For Jesuit Use Only

A. M. D. G.

ISO BULLETIN

B. V. M. H.

Vol. IV JANUARY, 1946 No. 1

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

By L. P. McHATTIE, S.J.
ISO BULLETIN Observer

It was not a new idea, that of having the representatives of labor and of management meet at a conference table, under the auspices of the Government, and without any compulsion or interference strive to solve the problems that bedevil industrial relations. Back in 1919, at the end of another world-wide conflict and with industrial unrest mounting, President Wilson had called a somewhat similar meeting of industry and labor. On that occasion there had been a complete breakdown when the leaders of industry had insisted on a definition of "collective bargaining" which allowed for "company unions." But, the failure of the League of Nations that came into being after World War I did not prevent a new attempt being made at San Francisco. And this willingness to try again in the international field is the same spirit that prompted another conference between the principals in the field of American industry.

In fact, one of the instigating factors in the recent Labor-Management Conference was a letter written to Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach by a delegate to the San Francisco conference, Senator Vandenberg. In this letter, July 30, 1945, the Senator from Michigan described the San Francisco conference as "a triumph of the Council Table" where "men of good will resolved their differences for their own and the common welfare's sake" and "quit warring with each other in order to stop our common enemy—war itself." He asks if there is not "an analogy between the two problems (peace abroad and peace at home)" and whether the same method of "intimate and friendly consultations" which was used at San Francisco might not also apply "at home in respect to these vital industrial relationships."

President Truman and Secretary Schwellenbach had, it was said, already been considering the feasibility of some kind of Labor-Management Conference to provide principles at least for their own activity during the troubled period that they, in agreement with most keen observers, saw coming with the end of the war and the expiration of labor's no-strike pledge. A conference, too, might indicate the type of labor legislation that could replace wartime measures and be acceptable to both capital and labor. Of course, there were those who "knew" in advance that the conference would accomplish nothing, and that it was but a show put on by the principals for the public benefit or allowed by the President and the Government to gain public support for labor policies that were already in mind and would be implemented immediately afterwards.

Origins

The remote planning for the Conference was entrusted to the heads of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor, that is, to Ira Mosher, Eric Johnston, Philip Murray, and William Green. Working with the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce these men appointed an agenda committee consisting of: Boris Shishkin (AFL), Ted Silvey (CIO), Joyce O'Hara (U. S. C. of C.), Raymond Smethurst (NAM), Paul H. Douglas (representing the Secretary of Labor), and Charles Symington (representing the Secretary of Commerce).

In calling the conference President Truman referred to it as "an effort to establish long-term policies which will make possible better human relationships in American industry," and the agenda committee limited the prepared agenda to such "long-term" remedies, though it also allowed, most probably at the insistance of the CIO, that "short-term" remedies might be also sought "through special committees set up for the purpose." The distinction between the two was never perfectly clear to the present writer, but in a general way the expression "long-term" was used of remedies which would take the form of statements of policy or prescribed procedures, while "short-term" referred to proximate solutions of immediate problems. The "long-term" meant sociological or human relationship questions; the "short-term" economic factors.

Delegates

The Conference was composed of 39 members, of whom 18 represented employers and managers, 18 labor, and 3 the general public. Of the management delegates nine were chosen by the C. of C., and nine by the NAM; of the labor delegates eight represented the AFL, eight the CIO, one the United Mine Workers of America, and one the Railway Brotherhoods; the three non-voting public representatives consisted of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Conference, Judge Walter Stacy, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, and the Conference Secretary, Dr. George W. Taylor. Each delegate had an alternate, and these alternates, though they had no voting power when the delegates were present at general meetings, served on the various committees with full voting power, addressed the meetings practically as freely as did the delegates, and hence for all practical purposes doubled the size of the conference.

In addition, Labor and Management were each allowed two official advisers, while Mr. Symington, listed as adviser to Secretary Wallace, often served as his alternate in that he alone was present from the Commerce Department. Secretary Schwellenbach had no adviser listed, though undoubtedly Paul Douglas would

have served in that capacity had not illness prevented his being present. The advisers for the conference were the individuals who composed the agenda committee: Shiskin, Silvey, O'Hara, Smethurst, Symington, and the absent Douglas. These brought the membership of the conference, voting and non-voting, to a total of 82. And they were, by and large, a remarkably capable and influential group of men, according to the norms which prevail in American industry.

Among the labor delegates were such leaders as William Green, Philip Murray, John L. Lewis, Dan Tobin, David Dubinsky, R. J. Thomas, Sidney Hillman, James Carey, Joseph Curran, William Hutcheson, George Meany, to give a few whose names are sufficiently well known to indicate the range of labor philosophy, from conservative right-wing to communist-suspect.

Business Leaders

And the management delegates were not less prominent men in their field, including, in addition to Johnston and Mosher, Charles Wilson (Pres. of Gen. Motors), Wm. Rand (Pres. of Monsanto Chemical), David Sarnoff (Pres. of R. C. A.), Harry Woodhead (Pres. of Consolidated Vultee), John Holmes (Pres. of Swift & Co.), M. W. Clement (Pres. of Pennsylvania R. R. Co.), James Tanham (Vice Pres. of Texas Co.), E. J. Thomas (Pres. of Goodyear Rubber), and representatives from such other fields of industry as sand, aluminum, tools, sugar, metal trades, public service, steel, automobile, rolling mill, brick, coal, cork, brass, dairy products, shipping, and shipbuilding.

There was no questioning of the fact that the membership of the conference was broadly representative of American industry and labor, at least of the larger units in each case. And, granting that the public, through the Labor Department, bore the expenses of providing the auditorium, the clerical assistance, and various incidentals, still, when the annual salaries of the labor and management delegates and alternates are considered and the fact that these men gave rather fully of their time from November 5 to 30—they worked regularly from 10:00 to 12:30 and 2:30 to 5:00, Tuesday through Friday of each week except Thanksgiving, often holding caucuses of informal meetings at other hours—then, if the conference was a mere gesture, it was an expensive one for all concerned. And the nation's press undoubtedly paid a fair sum in connection with the meetings.

There were generally about a hundred reporters present, and many of them were specially sent labor reporters of the larger papers. Thus, the *New York Times* had two capable men, Louis Stark and Joseph A. Loftus, who were always present, and apparently had no other assignment for the month of November. (Incidentally, the most complete and on the whole accurate account of the conference this writer has seen appeared day by day in the *New York Times* under the names of these two men; the *Times* also printed in full all the important documents.) Anyone who had any press connection was freely admitted to the conference, though it was practically impossible to get in otherwise, aside from such subterfuge as borrowing a badge from a reporter who was not going to be there for a particular meeting.

Conference Opens

The opening day, November 5, was impressive, with addresses by President Truman, Secretaries Schwellenbach and Wallace, Wm. Green, Philip Murray, Ira Mosher, and Eric Johnston. All the speeches were a mixture of optimism, admonition (for the other party or parties), and apprehension over possible outcomes.

The President and Secretary Schwellenbach stressed the fact that the conference was not a government affair but an opportunity for labor and management to put order into their own house without political or governmental pressure. Mr. Truman claimed that the problems are not insoluble, that the nation held high hopes for the conference, but added that the people are worried about industrial relations, and that if the conference did not find an answer to the problems an answer would have to be found elsewhere. This last was looked upon by most delegates as a threat of control of industry and labor by legislation. Mr. Schwellenbach, in addition to itemizing many of the complaints against both labor and management, suggested the possibility of a czar (in the baseball sense) as a solution to the problem of jurisdictional disputes between unions.

Philip Murray introduced the first dissent when he criticized the agenda for neglecting what he said was the most important single factor in industrial strife today, i. e. the problem of wages. The President had not mentioned wages when in his talk he indicated specific items about which agreement was to be sought, while both Wm. Green and Ira Mosher in their speeches explicitly attacked Murray's position.

Wages Again Excluded

In advocating that the conference confine itself to the prepared agenda, i. e. to ways and means of minimizing industrial disputes or long-term remedies, Mr. Green contended that the inclusion of wages, full employment, and other controversial issues would necessarily lead to a complete failure of the conference. Mr. Murray's position was that the mere provision of the machinery of collective bargaining would be useless without any statement of policy on the issues that must be bargained about.

Ira Mosher, in addition to expressing his opposition to Murray, suggested that the conference would serve a real purpose, even in the absence of perfect agreement, should it mark out clearly the specific areas of agreement and disagreement between labor and management. Only Secretary Wallace seemed to support Murray, perhaps unintentionally since he gave a prepared speech, when he emphasized that the important question today is the relationship between wages, profits, and prices. Eric Johnston said that what is needed is a code of conduct, which, in his opinion, should be based on four general principles: a recognition of labor unions and collective bargaining as a part of the democratic process; a recognition of management's right to manage, i. e. to initiate and make the final decisions; a recognition of the economic fact that higher standards of living come only from increased productivity; and a recognition that all must share equitably in increased production, the consumer by lower prices, labor by higher wages, and the investor by sounder profits.

Second Day

The second day was in part but a continuation of the first. H. W. Prentis, Jr., a former president of NAM, repeated the decision of management to concern itself only with procedures, while R. J. Thomas, President of United Auto Workers (CIO), followed Mr. Murray's lead and stressed the emptiness of procedure without some statement on what should be the substance of the agreements.

In a short, calm, and soft-spoken address which was well-received, Willard Townsend, Negro President of the United Transport Service Employes (CIO), brought up the question of discrimination in employment. This question, like wages, was not on the agenda, and Mr. Townsend made no request that it be put on, but his speech had the same effect as if he had so requested.

With the introductory speeches over, minor conflicts arose over rules and organization of the conference. The preparatory or agenda committee had suggested that the agenda be divided and handled by six separate committees, as follows:

I. *Collective Bargaining:* dealing with "the full and genuine acceptance by management of collective bargaining," "adherence by both parties to a policy of responsibility for living up to the letter and spirit of all collective agreements

and effective measures to carry it out," and action needed by unions and management to control their members, officials, and supervisory forces in cases of violations of an agreement.

II. *Management's Right to Manage.*

III. *Representation and Jurisdictional Disputes:* dealing with the determination of the collective bargaining agencies, and the prevention of inter-union disputes.

IV. *Conciliation Service:* dealing with ways of improving and strengthening the Conciliation Service of the U. S. Dept. of Labor.

