

TOWARD INDUSTRIAL PEACE

Management Can Help Unions Eliminate Reds

By Richard M. McKeon, S. J.

Director, La Moine College School of Industrial Relations

On July 15, 1949 the "Daily Worker" made the following statement: "Communist leadership in the labor movement and the only hope for a new era of revolutionary industrial peace..."



Fr. McKeon

These words reflect the Communist policy of the Communist International. And yet it has taken many of our labor unions and leaders all these years to become aware of the immediate purpose of the Communist infiltration. Now the C.I.O. seems determined to clean house in those unions where their strength has been too manifest.

STEALING ONCE said: "The trade union are the basic drive shaft, the basic transmission belt through the help of which the Party is bound to the working class."

In Czechoslovakia the unions were dominated and we know how easily the nation fell. The same instructions are being followed in America which were issued in 1921:

"In those capitalist countries where a large majority of the population has not yet reached revolutionary consciousness, the Communist agitators must be constantly on the lookout for new forms of propaganda. The factions...

must carefully prepare the participation of the communists in conferences and meetings of the trade-union organizations."

WHO IS responsible for this tolerance of economic evil? Not the Church for she has been uttering clear warnings for many years. But sad to say, her children who occupy high places in the world of industry have been slow to hear constructive principles as well as warnings of danger.

Union members by not attending their meetings faithfully have allowed the communists to take over and direct policy far beyond their numerical strength. It is not today, but the present self-complacency of all Americans should be shaken.

For communism means the destruction of the natural God-given right to possess private property. All land, all factories, all types of industry are to be owned and controlled by the state.

This means that labor becomes slave labor. For it follows that if the state owns the means of production and controls the distribution of all wealth, it must dominate the people and this means slavery. If this is true for the ordinary citizens of such a regime, what about those who have incurred the displeasure of the state?

IN 1948 Christopher Mayhew, British Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, citing statistics afforded by prisoners and officials who escaped from Russian concentration camps, estimated that from 5,000,000 to 15,000,000 people were being cruelly...

exploited for their cheap labor. He said: "It can no longer be denied that the Soviet Union is making use of large numbers of prisoners as forced labor in conditions denying to them the basic human rights; that these human beings, once deprived of their liberty, are maintained in conditions of wretchedness and undernourishment; that, under the cloak of arrests for crimes and other offenses against the regime, the Soviet Government has acquired for itself a vast body of cheap labor utterly without rights; that, in short, the Soviet Union has instituted a slave system recruited from among its own citizens which in scope has no parallel in history."

We simply remind our workers that products from such slavery will be placed on the world market to compete with those of a free system.

IN VIEW of all this the responsibilities of our labor leaders are most grave. It has not been an easy task to keep their unions free from communism. Where infiltration has occurred they have suffered greatly especially in character assassination.

We believe that management, instead of helping these leaders, frequently used the situation to belittle the labor movement. This has injured the common cause.

Businessmen should recognize that the vanguard of our battle with communism is in the ranks of labor, and credit for much of the success in the fight should go to members of organized labor.

Editorials New Vineyards Of Souls For Christ Loyal Citizens Respect Authority Men Who Forget God, Forget Country

By Magr. William M. Hart

Two New Parishes The past week witnessed the appointment of Pastors to two parishes about to be canonically erected in the northern and eastern section of the episcopal city and surrounding territory in Irondequoit. Father Francis Feeney has been named to St. James Parish on Brockley Rd., Father Bernard Newcomb to St. Cecilia's parish on Culver Rd. This brings the total of Rochester city parishes to forty-six.

It is the duty of the Bishop to erect new parishes when the number of Catholics in any district has grown so large as to make it difficult to give them proper care through existing parishes. The new unit will reduce the distance they have had to travel because it will bring them a church and school closer to their dwelling places.

Bishop Kearney and his priests and people rejoice at the growth of the Church which is responsible for the addition of these new units to the list of parishes.

New souls for Christ, new families on the diocesan roster, new facilities for the training of the little ones, new altars for the offering of Holy Mass, new pulpits for preaching the word of God: all of these will result from the establishment of these two new parishes.

Soon a devout people shall see the beginnings of the buildings that shall serve them as parishioners of St. James' Church, of St. Cecilia's Church. Soon shall be answered the petitions of faithful parents who have besought the Bishop to give them needed facilities for themselves and their children in the practice of their religion.

Our Greetings

In this important event in the current history of the diocese, the Courier Journal extends its greetings to these latest additions to the list of our churches. Greetings to the new parish named after St. James, the patron saint of Bishop Kearney; greetings to the new parish named after St. Cecilia, the great patron of Church music. Greetings to the loyal people who will bring to God's honor and glory. Greetings to the new Pastors, Father Feeney and Father Newcomb.

