

# Courier Journal

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

Advertising Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Sales Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Printer: J. J. HARRIS, New York, N. Y.

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

Advertising Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Sales Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Printer: J. J. HARRIS, New York, N. Y.

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

Advertising Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Sales Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Printer: J. J. HARRIS, New York, N. Y.

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

Advertising Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Sales Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Printer: J. J. HARRIS, New York, N. Y.

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

Advertising Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Sales Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Printer: J. J. HARRIS, New York, N. Y.

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

Advertising Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Sales Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Printer: J. J. HARRIS, New York, N. Y.

Published by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947, by the Courier-Journal Company, Inc.

Printed at the Courier-Journal Press, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Single copies, 10 cents.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N. Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: Please send address changes to the Courier-Journal, 111 Broadway, New York 5, N. Y.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 1, 1947.

Feature Editor: JAMES J. HARRIS, Editor: J. J. HARRIS

Business Manager: J. J. HARRIS, Circulation Manager: J. J. HARRIS

Editorial Board: J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS, J. J. HARRIS

## The Yardstick

By Rev. Geo. Higgins

The Freedom Road

Organized labor is being advised by its critics, and even by many of its friends, to let bygones be bygones and to give its full support to the administration of the new labor law.

While we are advising our constitutional right to try to have the new law amended or repealed, let's all be good Americans and abide by the vote of the majority of our chosen representatives; and, if possible, let's smile and pretend as though we like it.

This is good enough advice as far as it goes; and labor will probably follow it. But freedom means there is a limit to which the majority of even the workingman can be stretched.

It is asking too much of the workingman's patriotism, for example, to expect him to believe in the Taft-Hartley Act—provisionally and at the eleventh hour as it were—has rescued him from the jaws of collectivism; that the purpose of the act is to help American labor unions regain their rights as free associations is precisely what he is told, in all seriousness, responsible only to their members. Yet, this by Miss Longan in a feature article in Human Events, entitled "Labor and Collectivism."

Miss Longan's point to be reminded that it is possible to live a life—even the best of us—without being a slave. She starts from the perfectly valid premise that collectivism is a terrible scourge. Well and good. Unfortunately, however, she then takes a running jump and tries to demonstrate that under the Wagner Act, and the New Deal in general, "free American unions became rigid associations, held tightly together in a hierarchical cartel, in which the membership was powerless and in which power was exercised by the few." What the Wagner Act has given to the American worker, she continues, "is not collective bargaining but collectivism, for which labor did not bargain. All that saved the workers of the United States from total absorption in one centrally-controlled mass organization, was the split between the centralized CIO and the still decentralized A. F. of L."

Miss Longan's indictment of the Wagner Act sounds all the more emotional in view of some of the examples which she uses to bolster up her argument. The following is quoted out for honorable mention because of its unintentional humor which will be amusing to none so much as to John L. Lewis himself.

"The administration," Miss Longan charges, "seems to have put its key men in the powerful but invisible second-line positions, especially in the CIO. . . . John L. Lewis challenged administration dominance in 1940, but after the election the permanent secretariat of the CIO moved him from office."

Andrew who knows with what reluctance Mr. Lewis accepted the presidency of the CIO, and with what persistence John L. Lewis imported him to accept it, will find Miss Longan's version of this incident a cause for laughter.

Seriously, though, Miss Longan's amazingly over-emphasized thesis ought to serve as a warning against the substitution of slogans for clear thinking. Collectivism is admittedly an evil. Of course it is. But if the American workingman has to be opposed to the Wagner Act to serve that he is opposed to collectivism, then the American workingman will probably be happy to be called a collectivist—and so will the writer of this column.

To say that the Wagner Act has been administered badly at times is one thing; but to argue that the Wagner Act has led to collectivism is so patently emotional as to be almost unworthy of serious rebuttal. Suffice it to say that the late Monsignor John A. Ryan—who was fighting collectivism before the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act were out of knee pants—published an estimate of the Wagner Act which ought to be recalled at this time. If only because it contradicts Miss Longan's opinion so pointedly.

The Wagner Act, he says in his autobiography, "is probably the most just, beneficent, and far-reaching piece of labor legislation ever enacted in the United States." To which the vast majority of the workingmen, for whom Miss Longan presumes to speak, will say, "Amen."

