the companionate and other similar substitutes for Christian marriage.

A quotation from Barry seems to summarize the points already brought out by the foregoing authorities,

"Grant the sincerity of those who advocate it; grant also that some such regulation is to be preferred, socially and morally, to the chaos which it aims at superseding; it remains that the system could hardly be a lasting solution. It seems to offer a kind of social harmony; but it is at too dangerously low a level. It is hopelessly vitiated, from our standpoint, by its perilous over-simplification. It isolates 'love', as sexual desire, from the responsibilities and sacrifices involved in the sharing of a permanent home. And this, though it may do something to accommodate the appetites of the average sensual man to what is demanded by social well-being, can never do justice to love itself. We have seen that to isolate love from the whole context of social experience is a certain way to making it insecure."³

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; *The Christian Family*, pp. 29-30; cf., also, Committee on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; *Ideals of Love and Marriage*, p.15.
2. Cf. *Ideals of Love and Marriage*, p. 14.
3. F. R. Barry; *op. cit.*, p. 220.

When the implications and facts of marriage arrangements of the type discussed have been squarely faced, the attitude toward them on the part of Christians seems most obvious.

(2) Divorce.

To foster a Christian attitude toward divorce, the concept of marriage as sanctioned by Jesus must again be noted. That His ideal was an enduring relationship is unquestionable, as is indicated by His words: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."¹ As a single concession to this life-long relationship, it is generally agreed that Christ sanctioned divorce "for the sake of fornication"², though He clearly pointed out that such was not the plan from the beginning.³ Some would dispute the authenticity of this one exception, claiming that it is not in accord with the records of the other three gospels but was very likely interpolated at a later date.⁴ Others would not dispute the validity of the phrase but contend that the emphasis was not upon divorce but upon the inability to remarry.⁵ There are those who would criticize all these viewpoints on the basis that marriage is no longer marriage when its sacred principles have been broken. Therefore, they would contend that it is morally wrong to keep individuals bound in such a relationship. Barry

.

1. Matt. 19:6.
2. Matt. 19:9.
3. Cf. Matt. 19:8.
4. Cf. F. R. Barry: op. cit., p. 231.
5. Cf. M. H. Gates; Divorce and Remarriage, in Honest Liberty in the Church, pp. 145-7.

takes a charitable position toward this viewpoint though he would urge that every Christian grace and discipline be exerted to avoid divorce as the easiest way out.¹ In all these varying attitudes among religionists, however, it is to be noted that the major emphasis is upon the need to challenge young people to a return to the ideal of Jesus and to live in accord with Christ's principles so that divorce may be avoided.

(3) Birth Control.

No virtue of Christian character was held in higher esteem in the early church than absolute purity. Rigid standards in this regard were built up about family life, sex, and the sex relationships, even to a somewhat ascetic constraint. It was with such standards that the early settlers of our country established and conducted their homes. It was of little wonder that they recoiled against such proposals as birth control or divorce. Within the last two hundred years, however, changes in attitude have been brought about in family life which exceed the changes of all the previous fifteen hundred years of history of the early church.² There are many who cling to the traditional ideals, and yet others have modified these with sincerity of spirit. In view of these facts, one cannot expect to find a unity of opinion in the Christian church of today.

The report of President Hoover's Research Committee on

.

1. Cf. F. R. Barry: *op. cit.*, p. 235.
2. Cf. Delaware Study Conference Reports, 1931: *Changing Standards of the Family*, p. 6.

Social Trends surveys the church's expression in recent years in regard to this problem.¹ The chief impetus, however, for the American Protestant churches to discuss this matter came as a result of the action of the Lambeth Conference in England in 1930. This conference admitted the need of limitation of children under certain conditions and recognized contraceptive methods at times, at least, as legitimate. Six months later the Committee on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America issued a statement as to its attitude toward the subject. It was to the effect that the church as a church should not seek to impose its own ideas in regard to the use of contraceptives upon individuals, and further, that the church should not prevent physicians from giving such instruction and information. A majority of the committee which made this particular study concluded that the "restrained use of contraceptives by married people is valid and moral." In this conclusion, it did not fail to recognize the accompanying dangers in the practice and the possibilities of its abuse.² However, a minority opinion was also voiced by the committee. This was their statement,

"A minority of the committee believes that sufficient stress has not been laid upon the idealistic character of the teachings of Jesus concerning marriage and its obligations. . . . In view of the widespread doubt among Christian people of the morality of the use of contraceptives, and the scruples experienced by many in making use of them, it appears to these members of the committee to be the plain duty of the Christian church, when control of conception is necessary, to uphold the

.

1. Cf. Recent Social Trends in the United States, pp. 1016-7.
2. Cf. The Birth Control Statement: Information Service, Volume X, Number 13, March 28, 1931, p. 2.

standard of abstinence as the ideal, recognizing it as a counsel of perfection, and that Christian morals are much more exalted than is generally supposed. . . .¹

Almost immediately after the presentation of this report to the public, editorials and comments were voiced in newspapers and church publications. Of all comments surveyed at the Federal Council office, excepting those by Catholic papers, only thirteen openly condemned the position set forth, while forty-five approved at least mildly; ten others took no definite stand.² These reactions together with the report itself may therefore be regarded as reflective of modern attitudes toward the problem in the church at large.

Such divergent views in the church of today on this subject clearly show that the responsibility of decision in the matter falls upon the conscience of the individual. Whatever the individual decides must only come, however, upon the realization of certain fundamental Christian principles. Christianity sets supreme value upon the individual worth of the child and its right for wholesome nurture and development. Then, it is certainly not in accord with Christian principles to bring into the world children not wanted and not loved.³ Further, selfishness as a motive for the limitation of families is incompatible with Christian virtuousness. Moreover, Christian character presupposes discipline and control and self-indulgence finds no place. If these vital concerns are regarded, then no matter what attitude is accepted, birth control will not be allowed by Christian

.....

1. **The Birth Control Statement;** Information Service, Volume X, Number 13, March 28, 1931, p. 2.
2. **Cf. Public Opinion on the Birth Control Statement;** Information Service, Volume X, Number 19, May 9, 1931, p. 1.
3. **Cf. F. R. Barry;** op. cit., p. 223.

people to be an unstabilizing feature of the Christian home.

Thus, it is seen, men and women of today are confronted with the temptations of experiment in marriage, escape from the difficulties of the marriage relationship through divorce, and the selfish freedom offered through the practice of birth control. In their ordinary acceptance, the factors behind these temptations definitely tend to disintegrate the home. The meeting of these issues with unflinching Christian standards and attitudes can alone keep the home stabilized in the face of their impact upon it.

b. Through the Expression of Christian Virtues and Character in the Life of the Home.

Christian virtues and characteristics cannot be adequately discussed apart from their expression in life itself. Admittedly, they permeate successful family life in all its phases. Therefore, in this discussion it must be recognized that some overlapping and repetition is inevitable.

That the home must not only be founded upon true love, but that it must be conducted in the spirit of love seems almost too obvious to mention. This is, however, the very essence of the family's power to endure. Love must be genuinely manifest between husband and wife and be extended toward and among the children. It is a love that is based on mutual interests; love that is capable of growth and the mellowing of years. It is love that is of and for God. This unselfish love is included as one of four points of emphasis which Dr. L. Foster Wood brings out in an editorial in the Federal Council

Bulletin as a need for family religion in this day. Together with this he includes the need for understanding in the home, the development of a spirit of mutual helpfulness, and the regard for each expression of the home, no matter how small, as a Christian task.¹ The cultivation of these principles cannot help but be stabilizing to the modern home.

It is evident that selfishness and self-aggrandizement tend only to tear down and destroy family stability. Positive altruism which expresses itself through willing sacrifice and service, therefore, must be fostered in the home. Healthy family life, moreover, thrives on the spirit of Christian good-will.² Furthermore, the spirit of loyalty is one of the potencies of the past which the home of today vitally needs. Cope points out that loyalty finds its source in the affections of the home, for it expresses itself first in loyalty to persons and then to principles and standards.³ These, then, are but a few additional Christian characteristics which must be exercised to bring about true stability in the home.

In summarizing, the whole catalogue of Christian virtues might well be included or implied as being essential to expression in home life. However, genuine love, understanding, mutual helpfulness, positive altruism, and noble loyalty are some of the characteristics that have been particularly discussed as being indispensable for successful family life. That these virtues cannot be adequately made

.