God's blessing be with them as they begin to build for God and His Church!

For God And Country

Duty and choice combine in binding loyal citizens to God and country. As children of God, we recognize the ties that join us to Him in love and gratitude as our Creator, our Father. Our love for Him makes us glad to recognize our duty, to choose devotion to Him as our most happy lot.

Duty and choice bind us to love our country. We are bound to respect lawful authority as coming from God; we revere and obey the constitution and the laws of free America, because they are to us the ordinance of God in our civic life and activities.

We gladly give ourselves to this patriotic love for our country, to this devoted obedience to its laws, because America appeals to us as the land of the free, the home of the brave. We see in it a united number of all who believe in government as coming from God, as guaranteeing to men the freedom God their Creator has given them as sponsor of man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Against God And Country

Duty and choice have gone by the board in those traitorous Americans who have given up God and have chosen to betray their country. God and His goodness, God and His gifts to mankind, God and His beneficent benedictions on His children of earth, have been rejected. The duty of faith in God has been laid aside. The choice of the good things of God for the children of men, has been given up for something more barren.

Men who forget that man forget their country. Men who are disloyal to their God, soon become disloyal to their country.

Behold today the disgraceful examples of duplicity, of applied efforts to embarrass and injure our governmental agencies and our government itself, of studied acts to betray America to its pagan enemies. A jury has already convicted Judith Conlon, another jury has voted eight to four for the conviction of Alger Hiss. More of the love of God in our public servants, would tend to keep them loyal and true to their country. Lovers of God can not be lovers of Communism!

America needs a spiritual reawakening! Our leaders must follow the way of the founding fathers, must profess their humble dependence on God. Our people must follow them in the practice of Christian principles. May faith prevail in our hearts to keep us loyal to God and country.

Nothing To Eat

Hunger plays no favorites. Every man is close to it, so close to it that just a slight closing off of supplies will bring him right up to it. Every man is so close to hunger, that the only thing that keeps it from him is God's goodness.

Famine follows floods, dearth of food follows drought, austerity must follow any failure of prosperity. But men do not worry about it. They take it for granted that God will take care of them.

God knows the needs of man. God is eager to supply those needs. God gives us food in season, food in abundance, as part of that divine benevolence known as the Providence of God.

Christ had compassion on the four thousand who had so loved His teaching that they had travelled with Him three days with no thought of food. For them He multiplied the seven loaves and the few fishes so that they all were satisfied, and seven baskets of fragments remained.

Have we ever followed so closely after Christ and His teaching that we have forgotten to take food? Have we ever found our love for things spiritual blotting out our usual interest in things material? Perhaps we can learn a lesson from the four thousand, not just the lesson of Christ's compassion on them; but the lesson of a consuming desire to be near Christ, to hear His blessed words, to know His teaching, to seek His blessing on our souls.

Breakfast and dinner and supper were passed up by the four thousand for three days, in their unappeasable appetite for the food of Christ's word. While we enjoy by His bounty the good things of the table, let us not forget to seek of His compassion the more important nourishment of the Eucharistic Table.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE WORLD? A Question of Freedom Is Raised at Harvard

By Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P.

In the latest Harvard Alumni Bulletin there is recorded an exchange of opinions on academic freedom between President Conant and Grenville Clark, senior member of the Harvard Corporation, speaking together in favor of freedom and Frank E. Ober of Baltimore a graduate of the Harvard Law School, demanding restraint upon lecturers in the Harvard faculty.



Fr. Gillis

The debate concerned especially off-campus statements and activities rather than those in the classroom. Dr. Conant's position is briefly this: The attitude of Harvard toward the extracurricular activities of its professors is a policy of long standing.

Dr. Conant proceeded to quote his predecessor, A. Lawrence Lowell, who wrote in his annual report of 1918-1919: "In spite of the risk of injury to the institution, the objections to restraint upon what professors may say as citizens seem to me far greater than the harm done by leaving them free."

"A policy of restraint would tend seriously to discourage some of the best men from taking up the scholar's life, and if a university or college censures what its professors may say, it restrains them from uttering something that it does not approve, it thereby assumes responsibility for that which it permits them to say."

BY WAY of further elucidation of the attitude of Harvard in regard to off-campus freedom for the faculty, Mr. Clark ex-

plained to Mr. Ober "Harvard thinks that repression is not wise or workable under our system. Harvard is not afraid of freedom and believes adherence to this principle to be fundamental for our universities and for the integrity of our institutions."

"She believes that the members of the faculties, in their capacity as citizens, have the same rights to express their views as other citizens, and that those rights should not be restricted by the university by trying to keep a watch on professors or otherwise."