V. *Initial Collective Agreements:* dealing with the proper procedure in negotiating first contracts between a union and an employer, and the use of conciliation if negotiations seem to be breaking down.

VI. *Existing Collective Agreements:* dealing with the adjustments of disputes during the life of a contract, the negotiation of a succeeding contract, the inclusion of no-strike and no-lock-out provisions in contracts, provision of facilities and personnel by labor and management to settle grievances quickly at the level where they occur, the early use in connection with renewing contracts of conciliation, mediation, and, if necessary, voluntary arbitration.

In addition there was a Rules Committee, dealing with procedure and the like, and, the most important group in the Conference, an Executive Committee, which would "coordinate the work of the Conference," "be responsible for the integration of reports of all other committees, except rules," "consider . . . any subject on the agenda not otherwise assigned," and "deal with such other matters of a general nature as may come before it." A Public Relations Committee was to assure that the work of the Conference be properly understood by the general public, and all Conference releases were to be submitted to it for approval.

Battle Over Committee

The minor battles referred to came over the personnel of the Executive Committee. Without going into the unimportant details the final result was that this committee, instead of its original eight voting members, (four from management, two from AFL, and two from CIO) was to have 16 members, with eight from management, three from AFL, three from CIO, and one each from United Mine Workers and the Railway Brotherhoods. As the group which more than any other could make the Conference a success or failure, it is worth noting its personnel: for management, Eric Johnston, Ira Mosher, H. W. Prentis, Jr., David Sarnoff, Wm. Rand, M. W. Clement, John Holmes, and Herman Steinkraus (Pres. Bridgeport Brass Co.); for the CIO, Philip Murray, R. J. Thomas, and Lee Pressman (General Counsel, CIO, and suspect in certain quarters of being a fellow-traveller); for the AFL, William Green, Mathew Woll (Vice Pres. AFL), and George Harrison (Pres. of Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks); for the Mine Workers, John L. Lewis; and for the Railway Brotherhoods, T. C. Cashen.

The non-voting members included the Conference Chairman, Walter Stacy, the Conference Secretary, George Taylor, and the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce. The other committees varied in size, but always with an equal number from management and from labor, and rotated the chairmanship between the two.

New Committee

A completely unplanned committee came into being the very first day, and one that in the long run may prove to have had an important part. A picket line was formed in front of the Auditorium by the independent unions, calling attention to the fact that they had not been invited, which, of course, was also true of some businesses which belonged to neither C. of C. nor NAM.

Similarly there were important segments of the public which felt that they were not adequately represented by the Labor and Commerce Departments. To compensate for such omissions, which were intentional and aimed at keeping the conference from becoming unwieldy, it was decided to set up a Public Hearings Committee, composed of non-conference members—they were Frank Graham, Chairman, William Ogburn, and Otto Beyer — before which individuals and groups might appear, have their say, and be assured that, through the committee, their complaints and suggestions would be presented to the Executive Committee of the Conference for consideration.

Among the many who appeared before this Public Hearings Committee were: Benjamin Marsh, representing People's Lobby, Inc.; Colston Warne, representing the Consumers' Union of the U. S.; R. A. McGowan, of the N. C. W. C.; John Carson, of the Cooperative League, U. S. A.; Beverly Boyd, for the Federal Council of Churches of Christ; Aaron Opher, of the Synagogue Council of America; and W. Allen Nelson, of the Foreman's Association of America.

The following passage is quoted from the last of three reports by the Public Hearings Committee to the Executive Committee:

It is significant not only that the representatives of the consumer groups, representing wide public interests, and other civic groups, but also that the responsible officials of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing the Bishops of the Church, officials of the Synagogue Council of America, representing the six national bodies of the Jewish faith and of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, composed of twenty-six Protestant denominations, presented statements in support of setting up machinery for voluntary arbitration, improved conciliation, and fact-finding as effective aids in the settlement of industrial disputes.

An earlier report refers to Mr. Carson of the Cooperative League as making "a strong case in support of Fr. McGowan's plea for fact-finding as an effective device in the prevention and settlement of labor disputes." We mention these facts because of the significance they may have for labor legislation in the period following the end of the conference. They seem to have had little influence on the Executive Committee so far as can be judged from its reports. There is no mention of "fact-finding" in any of the reports by either labor or management.

Permanent Committee Formed

From November 7 to 28, with time out for the Thanksgiving holidays, the various committees labored at their reports. Of the six dealing with the set agenda, three it, became increasingly clear, were failing to come to any agreement. In the Executive Committee, the question of discrimination in employment was handled successfully, and, as it became more certain that full accord on the prepared agenda would not be reached, a proposal was made to form a permanent committee of eight, two from C. of C., two from NAM, and one from each of the four labor groups, which would meet irregularly after the Conference was over with the aim of creating better understanding.

There was considerable discussion of Mr. Murray's resolution on wages, not so much on its intrinsic merit as on the advisability of making it conference agenda. Finally, by a vote of 13 to 3, i. e., with only the CIO members dissenting, the Committee passed a resolution which in effect stated that the Conference was not intended to handle the wage question. The Executive Committee also approved and recommended to the Conference the reports of the three committees which had been successful in coming to some agreement, and made a last minute attempt to reconcile the divergent labor and management reports of the other three committees.

On November 29 the Conference went again into regular full meetings to consider and vote on the resolutions and re-

ports of the various committees. The original rule, as prepared by the Rules Committee, required that "in order to make any recommendation adopted by the conference reflect the overwhelming opinion within both the labor group and the employer-management group . . . the assent of at least 15 members of each group" would be necessary for adoption. Management had throughout presented a solid front on all matters, while the divisions in labor were obvious from the beginning, though in general it was the CIO against the AFL, with Lewis and Cashen normally joining forces with the latter. (It was this tendency of Lewis to line up with Green against Murray which gave added strength to the already prevalent rumors that he intends to return with his Mine Workers to the AFL in the near future.

It was Lewis, however, who objected to the need of at least four negative votes to reject any proposal, his argument being that thus any group there (C. of C. or NAM, with nine votes each; the AFL or CIO with eight each) could block a report, except for his United Mine Workers and the Railway Brotherhoods, each of which had only one vote. He proposed that a unanimous vote be required for approval of recommendations. And the lion lay down with the lamb, as Eric Johnston facetiously remarked, when Philip Murray said he would support Lewis' proposal, if the unanimous vote rule should also be made to apply to the Executive Committee. This last would knock out the Executive Committee's resolution excluding from the conference Murray's wage question. When Eric Johnston said that management would be willing in this case to lie down with both the lion and the lamb, the rule of unanimity was applied to both Executive Committee and General Conference meeting procedure.

Unanimous Resolutions

The two resolutions of the Executive Committee which were adopted by the Conference unanimously were the following:

"Resolved, that the Labor-Management Conference urge on all elements of labor and management the broad democratic spirit of tolerance and equality of economic opportunity in respect to race, sex, color, religion, national origin or ancestry in determining who are employed and who are admitted to labor union membership."

"Resolved, that this Conference expresses its approval of the formation of an informal committee consisting of eight members, 2 from C. of C., 2 from NAM, and 1 from each of the 4 labor organizations present, this group to meet at such times as it sees fit for the purpose of creating better understanding between the respective groups, without any stated agenda, without any indication that they carry responsibility for their respective groups, and without any definite program."

Conciliation Service

The full, and rather lengthy report of the *Committee on Conciliation Services* was also adopted. It recommends that "all possibilities of settlement through collective bargaining" be conscientiously exhausted before either party in a dispute requests conciliation or mediation services; that there be a Federal Conciliation Service, its personnel made up of individuals who have not only impartiality and integrity but also a knowledge of labor-management problems and sufficient formal training in conciliation techniques; that adequate pay be provided to attract capable men; and that there be attached to the Director of Conciliation Service an Advisory Committee consisting of "equal members of representatives of management and labor selected by the Secretary of Labor from a list of nominees submitted by leading organizations of employers and labor."

"Conciliation must, under all conditions, be maintained as distinct and separate from arbitration," and hence a conciliator should never be assigned to a case as an arbitrator, except by written request on part of both parties. There should be no permanent arbitrators in the Division of Arbitration, but only a Chief of the Division, who would do no arbitration work himself, but maintain a pool or list of capable, trained, impartial arbitrators, which list, including experience and qualifications, should always be available to labor and management.

The *Committee on Initial Collective Agreements* presented a two-page report the main points of which were: the employer should not question his obligation to bargain with the union which is the accepted or lawfully established bargaining agent of all employees; there should be no delay in establishing relationships and beginning negotiations, the aim of which should be a signed agreement for a defined period of time; before specific bargaining on individual items, each party should present a general statement of its position, which statements should be explored jointly, areas of agreement sought, and issues clearly defined.

Inflammatory statements which question sincerity or good faith, threats or actions which interfere with normal operations, should be avoided while negotiations are in process, during which time each should show respect and consideration for proposals presented by the other party; conciliation should be employed only when, after reasonable time and full effort, collective bargaining has failed to bring about agreement. The conciliator should, if possible, be invited by both parties to participate, or at least the party inviting conciliation should notify the other party of his action; if conciliation fails, then voluntary arbitration may be considered, but, before asking for arbitration, the parties should agree on the precise unsettled issues to be arbitrated, the terms of the submission to arbitration, and the principles or factors by which the arbitrator shall be governed.

On Existing Contracts

The *Committee on Existing Collective Agreements* prefaced its recommendations with the observations that, since agreements are administered by persons of varying temperament and understanding, they should be as clear and simple as practicable and written in laymen's terms, should be thoroughly understood by both employer and employees as a result of discussions or even educational campaigns, but that understanding is not sufficient and must be implemented by "an honest effort on the part of all to effectuate the spirit as well as the letter of the agreement, a continuous demonstration by the parties of their willingness to conduct their relations on a basis of mutual fairness and respect."

Even then grievances and disputes over interpretation and application of the agreement will arise. Hence, the committee recommends that the agreement itself contain provisions that such disputes or grievances be settled without interruptions to normal operations by an effective grievance procedure with arbitration as its final step.