1. Cf. Family Religion in the New Day, pp. 3-4.
2. Cf. C. A. Ellwood; op. cit., pp. 190-1.
3. Cf. H. F. Cope; op. cit., pp. 31-33.

manifest without the dynamic of true religion through Christ is basic to our whole discussion of their stabilizing power.

It is obvious and undisputed that the family group of today needs stabilizing. True religion offers itself as an impelling force in meeting this need. It evidences its power through the cultivation of Christian attitudes toward current marriage problems such as companionate marriage policies, divorce, and birth control. In respect to these, it does not seek to legislate, but rather to challenge individuals to consider their actions in the light of Christian principles and teachings. Moreover, Christianity makes possible the expression of high and noble virtues and character in home life and thereby definitely contributes to the stabilization of the home.

3. As an Agency in the Centralizing of Home Life.

a. Through the Development of General Culture in the Home.

The centrifugal life of the modern home must be checked at least to a certain degree, if its continuance is to be expected. One means of bringing about its centralization is through the fostering of cultural interests within the home. That this should be considered from a religious viewpoint is altogether logical and fitting since culture in the broad sense of the word is so interwoven with religion that it cannot long function in the race without it.¹ Samuel Smith Drury has recognized this need in the Christian home and writes thus:

.

1. Cf. C. A. Ellwood: op. cit., pp. 17, 34-5.

"Each family needs a secret evening; the interfering world rigidly excluded, when strong heart and tried experience by the alchemy of love can feed receptive youth. The elders too need that resilience which drives off what the monks called accid , the bane of middle life. . . This is culture indeed, the exchange of power in the divinely drawn circle of the family. If elders are busy with their own affairs, if each member is selfishly realizing his or her own self at separated points, the home becomes a boarding house and the beacon light of culture does not guide."¹

Albert W. Beaven devotes three chapters of his small book, "Fireside Talks for the Family Circle," to the discussion of the promotion of general culture within the home. In one chapter he discusses literature, in another art, and in a third music. The ministry of well-selected books and clean magazines in a family library can scarcely be estimated, he brings out. Interest in the finest and best literature is fostered, and an aversion is created toward the cheap, degrading magazines and trash that are so widely spread abroad.² As for art, the cultivation of good tastes may be encouraged through the family's sharing together in the study of copies of the works of the great masters. Novel ways of doing this may be worked out by the parents and definite interest within the home brought about.³ A secret charm for the strengthening of home ties exists also in good music. Love for the finest is largely dependent upon the giving of the best to children from their earliest years. In this day of radios, player pianos, and victrolas, the home may definitely influence through the music which it chooses, the type of music which it wishes its children

.

1. S. S. Drury; The Standards of the Modern Home, in Honest Liberty in the Church, pp. 180-1.
3. Cf. Chapter VI, pp. 45-55.
4. Cf. Chapter VII, pp. 56-64.

to appreciate. Old-fashioned "sings" in which the best hymns and songs are learned and sung together develop strong bonds among the members of any family.¹ Thus, it is seen that even in the home of today, there are still opportunities where conscious effort may be made to develop good tastes, in literature, art, and music, with the result that definite interest in these things may contribute to the centralizing of life within the home.

b. Through the Promotion of Social Activities as a Family.

It is admittedly difficult for the home of today to compete in its social program with the commercialized amusements which have become so popular. However, since play is such a vital factor in the character development of children and youth, the home should seek to grapple with this problem.² Social activities within the home should be provided whenever possible. In this way the leisure moments which are the times of temptation may be supervised and directed. Frequently, some play equipment may be added to the home through the mere realization of the need to meet the play problem, or through a reduction in the amount of money spent on luxuries.³ Experience has long taught that if young people cannot bring their friends into their own home, they will find some place else to which to go. Thus, the home of today with its limited quarters has a decidedly difficult task. The trend of city dwellers to the larger homes of the suburbs may well be

.....

1. Cf. A.W.Beaven: Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, Chap. VIII, pp. 65-75.
2. Cf. W.W.Faris: The Christian Home, Chapter VII.
3. Cf. A.W.Beaven: op. cit., pp. 88-90.

commended from the social advantages offered within the home.¹ However, even the smallest urban home may well be willing to endure some inconvenience and discomfort and welcome its children's companions. In so doing it will find one secret of keeping the social activities built about the home.²

It is foolish to feel, however, that the home in this day and age can confine the amusements for its children and youth within the home. Outside interests and inducements are too strong. Therefore, parents should endeavor to follow and direct their children's interests. The home must build up in its children the desire for only the better sort of commercialized amusements that indulgence in the cheap and inferior may not gain a stronghold in their lives nor have the opportunity to destroy their finer sensibilities.³ Whenever possible, the family should seek to enjoy outside diversions of a worthwhile sort as a family group. The automobile may well serve to take the family away on pleasant drives together and to share in one another's companionship.⁴ Thus, a family whose members can play one with another has established a most fundamental bond of strength and unity of spirit.

c. Through the Sharing of Interests.

When parents endeavor to keep young with their youth, they

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Changing Family*, pp. 67-69.
2. Cf. H. F. Cope: *op. cit.*, pp. 185-7.
3. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 190-3.
4. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, p. 61; *The Changing Family*, p. 173.

have exerted an admirable effort toward the preservation of home unity. Children are keenly aware when their parents share with them in their interests, and they respond with their confidences. Conscious effort on the part of parents can make this possible even in the busiest of homes, as was evidenced by Theodore Roosevelt's constant interest in his children, even though burdened with the responsibilities of the chief executive of the land. Then, too, the sharing of plans and problems by parents with their children will stimulate reciprocation on the part of the children, thus strengthening the family bonds of love and understanding. Thus, sympathy, confidence, and loyalty are developed among the family group by mutual sharing and a more centralized home life is the inevitable result.¹

That the development of general culture within the home, the promotion of social activities as a family group, and the sharing of interests brings about a more unified type of home may be quickly conceded from the foregoing discussion. How religion functions as an agency in bringing this about may be less evident. The claim is made, however, because true religion seeks to foster beauty and loveliness, to encourage worthwhile joy and genuine happiness, and to bring about a thoughtfulness for one another that expresses itself in the mutual sharing of interests. Moreover, religion provides the necessary spirit of willingness, sacrifice, and courage which must be exercised in order to combat the great social forces which make difficult the task. And lastly, the ideal sought for is of a religious nature. At

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, pp. 60-62.

least, this is certainly Fiske's interpretation. He says,

"It is worth careful notice that Jesus' ideal of the Kingdom of God, his better world that is to be, is home-centered. That Kingdom of God's good will can never come until we restore the home as the real center of life."¹

In view of these claims and possibilities, therefore, it is concluded that religion functions as an active agency in the centralizing of home life.

4. As a Motivating Power in the Building of a Cooperative Form of Government.

It has already been observed that the patriarchal form of government which dominated in the past has very largely fallen into disrepute. Increased freedom and individualism have revolted against what formerly approximated tyranny.² The result has been a swing almost to the other extreme and domestic anarchy has arisen in the ultra-modern home.³ Neither tyranny nor anarchy are in accord with Christian principles, and thus it is our purpose to consider how a cooperative sort of relationship which is democratic in nature may be developed.

a. Through the Consideration of the Role of Parents.

Since the "dethronement" of the father, the position of the parents is one of the most essential considerations in the home of today. Holt voices the opinion that modern parents must work coopera-

.

1. G. W. Fiske: *The Changing Family*, p. 74.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Changing Family*, pp. 192-3.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Changing Family*, pp. 194-6; *The Christian Family*, pp. 55-6.

tively as comrades, being careful to recognize the natural rights of each member of the home.¹ Fiske remarks that "Parents lead but do not tyrannize" in the modern home.² He adds that their superior wisdom should be recognized because of their wider experience, but that no unreasonable autocratic rule should be exercised by them on this account.³ The same attitude is no doubt implied by Dr. L. Foster Wood when he suggests that one of the matters with which religion is today vitally concerned is "the working out in home life of satisfactory combinations of freedom and team work."⁴

With the development of a spirit of camaraderie between parents and children, however, there seems to be no vindication for the abandonment of the age-old right of parents for respect and honor.⁵ The spirit of the Apostle Paul's words, "the husband is the head of the wife",⁶ seems to have been adequately and popularly interpreted by William Wallace Faris. He says,

"No one ever charged Christ with being 'bossy', and the head of the house holds his place only on condition of being Christly; he has rightful power only in so far as he is Christly."⁷

He further points out that the command for children to obey their parents is in reality, "Obey both parents, you children".⁸ The addi-

.