Those statements, President Conant's the late President Lowell's, and Mr. Clark's are interesting contributions on the subject of intellectual freedom and they may be looked upon as fairly "liberal." But as I read them there came to mind a much stronger statement made by President Lowell in 1924.

Attempting a challenge from Bertrand Russell who had accused Harvard of being less liberal than the English universities, Dr. Lowell retorted, "At Oxford a student's publication was suppressed on account of certain opinions it had expressed; nothing of the kind I believe has occurred here (at Harvard) in the memory of man, and you (Dr. Russell) lost your fellowship at Cambridge on account of your opinions. No such thing happened at Harvard."

I MAY ADD that in German universities, upon which Harvard had largely modeled itself, the common axiom was that "there shall be no limit to what the teacher may tell his students except his own instinct for the truth." Perhaps we should be content with this explanation of the official stand at Harvard on academic freedom. But I, for

one, would like something more specific.

For example: one element, if not the chief element in Bertrand Russell's offending, was his teaching on sex-morality. He taught, all the way from England to America to China, that the sex-experiences of adults are nobody's affairs but their own.

On a broader plane he held that the Ten Commandments were a code adapted to the pastoral age, or at the latest the agricultural age of history, but that in the industrial age, and in what he called the "personal age," the Decalogue, or at least that part having to do with sex-morality, is outmoded and obsolete.

Would President Conant champion the right of an undergraduate journal at Harvard to advocate that sort of "liberalism"? Would Harvard permit a professor to inculcate the Bertrand Russell view of sex-relationships?

In regard to the kind of question immediately under discussion between the Harvard officials and the protesting alumni are we to understand that a professor, either off-campus or on campus may speak or act in favor of a political plan to overthrow the American Republic? If so Dr. Conant would be doing a favor to the public in saying so. If not what becomes of Harvard liberalism?

Are we to agree with Bertrand Russell that English universities are more liberal than Harvard? Or that the prewar German universities allowed a greater intellectual freedom than Harvard? Does Harvard draw a line beyond which freedom may not go? If so may we know where that line is drawn? Say, rather, may we know why the line is drawn at all? If the minds of professors and students are to be "independent"

THE TOP OF MY MIND

Bridging the Chasm for Those Seeking the Faith

By Gretta Palmer

Hunger for the Faith among non-Catholic Americans seems to be reaching famine proportions. The spectacular success of Thomas Merton's "Seven Storey Mountain" is being topped by Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen's "Page of Soul." Both books are being bought by avid non-Catholic readers.

And both books, it may be remarked, are thoroughly uncompromising in their appeal. No watering-down of doctrine to avoid "offenses," no careful understatement of the Catholic claims. These writers stress the need for facts and supernatural help for fallen man; it holds the balance of the clock of our time. They never shilly-shally to win friends, and they are winning friends by the hundreds of thousands.

Both books have, to a high degree, what is known in the trade as "reader identification." And that can be said of very few books in which a formal exposition of the Faith is made. There may be in this fact a clue for Catholics who wonder how we can talk about the Church persuasively to modern men and women who view it with philosophy and inner skepticism.

For "reader identification" makes no demands of piety or logic on the reader; it appeals to his self-interest, his egoism,

who walks before him holding a lamp to help him see.) The mere suggestion that love is anything more than a happy accident will be startling news to minds brought up on the concepts of Tin-Pan-Alley and the radio.

IT IS NOT dispensing the truths we have to offer to admit that the two most arresting words to men and women today are "you" and "love." We may lament the degeneration in public taste since the Age of Faith when men would listen to a schoolman who offered the enticing statement, "God can be proved from design."

But ours is a world in which emotion has largely replaced thought and if we are going to help that world, we have to take it as it is. The Faith is not served by putting a man to sleep with precise statements tailored to another way.

But suppose we throw the plank of "love" across the chasm that separates our friends from any knowledge of Catholicism? We need not talk about the love of God, for God to our modern listeners is a vague and somewhat embarrassing topic.

If you tell a non-Catholic that love is more than an emotion, you have already staggered him. If you go on to explain that it is a faculty of the intellect and the will, he is pretty sure to ask you what you mean.

(And you had better know. A common simplification says that the will is a master who needs a servant, the intellect,

THE MODERN world rarely distinguishes between that exhilarating experience known as "falling in love" and love itself. Divorce statistics indicate that the marriage of today comes to an abrupt end at just about the time when the last installment has been paid on the bridal refrigerator. The honeymoon is over the bloom is off, "love" has ceased... and when does the next train depart for Reno?

Now, a large number of these marital catastrophes would not occur if husband and wife shared the Catholic view of love, instead of regarding it as a kind of mutual hypnotism. It is quite true that love begins with an enchantment, and that this enchantment does not last. But it is not intended to last.