The committee then outlines at some length what it considers to be effective grievance procedure, some of the points of which are: the procedure should be designed to facilitate settlement as soon as possible, especially where discharge or disciplinary action is involved, and on the level where they occur, especially when they do not involve policy or contract interpretation; the filing of grievances should not be looked upon by supervisors as an antagonistic action but as an aid in discovering and removing causes of discontent in their departments; reference of a grievance or dispute to an umpire, arbitrator, or board should be reserved as a final step when all else has failed, but once referred to such authority, the decision given should be accepted by both parties as final and binding; and ample time should be provided in the agreement for the negotiation of a new or modified agreement. As is the case with the other two committee

(Turn to **Labor**, page 18)

Atomic Bombs Poised Over the Soviet Kremlin

By ROBERT A. GRAHAM, S.J.

Overheard at recreation:

"I see they're having another meeting of the United Nations. London, this time. Didn't they finish the job at San Francisco?"

"Well, if I get it right, all they were supposed to do at San Francisco was to draft a Charter for ratification." At London they are having the first General Assembly. So it's the first meeting of the United Nations Organization."

"Did we ever join that Organization? When did that happen?"

"Did we join it?—and how! By a vote of 89 to 2 in the Senate on July 28. Not even Senator Wheeler voted against it."

"But they sure rushed it through. Looks suspicious to me. We should have taken more time to examine it."

"Examine it! Where were you all the six months before? That was the biggest topic, next to the war! The public turned the question inside out. It was a clear verdict—thumbs down on isolationism!"

"I'll bet this new organization will be no better than the League of Nations. Only this time instead of the Grand Orient, you have the Russians running the thing. And the British are in there big as life. What can you expect out of that situation? We're babes-in-the-woods in that company."

"Do you think the Russians and the British won't be getting in our hair without a United Nations Organization?"

"Well, I guess it's a pretty small world nowadays. But look at Russia's record: the Baltic Republics, Poland. The Russians treat their friends worse than their enemies. They put the heat on Czechosovlakia and Iran. They're crooks, plain and simple. We've lost the peace already."

"You seem to be happy about your pessimism. But what do you suggest doing about it?"

"Simple, just drop a few atomic bombs on Red Square."

"Now, now, aren't you being a little frivolous, and slightly immoral?"

"They started it didn't they? Well, perhaps war is not the answer, although your blood boils when you think that we went to war to save Poland, and now she suffers the same fate from her "liberators" anyway. And this even though the Soviets signed the Atlantic Charter. Seriously, what *can* you do when you're dealing with people who can't be trusted out of sight?"

"The answer to that one is easy: just don't let them out of sight!"

"What do you mean? How can we keep the spotlight on the Russians?"

"You ought to know that power politics flourishes in the dark. Big nations don't like to work in the open. When they work in the open they have to explain their motives to the world. And that's, shall I say, 'inconvenient'."

"But big nations don't care about world opinion. And what does Russia, especially, care about what the rest of the world thinks?"

"Well, I must admit that the Russian bureaucrats seem impervious to the pressure of world opinion. But they do respect force. And force can only be mobilized and intelligently guided through full knowledge of the issues at stake. If I were a Soviet diplomat and had something up my sleeve, I would never have sponsored an international organization whose effect would be to keep me under the spotlight all the time."

"But all the United Nations can do is talk. Russia has a veto over sanctions."

"So you think talk is harmless. The Soviets don't think so. The whole story of their attitude toward the General Assembly is their effort to stop its mouth. They know the value of propaganda. They know what *they* can do with talk; they're afraid that this can be turned against them. Everybody knows that the Russians are in favor of secrecy, of Big Three private confabs, of closed sessions. They don't like open voting and open argument, if they can help it."

"But how is that going to help the mess in Eastern Europe?"

"Lots of things are happening right now in those regions. They say the Holy Father is greatly worried. But he isn't saying anything in public. The situation is too delicate. He's waiting until a forthright statement is more likely to have good effect, rather than merely arouse additional opposition to the Church. And he's not the only one who is worried but silent."

"But should we Catholics be silent while the Russians are gobbling up all of Europe?"

"I said 'silent', not 'inactive' or 'indifferent'. And incidently the Russians aren't gobbling up all of Europe. The elections in Austria and in Hungary tell us that. But our hope for a settlement of those trouble lies in systematic international cooperation. The United Nations didn't create those issues, but they can help to solve them, and certainly to prevent their aggravation. So we're putting our chips on the United Nations."

"Lots of people say we're leaning on a reed."

"May I call their attention to the alternative? Without the United Nations we are back in the morass of pure power politics. And in that kind of a game the Russians are past masters. I say, why should we play them on their home grounds? Bring them out into the open, in the fresh air of free discussion and established procedures, such as you have even in the much maligned Security Council. Then you have a better chance for justice and fair-dealing."

"But you can't trust the Russians. They don't believe in morals."

"Aren't you getting a little repetitious? We can trust them if we know what they're up to and don't let them out of our sight. That's the key value in international organization. And, by the way, is it a sin for us to trust other people?"

"No, it's no sin; but it's sure naive when you're dealing with those Reds."

"It seems to me that we are the Christians. Do we condition our practice of the virtues on their practice by atheists? When is the vicious circle going to end? Maybe the Soviets started it; but the question is: who's going to end this merry-go-round of mutual distrust?"

"But these matters are too vital to base on mere hypothetical trust. The future of the Church is at stake."

"Precisely. There are tremendous moral and spiritual issues at stake. We Catholics in America, particularly, should do all in our power to see that our country stands up for what is just. And we ought to support policies which will

enable this country to carry out its just aims. But, I ask you, who is helping Poland, *et al.*? The man who just sits back and criticizes and daily finds confirmation of everything bad he had predicted? Or the man who acknowledges the evils but also supports policies that are calculated to abolish them?"

"The Bishops said only last month that the war is over but peace is not here. The world is in a terrible state."

"Are you telling us anything? But the Bishops also said that we "acted wisely" in joining the United Nations Organization. They know that without an international program of collaboration upon which we can base our hopes and plans, there won't even be the faintest glimmer of peace."

"I still think we ought to drop an atomic bomb, just one, on the Kremlin."

"Is that your idea of the Christian solution of peace?"

"No, but it's sure practical."

Frequency Modulation Stations

By JOHN H. WILLIAMS, S.J.

THE AFL's International Ladies Garment Workers Union has applied to the Federal Communications Commission for permission to operate a chain of frequency modulation stations in New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Chattanooga.

The ILGWU has set aside $250,000 to establish its four FM stations, but doesn't propose to maintain them through union subsidies. They will sell time to an extent which will make them self-sustaining, the Executive Secretary of the Union declared, but from that point on, however, they will cease to be profit-making enterprises and will devote most of their time to social, cultural and spiritual programs.

A recent issue of the *CIO News*, official publication of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, announced that the U A W Executive Board has authorized expenditure of $400,00 to set up ix FM stations at Detroit, Chicago, leveland, Los Angeles, Flint, Mich., and Newark, N. J. Other stations are springing up over the country at a brisk rate, so that soon everybody will be in the FM education business.

Costs Surveyed

The whole question is of interest to Jesuits everywhere both for its educational and its social possibilities. Because the average Jesuit might not have at his disposal the ABC's of FM organization, here they are:

Cost of establishing an FM educational station varies between a $30,000 maximum and a $20,000 minimum, for an average-powered station of 1000 watts. Annual expenses, which would include salaries and overhead, would be about $8000. Personnel included an engineer licensed by the FCC, a station manager, at least one professional announcer, and casual talent, generally drawn from faculty and students of the educational institution. The station would also have a library of transcribed material.

Applications for FM stations and information may be secured from:

Mr. T. J. Slowie, Secretary,
Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Program Time Varies

A station agrees to broadcast for a previously determined period of time. In the beginning this may be only two hours daily. Later the program time may grow into a full day schedule of eight hours.

Many school systems have undertaken broadcasting schedules. Miss Judith Waller, director of Public Service for NBC, Central Division, Chicago, Illinois, has surveyed many of these.

During the polio epidemic several years ago the Chicago public school system attempted to continue classes during the period of quarantine. Teachers without special training attempted to speak, but the results were poor, despite cooperation of the newspapers. Finally the stations refused to carry the broadcasts despite the desire of the Board of Education.

Chicago Opens System

This complete failure inspired the Chicago School system to hire a Radio Director. Under his supervision teachers were trained as radio speakers, a Radio Council was established in the schools, until the resultant fine programs were widely carried. In 1943 the Chicago Public school system opened its own FM station which sends programs to all public schools.

A short-lived attempt in Cleveland failed because its primary purpose was to teach teachers to teach, not to instruct and entertain listeners. The Detroit system is quite different, since it consists largely of in-school broadcasts, which are devoted largely to social topics which are supplied by Radio Clubs set up in the schools.

The Canadian Broadcasting Co., analogous to the BBC, has its own school department, which prepares its own publications, and presents broadcasts in the several provinces of Canada. Each province is responsible for several broadcasts. The British system (BBC) sends programs directly to schools from one central station. Teachers are provided with program sheets a year in advance so that curriculum and programs can be unified.

CBS Changes Plan

Our own Columbia Broadcasting System has developed its School of the Air, which until this year was an in-school broadcast (that is, a broadcast sent out during school hours and directed exclusively to a student audience), will be extra-school this year.

Commercial stations have not in the past been too cooperative. Programs have been shifted to odd times in favor of paying entertainment. This will be remedied as school systems succeed in preparing more attractive material. The present tendency is to organize an entire series of broadcasts, as, for instance, the "Let the Artist Speak" series which the Chicago Public School system has prepared, the "Rivers of America" series, and others.

There are splendid possibilities for educational FM, Paul A. Walker of the Federal Communications Commission reported at a FM Station Workshop in Columbus, Ohio, last spring. The FCC has opened 20 channels to non-commercial educational broadcasting. Some states have already started plans for state-wide educational networks. At the present time there are six FM educational stations in operation; six more are under construction, and 23 applications for licenses are on file with the FCC.

At the present time more than 400 applications have been filed with the FCC for commercial licenses. As the commercial channels are filled up there will be an increasing pressure upon the FCC to release some of the unused educational bands to commercial stations—if educators do not take them.

Certainly there will be many educational stations. Who will own them? Who will speak over them? What kind of ideas will be spread by them? Will the educational FM stations of tomorrow improve life in America or harm it?

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND UNO

By WILLIAM L. LUCEY, S.J.

The recent Statement (November 17, 1945) of the Catholic Bishops of the United States is a fine directive to the leaders of this nation and the American Catholics in solving the problems of peace and achieving a sound international order.