1. Cf. H. Holt: op. cit., pp. 4-6.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Changing Family*, p. 196.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, p. 57.
4. L. F. Wood: A Social Hygiene Program for the Churches, *Journal of Social Hygiene*, Vol. XVIII, No. 8, November, 1932, p. 431.
5. Cf. Ex. 20:12; Eph. 6:2.
6. Eph. 5:23.
7. W. W. Faris: op. cit., p. 17.
8. Cf. Eph. 6:1.

tional phrase, "in the Lord", involves parental Christliness as is presupposed in the reference to the father as head of the household.¹ Thus, the Christian ideal for parents of today would seem to be to preside over their homes with loving council and direction that is God-given.

b. Through the Consideration of the Role of the Child.

Homes of today are built about the interests of the child. As an extreme reaction from patriarchal tyranny, the ultra-modern home has allowed a "high-chair despot" to arise.² Freedom of expression for the child has been widely popularized. Fiske drolly remarks upon it in this manner: "This gospel of free expression for children has some vigorous defenders, but it is never popular with the neighbors."³ Child-centered homes, however, need not admit the tyranny of the child. Rather, homes which are anxious for the best development and advantage of the child will seek to recognize the child as a personality with the right to voice an opinion. Reasonable demands for obedience may be made, but in so doing the individuality of the child need not be crushed.⁴ Trusted, guided, and directed, the child in the home of today has almost limitless opportunities.

c. Through Wholesome Parent-Child Relationships.

In the Christian home it is recognized that the child is of as inestimable value to the parent as is the parent to the child.

.

1. Cf. W. W. Farris: op. cit., p. 18.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske: The Christian Family, p. 56.
3. G. W. Fiske: The Christian Family, p. 56.
4. Cf. Ibid., p. 57.

Therefore, in order to safeguard the home, healthy parent-child relationships must prevail. The secret of bringing this about lies in the sharing of tasks, the recognition of mutual obligations, and willing cooperation one with another.¹ A definite means of realizing these ideals is through allowing the child a place in the family council. By admitting him into the family's discussions and planning, a sense of responsibility and real participation in the family group is felt. Mutual understanding between parent and child is fostered, and harmony, satisfaction, and a general spirit of happiness are bound to result.² Thus, a democratic form of government in the best sense of the term is considered to be most ideal for the family of today. Religion is a motivating power which can make this possible, because it provides for the exercise of parental rights, the satisfying of legitimate child rights, and the establishment of wholesome parent-child relationships.

5. As an Incentive to the Subordination of Material Interests to the Spiritual Values of the Home.

a. Through the Recognition of the Worth of the Individual.

Christianity is based upon the principle of the worth of the individual. Christ said that it was not His will that one of His little ones should perish.³ Salvation as taught in the New Testament is for "whosoever wills"⁴. Christ showed the supreme value of the little child by setting him in the midst and teaching that men must

.....

1. Cf. W. W. Fais; op. cit., pp. 24-5.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske; The Christian Family, pp. 57-6.
3. Cf. Matt. 18:14.
4. Cf. Rev. 22:17.

needs become as little children to enter into the kingdom of God.¹ Such then as Jesus took in His arms ought not to be subjected to the hardships of industrial toil for purely materialistic gain. A spiritual recognition of their worth will prevent their exploitation and give them the rights of the childhood training which is theirs.²

b. Through the Recognition of the Greatness of the Home Task.

One of the profoundest changes in all industrial and social life, as we have already shown, is the great influx of women into industries and vocations. It has been noted that the majority of women assuming such responsibilities do so from economic necessity. To those, however, who enter the business world for mere selfish reasons, such as for the enjoyment of greater luxury or diversion, there must be presented a challenge to realize the greatness of the home task. As Ellwood says, "the duties of the home are paramount to those of business."³ Even so, this is a period of transition, and as Barry asserts, one cannot from the Christian standpoint be too dogmatic nor condemnatory.⁴ Through the dilemma in which woman finds herself, however, she must be reminded, as Dr. Wood has suggested in another connection, that in the ordinary tasks of the home she can indeed contribute to the building of the kingdom of God.⁵

Thus, it is concluded, that religion gives men and women the incentive to regard the things of life in terms of spiritual values; it replaces low, material desire with noble ideals of con-

.

1. Cf. C. A. Ellwood: op. cit., p. 208.
2. Cf. Ibid., pp. 195-6.
3. C. A. Ellwood: op. cit., p. 196.
4. Cf. F. R. Barry: op. cit., pp. 236-240.
5. Cf. Editorial, Family Religion in the New Day: Federal Council Bulletin, Volume XVI, Number 2, February, 1933, p. 4.

duct which are capable of realization. It recognizes the worth of the individual and ennobles the task of homemaking.

In the early part of "Christianity and the New World", by Barry, a searching challenge is presented, which seems pertinent to our whole discussion. It is as follows:

"Can Christianity come out into the open, take a survey of the various new factors, psychological, economic, sociological, and offer creative moral leadership at once more progressive and more stable than non-Christian thinking can promise?"¹

The author then adds, "The Church stands or falls by the answer." In our presentation of the functioning of religion in the preservation of the home, we have attempted to do precisely what Barry suggests, confining our emphasis to the home and the expression of religion in the home. On the basis of modern authorities it has been shown that religion is inherently able to rebuild an attitude of sanctity about the home, to give the home a new stability, and to contribute toward its centralization. Moreover, it has been pointed out that religion fosters a cooperative form of home government and raises life from an emphasis upon material things to an appreciation of spiritual values. It is believed, therefore, that these factors vindicate the claim that religion can fundamentally meet the needs of the modern home.

C. The Role of Religion in the Life of the Modern Home.

With a consideration of all that is happening in modern life, it becomes evident that the fundamental problem of the home is a re-

.

1. P. 5.

ligious one.¹ The late President Coolidge's statement, "The greatest need of America is religion, the religion that centers in the home", is one that has often been quoted by those who have at heart the problem of the conservation of the Christian home.² The challenge is set forth for the home to assume and meet its religious responsibilities. It must think of its duties in terms of religion and realize that its obligation toward the children which it brings into the world is primarily religious.³ As Frank Kingdon says, "We cannot raise a religious generation in irreligious or careless homes."⁴ It is fitting, then, that the role of religion in the home be considered.

1. In the Lives of Parents.

Authorities emphasize over and over again the need for a vital religious experience on the part of parents. Sneath says, "Our immoral, irreligious, inefficient parents are our greatest national meance; . . ." ⁵ The unconscious influence of the parents upon the child can scarcely be realized or estimated. Modern psychology shows that the child is a born imitator in thought and action, and therefore it follows that the child's first concepts of God and all that is Christian come to him very largely through his parents.⁶ If parents

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; *The Changing Family*, p. 307.
2. Cf. R. E. Magill; *Making the Foundations Sure*; cf., also, G. W. Fiske; *The Christian Family*, p. 17.
3. Cf. H. F. Cope; *op. cit.*, pp. 46, 51.
4. Cf. F. Kingdon; *Humane Religions*, quoted by C. W. Brewbaker; *Evangelism and the Present World Order*, p. 14.
5. E. H. Sneath et al; *Religious Training in the School and Home*, p.19.
6. Cf. F. H. Richardson; *Parenthood and the Newer Psychology*, pp. 62-74, 190-1; cf., also, E. H. Sneath et al; *op. cit.*, pp. 154-5.

are delinquent religiously, then, what can be expected of the children of the home? From the viewpoint of a sociologist, Elmer says,

"Parents cannot hope to satisfactorily aid their children achieve the goal of a well balanced life by teaching any set of ethical and moral conduct and fail to live according to their own teachings. The practical application of a principle of life, the overt act, becomes the dominating factor in the child's life. The child will tend to imitate what is continually set before him. Hence the attitude of parents as expressed in overt acts during the early years of the child's life will tend to become a habit pattern."¹

Thus, the parent cannot expect that his child will learn the true meaning of religion by sending him off to the church school or even by attempting to teach him to do the things that are ethical and right. Rather must parents realize that they must know Christ, believe Him, live in accord with His principles, and then teach His ways to their children.² That this is worthwhile is echoed again and again by the testimonies of sons and daughters in later years to truly devout fathers and mothers.³

2. In the Character Training of Children.

Heredity and environment are admittedly basic factors in determining whether or not the child shall turn out for good or for evil, but the church has always emphasized the greater power of environment. It has taught, as Holt reminds us, ". . . that character can be changed and definitely modified by ideals, by guidance, and by the will and disposition of the individual. If it were not so, then

.