Organized labor will obey the Taft-Hartley Act. American labor will obey the law because of its own labor. It is dedicated to the defense of its constitutional form of government, not because it thinks that the Taft-Hartley Act is a great achievement in constructive political action.

Labor doesn't think anything of the kind. On the contrary, it thinks that the act is a very unwise piece of legislation which will hasten, rather than postpone, the growth of collectivism in the United States. It thinks that the Taft-Hartley Act drags the government into the day-to-day processes of collective bargaining to a degree that is unhealthy if not dangerous; and to a degree which ought to frighten the person of Miss Longan's persuasions right out of her wits.

If Miss Longan believes that "the crisis of our time turns on whether individuals can remain free of state power," one would expect her to join with the labor movement in lamenting the enactment of a bill which gives the Federal Government a greater voice in industrial relations than it has ever had before. Even those lawyers who favored the passage of the bill admit that the act will prove a bonanza for the legal profession.

If this be the road to freedom, then Miss Longan and the American labor movement are poles apart in their definition of freedom, and in their understanding of its meaning in practice.

Do You Remember?

Here are some items from the files of the Courier-Journal of twenty-five, ten and five years ago. How many do you recall?

25 Years Ago—July 14, 1922

Catholics in Oregon seeking to save their schools from attack by big game launched a campaign appealing to sense of justice of all people in the state.

10 Years Ago—July 15, 1937

Distortion of facts such as the number of clergy and other statements made by the magazine regarding the Catholic Church in Spain were corrected in an open letter in the Catholic Courier.

5 Years Ago—July 16, 1942

Miss Margaret Sanger, birth control zealot and National Health Center of Auburn, was vigorously denounced in editorial appearing in Catholic parish bulletins at Auburn.

## Manslaughter—1947 Style



## As We See It By Dan Patrick The Farley Memoirs

From the limbo of history, Jim Farley resurrected the question as to whether or not a Catholic can be elected President of the United States.

In his rather amazingly frank series of articles just concluded by Collier's Magazine under the general title, "Why I Broke with Roosevelt," Farley reveals that his availability as a potential Democratic candidate brought the issue to a head in the skirmishes preliminary to the 1940 campaign.

Jim Farley's memoirs of these untold chapters in American history are extraordinary in many ways. They carry weight because of Farley's sheer honesty, impeccable character and remarkable memory.

The former Postmaster General and Democratic National Chairman has an enviable reputation among politicians—Republicans and Democrats alike—as a man of his word and one who can and will tell the whole truth however trying may be the circumstances.

As to the accuracy of the Farley memoirs, Arthur Krook, chief of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, writes:

"The current publications in Collier's by James A. Farley which deal with the gradual breach that arose between President Roosevelt and himself over the third term and other matters, have many facets of intense interest."

But to those who at the time discussed these developments with Mr. Farley, and like him made notes of the discussions, one of the striking effects of the memoirs is the incontrovertible proof they furnish if that were required of the accuracy of his records and precision of his memory."

In his memoirs, Farley recalls a rather dramatic conversation he had with the late George Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago on the subject of his Farley's presidential ambitions.

From his previous conversations with Roosevelt, Farley had concluded that the President was not a candidate for a third term. But Cardinal Mundelein, fresh from a White House visit, told Farley: "It is my belief that he will run for a third term" and added, with obvious reference to the aspirations of the Postmaster General:

"It is my sincere feeling that a Roman Catholic could not be elected President of the United States at this time or for many years to come. I hope, therefore, that you will do nothing to do to degrade this country in another debacle such as we experienced in 1928."

Farley recalls his reaction to the Cardinal's statement in this reply:

"A great many people, among them the vice-president, senators, representatives and party leaders, feel differently. Men who know something about politics. Conditions are not the same as they were ten or twelve years ago. When Al Smith ran, the Democratic party was not in power; Smith was leading the fight for repeal of the prohibition law; the country was

prosperous; Smith's choice of Raskob, a Republican, for National Chairman was an affront to the old-time Democrats; Smith's conduct of the campaign was anything but skillful and diplomatic. It was doubtful that any Democrat could have been elected in that year, and the religious issue alone could not be blamed for Smith's defeat."