Naturally, attention was directed to the United Nations Organization which will soon be functioning. Although their comment is limited to two paragraphs, the Bishops manage to explain both the advantages and the weaknesses of the Charter: it is an improvement over the Dumbarton Oaks proposals; the Security Council is not much more than a virtual alliance of the big powers with the result that the international society is not soundly organized; our decision to participate, despite the defects, was a wise one; by using the machinery provided for revising the Charter and removing the defects a sound institutional organization of the international community can be developed. These two paragraphs are such a clear and concise comment on the Charter they should be studied by all of us:

> "Our peace program envisions a world organization of nations. The Charter which emerged from the San Francisco Conference, while undoubtedly an improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, does not provide for a sound, institutional organization of the international society. The Security Council provisions make it no more than a virtual alliance of the great powers for the maintenance of peace. These nations are given a status above the law.
>
> Nevertheless, our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. It is better than world chaos. From the provision in the Charter for calling a constituent assembly in the future, there comes the hope that in time the defects may be eliminated and we may have a sound, institutional organization of the international community which will develop, not through mere voluntary concessions of the nations, but from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society."

Our hope, then, of an organized international community depends on improvements gradually introduced into the Charter. We are not encouraged to stand by awaiting the time that a perfect Charter is written and rejecting all attempts on the score they are not free from defects. The present Charter must be used and improved. But the Charter will not change itself; it is an instrument which must be used by all of us, and our first task is an understanding of its present structure. The Charter should be studied, and its defects and its benefits known. This brief comparison of the Charter with the League of Nations might be of some aid in that understanding.

Origin

The League of Nations, the rather hasty work of a few men of one nation, was part of the Versailles Treaty. It was incorporated into the treaty without much enthusiasm on the part of the major European nations whose cooperation was needed for its success. In the United States the League became a political issue and the public discussion of its merits and defects was colored by the political atmosphere. Eventually, the United States decided not to be a member of the League.

The Charter of the UNO was deliberately separated from the peace treaty or treaties, and it was hoped that the international organization would be established or near ready for operation at the war's end. The support and cooperation of the major powers were sought from the beginning, and not until an area of agreement among them was achieved did they give much attention to the superstructure. The attempt to keep the important problem out of politics succeeded; both major parties supported the idea of an international organization; both Houses of Congress by resolutions gave assurances that the United States would participate in the new organization; the public was urged to study the embryo organization, to criticize it and to offer improvements and amendments.

Organs

The Charter has retained many of the League's organs but has radically changed or improved them. New ones have also been added.

The Assembly

Membership is the same; every member nation of the organization is represented and entitled to one vote irrespective of size and population. The method of voting has been changed. Under the League a unanimous vote was required for all important decisions, whereas now decisions on important questions will be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. The most important change introduced by the Charter is the division of responsibilities and powers between the Assembly and Council. The League of Nations Assembly and Council had the same general powers; under the Charter the responsibilities and accordingly the powers are divided. The primary responsibility of the Charter's Assembly is the promotion of international cooperation in the political, economic and social fields, although any matter within the scope of the Charter is the proper concern of the Assembly.

The Security Council

The primary responsibility of maintaining peace and security is centered in this Council. It is composed of five permanent members (the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China and France) and six non-permanent members elected by the Assembly for two years. The League, too, had permanent and non-permanent members; Japan and Italy were in the places now held by China and Russia.

A big difference between the two Councils will be found in the power to use force to keep the peace. The Charter empowers the Security Council to use force whenever a situation or an international dispute threatens the peace. The military force is supplied by the member nations according to agreements made with the Council. These agreements will stipulate the quota of military power each nation must have available at the call of the Council. However, the Charter does not establish a system of collective security,—a system whereby any aggression by any nation is checked by the collective forces of the Council. The method of voting in the Council prevents this, for the Council can not make any important decision unless there is unanimity among the five permanent members. This is a serious defect and one that must in time be removed if wars of aggression are to be outlawed.

The Court

The World Court, established by but distinct from the League Covenant, has been taken over by the United Nations

Charter. The name has been changed from Permanent Court of International Justice to The International Court of Justice. One important change should be noted. The Court was not part of the Covenant; a nation could be a member of the League without being a member of the Court and a member of the Court without being a member of the League. Now the Court is an integral part of the United Nations Organization; all Members of the United Nations are *ipso facto* parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. However, a state which is not a member of the organization may become a party of the Statute.

The Economic and Social Council

This is a new and important Council. The League did not establish any machinery for international cooperation in the non-political field: economic and social matters. This was a serious defect and has been remedied by this Council of 18 members elected by the Assembly for three years. There are no special privileges in this Council, although nations of great economic wealth must of necessity be on the Council if any success is expected.

Economic, social, cultural, educational and health problems of international concern and the promotion of human rights and the fundamental freedoms of all are the proper concern of the Council. Subsidiary agencies and commissions may be established and already existing autonomous agencies dealing with specific problems (such as the International Labor Office) will be related to and their work coordinated with the Council.

The Trusteeship Council

This is also a new Council established to administer the dependent areas which have been entrusted to the UNO. The League did establish a mandate system (Article 22), but the territories were mandated to individual nations without much international control and some of the territories became integral parts of the national domain of the mandatory state. The system did not work out very well.

The Charter contains an excellent declaration of principles and objectives aimed at the progressive development of dependent peoples towards independence, and all members of the UNO are committed to them. There is, however, one defect; certain strategic areas are withdrawn from the international control of the Trusteeship Council and the Assembly and are placed under the Security Council.

Disarmament

The Charter places less stress on disarmament than did the League. A *second responsibility* of the Security Council is the promotion and acceptance of a system for the regulation of armaments. This regulation can be the equivalent of a sane and sound disarmament program, but the lack of emphasis on this essential step for the elimination of aggressive war is noticeable. It seems like a return to the once discredited idea: *si vis pacem, para bellum*; it certainly is a long way from the Atlantic Charter's declaration that all "nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force . . . They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burdens of armaments." But a satisfactory system of disarmament (at the proper time) is not an easy problem to solve; there must be a political equivalent with assurances of security for all nations before nations will abandon the hope of security through mighty armaments and military alliances.

Amendments

The League Covenant could be amended by a proposal approved by a majority of the member nations including the nations represented in the Council. Any nation which refused to be bound by such an amendment was permitted to withdraw from the League. Amendments to the UNO Charter must a) be adopted by two-thirds of the Assembly and b) be ratified according to their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the Members including the five permanent members of the Security Council. Provisions for a general conference to review and alter the Charter are also stipulated. Any alteration recommended by the general conference must be ratified in the same way as an amendment.

It is the method of amending the Charter and especially the method of revision by a general conference which contain the promises of a better and stronger Charter. Whenever the five big powers of today want a stronger international organization, whenever they want a sane federation of nations, the machinery to take that step is at hand.

Such a general conference to make recommendations can be called at any time by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly and the vote of *any seven members* of the Security Council. The approval of the United States, Russia and Great Britain is not needed for the calling of the convention. Their consent, however, is needed before any alteration can be made.

But it is idle to talk about a real world federation of nations if the big nations are unwilling to accept it; there can not be one without the participation of all three. It is idle to talk about a world federation while it is doubtful if these nations will abide by the obligations and restraints imposed by the Charter. Let them first cooperate to the full extent within the framework of the Charter; much will be accomplished if they do that. And the machinery for a better and stronger Charter is awaiting their use whenever they want a better and a stronger Charter.

Quebec Still Colonized

By W. B. FAHERTY, S.J.

THAT one of the most early settled provinces in North America can still be colonized is the conclusion to be drawn from the *Report of the Committee on Colonization in the Province of Quebec.* Far from being utopian, as so many studies of this kind are, this document is down to earth. The five members of the committee—a priest and four laymen—recognized the fact that for successful colonization there must not be a marked difference in the standard of living between the urban worker and the rural colonizer.

The investigators first ascertained what sections of their Province had enough natural wealth to allow of greater population. The resources of Quebec that provide a basis for extensive colonization are arable land, forests and the sea with its abundant fish.

As a solution to the problems arising from the seasonal nature of fishing and some types of farming, the committee recommended four types of colonies, all of which give a yearly program of productive work: a) agriculture alone; b) agriculture and forest; c) fishing and forest; d) forest alone. Nor were they recommending mere possibilities. Farming and forestry, they found out, have been combined successfully by many French-Canadians. The committee, further, recommended cooperative marketing of the lumber.

Regional development programs are recommended with both economic and social features, which read considerably like certain phases of the U. S. Senate Bill calling for the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority Throughout, solid family life and the traditional Canadian and Christian ideals are encouraged.

The Hon. J. D. Begin, Minister of Colonization, who appointed the Committee and authorized the study, says in a speech given at the end of the report that the program of colonization has the support of all the higher clergy, the Province Prime Minister, a large number of brothers and nuns, economists and patriots.

The "Peace" Terms of Potsdam

By REINHOLD DOERGE, S.J.

SINCE the publication of the decisions of the Potsdam Conference about the treatment of Germany the most controversial comments are filling our newspapers and journals. The scale of epithets runs from 'just punishment' as a sound basis for a just peace to outraged cries of 'crime' and 'revenge—but not peace.' Indeed, for an average American unfamiliar with the economic situation and geography of Europe who is used to the abundance of area and resources of his own country it is difficult to form an unbiased judgment on these terms.

However, since the Big Three made the whole German people—every single individual, including the former inmates of the concentration camps—responsible for the actions of a dictator, by implication every single American must be held responsible for what has been done in Potsdam, so much the more so inasmuch as the United States is a democracy, governed by the sovereign people.

Let us therefore reduce the polished diplomatic phrases of the Potsdam communiqué to bare figures and see for ourselves. You do not have to be an expert to do that. Simply find a good economic atlas of the world, take paper and pencil, and start figuring.

Boundary Changes

In the East the German border will run along the Oder and Neisse rivers. In the West probably not much of the pre-war border will be changed. Into this territory the whole German population has to be pressed according to the decrees of Potsdam. In order to find the approximate number of this population we take the population of Germany in 1930 from our source and add the natural growth of the last 15 years plus the German minorities of the Eastern countries minus the war losses.