1. M. C. Elmer: op. cit., p. 42.
2. Cf. W. P. McNally: The Christian Home, in Christian Ethics, pp. 88-9.
3. Cf. A. W. Beaven: op. cit., pp. 18-20; cf., also, G. W. Fiske: The Christian Family, pp. 72-3.

the whole thesis of Christianity would fall to the ground."¹ The challenge for the home, then, is to become a "character clinic" for the practice of religion.²

As the Jesuits have long recognized, the building of character must begin with the very little child, since his moral and religious conduct for life is largely determined in his earliest years.³ Normally and naturally through guidance in the work, play, and general life of the home, Fiske suggests that such traits as dependability, helpfulness, truthfulness, willingness may be woven into the fiber of Christian character.⁴ In this process, however, it must be remembered, as Cope says, that

"Moral training is not a matter of cultivating honesty today, purity tomorrow, and kindness the day after. Virtues have no separate value. Character cannot be disintegrated into a list of independent qualities. We seek a life that, as a whole life, loves and follows truth, goodness, and service."⁵

It must be realized, moreover, that religious development is constantly taking place in the child either negatively or positively in all phases of the home's activities. Therefore, the parents must be concerned with sowing and nurturing good seed that the Husbandman may bring forth that which is good.⁶

Furthermore, the Christian home must not shrink from assuming its responsibility of training its children and youth in matters

.

1. H. Holt: op. cit., p. 41.
2. Cf. G. W. Fiske: The Christian Family, pp. 108-110.
3. Cf. E. H. Sneath et al: op. cit., pp. 4-5.
4. Cf. G. W. Fiske: The Christian Family, pp. 108-118.
5. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 52.
6. Cf. Ibid., p. 56.

in regard to sex and parenthood. Modern writers are emphasizing this need most emphatically. This is due, no doubt, to the home's failure in the past, and the great number of problems thereby aroused in adult life.¹ The educated modern parent recognizes the need of this instruction for his child, but only the Christian parent can spiritually interpret it in terms of noblest purity and honor.

In the character training of the home, then, Christian parents have a definite responsibility to send forth children into society who are happier, saner, and more efficient in every respect than the children of the non-Christian home.² This should arise from the sense of spiritual values that religion in the home can give, and the zealous desire of parents to develop in their children a balanced life³ which leads to the "measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."⁴

In view of all this, it is to be admitted with Cope that

"It is easy to insist on the responsibility of parents for the character-training of their children, but is difficult to see how that responsibility can be properly discharged under industrial conditions that take both father and mother out of the home the whole day and leave them too weary to stay awake in the evening, too poor to furnish decent conditions of living, and too apathetic under the dull monotony of labor to care for life's finer interests."⁵

Christianizing the social order is ideally the only answer and solution, and yet this can only come about through individuals. If parents are

.

1. Cf. H. Holt; op. cit., p. 59.
2. Cf. Ibid., p. 40.
3. Cf. The definition of character in an unpublished report of the Committee on Character Education of the National Education Association, quoted by T. W. Galloway: Parenthood and the Character Training of Children, p. 48.
4. Eph. 4:13; cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., pp. 48-9.
5. Ibid., p. 20.

willing to allow God to vitalize their lives, as has been discussed as prerequisite to any effective attempt in training children in Christian character, strength even in the face of the most perplexing circumstances will be given to exercise this great responsibility in the nurture of the young.

3. In the Adaptation of Certain Forms of Religious Expression.

Material on this phase of religion in the home is very accessible. In our study, however, we have made no attempt to survey systematically the great host of books of a devotional nature which are published, since we have regarded the mechanics or methods of religious expression as but one phase of the general subject of the integrating influence of religion in the home. Mechanics and method must be considered, however, for they present a very real problem to the parents who desire to keep their homes Christian in tone and nature.¹

a. Family Worship.

Scarcely a writer who discusses anything in connection with religion in the home fails to mention the family altar or custom of family prayers. Expression ranges from urgent pleas to restore the broken altars of old,² through suggestions for some adaptation of them, to the declaration that the practice is absolutely impractical for the modern home.³ In the past, family worship was a general though not universal

.

1. Cf. C. B. McAfee: Keeping Alive a Family's Thought of God, p. 1.
2. Cf. R. E. McGill: Rebuilding Broken Altars.
3. Cf. S. W. Stagg: How to Promote Home Religion, pp. 3-4.

custom in many Christian homes.¹ Today, however, it is estimated that there is scarcely one home in eight in which white American children share in family prayers.² The majority of authorities present the opinion that the values of the family altar must be conserved. Sneath says, "He who buries family worship in the graves of his forefathers inter a source of virtue and of power which he and his sons sorely need."³ Beaven adds that if the practice were needed under the conditions of the past, the home of today is certainly in even more vital need. Like other Christian distinctives it calls for the exertion of a desire and willingness to face and meet difficulties and problems from within and without the home.

The plea for the restoration of the family altar of the past or at least some adaptation of it is based upon fundamental values that are an inherent part of it. The most outstanding of these, according to modern thought, seems to be the opportunity which the family altar affords for corporate worship. In the united fellowship of common religious expression toward God, there is a distinctly social value.⁴ Fiske says the practice is "the greatest single force for family unity and morale."⁵ In addition, family worship gives opportunity for definite religious expression. Feeling, attitudes, and general conduct are not wholly satisfying; religion seeks for an op-

.

1. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., pp. 126-7.
2. Recent Social Trends in the United States, p. 674.
3. E. H. Sneath et al: op. cit., p. 161.
4. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 128.
5. G. W. Fiske: The Christian Family, p. 95.

portunity to objectify itself, and family worship in the home makes this possible.¹ Further, this definite form of religious worship provides a means for the expression of the higher meaning of the family; it gives to the family group that touch of sacramental significance which rightly characterizes the home that is Christian.² Ideals that are distinctly Christian are set up by the family worship custom and a safeguard of that which is morally highest is set about each member of the family day by day.³ Such an institution also affords an occasion for direct religious instruction.⁴ The little child learns to pray in the presence of others and some of his problems may be discussed.⁵ Learning to read the Word of God, and hearing it read has a definitely cultural advantage for children of the home; they are becoming acquainted with the finest literature in the world, and familiarized with the beauty of its style and its phraseology.⁶ Moreover, family worship contributes to the spirit of goodwill in the home, gives courage, and sweetens home life in general.⁷ Certainly the benefits which these writers have pointed out should arouse parents to attempt to conserve or restore this valuable institution of home life.

Having recognized the genuine worth of the custom, then, our next consideration must be how to make the family altar an integral

.....

1. Cf. H. F. Cope: *op. cit.*, pp. 128-9.
2. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 129; cf., also, G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, p. 95.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, p. 95.
4. Cf. H. F. Cope: *op. cit.*, p. 129.
5. Cf. A. W. Beaven: *op. cit.*, p. 23.
6. Cf. H. F. Cope: *op. cit.*, p. 130; cf., also, A. W. Beaven: *op. cit.*, p. 23.
7. Cf. R. E. Magill: *Making the Foundations Sure*, pp. 3-4.

part of modern home life. Finding the time for such worship is perhaps the most difficult problem with which the modern family has to cope. Some authors suggest just after breakfast or the supplementing of the grace asked at breakfast time with some Scripture verses and a general prayer for the day.¹ For many homes this may be very impracticable, as various members of the family may have to leave for the day's tasks at very different hours. For them, after the evening meal may prove to be a more suitable time. The important consideration is to plan a definite time, a time which is most convenient for all members of the home. With this, it must be realized that only when family worship is planned as a regular part of the daily schedule can it succeed.² The length of the worship period is a second matter of concern. Authorities seem generally to agree that the time set apart for such devotions must be brief. The leisurely long prayers of the past are impracticable; a period of from five to ten minutes is all that modern writers suggest.³ A third important consideration in connection with the successful conducting of family devotions today is the use of worship materials. Here lies one of the greatest opportunities for Christian parents to manifest their interest and ingenuity in planning a varied type of worship that will not be boring nor monotonous. Special days, birthdays, festive occasions should all be allowed to lend color to the group worship. Scripture can be used in a variety of ways

.