On the other side of the picture, there is no reason to believe that the Democratic party will not win in 1940; the party is now in power, there are hundreds of thousands of Democrats on government payrolls and, whether or not they like the name Farley, they could not vote themselves out of office just because the candidate was a Roman Catholic."

One sentence in that reply bears repeating: "It was doubtful that any Democrat could have been elected in that year (1928), and the religious issue alone could not be blamed for Smith's defeat."

We fully agree with Farley's comment on the 1928 results although there are many Catholics who carry a contrary view. That anti-Catholic bigotry swirled around the Smith candidacy in 1928 goes without saying. The loss of some Southern states can be laid directly to that bigotry. But, even discounting the loss of those states and putting them in the Democratic column, the final results would not have changed. The conclusion we draw is simply this:

Al Smith lost some Southern states because he was a Catholic. He lost the election because he was a Democrat. Any Democrat would have lost in 1928 just as surely as any Democrat would have won in 1932. As Al Smith was wont to say: Let's look at the record.

In 1928, Al Smith lost Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia, states which never before (or since) have left the Democratic column. These represent a total of 63 electoral votes. In the final 1928 count, Hoover had 44 electoral votes and Smith, 87. Taking these 63 bigoted votes from Hoover and crediting them to Smith, the results would have read Hoover, 381; Smith, 150.

West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri and New Mexico are so-called border states which went in the Hoover column in 1928. BUT these same states also went in the Coolidge column against Davis in 1924. For the sake of argument, however, let's put their 42 electoral votes to Smith's credit on top of the previous 63. The results would have been Hoover, 339; Smith, 192.

Finally, let's take Smith's own state of New York with its 45 electoral votes, which Smith lost by a margin of 2,193,344 to 2,089,863.

Crediting New York's 45 votes to Smith in 1928 on top of the previous 63 from the bigoted states and 42 from the border states, the fact remains that Hoover still would have won with 284 votes against 257 for Smith.

Is any further proof needed of the correctness of Farley's deductions on the 1928 results?

## Fr. Gillis Says:

So This Is History?

I have often stated, here and elsewhere, that I am no champion of Franco. I defend neither Fascism nor Communism. I can see, of course, that a dictatorial government may be necessary in a crisis. Even democracy—yes, American democracy—becomes temporarily dictatorial in a national emergency.

France, and, as far as I can see (balancing the contradictory report from Spain), the Spanish people in general consider themselves still to be not only in an emergency, but in the kind of war which Bernard Baruch says Russia is now waging against us, a "cold war."

There is, furthermore, in the Spanish character an individualism so great that it tends to become anarchy. So, I suppose, Spain needs a strong hand. Beyond that in defense of the Franco regime I would not care to go. But it seems to me that anyone who writes even a short article about Spain and Franco should at least refer to these basic facts.

A writer in Collier's for July 5, Ted Allan, manages to put together some 4,000 words about Franco without so much as a glance at the fact that Spain is still in a condition of emergency (not to say of war), and that Spaniards in an emergency need perhaps a more rigid control than Americans.

As a specimen of how a historical fact is mishandled nowadays, here is how Mr. Allan tells the story of Franco's taking over.

First: "On February 20, 1936, three days after the electoral victory of the Spanish Popular Front parties, a group of Spain's top generals met in Madrid with representatives of the Falange party and the landowners. Among those present were Generals Godea, Mola, Saliquet and Franco. At this meeting, plans were laid for the revolt of the army against the republic."

Second: "On March 24, 1936, Johannes Bernhardt met secretly with Adolf Langenhein, SS chief for Spanish Morocco, in Bernhardt's house in Tetuan. Bernhardt reported on the steps he had taken in preparation for the 'coming events.' He and General Franco, he said, had discussed the entire problem of German aid." Johannes Bernhardt, a German businessman, is in Mr. Allan's account "The Man Who Made Franco."