In 1930 Germany had 65 million inhabitants; by 1945 it would have had under normal conditions about 70 millions. The German minorities of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary which are to be transferred in a 'humane and orderly manner' are somewhat more than 5½ millions. The army losses of men killed and missing in action and the civilian casualties may be altogether between 5 and 10 millions. (In the last air raid on Dresden alone a few weeks before the end of the war 225,000 people, mostly aged people, women and children, were killed by incendiary bombs!) So we cannot be very wrong, if we assume that the population is at least the same as it was in 1930, namely 65 millions. This simplifies our further calculations.

The living standard in regard to food is much lower in Europe than in the United States. In 1930 there were in Germany several millions unemployed who got just enough unemployment relief to keep them and their families alive. Therefore the 1930 level of food consumption cannot be called excessive, but must be considered as a necessary minimum for the maintenance of normal health. In the former parts of Germany East of the Oder and Neisse rivers were raised the following percentages of Germany's crop total:

Rye	32.1%
Potatoes	29.1%
Oats	25.6%
Sugar Beets	23.9%
Barley	21.6%
Wheat	18.2%
Sheep	30.9%
Pigs	21.9%
Cattle	19.5%

Huge Food Losses

Therefore by losing the area east of the Oder-Neisse Germany loses 25% of its food production, including one third of her chief bread grain, rye, and almost one third of the vital potatoes. But in the late twenties she had to import annually for 2,885 million Marks chiefly basic foodstuffs, such as wheat, fats and oils, milk, butter, cheese and eggs. In other words, on the average every individual German spent 45 marks for imported food, or lived for one month out of twelve on foreign food: 8.3% of his annual consumption was imported.

With the same population to feed and 25% of the food production lost Germany will have to import 33.3% of her food, instead of formerly 8.3%. Probably the Big Three had that in mind, when they wrote: 'The proceeds of exports from current production and stocks shall be available in the first place for payment of such imports.'

Left with such a staggering food deficit everything therefore depends on the industry which must be able to produce for export in order to pay for food. Mr. Morgenthau's plan took care of the German industry! East of the new German-Polish border are 12.8% of the German industry measured by value of its output. This is a total loss. According to reliable reports the Russians dismantled the industries of their occupied territory and moved them into Russia.

The Russian zone of occupation holds 25.5% of Germany's industries. The French hold 5.4%: dismantling goes on there. So there is in the American-British occupied remainder of Germany 56.3% of her industry left. Of this 30% is destroyed by bombing, leaving in reparable condition 39.4%. From this Russia is allowed to take 25% 'of such industrial capital equipment as is necessary for the German peace economy'. So Germany will keep perhaps 30% of its original industry.

Many Jobs Lost

In 1930 German industries gave employment to 11,353,000 people. After Potsdam and the stripping of territories and industries there remains only work for 3,406,000. This means a start with about 8 million unemployed skilled industrial workers, or with their families some 30 million people without a living. Of course, in the first years most of them will find work in rebuilding the war damage. But this work is not remunerative work which creates foreign credit for buying foreign food. According to experts the food production inside the country cannot be raised by putting more manpower to agricultural work, but only by improving the methods and using more fertilizer which again has to be imported or produced by the industry. Besides all this, great amounts of reparations have to be paid.

So in the future "peace" the German people will have to get along with only 2/3 of the food necessary for normal humans. As a prelude during this winter the Germans have to subsist on rations of only slightly over one-half of the required minimum of calories. Yet, the Big Three solemnly announce: "It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or

Lest Father Doergé's strictures on Potsdam seem partisan, we supply confirmation of his judgment from two unimpugnable sources: *The Economist* (London): "The Potsdam settlement has in it not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the postwar world. At the end of a mighty war fought to defeat Hitlerism, the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace. This is the real measure of their failure." *The Protestant*, on the other hand, said: "Potsdam is the lighthouse from which rays of new hope illuminate the German horizon."

enslave the German people." This sounds like a bitter mockery.

Doomed to Failure

No wonder that 2,750 persons committed suicide in Berlin, Hamburg, Leipzig and Cologne in the first four days after the publication of the Potsdam terms. These people who lost their last hope were not the Nazis. The gangsters had no more hope to lose long before Potsdam; they knew that their ideas were doomed.

These suicides were exactly the people who had put all their hope in the termination of tyranny and the rise of democracy. They took their lives when they saw a new trial at democracy condemned to failure from the beginning. Men have certain inalienable rights, the most fundamental of which is the right to live! Everybody knows, what the act that violates this right is called. To deny these rights as a punishment requires at least a trial, unless you subscribe to Nazi methods.

Not All Guilty

To justify the punishment meted out the Potsdam declaration states: "The German people have begun to atone for the terrible crimes committed under the leadership of those whom in the hour of success, they openly approved and blindly obeyed." However it is a fact that the German people did not "openly approve" the acts of their leaders; they did not even have a chance of doing so. They did not "blindly obey" either: they saw only too well what happened to those who did not obey! Never before were the victims of a hold-up punished for failing to capture the bandits.

But what to do? It is probably too late to change the Eastern border, since Russia is already executing the mass migration.

Under the present circumstances there are three possibilities: First: Let 20 million Germans die of malnutrition so that the remainder can live from the produce of the country. No decent American will want this.

Second: Feed the people with lend-lease food shipments the end of which can not yet be foreseen.

Third: Grant the German people in their terrible predicament at least the tools to earn their daily bread.

The choice between these two possibilities is up to the American people! If the U. S. continues its present policy, the German people has still one way out and that is to become a Soviet Republic in the U. S. S. R. Under this condition Russia will be only too glad to deliver the necessary food and to rebuild Germany's industry. But once you will have surrendered the heart of Europe to the red totalitarianism, the outer rim of Europe will not be able to resist longer.

THE NAPKIN BOX

NEGRO IN JESUIT SCHOOLS

For a long time I have been pondering over the astounding principle stated by Father Healy in his recent "solution" of a "casus conscientiae" regarding the admission of a colored student to a Jesuit school: "Verum est quod scholae Jesuitarum, ut institutiones privatae, jus habent sive recipiendi sive excludendi quoslibet juvenes qui eas ingredi velint."

According to this principle, a Jesuit school, because it is a "private institution," has the right to receive or exclude as a student whomsoever it pleases.

This is a false principle.

A private institution, because it is a "persona moralis", is bound by the universal laws of justice and charity. Hence it does not enjoy an unrestricted privilege of doing what it pleases in the matter of admitting or rejecting students. Especially is this true where the rejection of a deserving and qualified student may involve his eternal salvation and always causes great public scandal.

Would the Rector of a Jesuit school, because it is a "private institution", be justified in refusing admission to a deserving and qualified student simply because he did not like the applicant's grandfather? He would be according to the principle laid down by Father Healy.

Are Jesuit schools, simply because they are "private institutions", relieved of all obligations in justice and charity towards an individual and society in general? They are according to the principle stated by Father Healy.

John P. Markoe, S. J.

●

ISO FUTURE

Adopting the words (October BULLETIN, p. 24) of the late Father General as most expressive and proper, one may say the ISO is intended to be the American parallel to "Action Populaire" and its general aim is "the conversion of modern society to Christ."

Plainly, ISO effort will be new and unfamiliar.

It will venture into comparatively unworked fields.

Surely it would be strange and unintelligible if this long-needed advance does not meet difficulty and opposition.

It may help to recall that Christ openly said He came *to cast fire upon the earth.*

R. Bernard, S. J.
St. Marys, Kansas

●

ARGUMENT FOR FREEDOM

Father Joseph M. Becker, S. J., of the Chicago Province in a letter in the *New York Times* of November 21, commenting on President Truman's message on compulsory medical insurance, used an argument which he has found by experience more useful than any other with the good but irreligious social reformer. Possibly others of Ours might find opportunities for using it. Father Becker wrote:

Dear Sir:

In his "Health Message" of November 19, President Truman was at pains to assure the American people that the proposed bill would not deprive them of two important freedoms. He said: "People should remain free to choose their own physicians and hospitals." And again: "People will remain free to obtain and pay for medical service outside the health insurance system if they desire, even though they are members of the system." And then in illustration of this second freedom he went on: "...just as they are free to send their children to private instead of to public schools, although they must pay taxes for public schools."

I wonder how many noticed that the illustration would not hold for the first freedom? Under our public school system do "people remain free to choose their own" teachers and schools? Only the rich have that freedom. And yet it is a much more important freedom for democracy than the freedom to choose our physicians and hospitals. A more democratic educational system would be one that paralleled the proposed health system, and "subject to national standards" permitted the tax-payers to designate "their own" teachers and schools as the recipients of public grants for education. Then the rich would not longer have a monopoly on that most precious of freedoms.

Sincerely yours,
Joseph M. Becker, S. J.

February ISO Forum . . .

CAN AND SHOULD URBAN SLUM AREAS BE REHOUSED?

Women Workers in the War Period

By CLIFFORD CARROLL, S.J.

THE President of the United States in an address on July 7, 1943 said that there were over two million women workers in the munitions plants alone producing the munitions with which the United Nations were steadily beating down the Axis. He ended with a sweeping compliment, "They are doing a grand job, all of them." It gave a lift to many a tired mother who had packed the youngsters off to school and taken up her own lunch pail to go off to work in the jammed busses of the early morning.

Those two million in the munitions works were just part of the working force of women estimated at 17,500,000 at its peak. If we didn't know it beforehand, war has taught us that women can do eighty per cent of the jobs connected with the war production. That, at least, is the conclusion of the Industrial Hygiene Foundation according to an Associated Press dispatch of January 23, 1944 naming Dr. C. O. Sappington of Chicago as the Industrial Health Specialist who conducted the survey.

There was a 36 per cent increase in the number of women employed as a result of the war-time changes in the labor force. In numbers that means that before the war there were 13,000,000 women workers, and at the end of the war there were around 17,500,000 according to the *Monthly Labor Review* for August, 1945. This increment to the labor force included 1,900,000 more working women in the age bracket above 35 years than would normally be employed in industry. Besides those just mentioned there were 600,000 more women from 20 to 34 than would normally be employed.

Only Half at Same Work

An analysis made more or less at the midpoint of the war in March, 1944 shows that about 50 per cent of the women working in 1944 were employed in the same occupation group as they had been in the pre-war days of 1941. 69 per cent of the women were from 20 to 44 years of age. 42 per cent of them were single.