1. Cf. C. B. McAfee: op. cit., p. 3.
2. Cf. C. W. Brewbaker: op. cit., p. 63.
3. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 137; A. W. Beaven: op. cit., p. 25; E. H. Sneath et al: op. cit., p. 161; R. E. Magill: Rebuilding Broken Altars, p. 4.

other than the mere reading of it. Stories, pictures, poems, and song may be introduced in many ways so that this brief time together may be made a real period of enjoyment. Many suggestive books are available and may definitely help the busy parent of today to make family worship a happy experience.¹ In conclusion, it should be suggested that the family prayers, whenever held and whatever sort of program followed, should be conducted in a manner that is natural and unstilted. Reverence can be made possible without reading and praying in strange hallowed tones that make the worship period seem apart from the general normal home life.² Planning the worship period so that the various members of the family can all participate at one time or another will aid in creating a feeling of real unity in the worship one with another.

The family altar, then, it is believed by some, may be preserved and adapted for the "altered family" of today, because it has inherent values which make its continuance worthwhile.³ Parents who are genuinely Christian will exert unusual effort to meet the problems of time and program to keep alive the family's thought of God.⁴

b. Substitutes for the Family Altar.

Some believe the circumstances in which the family is placed today are insurmountable as far as planning for a family altar is con-

.

1. For example, J. P. Smith: The Family Altar; H. M. Robinson: How to Conduct Family Worship.
2. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 139.
3. Cf. A. W. Beaven: op. cit., pp. 18-25.
4. Cf. C. B. McAfee: op. cit.

cerned.¹ Admitting that this may be true in a proportion of family groups, it is absolutely vital and necessary that some form of religious expression take the place of group worship in the home. Beaven says in this connection,

"In our day, hurried as it is and with its divergent interests for different members of the family, it may not be entirely possible for us to maintain the family altar in exactly the same form in which it used to be maintained, but we need have no hesitation in saying that if we cannot maintain in our modern life something that for our generation will give us as real a sense of God at the heart of the home as the old family altar did for the previous generation, we will pay a high price for our failure."²

Unquestionably, parents of today are faced with the question of values.

If they believe that there must be definite expression of religious habits in the home, they must make conscious effort for such expression. For the busy modern family one suggestion as a substitute for the daily family altar is a weekly "Sunday night tryst" around the fireside.³ This may be a period of a half hour or so, possibly before the children's bedtime. It may be planned to include more than would be expected in a brief daily form of worship. In addition to the Bible, a discussion about some fine bit of literature or art could be included. Opportunity for a sharing of that which has been of inspiration and help during the week could be given. Problems and difficulties could be talked over. Good music from the radio or victrola could be used to help make the "tryst" homey and beautiful. In this time together a scripture passage might be chosen in the group to be

.

1. Cf. S. W. Stagg: *op. cit.*
2. A. W. Beaven: *The Fine Art of Living Together*, p. 142.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Importance of Worship in the Home*, pp. 11-12.

carried through the week in special thought. Such a period of inspirational thought would undoubtedly prove to be an oasis of joy to a busy family in the desert of a hurried week.

Another plan which has been suggested to replace the group worship of the home is the following out of a definite teaching program in religion on the part of mothers with their children.¹ Such a program calls for the cooperation of the church; manuals adapted for the various age groups are provided and mothers are instructed in the best methods of following through a series of lessons day by day with their children. In this way a definite program is provided for religious instruction in the home, and home religion is made to center directly upon the child. One is perhaps led to question whether or not the modern mother could find time for such a program. However, when it is remembered that Susannah Wesley sat down alone with each of her seventeen children, one wonders whether the modern mother, with her two or three, cannot find time!

Thus, in the busy and irregular life of the modern home, it may be felt that family devotions are an impossibility. In their place, therefore, a regular Sunday night tryst for the family or the following out of a definite series of lessons with the mother as teacher have been suggested. The fundamental concern is that some definite religious expression be found in the home.

c. "The Ministry of the Table"²

Cope's phrase, "the ministry of the table", is borrowed, be-

.

1. Cf. S. W. Stagg: op. cit.

2. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., pp. 164-172.

cause it seems to so adequately express all that which may be expected from the times when the family group gathers around the table. Though many modern families may fail to share their meals together, there is more likelihood for them to be found together at this time than at any other.¹ Thus mealtime offers one of the best times for the expression of true religion as a family group.

The saying of the blessing or grace at meals is perhaps as much a mark of religious expression in the home as any form of family worship. There seems to be no reason why it should not be the expected way in which the family should begin each meal.² It should not be mumbled, however, as a mere matter of form, but should be made a distinctive act of reverence asking for God's blessing, expressing thanksgiving for His gifts, and invoking His presence as the Unseen Guest at the table.³ A variety of form and expression needs to be used that the grace may continue to be made meaningful. At times, one of the children may be asked to offer a simple prayer of thanksgiving, or all may return thanks together in the words of some familiar verse of a hymn of thanksgiving. Occasionally, a Quaker blessing offered in silence may seem appropriate. A bond of affection and love may be expressed in this worship by the members of the family joining hands about the table.⁴ In summarizing, then, it may be said with Beaven, "If it is a real act of worship grace at the table puts the

.

1. Cf. Ibid., p. 164; A. W. Beaven; Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, pp. 76, 84.
2. Cf. A. W. Beaven; Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, p. 31.
3. Cf. Ibid., p. 34; H. F. Cope; op. cit., p. 133.
4. Cf. A. W. Beaven; Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, pp. 31-34; H. F. Cope; op. cit., pp. 133-4.

whole family gathering on a high plane."¹

The conversation of the table offers to the home one of the greatest opportunities for character building of its children. Parents may help their children to develop the art of good conversation through the table talk. Then, too, table conversation may be truly educative, if worthwhile subjects, such as are suggested by some experience of the day in school or at work, are discussed. Each member of the family should be encouraged to develop the habit of saving the very best of the day to share at the dinner table. In this way table-talk may be made interesting and cheerful. When the conversation of the table, then, is kept high and elevating, it may serve to do more for the child than many a sermon or lecture.²

Thus the whole experience about the table may be truly made a ministry in the home. From the introduction of the meal by some form of sincere though simple prayer of thanksgiving, through the entire conversation of the meal a sense of family unity and friendship with God and one another may be fostered and developed.

d. Bedtime Prayer.

The mother who kneels beside the bed of her child who cannot yet talk nor walk and asks God's blessing and care for him is both fulfilling a need for herself, and one for her child. She is drawing nigh to the God who gave her her most precious gift, and she is causing a deep unconscious blessing to be brought about in the life of her

.

1. A. W. Beaven: Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, p. 32.

2. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 164.

child.¹ As the child grows and begins to be able to express himself, the mother may teach him simple prayers. Longer prayers in verse or prose may follow. In these prayers, the mother may safeguard her little one from "vain repetitions" and try to arouse in him a real desire for prayer.² Finally, the child may be led to pray original prayers spontaneously. Through these, the child's innermost thoughts will be revealed and the mother will have the opportunity to correct sympathetically and carefully any misconceptions that may have entered the child's mind, and to teach him the deeper meaning of prayer.³ From these quiet times with the mother, or, better still, both parents, the tiny child may be led into a life of invaluable prayer habits.⁴ Certain safeguards, however, need to be set about the custom of bed-time prayers. The child must not be led to feel that the night brings danger, and that his prayer is just a fearful plea for protection and safe-keeping. Rather should he be led to feel that it is communion with God at the close of the day. Further, no particular virtue need necessarily be associated with the time for prayer. The child should be encouraged to pray not as a matter of routine or of force but rather as the expression of desire to talk with God.⁵ It is most evident, therefore, that experience through prayer may begin in the child's earliest years. In so doing, the parents are helping their children to enter into the experience of personal prayer, and to prepare for

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; *The Christian Family*, pp. 85-7.
2. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 88-92.
3. Cf. L. A. Weigle and H. H. Tweedy: *Training the Devotional Life*, pp. 20-22.
4. Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
5. Cf. H. F. Cope: *op. cit.*, pp. 135-7.

the experience of group and public prayer.¹

e. Sabbath Observance.

