



## As We See It

By DAN PATRICK

Much to our gratification, the articles appearing in our Victory Magazine of recent date are eliciting considerable comment.

Peculiarly enough the two which most readers have singled out are authored by women—Clare Boothe Luce and Dorothy Thompson. Both, of course, are widely known for their positive views on a number of subjects especially in the field of foreign affairs.

Our own State Department is reputed to consider Mrs. Luce the best-informed individual on foreign affairs in the nation outside of the Department itself. Mrs. Thompson is generally conceded to be an outstanding authority on Germany and its problems.

We mention this pair because a lady we know has questioned the propriety of including the viewpoints of Mrs. Luce and Miss Thompson in a magazine issued under Catholic auspices. The lady in question wondered if Catholic women are so bereft of talent and literary ability as to force us to resort to the writings of those outside the Church.

Before enlightening the lady on her wonderment, it might be well to emphasize that all writers for the Victory Magazine, including Mrs. Luce and Miss Thompson were solicited by us and asked to write on a specific subject assigned by those who prepared the magazine.

In extending such invitations, the Magazine editors were primarily concerned with obtaining the commanding authority on each subject. We did not inquire into the religious affiliations of the prospective contributors and if you reexamine the Magazine you will find Protestants and Jews as well as Catholics represented in its pages.

Now for the lady's wonderment.

No we don't think our Catholic women lack talent and literary ability. However, granting that they have such ability, the records show they don't use it. Now that the lady brings up the question we can't for a moment think of a single Catholic woman who could handle the subjects assigned Mrs. Luce and Miss Thompson with the skill and ability which this pair has consistently displayed.

"That, you might say, is a sad commentary on our Catholic women. To which we add a fervent Amen."

The Church recognizes motherhood as the prime function of womanhood. The millions of Catholic mothers who are carrying through on that life assignment so magnificently certainly do not come within the scope of our criticism.

The children they bring into the world and raise to manhood and womanhood are eloquent testimonials of their work and sacrifices. Such matters as international affairs, domestic writings and reputations fade into insignificance alongside the tremendous role of motherhood.

And by the way, this motherhood is particularly significant this week as the Birth Controllers, boasting their perverted ideals behind such fancy phrasing as the League for Planned Parenthood, start out on their annual quest for members. It's almost ironical that an organization which preached control of numbers should make an annual show of increasing its own numbers.

Excepting, therefore, the vast majority of our Catholic women, we still have goodly number left who have ability and time to exert that ability.

And in which direction to they exert it? Unfortunately too many exert themselves unto exhortation climbing the social ladder and attending this affair and that affair because "it's being done" and "you've got to meet the right people." O, yes, there is chaos in the world. Strikes—Inflation—Russia and the like. But these women can't be bothered. Those things are so dull, isn't it?

A business man of our acquaintance met one of these women at a cocktail party the other evening. She complained to him about the clergy "dabbling" in labor matters, declaring somewhat emphatically that they should tend to their religion and her husband and business men like himself should handle business. Apparently a papal encyclical in her private opinion is some kind of a vehicle.

It is high time that some of these women be stirrers themselves on the problems of the day which, in the final analysis, are their problems and will vitally affect their welfare and that of their children.

The course they should follow has been clearly charted by the Pope in his recent encyclical on the duties of women. The Holy Father exhorts them to a certain activity in politics to safeguard their inherent rights.

Yet, there are plenty of latent Luces and Thompsons in our midst. We're noticing and so is the rest of the world. But right now their influence is positively deadening.

I don't know who my grandfather was; I am much more concerned to know what his grandson will be.—Abraham Lincoln.

## STRANGE BUT TRUE

*Little-Known Facts for Catholics*

By M. J. MURRAY



## Washington Powers to Divide Spoils In Pacific, Near East

By TOM ROGERS

Washington — We're off!

The game of power politics has never seen so many chips on the table. And the final division of the spoils will probably run as follows:

The United States will get the Pacific back it wants.

Russia, however, will get the Kurile Islands and will definitely

become the dominant interest in Korea. Old-time China, hardly fear a great loss of face for us in the East if the Communists thoroughly organize Korea. As mentioned in this column three months ago—the Japanese Reds are going to make great numerical gains this year—and Korea is only a few miles across the straits.

Despite General Marshall's mission, the Soviet, as J. B. Powell of the Shanghai Weekly Review told the writer in August, will dominate the rich Manchurian industries and will be delighted to find an "understanding" man such as Mao Tse-Tung in the provinces just to the south of Manchuria.

England will definitely return to Hong Kong.