Altogether there were 6,650,000 females entered the ranks of labor during the war period, and 55 per cent of them were 20 to 34 years old. 44 per cent of them were single, 56 per cent of them had been home houseworkers.

Almost as interesting as knowing who made up the force that entered industry, is the information about those who didn't enter. 33,260,000 didn't enter the field of industrial labor. 43 per cent of them were over 45 years old. 14 per cent of them were under 20. 65 per cent of them were married and had their husbands present in this country.

We saw above that 50 per cent of those women working in 1944 were engaged in the same industrial group as they had been prior to Pearl Harbor. We would expect then, that in the purely war industries, 49 per cent of the workers came from outside the labor force, and it probably helps us to understand the terrific turnover in personnel and explains why the strictly war plants had to train all their people from the very beginning in the rudiments of industrial labor.

Not New Development

There isn't anything new about women working. Neither is there anything new about the increasing numbers of working women. We have known that since 1890, when 17.2 per cent of all women were working, the trend has steadily gone upward between one and two per cent each decade so that by 1920, 20.5 per cent of all women were working, and this figure jumped to 32.9 per cent in 1944 reflecting the extraordinary change in the working force of the nation. As one would suspect the greatest increase has been among the married women, of whom approximately 3,130,000 joined the labor force. (1)

It would be pleasant simply to dismiss the whole business of women in industry with the remark that this is nothing but a review of statistical material on the employment of women. The fact of the matter is, that wrapped up in those figures is the story of what is happening to the family, the nation and the Church.

Problem of Earnings

Some people have no doubt at all as to the desirability of putting more and more women in the labor force. They want the nation to make its plans to include more and more women. "Sixty Million Jobs" may be just a slogan. If it isn't just a slogan, it is a declaration of intention in which we should all be vitally interested. It means keeping women in industry. It means converting what we thought was a war-distorted view of society into a regular peacetime blueprint of the state of things to come.

As things stand, the average woman who marries stands a very good chance of being asked to do two full-time jobs. At least, if she is a child-bearer and home-maker she will be doing what the experienced say is two full-time jobs. In no other way can the family "keep up with the Joneses."

The reason is factual and easy to see. Granted the proposition that there is equal pay for equal work, no man can possibly earn as much as a man and his wife together. Two may live as cheaply as one but two certainly can make more than one.

Home Jobs Disappearing

Another observation that might be made in connection with the facts about women workers is that many, very many of the economic functions of the distaff side of the house have been removed from the home to the factory with little possibility that they will be restored. Dairy tasks simply won't fit into the picture of modern urban life. Spinning, weaving, tailoring have all been transferred to the factory. Canning, dehydrating, processing food, with the exception of the final stages, have all passed to industry.

Therefore, with all the good will in the world a woman who wants to make her economic contribution to the household (and that is part of the concept of the living wage!) finds that she is handicapped because her opportunities have been removed. She is almost driven to follow them into the factory.

Are women able to work and rear families too? Evidently something is occurring along these lines, because despite the increased number of women employed in industry and despite the inroads made by short-sighted industrial maternity policies, the birth rate has increased so that in the first two years of the war there were a million more babies than were reported in the last two years of peace. Those are some facts for the social planners to mull over.

(1) Many of the data above were derived from Mary Elizabeth Pidgeon, Changes in Women's Employment During the War, Special Bulletin No. 20 of the Women's Bureau, June, 1944, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS SEMINAR

St. Mary's is the scene of a seminar in social problems which has some points of interest. **Father Augustine C. Klaas** is the director, and seven scholastics are working under him.

All seven scholastics came into the seminar equipped with special study and experience in the topics they were to treat. The approach to the social problems was made from the standpoint of Heinrich Pesch's "Christian Solidarism". The encyclicals were used only as source material.

By approaching the problem from the theoretical analysis of Christian Solidarism, more real understanding of problems, principles, applications, and solutions has resulted. After all the theory of Christian Solidarism is, in point of fact, the theoretical basis of *Quadragesimo Anno* itself! Special attention has been given to the logical sequence of papers. A topic was assigned to each member of the seminar, but each topic was divided into two papers which were to be given a month or six weeks apart. This made the seminar really a program of cooperative study; and discussions have been very extensive and profitable. Discussions have usually lasted from forty-five minutes to an hour usually being ended only by the bell ringing for points and examen.

The seven topics treated are: Social Justice **(Mr. Porter)**, Private Property **(Mr. Elliott)**, Role of the State in Society **(Mr. Blum)**, Production and Distribution in a Functional Economy **(Mr. Hanley)**, Labor and Labor Betterment in a Functional Economy **(Mr. Majoli)**, Place of the Cooperative Movement in the Program of the Encyclicals **(Fr. Kennedy)**, and International Community **(Mr. Cervantes)**.

Anyone interested in further details can obtain them by writing the beadle of the seminar, Mr. Richard L. Porter.

●

Father Robert A. Graham has gone to the opening of the General Assembly of UNO in London as the representative of *America* and ISO.

■

Quite clearly it was the hope of our late Holy Father when he established the Feast of Christ the King to have this one of our great feasts of the year. Thus far it has not become what was expected. Perhaps enough time has not elapsed but there is one Jesuit who is making an effort to lift the feast into popular celebration. Under the leadership of **Father John P. Smith**, the **Church of the Gesu**, Philadelphia, now celebrates the feast on a scale that calls the attention of the city to its importance.

A Solemn High Mass was sung in the Gesu this year and in the afternoon 800 of the parishioners, including all the Church societies, along with two bands, paraded throughout the neighborhood of the parish. There was an animated rosary in honor of the 20 dead servicemen, a sermon by **Father Dennis J. Comey** and Solemn Benediction.

Most of the windows of the parishioners displayed a picture of Christ the King with an American flag. This was part of the city-wide celebration sponsored by the Archdiocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, the director of which is Rev. John J. McKenna, a graduate of **St. Joseph's Prep.** For the picture an artist made an original drawing, 100,000 copies of which were distributed throughout the city.

Devotion characterized the Gesu parish throughout the celebration. Father Smith reports that during the last two years the devotion to Christ the King has spread widely throughout Philadelphia. It is hoped that other dioceses and other Jesuit parishes will follow this inspiring lead.

●

In his endeavors to aid the returning veterans, **Father Bunn** called a meeting of the Maryland Education Conference which brought together all the schools and colleges of the state. Father Bunn presided as Chairman.

●

A detailed mimeographed report of the first of five New England Provincial Meetings for the coming year has been sent to the Central Office by **Father William F. Drummond**, Province representative of the ISO Executive Board and Chairman of these meetings.

At the meeting held at Weston College on October 21 the "Full Employment Act of 1945" was discussed with 95 of Ours in attendance. **Mr. James T. Creamer** initiated the discussion with an analysis of the bill providing background on Congressional attitudes. **Father John A. O'Brien** of Boston College followed with an ethical appraisal of the premises of the legislation. **Father Ernest B. Foley**, also of Boston College, offered some detailed commentary on the economic implications of the bill.

In the discussions that followed, **Fathers Edward F. Schroeder** of Holy Trinity Parish, **Raymond Cahill** and **Paul W. Facey** of Holy Cross were prominent.

●

Father Joseph P. Ayd continues his highly effective work as Chaplain of the Maryland State Penitentiary, a post for which he has long and efficient service. His wide experience has made him a poular speaker throughout the city.

●

Modern missionaries are so interested in the self-help value of credit unions for native populations that the credit union courses were a strong feature of the **ISO Mission Institute** last summer in St. Louis. News that a colonial government has the same social awareness as our missionaries is reassuring, especially after hearing that credit unions in Jamaica are now subject to taxation.

When a Caribbean hurricane lashed the southern coast of British Honduras on October 4th with a 90-mile wind, a prodigious problem of reconstruction had to be faced. Word has just been received that the credit unions at the Jesuit Mission at **Punta Gorda** and **Baranco** have been chosen by the colonial officer of Social Welfare as approved agencies for supervising the cooperative reconstruction of houses that were destroyed.

Members of the **St. Peter Claver Credit Union** of Punta Gorda, of which **Father Marion Ganey** is moderator, met three days after the hurricane to institute a plan for cooperative rebuilding of houses. Owners of damaged homes will borrow from their union the funds necessary to pay laborers $1.00 a day, with the stipulation that the laborers automatically deposit 30 cents of each dollar to their several accounts in order that the credit union may extend loans to as many homeless families as possible.

Mr. St. Albans, the social welfare officer, addressed a large credit union meeting on the mission grounds at Punta Gorda, and praised the initiative of members in undertaking self-help immediately, prior to the arrival of governmental aid from Belize, the colonial capitol.

The Punta Gorda Credit Union, the first in British Honduras, has attracted widespread interest among leaders of the credit union and cooperative movement in the United States.

●

From Valencia in Spain **Father Pascual Gisbert** has arrived in St. Louis to continue studies for a doctorate in Sociology at the **Institute of Social Sciences.** Father Gisbert had volunteered for the Bombay mission, and the Rector of St. Xavier's College there, Father A. M. Coyne, urged Father Gisbert to come to the United States for his studies. Upon conclusion of his work here at the ISS Father Gisbert will join the faculty in Bombay. He has already taken the honors A. B. in Sociology at London University.

The Traffic Tower

Nonne et Ethnici? When one reads about the charitable activities of the Quakers it is important to realize that there are only a little over 100,000 Friends in America. Of course, the support of many non-Quakers has done much to make this activity possible but the record of the efforts untainted by any sectarian or proselytizing purpose of the Friends to relieve human suffering is altogether admirable.

After the first World War the rebuilding of houses in French devastated areas was one of the tasks the Friends Service Committee undertook. Because Quaker philosophy recognized no national barriers against humanitarian work, American and British Friends were among the first to launch a program of child feeding in the starving cities of Germany and Austria. Along with the Papal Relief Mission, the Quakers were at work in the Valley of the Volga during the 1921 - 22 Russian famine. After the Spanish Civil War they sent relief workers to the internment camps in France and lightened the dreary life of these camps with milk for the children and books and school accessories and a few other elements of civilized life.

Under the leadership of Howard Kirshner they were at the forefront of the effort to obtain some system of feeding the civilian population of France, Belgium and the other occupied democracies during the recent war. Here at home they have sent out volunteers to help returning Japanese-Americans on the west coast open up their homes and repair the effect of neglect and willful damage, an important contribution of moral support in the midst of a return to an alien and, often, hostile community.