As a reaction against the rigid disciplines of the old-time Sabbath, a deplorable disregard for the sanctity of the day has arisen. It has become commercialized and made a day of general revelry and diversion.² In contrast with both these extremes in respect to the day, stands Christ's ideal for the Christian Sabbath. He interpreted it not as a day filled with negative prohibitions, but rather as a day of positive opportunities and privilege.³ The Christian family of today, then, has the difficult task of trying to live in the true spirit of Christ's teachings.

Church attendance as a family group on Sabbath morning is unquestionably the family's duty. Excuses may be many and varied, but it cannot be escaped that it is the Lord's Day and that He is worthy of worship in His House. The man who insists upon spending the whole day in what he calls rest and recreation is less adequately prepared for a busy week than the man who spends part of the day in gaining spiritual refreshment. Further, the man who contends that he can worship God just as well in nature is rarely genuinely honest. If he is, however, he fails to take into consideration the example of Jesus and the New Testament teaching in regard to church attendance. Still further, he selfishly fails to realize that if every Christian

.....

1. Cf. L. A. Weigle and H. H. Tweedy: op. cit., p. 17.
2. Cf. C. W. Brewbaker: op. cit., pp. 14-15.
3. Cf. A. W. Beaven: Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, p. 113; E. M. Shields: Sunday with the Child, pp. 1-2.

followed that principle there would be no need for churches.¹ Church attendance, therefore, should be part of the Christian family's Sabbath program.

If the family meets its responsibility by attending the church together in the morning, the chief problem of the day presents itself in the afternoon. Beaven offers these suggestions in attempting to help make the day a happy one. He recommends that a more simple meal be served than the customary Sunday dinner, so that the day may function more normally. In this way a late dinner, an unusually tired mother, and children who have become irritable in waiting for their meal may be obviated. Part of the afternoon the parents will very likely want to rest in quiet, but they must not necessarily expect their children to enter into an appreciation of such an opportunity. While parents are resting, then, the older children may keep the younger ones amused with some sort of quiet activity such as making scrapbooks for hospitals, or reading. During the afternoon the children may be led into memorization of Scripture in a number of attractive ways that will make it a joy rather than drudgery.²

With all this, however, children demand physical activity and Sabbath fails to make an exception. Walks for the children with the parents will help to meet this need.³ Family "sings", worthwhile Bible games, and service projects and activities may be participated in by the family group, and the afternoon made an enjoyable one.⁴

.

1. Cf. A. W. Beaven; Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, pp. 115-116.
2. Cf. Ibid., pp. 118-120.
3. Cf. A. W. Beaven; Fireside Talks for the Family Circle, p. 121; E. M. Shields: op. cit., pp. 2-3; H. F. Cope; op.cit., p. 162.
4. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., pp. 154-162.

The twilight hour of the day may be made one which will carry through the years as a happy experience. It may be the time when the family will sing together, or when mother or father tells a story, or when the family just share together in sweet, unhurried, friendliness and communion. Those who are old enough will again rightfully go to the House of God.

And so, the Sabbath may well be made a day of great blessing. Through the legitimate play and companionship that is afforded on that day the unity of the family will be strengthened, opportunity given for the doing together of the more ideal things of life, for penetrating deeper into the child's experience, and for the seeking of the lovely and the beautiful together.¹ In Beaven's words,

"To sum up, then, our aim as parents should be to make Sunday the big day of the week; to watch against restraint or making the day so inactive as to be dull; to fill it with the most wholesome and happy experiences for the entire family, and send all out into the next week with new power and resources."²

The Christian home of the past proved the worth of certain forms of religious expression such as family worship, the ministry of the table, bedtime prayer, and Sabbath observance. Modern authorities who are interested in keeping the home Christian agree that the values from these forms of religious expression must be conserved. An endeavor has been made, therefore, to show how they may be adapted and made to function in the home of today.

.....

1. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., pp. 150-2.
2. A. W. Beaven: op. cit., p. 124.

4. In the General Atmosphere of the Home.

Appropriate and fitting as is the observance of certain definite religious practices in the home, such as have been described above, they in themselves do not constitute the whole of family religion. Rather is the religion of the home something much broader and more intimate, as Dr. L. Foster Wood has suggested.¹ Cope writes that "Religion should present itself concretely, practically, and as an atmosphere and ideal in the family."² When this is done, religion is the life of the home and through all its phases of life, the child learns the way of the life which is eternal.³

Authorities mention no phase of home life as more essential to the expression of true religion than that of the general atmosphere. Sneath speaks of it as "the most subtle and potent force in the moral and spiritual development of the child."⁴ This is true, he points out, because of the definite set which it gives the child toward life, through its interests, its pleasures, and its concerns. Spurr remarks that a thoroughly religious atmosphere which is unstilted and genuine is one of the most fundamental factors necessary for the preservation of the home.⁵ In close connection with this contention, is the view expressed by Rufus Jones in his paper on "Religion and Family Life". He says, "The first step toward rebuilding our new society is in the

.

1. Cf. Editorial, Family Religion in the New Day; Federal Council Bulletin, Volume XVI, Number 2, February, 1933, pp. 3-4.
2. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 63.
3. Cf. Ibid., p. 6.
4. Cf. E. H. Sneath et al: op. cit., p. 148.
5. Cf. J. E. C. Weldon et al: op. cit., p. 83.

direction of the recovery of a truer and more vital spiritual quality in the home."¹ He shows what has already been mentioned in another connection that the plastic nature of the child, with his inborn capacity to imitate, is very definitely shaped through the unconscious influences of the home.² As Horace Bushnell has said, "The odor of the house will always be in his garments, and the internal difficulties with which he has to struggle will spring of the family seeds planted in his nature."³ Therefore the home which is not Christian in atmosphere and influence cannot expect successfully to train and nurture its young people in Christian living.⁴

The problem remains as to how this desirable Christian atmosphere may be attained in the homes of today. Faris says that the charm of any home, no matter how modern, may be truly brought about through "simplicity, sincerity, pervasiveness and winsomeness of piety and method."⁵ Again he suggests that children should breathe in what God-filled parents breathe out.⁶ Edward Leigh Pell in his charming little pamphlet entitled, "A Question of Atmosphere" addresses the mother of "John" and discusses how she may weave this most precious and intimate garment of atmosphere about him. Since the wearing of it affects all his later life, it is well for her to weave it with the utmost precision and care. The secret of her suc-

.

1. In Family Life Today, p. 184, M. E. Rich, ed.
2. Cf. M. E. Rich; Family Life Today, pp. 184-5.
3. Quoted by L. J. Sherrill: How Religion is Taught in the Home, p. 9.
4. Cf. Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.: Christian Education in the Family, Bulletin No. 3, p. 5.
5. W. W. Faris: op. cit., p. 15.
6. Cf. Ibid., p. 31.

cess lies in the directing of her thoughts upon the things that are true and pure and lovely.¹ This can only be done through willingness to find the time, but the greatness of her task should make her effort worthwhile. In speaking of the endeavor to make wholesome home environment and atmosphere, Richardson remarks that intelligence, ingenuity, and an intense desire to do so are necessary.² Certainly, then, the development of a religious atmosphere predicates these together with a sense of dependence upon Him who can transform even the humblest of homes.

An impetus toward the development of a religious atmosphere in the home has been given within the last few years through the plan of home dedication. It originated as a definite movement through Professor H. Augustine Smith, when he dedicated his new home in Wellesley in 1926. The plan consists of a simple program of song, poetry, and prayer, in the presence of a few friends or just the family, for the purpose of setting the home apart as a truly Christian abode. A most impressive ceremony can be worked out by dedicating with an appropriate verse of Scripture each part of the physical house - the windows, the lintel, the hearthstone, the pictures, and all the other important details. The plan may be used in the dedication of new homes, either newly founded or newly entered upon, or it may be fittingly adapted for the reconsecration of old homes.³ Certainly, such

.....