France and Holland, with the help of British troops and superior arms, will return to the Indies and to Indo-China—and the same of Asia for the Americas will eventually share again—but this time the wind will be from another direction.

Russia will get what she wants in Iran. (Witnesses in the East predict that Colonel Schwartzkopf will talk when he returns to the States.) And Russia will probably get what she wants in Turkey—and that will be the fulfillment of an old Czarist dream: the oil fields of the Black Sea area and . . . THE DARDANELLES.

This will cut close to the life-line of the British Empire to India. So will the land routes which will be controlled by the Russians in Iran. And the recent rumor in Paris that the Soviets were buying shares in the Suez Canal (which is a private corporation) is scarcely calculated to give the British peace of mind. Russia, of course, will keep all she has staked off for herself in the Balkans, the Balkans and Eastern Europe.

Finally, Italy will lose the Tyrol to Austria and Italy to

## Apathy Hinders U.S. World Leadership

BY J. J. GILGORET

Washington (MC) — The apathetic attitude of the American public is believed by many observers here to be a prime hindrance to this country's exercise of its potentially preeminent leadership for world organization and lasting peace.

President Truman, in his recent adoption of the "fire-side chat" technique, plainly blamed the apathy of Congress for the failure to obtain legislation which he deems vital to the country's broad post-war recovery. Observers take the view, however, that if it is true that Senators and Congressmen are apathetic, the blame rests primarily upon their constituents—the people who are responsible for the individual members.

Apathy has been expressed in Washington over the apparent indifference of the American people to the deliberations at the first meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in London. At the same time, dispatches from the English capital told that the highest concern was being shown by the UNO delegation as to how the United States would react to, and how far it would support, any proposal that was brought before the meeting.

The delegates, it was said, showed considerable anxiety over the mounting and broadening strikes in the United States just as the UNO meeting was commencing. They were disturbed, too, by the demonstrations among GI's abroad to be brought home quickly, and they were wondering how the rapid confirmation of the U. S. Army and Navy would affect this country's ability to give teeth to rules adopted for world collaboration.

Observers in London were loath to admit that they sensed beneath this concern a virtually universal feeling that the United States is the real hope of world organization for peace—that it is the one country that has not only the means to be aimed at but also the power and influence to give them actuality.

People abroad, apparently, are much more dismayed by signs of war in the United States than by the people at home. Strikes and lockouts seem to be regarded here merely as "pressing paper" that necessarily follow a war. Many students of such matters complain that the American public is inclined to be interested not in the basic issues involved in a labor-management dispute, but in the result of the dispute, and only then when it affects them directly, as, for instance, when they have to walk to work or get along on fewer steaks and chops.

Assuming the headlines that appeared in one edition of a newspaper, one could not help seeing stories telling of more than a million workers being "out" or threatening to strike, paralyzing such basic industries as steel, communications and meat packing, of fantastic housing shortages, of Congressional inquiries to fix responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster; of the top officers in our Army and Navy explaining to a mass meeting of Congressmen the whys and wherefores of this country's demobilization program, and similar matters of great national importance.

If the American people will not interest themselves in ascertaining the basic issues in such vital and personal matters, obviously such news can they be expected to understand that having no international allies which to appeal to this leadership in world affairs that we are helpless escape?

If the American people, taking them as a whole, are not interested in finding out the real reasons why electrical equipment is not being produced, or meat is not being processed—here at home, how can they be supposed to be concerned with the fate of the Baltic States or the future of Russia, the future of Spain, the Middle East, German negotiations in China?

Americans should not have the impression of grave national honor to a few individuals, nor they cannot have an interest in international affairs to a small extent. Their obligation, in comparison, is to have some knowledge of all or as much of the world as has been broken and presented to half a life through heresy positions. Our defense or enlargement of the rights of small nations will be to the credit or discredit of all of us, despite the fact that only a few persons had anything to do with mapping the course taken. Policies which our State Department projects abroad—be they educational, social, political—are credited to all the American people, though precious few have anything to do with preparing or presenting them. This is another true when our Government advertises itself as giving a real insight into the United States as it is.

It is not enough for Americans to know that strikes and lockouts are settled or how they are settled. They should acquaint themselves why they occur. Only in that way can they prevent them.

In the same way, Americans must make sure that they understand what we are doing in international relations, and why we are doing it. They must make sure that, if our Government is painting a picture of this country as peaceful elsewhere, that picture is a true one. Interest themselves in important political international affairs as they are discussed before they get out of hand. We should have been told more about the Korean situation.