Every summer the Friends Service Committee enlists a number of young people (the majority of them non-Quakers) in work-camp projects in this country and Mexico to serve some community need—the repair of a rural schoolhouse, for instance, or the improvement of a Negro settlement in a crowded city. Each summer, too, some 15 Institutes of International Affairs are held in campuses of various colleges from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

William Henry Chamberlin in *The New Leader* (from whose article these facts are taken) says of the Quakers: "In their relief work they can perhaps only bail out a few tincups from an ocean of human misery. Yet the spirit that has inspired this work is not negligible. It is at least a small oasis of humanity in a desert of hates."

In paid advertisements on December 1 the American Friends Service Committee appealed to Americans to support their efforts to include Germany and Austria in American relief efforts this winter. Pointing out that UNRRA is barred from aiding German nationals due to restrictions within its Charter, the advertisement asks: "let the distribution of our help be impartial, according to need, to friend and foe alike". The Quakers request that the American Government mobilize foodstuffs, transports and funds to raise the individual rations to 2,000 calories daily; that the American Armed Force accept the assistance of the American voluntary relief agencies in the specialized care of children, expectant and nursing mothers and the aged; that mail and parcel post services to central Europe be resumed, in order that persons in the United States can supplement rations by sending food and clothing to their friends and relatives. "These are essential steps to avert financial and wholesale death in Europe this winter", the advertisement states, supplying a coupon to be filled in and mailed to American Friends Service Committee, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania with the names of those who approve their efforts.

•

Question Could an explanation be found for the Soviet's lack of enthusiasm for UNO in their preference for another potential world organization—USSR?

•

Presbyterian ISO? To instrument its conviction that "if we are to help shape the cultural pattern with the basic precepts of our religion, and if we are to minister to the needs of our people, it is necessary that we learn how to present effectively the Christian religion in urban and industrial communities." The Presbyterian Church has established the Presbyterian Institute of Industrial Relations. The purpose of this Institute, the *Bulletin of Information* states, "is to give to church leaders training, on a graduate level, that will meet the particular needs of the Church in city and industrial areas."

Eight monthly terms have been scheduled for 1945 - 1946 at the seven - story Labor Temple in New York City's Lower East Side; one term of the Extension Institute will be held at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago; another at San Francisco Theological Seminary in San Anselmo, California. The Institute is open to ministers, theological students, mission workers, teachers and laymen (colored and white) engaged in industrial fields. Expense for the four-week course is $75. Courses scheduled include: Urban and Industrial Sociology; History of the Church and the Labor Movement in the Industrial Expansion of America; Laboratory and Observation; Building a Program for the Church in City and Industrial Areas; The Church and Urban Sociology; Current Industrial Issues and The Religious Basis for Social Action.

These courses, the *Progressive* reports, take largely the form of discussions on a schedule running from 9 A. M. to as late as 10 P. M., the students sitting around a horseshoe arrangement of maple tables in a library, with the instructor seated at a desk in the center.

In answer to a question of a student "Is it our part to take sides?", Dr. Liston Pope, who goes down weekly to New York from Yale's Divinity School to discuss the role of the church in industrial society, recommended absolute neutrality.

Dr. Pope suggests this seven-point program of tactics to ministers: "1. to be familiar with industrial tensions before they reach a crisis; 2. to interpret the conflict from the standpoint of the total community; 3. to keep Christianity from being used as propaganda by either side; 4. to keep the real issues—the human factors—to the forefront in the case; 5. to insist on civil liberties, such as free speech and free assembly, and to see that the police represent the total liberties of all the people, rather than those of one side; 6. to keep the issue from being settled on the basis of sheer power, wielded by either side (hands-off policy is not really hands-off, for doing nothing lets the stronger side win); 7. to offer one's services in mediation, arbitration, and conciliation."

Graduates, we are told, have been quick to put thier training to use in Rochester, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Brooklyn, inaugurating public forums and participating in arbitration work.

•

Anti-Bureaucracy Senator Byrd of Virginia indicates that he believes the 3,649,000 employees of the government could easily be cut by a million without detriment to public service.

•

Interracial Tea Miss Willmann, of *The Queen's Work*, calls to our attention an interracial meeting and tea, sponsored by St. Margaret's Academy, Minneapolis, Minn. The program, highlighted by the singing of James Weldon Johnson's "Lift Every Voice and Sing" and choral readings from Claude McKay's sonnets, presented

addresses by Rev. F. J. Gilligan, Dr. Charles H. Williams, member of the Minnesota FEPC, Mr. S. Vincent Owens, Urban League, Mr. Cecil Newman, editor of *The St. Paul Recorder* and *The Minneapolis Spokesman*, and Mother Barbara, of the Oblate Sisters of Providence and superior of the Convent in St. Paul. A distinguished group of white and Negro guests attended.

•

Student Housing The Federal Public Housing Authority (see Traffic Tower, November, 1945) announces that 3,527 surplus housing units have already been transferred to colleges and municipalities to provide for the the housing of veterans. Ohio State university, Wisconsin, Cornell, Michigan, Indiana universities, among others, have received these units. Since 275,000 units have been declared surplus, there are still many more available. An amendment of the Lanham Act authorizes the FPHA to give preference to the families of veterans and service men. "Since the FPHA has had no funds to pay the cost of moving structures under this authorization," Philip M. Klutznick, the FPHA Commissioner reports, "we have been supplying as many units as possible, provided the institutions or cities needing them pay the costs of moving." A pool of 10,000 units is being maintained to provide for institutional needs. Mr. Klutznick, it might be observed, is a graduate of Creighton University's School of Law.

•

Plenty of Sailors In connection with the proposed bill or military conscription, it is interesting to recall the remark which Vice-Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Chief of Navy Personnel, made before the Senate Military Affairs Committee some time ago. He assured the members of the committee that volunteers applying for enlistment in the Navy are supplying all of the Navy's current needs for personnel. They are receiving 500 volunteers daily or a total of 16,000 a month. There are at the present time 323,000 regular Navy men. With these volunteer additions to the Navy, personnel will be brought to the figure of 500,000 by next September 1.

•

Hungary Conservative Recently Hungary held its first free election in many years. Results of the election gave a strong majority to the Conservative Small Land Holders Party. In the Budapest elections the party won a decisive victory over a Coalition Ticket formed by Socialists and Communists. Fifty-eight per cent of the four million voters favored Small Land Holders Party.

•

Diplomatic Career In an article in *Liberty* for November 24, Blair Boles and Walter Fitzmaurice discuss "Top Brains" instead of "Top Hats." Under that title they are considering foreign service as a field for young Americans.

We have applicants to the number of 80,000 indicating they are interested in this as a possible career. Yet the money set aside for foreign service this year was $783,000, "enough to finance about six minutes of the late war."

Thus far foreign service has been a step-child; there are possibilities, however, for an improvement in future status. At the current time there are 250 establishments overseas with 792 foreign service officers, as well as 61 ambassadors and ministers, 666 auxiliary officers to 30 foreign service clerks, 1,027 auxiliary clerks and 1,567 other members. So it is easy to see that while one year 44 candidates from 164 applied for the service only 37 made the grade.

Foreign service officers start at $2,500 and run up to $10,000 with their allowances running up to $3,000, but the entire system apparently has been based on inadequate salaries.

Joseph P. Kennedy used $250,000 of his own money while Ambassador to England; Ambassador Davies spent $50,000 a year in Moscow; it takes $75,000 to run the Paris Embassy.

Ambassadors were voted in 1856 $17,500 a year which has never been changed. Peru's ambassador, to Washington, averages $26,000 a year; Brazil pays its ambassador $20,000 in salary and $12,037 in allowances. The British ambassador to Washington gets $70,000 a year in allowances so he will not have to pay income tax.

Apparently Congress is considering this important branch of the service with the thought that it is going to be important.

•

Disce ab Hoste The quotable Father Edward Dowling is responsible for the following epigram: The urban Liberal is the counterpart of the rural Protestant. Father Dowling explains that since it is not fashionable to attend church in the city, the Protestants there work off their excess religious emotions in pressuring for political causes of dubious value. Father Dowling asked himself in the midst of a discussion at a newspaper guild convention, he tells us, where he had heard such a point of view before. It was at a camp meeting at Argyle, Kansas, he recalled.

Catholics, however, could learn something from those "extra muros." The sense of human solidarity possessed by many Socialists is an admirable thing. And, as for the duty of personal charity, there is the bothersome comment overheard at an AA Meeting: "It is a marvelous thing for a fellow that he can find people in every city in the country interested in him and intent that he will have a good time and not get into trouble. I mean AA groups, not church organizations."

•

Sanity A specific note of political sanity is discoverable in the rejection by the Danish Government of the propsal to incorporate the German territory of South Schleswig into their little progressive republic. Foreign Minister Moeller says such acquisitions would mean future trouble.

•

Peron Un-haloed The menace of identifying nationalism with religion is troubling Argentine Catholics as gangs of young hoodlums break up democratic meetings with the shout "Viva the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church."

A Franciscan, writing in *Orden Cristiano* says: "Such cries at this moment and by such elements do serious damage to the Church. These deranged youths do incredible evil to all Catholics before the anti-totalitarian masses... It is an undeniable fact that such imprudence can prepare an anti-Catholic movement, and no one can deny that such a phenomenon is possible in the Argentine Republic... They must not confound the Church with a political faction, nor sow confusion among men, and they must distinguish the religious from the profane."

It is remembered that the nationalists endeavored to play down the Pope's Christmas Message of 1944 because it dampened their efforts to exploit Catholicism for their purposes. The claim was made that the Christmas Message represented merely a personal opinion of the Pope since it was simple "allocution" and not an "encyclical letter." Monsignor Francis Franceschi answered these claims in peremptory fashion in the weekly *Criterio*, pointing out that many of the most influential statements of the Pope in the past have not been in encyclical form and indicating, ironically, that the condemnation of "Sillon" is an example.

"When an allocution is given on the solemn feast of Christmas", Monsignor Franceschi declared flatly, "and is directed to Catholics of the whole world on a subject of such transcendent importance as this is, it is an offense against

the Vicar of Christ and a clear and serious lack of obedience to consider it as only a personal opinion of the Pope or a particular exhortation and, in a word, to detract from its character of a highly important act of the Supreme Pontiff in the exercise of his universal teaching power."