1. Cf. Phil. 4:8.
2. Cf. F. H. Richardson; op. cit., p. 94.
3. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, pp. 73-75; *The Changing Family*, pp. 211-223; A. W. Beaven: *Fireside Talks for the Family Circle*, pp. 8-9; C. W. Brewbaker; op. cit., pp. 64-5.

an attempt to attach spiritual significance to the more commonplace things of the physical environment of the home cannot help but contribute to the upbuilding of an atmosphere within the home that is truly of the Spirit of God.

To summarize, it may well be admitted that atmosphere is an elusive, intangible part of home life. Its far-reaching influence and vital significance in the present and future life of the child, however, demand that it be sweetly permeated with the love of Christ that He may indeed be made the Head of the Home.

5. In Cooperation with the Church.

The major emphasis of our discussion has been that the home in the society of today needs to reawake to its inherent religious nature and to assume its definite religious obligations in order that its unity be preserved. In this consideration, however, the home's relationship to the church must be regarded with more than mere incidental mention.

The home and the church should be allies of the truest sort, because they share a common purpose, namely, the building of Christian character.¹ Moreover, the kinship of the church and the home is deeply rooted because the church is basically made up of Christian parents and their children.² If these fundamental ties of intimacy were more readily recognized there would be more of a sense of coopera-

.

1. Cf. H. F. Cope: op. cit., p. 198; A. W. Beaven: op. cit., pp. 130-1.
2. Cf. Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.: Christian Education in the Family, Bulletin No. 6, p. 27.

tion between the church and the home, rather than the altogether too frequent sense of competition.¹ Furthermore, if Christian homes were more ready to realize that it is they who make up the corporate body of the church, they would perhaps be less ready to criticize its functionings and more ready to endeavor to bring about in the church the things which they expect it to give to them.²

These two fundamental institutions of society, therefore, are inherently interdependent and the life of the one is intermingled with that of the other. McNally has expressed this truth in these words, "The Church, depending on the family for the preservation and spread of the Christian religion, sees in the evil forces assailing the home a grave danger to its own life."³ The problem of cooperative action must thus be faced and met.

Since the influence of the home precedes that of the church, consideration should be given to what the church may do to help the home in its religious life. Dr. L. Foster Wood suggests that the church must think more and more in terms of the home.⁴ More home problems may well be discussed from the pulpit in the light of Christian teachings. Mothers' clubs, parents' groups, and young people's societies ought to provide for the opportunity for the discussion of vital home concerns. Pastors should endeavor to give more of their time for advice and counsel to parents in regard to their children.

.....

1. Cf. H. F. Cope: *op. cit.*, p. 199.
2. Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 200-202.
3. W. P. McNally: *The Christian Home*, in *Christian Ethics*, p. 55.
4. In a personal interview with the writer.

Several ways in which some churches are already helping to meet the need of the home, Fiske points out, are by offering wholesome recreational activities, trained teachers and leaders to supplement the religious instruction of the home, the opportunity for service of goodwill both within and without the church, and the giving of whole Sunday evenings to the interests and problems of their youth.¹

As the result of a group study in regard to "The Changing Standards of the Family", the following recommendations were made for the church in the interests of the home. First, that the church should provide an educational program within the church, and second, that the church should more actively and sympathetically align itself with those organizations which are seeking to bring about better family adjustments and general welfare within the home.² The recommendations given for the educational program within the church are chiefly concerned with education in regard to sex, and preparation for marriage, and their problems. The church is further urged to think in terms of family needs and to demand that its ministers in training be required to take courses which shall assist in meeting the problems of the home. Moreover, it is suggested that the church make a new study of the family in order to discover how traditional Christian practices of the past may be adapted for the home of today. The following out of such lines of activity and study as has been presented by these

.....

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske; *The Christian Family*, pp. 133-135.
2. Cf. Delaware Study Conference Reports; *A Study of the Significance of Jesus Christ in the Modern World*, Group I, Commission 3, p. 21.

authorities would no doubt lead to an amelioration of the church's program of assistance to the home.

Conceding that the church can do more for the home in the future than it has done in the past, the fact remains that the church cannot succeed in building up Christian character without the cooperation of the home. As Fiske graphically describes the situation, "religion must have a home base."¹ How this "home base" may function effectively has already been rather fully discussed. Provided, then, that every endeavor is being made within the home to build up an active Christian life in each of its members, there remain certain responsibilities of the home toward the church. Most fundamental among these is the home's obligation to see that every member of the family that possibly can attends church regularly. When church attendance is made the accepted custom of the home, many opportunities for unpleasant discussion will be avoided. The "institution" of the family pew is still quite practicable. A variety of opinion may exist in respect to the child's attendance at the regular church service, but it is agreed that the value of the participation of children with parents in public worship must be conserved.² Regularity in attendance at the church school is also essential; the church cannot teach the children if the home does not send them. The supplementing of the church school program is most necessary also, for the church cannot accomplish its great task in so limited a period. The home may do this

.

1. G. W. Fiske; *The Christian Family*, pp. 14-15.
2. Cf. A. W. Beaven: *op. cit.*, pp. 126-8; 133-5.

in a variety of ways, such as keeping in close touch with the child's church-school teacher, familiarizing itself with his course of study, and providing opportunities for the carrying out of what he has been taught in the church school hour.¹ In conclusion, then, the church in all its weaknesses and limitations deserves the sympathy and respect of its homes. Parents must therefore not be overly critical of its program or of its leaders, but rather manifest helpfulness in every possible way through regular attendance, vital interest, and constructive criticism.

Thus, if the role of religion in the home of today is to be worthwhile and active, the bond between the church and the home must be strengthened. Both institutions are working together to develop Christian lives, and each can help the other in this privilege to an extent which has scarcely been realized heretofore.

D. Summary.

The foregoing study has revealed that the Hebrew home, the early American home, and Christian homes of today present a basis for the belief in the integrating influence of religion in the home. Further, it has been made evident that religion may definitely function in preserving the modern home, since it is a vital factor in the rediscovery of its sanctity, an impelling force in its stabilization, a contributing agent in its centralization, a motivating power in building a desirable form of government within it, and the chief in-

.

1. Cf. G. W. Fiske: *The Christian Family*, pp. 135-6.

centive for the subordination of material interests to spiritual values. Moreover, it has been pointed out that the role of religion in the modern home may be made manifest in a number of ways. Most fundamental of these is the expression of a genuine Christian experience on the part of parents and then the building of true Christian character in their children. In addition, certain external practices, such as family worship and grace at table, may well be adapted and instituted in home life today, because of the positive values which they may give. Then, too, the whole tone and atmosphere of the home may be filled with the Spirit of Christ so that every phase of home life may contribute toward the realization of the Christian ideal for it. However, religion within the home is incomplete in itself, and definite, sympathetic cooperation must be established with the church. Thus, since religion has already manifested a unifying effect in home life, a power to cope with certain needs, and the potentiality of assuming a vital role in the home, it is concluded that home religion may have a definitely integrating influence upon family life today.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In review of our study, three important factors are to be noted. First, the family is a fundamental institution of society which is worthy of preservation because of its history, its functions, and its intrinsic value. Second, this vital unit of human relationships is threatened with disintegration by many economic, social, and moral and religious influences of modern life. And third, family religion manifests itself as a potent means of counteracting these disorganizing forces and of definitely integrating the modern home. This claim for religion is based upon the unifying effect that it has already shown in home life, upon the definite ways in which it may function in meeting the difficult problems of the modern home, and upon the role it may assume in any home which really exerts itself to include it.

In the complexity of modern society, however, the realization of this integration through religion is not to be achieved in any easy or simplified manner. Rather it predicates great effort and courage, especially on the part of parents. Rufus Jones utters a striking challenge on this point when he says,

"We moderns have the habit of conquering difficulties, of succeeding with great adventures, of daring to try what seems impossible. Has not the time come to apply that spirit and that attitude to other conquests than those of space and matter? That same determination of purpose which has cleared the virgin forests of this continent, made the deserts blossom like the rose and tapped for daily use the inexhaustible resources of

nature can recover and revitalize the home and make it once more the nursery of souls."¹

Family religion, indeed, is still practicable, though some of the forms of religious expression must needs be adapted and modified from their use in the past. The power of Christ is able to work in the homes of today to keep them intact, and to bind them together with ties that are not earthly but divine. Thus, though many agencies may contribute toward the preservation of the family, the home is fundamentally dependent upon the great dynamic of religion to bring about its integration.

.....