Third: "On July 18, 1936, the Spanish army rose in revolt and proclaimed itself the government of Spain. A few days before, a Heinkel-Lufthansa plane had brought Franco from the Canary Islands to Morocco. On July 18, Franco made a broadcast from Tetuan in which he said, 'Spain has saved herself.' Franco and his fellow generals seemed convinced that all of Spain would be under their control within thirty days."

Notice: there is no mention of the Spanish Civil War, no reference to the fact that Moscow had moved into Madrid with a Fifth Column, no mention of the savagery of Moscovized Communists in Spain, not even the most hurried account of the incredibly brutal slaughter of priests, or of the sacrilegious and sadistic mistreatment of nuns, the firing of churches, convents, Catholic schools, no hint of the orgy of lust and murder that had swept Spain, and the demoralization of the so-called republic, or of how that victory of the "Popular Front" at the polls had been achieved.

In a word, there is not even so much as a hint of what made Franco's entry so easy and his victory a walk-over. The all-important fact is omitted. The people of Spain were eager that the army should come in and produce some semblance of order. Leave out that fact and the entire Franco movement becomes untelligible.

It is as though one were giving a quick sketch of the American Revolution and neglected to mention the manifold indictment of the King of England as contained in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence. What would we think of a Spaniard who should write in a Spanish paper that in 1776 a man named Washington came up from Virginia to Massachusetts, gathered an army and drove the English out of the country?

That epitome of the American Revolution would be quite as intelligible as Ted Allan's three sentence account of how Franco became head of the Spanish Government. But that's about the way history is written nowadays, at least for the readers of popular periodicals.

Calendar of Saints

SUNDAY, July 20—St. Margaret, virgin and martyr, was a victim of the last general persecution, at Antioch in Phlida. She is said to have been tortured by her own father, a pagan priest.

MONDAY, July 21—St. Praxedis, virgin, rendered a great service to religion in the first and second centuries. She used her great wealth to relieve the poor.

TUESDAY, July 22—St. Mary Magdalen, whom Jesus raised from a life of sin to take her place among the saints of the church, was one of the family "whom Jesus so loved" that He raised her brother Lazarus from the dead. She stood with the Blessed Virgin and St. John at the foot of the Cross. When the faithful consolation of Jesus so moved the public prosecutor that he declared himself Christian on the spot. Accused and accuser were thereupon killed.

WEDNESDAY, July 23—St. Apollinaris, bishop and martyr, was the first Bishop of Ravenna and a disciple of St. Peter.

THURSDAY, July 24—St. Christina, virgin and martyr, was tortured because she destroyed some golden idols belonging to her father, a pagan magistrate. She was miraculously preserved from death several times but finally was martyred.

FRIDAY, July 25—St. James, apostle, was one of the three chosen to be familiar companions of Our Saviour. When he was accused and brought before Herod Agrippa his fearless confession of Jesus so moved the public prosecutor that he declared himself Christian on the spot. Accused and accuser were thereupon killed.

SATURDAY, July 26—St. Anne was chosen by God to become the mother of the Blessed Virgin. The saint was far advanced in age when Mary was born, the fruit rather of grace than of nature. In gratitude, St. Anne and her spouse, St. Joachim, vowed Mary to God.

If Shakespeare had written it for Broadway, he might have said: The evil that men do gets the headlines, the good gets an inch or two somewhere on the inside pages.

## Just Between Us To Sign or Not to Sign

Every non-Catholic wanting to marry a Catholic is required to promise (1) that the Catholic partner will have perfect liberty in the practice of the Catholic Faith, and (2) that all the children born of this union will be baptized and reared Catholics.

Fr. Ginder We Catholics believe that ours is the one and only Faith personally established by Jesus Christ; that non-Catholics, however sincere, are simply mistaken in their beliefs. We don't quarrel. There is no throwing of stones. We live and let live. But that is our belief.

Because our church knows the danger to Catholic Faith

involved in the intimate and affectionate association of married life with a non-Catholic, she simply forbids Catholics to marry anyone who is not a Catholic.

But knowing human nature, she is prepared to make an occasional exception — IF the Faith is properly safeguarded in the Catholic party and the children.

In this one must concede that the Catholic Church is quite logical and consistent in her position.

The Catholic, it is understood