It is rather like the scaffold put up while a home is being built; when the solid structure is completed, the scaffold can come down. Modern men and women run up the upon brick inside of it, then they are shocked to find the firm timbers will not last a lifetime.

Love as represented in the slick paper magazines today is never related to the intellect and rarely to the will. People "fall in love" with characters who are described down to the last alluring detail of dress and eyelash length. They are "glamorous"; they have "charm"; they are "characters" but they have no character.

The reader is never told that before falling in love it is well to use reason or to ask, "Is she honest, unselfish, capable of sacrifice?" He would inquire more carefully about the attributes of a man who asks for a loan of \$100 than about those of the woman he promises to cherish until death. That is his tragedy.

THERE ARE a hundred pithy, illuminating statements of the Church on human love. Any one of them throws light on the non-Catholic divorce rate. Any one of them will give the non-Catholic a new conception of a subject which, you may fairly guess, has troubled him.

And if he once sees that we are wiser in this field than the quacks of the souls who have advised him until now, he will come back and ask for other wisdom from a Catholic source. Soon he may suspect that we always have the right answers because we know that life is all about... and that life is all about God. Then you may turn him over to the priest who will instruct him.

WOMEN'S VIEWPOINT Don't Judge the Eagle By the Lion's Standards

By Marie Weidman

They probably don't even like our hot dogs any more. The other day a visiting English girl properly tweed, had the temerity to state that America had the best plumbing in the world.



Marie Weidman

After viewing our best displays of Marie Weidman democracy, our schools and universities after observing Americans from a number of their most positive angles as provided by civic groups in a number of our Eastern cities, her most definite feeling concerned our drains.

When this effusion may have put our master plumbers into a nice glow, it leads the rest of us who are not plumbers to conclude that despite the spasms through which western civilization has survived, we are still regarded by the British and by Europeans as a group of insufferable upstarts whom Lord Cornwallis failed to subdue.

In fact, the more provincial of our foreign friends refer to us as business. He discovered our U. S. Customs courteous and cordial like "needed" pin cushion. American lawmakers were shockingly casual in Mr. Dickens' eyes, about everything, that is, except their tobacco chewing which he found highly offensive at least three dozen times in his American Notes.

In later years as our country grew in wealth and power other Europeans felt they could only consider us as a parvenue nation whose decadence, said one Italian, rivaled that of Ancient Rome. We were inveighed against as "barbarians laden with gold" whose only creed was the religion of progress. They said that we threatened the whole European fabric of society, that our schools were absorbing the individual and that our love of the automatic would hasten the end of the present era.

This was all before the cataclysm of war. When the battle smoke cleared somewhat it became apparent even to our most severe critics that our gadget ridden country had not only survived rather well but also had helped Europe to survive, rather less comfortably of course.

In our present efforts to aid Europe to regain her equilibrium we are being accused of all sorts of Machiavellian machinations to bolster our own economy. Our wealth and power frightens them.

smoke cleared somewhat it became apparent even to our most severe critics that our gadget ridden country had not only survived rather well but also had helped Europe to survive, rather less comfortably of course.

In our present efforts to aid Europe to regain her equilibrium we are being accused of all sorts of Machiavellian machinations to bolster our own economy. Our wealth and power frightens them.

THE TONE OF criticism has changed now. Mr. V. S. Pritch-

et, a British observer fears that his country may "drift" into the American way of life. This frightening prospect however, is mitigated somewhat by reports of certain Mr. Pritchett's countrymen intellectuals whose prolonged visits in United States indicate just how the country pails on their sensibilities.

From the warmth of our Pacific slopes and no people alive can luxuriate more completely in sunshine than the British - even their intellectuals come harassing little summaries of the stupidity of our institutions and our mores.

These foreign reports are not clever - even Mr. Evelyn Waugh's annoying remarks on our burial rites failed to amuse us - otherwise we may have forgiven them. Conversely of course we are all judged by the worst of our literary production like, for instance, Mr. Norman Mailer's outrage THE NAKED AND THE DEAD. No one could blame the London TIMES for their attitude toward this American production.

It is entirely true that we have a kinship with our English speaking critics. We speak the same language, we love the same literature and the impact of thirty million other kinds of immigrants to our shores has failed to change this devotion.

What our cousins here to learn yet though is that we cannot be judged entirely by their standards in America, since we do everything more efficiently. We have a set of norms of our own which may be too chrome-covered for foreign taste but which we find most satisfactory.

Advertisement for 'LOADING IT ON' featuring 'GARDEN BILLS' and 'MAXIMIZATION OF YOUR BENEFITS'. Includes a large graphic of a bill and text about maximizing benefits.

Advertisement for 'THE CATHOLIC Courier Journal'. Includes publication details, subscription rates, and contact information for the publisher, Most Reverend James Edward Kearney, D.D., President.