1. R. M. Jones: Religion and Family Life, p. 190, in Family Life Today, M. E. Rich, ed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE MODERN FAMILY

BOOKS

- Bosanquet, Helen: *The Family*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.
- Cooley, Charles Horton: *Social Organization; A Study of the Larger Mind*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1923.
Social Process. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1925.
- Dealey, James Quayle: *The Sociological Aspects of the Family*. Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1912.
- Ellwood, Charles A.: *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*. American Book Company, New York, 1912.
- Elmer, Marnel Conrad: *Family Adjustment and Social Change*. Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, New York, 1932.
- *Fiske, George Walter: *The Changing Family: Social and Religious Aspects of the Modern Family*. Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1928.
- *Goodsell, Willystine: *A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.
- Groves, Ernest R.: *Social Problems of the Family*. J.B.Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1927.
- Lindquist, Ruth: *The Family in the Present Social Order; A Study of the Needs of American Families*. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1931.
- Mowrer, Ernest R.: *The Family: Its Organization and Disorganization*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1932.
- Popenoe, Paul: *The Conservation of the Family*. The Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore, 1926.
- *Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends; *Recent Social Trends in the United States*. McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1933.

*Also used in religious study of the family.

Ross, Edward Alsworth: Principles of Sociology. The Century Company, New York, 1922.

Schmiedeler, Edgar: An Introductory Study of the Family. The Century Company, New York, 1930.

*Soares, Theodore Gerald: The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible: A Study of the Elements of Hebrew Life in Their Development from the Beginnings to the Time of Christ, and of the Social Teachings of the Prophets, of the Sages, and of Jesus. The Abingdon Press, New York, 1915.

MAGAZINES AND PAMPHLETS

Baum, Marie: "Family Life as a Social Institution", The Family, April, 1932.

Burgess, E. W.: "The Romantic Impulse and Family Disorganization", Survey, December 1, 1926.

Hinckle, Beatrice M.: "Changing Marriage, a By-Product of Industrialism", Survey, December 1, 1926.

Thompson, Warren E.: "College Youth Discusses Itself; View from a Classroom Window", The New Outlook, October, 1932.

Women's Bureau (United States Department of Labor): "Family Status of Breadwinning Women in Four Selected Cities", Bulletin No. 41, Washington Government Printing Office, Jacksonville, Florida, 1925.

Young, Donald: "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: The Modern American Family", The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, March, 1932.

THE RELIGIOUS ASPECTS OF THE MODERN HOME

BOOKS

Barry, F. R.: Christianity and the New World. Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1931.

*Also used in religious study of the family.

Beaven, Albert W.: The Fine Art of Living Together. Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1930.
Fireside Talks for the Family Circle. The Judson Press, Philadelphia, 1928.

Brewbaker, Charles W.: Evangelism and the Present World-Order. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1932.

Christian Ethics (The George Dana Boardman Lectures, 1927), McNally, William P.: The Christian Home. The University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1927.

Cope, Henry F.: Religious Education in the Family. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1915.

Delaware Study Conference Reports (Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, June 24-July 3, 1931): A Study of the Significance of Jesus Christ in the Modern World; Group I - The Effects of Modern World Trends on Human Life, Commission 3- The Changing Standards of the Family. The Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1931.

Ellwood, Charles A.: The Reconstruction of Religion: A Sociological View. Macmillan Company, New York, 1922.

Paris, William Wallace: The Christian Home. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work, Philadelphia, 1920.

Fiske, George Walter: The Christian Family. The Abingdon Press, New York, 1929.

Galloway, Thomas Walton: Parenthood and the Character Training of Children. The Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1927.

Hayward, Percy R. and Hayward, Myrtle Harmon: The Home and Christian Living. The Westminster Press, 1931.

Holt, Harold: Building Family Foundations. Morehouse Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1930.

Honest Liberty in the Church: A Record of the Church Congress (Protestant Episcopal) in the United States on its Fiftieth Anniversary A.D. MCMXXIV. Part II- Christian Marriage. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924.

Mathews, Shailer: The Individual and the Social Gospel. Published jointly by The Missionary Education Movement and Laymen's Missionary Movement, New York, 1914.

Rich, Margaret E., ed.: Family Life Today: Papers presented at a Conference in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Family Social Work in America, held at Buffalo, October 2-5, 1927. Houghton Mifflin Company, New York, 1928.

Richardson, Frank Howard: Parenthood and the Newer Psychology being the Application of Old Principles in a New Guise to the Problems of Parents with Their Children. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1926.

Silver, Abba Hillel: Religion in a Changing World. Richard R. Smith, Inc., New York, 1930.

Sneath, E. Hershey and Hodges, George: Religious Training in the School and Home: A Manual for Teachers and Parents. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1917.

Weigle, Luther Allan: Training of Children in the Christian Family. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1922.

Weigle, Luther Allan and Tweedy, Henry Hallam: Training the Devotional Life. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1919.

Weldon, J. E. G., et al.: Religion and Reconstruction. Skeffington and Son, Ltd., London, 1918.

MAGAZINES, BULLETINS, PAMPHLETS, and LEAFLETS.

Bruno, Frank J.: "The Family- Its Problems, Needs, and Programs: What Ten Years of Study Reveals", Religious Education, June, 1930.

Biederwolf, W.E.: "Reasons Why Every Christian Home Should Have a Family Altar". Educational Department, Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.

Boyson, Belle D.: "The Church and the Family", Religious Education, November 1929.

Christian Education in the Family (For Use of Parents in the Christian Education of the Younger Children - Birth to Eight Years), Bulletin No. 3. Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Christian Education in the Family (For Use of Parents in the Christian Education of the Older Children - Nine to Seventeen Years), Bulletin No. 6. Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

"Family Religion", The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America: Editorial,
"Family Religion in the New Day", Federal Council Bulletin,
February, 1933.

Committee on Marriage and the Home:

"A Bibliography on Young People's Relationships, Marriage
and Family Life", 1932.

"Ideals of Love and Marriage", 1932.

"Intermarriage of Members of Different Christian Com-
munities", March, 1932.

Department of Research and Education:

"The Birth Control Statement", Information Service,
March 28, 1931.

"Public Opinion on the Birth Control Statement",
May 9, 1931.

Fiske, G. Walter: "The Importance of Worship in the Home". Published
by the Committee of Religious Education and Publication,
Presbyterian Church, U.S., Richmond, Virginia.

"How One Family Handled Family Prayers". Published by the Board of
Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
Philadelphia.

Magill, R. E.: "Making the Foundations Sure". Presbyterian Committee
of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.

MacLean, J.A.: "Through Nature to God". Children's Division of the
Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.

McAfee, Cleland B.: "Keeping Alive a Family's Thought of God". De-
partment of Home and Church, Board of Christian Education
of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Philadelphia.

Moore, Walter W.: "Religion in the Home". Inter-Church World Move-
ment of North America, New York.

"Outlines of Marriage Instructions". The National Council, Depart-
ment of Christian Social Service, Church Missions House,
New York, 1932.

"Preparation for Marriage: A Bibliography". The National Council,
Department of Christian Social Service, Church Missions
House, New York, 1932.

Pell, Edward Leigh: "A Question of Atmosphere". Children's Division
of the Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.

- Robinson, Harold McA.: How to Conduct Family Worship. Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.
- Shields, Elizabeth McE.: "First Steps in Family Worship". Children's Division of the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.
"Sunday with the Children in the Modern American Home".
- Sherrill, Lewis J.: "How Religion is Taught in the Home". Children's Division of the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.
- Sibley, Harper (Mrs): "Family Life". Woman's Auxiliary, Church Missions House, New York.
- Smith, J. P.: "The Family Altar". Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.
- Stagg, Samuel Wells: "How to Promote Home Religion: The Working Program of One Church". The Abingdon Press, New York, 1922.
- "The Christian Home: A Program". Executive Committee of Religious Education and Publication, Richmond, Virginia.
- "United Church of Canada Board Favors Birth Control", Christianity Today, October, 1932.
- Weigle, Luther A.: "Home Training and the Problem of Authority". Children's Division of the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Virginia.
- White, J. Campbell: Five Studies on Child Welfare and the Church. Young People's Christian Union of the United Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh.
- Wood, L. Foster: "A Social Hygiene Program for the Churches", Journal of Social Hygiene, November, 1932.
- Woodhouse, Chase Going: "Character Development in Children of Successful Families", Religious Education, December, 1930.