●

Atomic War Discouragingly enough, we now find that future wars may be fought not by soldiers but by saboteurs. Each nation will attempt to plant atomic bombs in the key areas of nations and explode them by remote control.

Incidentally, while it cost $2,000,000,000 to produce the first bomb, from this point on the bomb can be produced for about $2,000,000 and that cost is rapidly decreasing.

●

Musing Advice To set the mood and clear the air for the meeting of the General Assembly of UNO we would recommend the delegates to read this verse by Richard Armour.

"Molotov Asks Erasure of Record of London Parley."—Newspaper Headline.
Expunge the record, leave no trace,
Get out erasers and erase,
All papers to their former whiteness.
Return, with statesmanlike politeness,
And if we meet again, pretend
The things we said, the words we penned,
The view on which we then insisted
Could not have possibly existed.
This might have seemed a trifle queer
Before this strange atomic year,
But now, in dealings international,
Few thing are quite so sound and rational.

●

More Labor Publicity A Labor School in San Francisco, called the California Labor School, has introduced a workshop in public relations, reports the *CIO News*. This is the first time that anything more than a class in public relations has been started for working men.

●

No Opposition Moscow reports through a Taas dispatch that in the Plebiscite held on November 2 in the Mongolian Peoples' Republic (Outer Mongolia) the people voted 24,683 to 0 in favor of independence. Soviet elections, it would seem, are always landslides.

●

White-Collar Pensions The Ford Motor Company has announced inauguration of a retirement plan instituted last December 30. The system, which benefits only salaried employees who have been with the Ford Company for at least five years and who earned at least $3,000 annually guarantees a minimum monthly benefit of $20 upon retirement at 65. The benefits could reach a total of $20,000 a year ($385 weekly). Under the terms of the pension plan the Ford Company pays more than half the cost of the monthly payments. The remaining contribution is deducted each month from the employee's salary.

In case of death before retirement, beneficiaries receive the entire sum contributed by the employee with accrued interest. If an employee leaves the company, he may withdraw his entire contribution as well as the interest it has accumulated, although he is free to leave his contributions and receive instead a paid-up annuity.

Annuities beginning at retirement amount to 30 per cent annually of the total contribution the employee has made to the plan by a five per cent annual deduction from his salary. Thus, if he in the course of his employ has contributed $4,000 to the fund he will receive an annual pension of $1,200.

●

GI Strikers Veterans of the late war, who would ordinarily benefit by the unemployment provision of the GI Bill of Rights, will receive nothing at all if they are out on strike or will benefit by a strike. This was the decision of the Michigan State Unemployment Compensation Board in the case of ex-GI's who walked out of the GM plant with the UAW or who stand to benefit by the results of the strike. The ruling has been approved by the Veterans Administration in Washington, but the Veterans of Foreign Wars has asked for a reconsideration of the decision.

●

Housing Shortage *Fortune*, in a recent editorial, asserts: "...for years the American building trades, with eyes fixed not on cheaper housing, but on the protection of jobs, have sought to hold prices up, to produce not more for less but less for more. The results have scarcely benefited the volume of employment in these trades or the consuming public."

●

Soviet Enigmas The *United States News* for November 16 makes a study of the roots of suspicion directed toward Moscow. Among the points it brings out are the following:

1. Stalin mysteriously stayed away from the Moscow celebration of the Revolution. Why?
2. Russia sent no delegation to Washington to discuss Japan.
3. Russia suddenly withdrew its troops from Germany and Eastern Europe.
4. The self-sufficiency of the Russian leaders toward the outside world. The United States is accused of trying to encircle Russia.
5. The Russian leaders fear for their own personal positions, chiefly because the Red Armies became aware of living conditions outside Russia.
6. Russian leaders do not want workers outside of Russia to know of working conditions in Russia.
7. The blackout on information continues a part of effective Russian policy. Against this the United Nations are asking for the freedom of travel and freedom of news about Russia they are not getting.
8. Russian leaders who expected the Russian soldiers to be greeted with enthusiasm now find they are greeted with deep ill will.
9. Russian is known to be aiming at self-sufficiency which means that trade at present with outside nations means the end of later trade.
10. The way in which the Russian Armies have stripped even free countries is causing deep anxiety.
11. The atomic bomb is being kept a secret from Russia largely because Russia keeps everything secret from the rest of the world.

●

Make Five Copies... One of the reasons for crowded office conditions in the United States is the fact that the Federal Government now rents from private office buildings 227,902,000 square feet. In 1939 it rented 65,776,000. Instead of decreasing, the Federal Government rentals seem to be rising, for in October, 1945 the Government was renting 5,000,000 more square feet than in August.

●

Corps. vs. Co-ops The August issue of *Fortune* has an interesting report on co-operatives in the United States, entitled 'Big Business without Profit'. Worthwhile for the average reader are these parts of the article: 'Introduction', 'Principles of Co-operation', 'Corps. vs. Co-ops', (a section on the struggle of the National Tax Equality Association to have the savings of the co-operatives made subject to corporation income taxes) and the conclusion 'Co-operative Boundaries', which gives a good picture of the present status of the co-operative movement in the United States. Of less interest is the fourth, and longest, section which discusses the growth of the Grange League Federation as an example of co-operative development. The main point of value for Jesuits here is the part Cornell University played in the work. Despite its fairness, the article provoked many letters of protest from private business men.

EUROPEAN

By MIC

(Editor's note: When we learned that St. Mary's College, Kansas, had been constituted the Central Bureau of Information for the Assistancy in sending packages to Europe, we asked them for a description of their activities.)

•

Out of a second-hand pair of trousers and into a full-dress suit is a big step. It's even bigger when attempted by a bouncing youngster, who little dreamed when he donned said trousers that he would soon step out in formal attire to meet society. But that's what happened in the case of the "Packages for Europe" drive at St. Mary's theologate, Kansas, which was recently christened the "Central Bureau of Information" for the American Assistancy in its work of sending packages to Europe.

Its trouser origin dates back to late last spring, when the Jesuit European Relief campaign was at its height. One of the theologians came forward with the idea that clothes be collected and shipped to Europe to counteract the coming winter. With Messrs. Joseph Sibenaller and Joseph Gregory at the helm, a drive was initiated, resulting in an accumulation of some five hundred pounds of clothing.

Along about that time word came through the chaplains that many of the Jesuits in Europe, especially in Holland and Greece, were on the verge of starvation. A request that small packages of food be sent to European Jesuits also arrived from Father Vincent McCormick, former American Rector of the Gregorian. In June the theologians shipped out several packages of food, with clothing enclosed, and by the end of July had the good news that the packages were getting through.

Fact Gathering Needed

It was then that the theologians began to contact their relatives and friends, asking them to send packages, too. But all the stamps and good will in the world were not enough to get the packages across. It was imperative that necessary data be acquired at once. To *whom* would the packages be sent? *How* would they be routed? *What* was needed?

Under the lead of Father Thomas A. O'Connor, Superior of Theologians, airmail letters were sent to European Jesuits to gather this information and acquire new addresses. As the returns began to pour in, Messrs. Joseph Costelloe and Eugene Coomes, in charge of printing, relayed the information via their press, to Jesuit relatives and friends.

The drive received a big impetus from the enthusiastic reception of Father O'Connor's article, "Our Debt Comes Due," in the October issue of the *Jesuit Bulletin*. A lady in New York wrote that in thanksgiving for the safe return of the five servicemen in her family from the theaters of war, she would like to transfer her Christmas packages to the Jesuits in Europe. An alumnus of Rockhurst sent word that he had contacted various fellow-alumni, who were going to buy staple items in large lots, and get the large shipment across by routing it in the weight-limited parcels through various senders.

Work Spreads Quickly

All the while the printing department was turning out multi-colored publicity blurbs, gummed labels of European addresses, and statements of postal regulations. Word began to arrive from everywhere of the successful collection methods discovered.

In Chicago, Father Shanley had gained the cooperation of the sisters in many of the Catholic schools and institutions in the vicinity of Loyola; in Cleveland, Father Rodman carried on the work by persuading the children of the Gesu parish to cooperate; in St. Louis, Father Meehan at the high school got the Student Council behind a drive for two tons of food; in New Orleans, Father Lashley's Sodality found individual classes glad to adopt a European Jesuit residence each; in Los Gatos, the novices and juniors sent more than 1000 pounds of dried prunes and over 250 boxes of other

What Can I Do?

PACKAGES CAN NOW BE SENT to Jesuits in Belgium, France, Greece, Holland, Italy and Poland.

FOOD: Dried fruit, powdered eggs, powdered milk, dehydrated foods, oatmeal, beans, peas, sugar, coffee, cocoa and canned milk, meat, fish.

CLOTHES: All articles of clothing, woolen goods, jerseys, shoes, bedsheets, towels. Also soap.

MEDICINE: Infirmary medicines, vitamins, brewers yeast tablets.

* * *

BELGIUM . . . I stopped at Brussels . . . The members of the community looked thin, pale, and pinched. The meals are very poor. They were hard put to find bedsheets, soap and towels for me.

—A Jesuit Chaplain.

FRANCE . . . Food less urgent. Impossible to obtain in France shoes, clothing, bedsheets, towels and material equipment for our 250 scholastics.

—Cablegram from four French Provincials.

HOLLAND . . . I made a three-day retreat at a Jesuit house. They need everything. They are slowly starving.

—An American Chaplain.

ITALY . . . Shoes cost $50 a pair, if you can find them. At night even a chaplain flashes his revolver as he goes about. Officers have been killed, robbed and stripped of their clothes.

—A Jesuit Chaplain.

POLAND . . . The condition of the Jesuits in the province is very trying . . . It is very difficult to get food and clothing.

—Secretary of the Jesuit Provincial.

•

UIT RELIEF

LI, S.J.

foodstuffs and clothing; in El Paso, the sister of one of Ours interested the P. T. A. of Father Joseph Walsh's St. Joseph Church in the project—Father Walsh printed 2000 sheets of addresses at the *Revista Católica*; in Denver, the Regis Mothers' Guild took up the work in a big way. And so it went all over the country.

There were difficulties, of which not the least important came from the postal system. Some packages were returned to their senders; other packages were turned down by postmasters; in one mid-western city, officials demanded duty on the packages.

Latest Information Sent

To offset this difficulty, Messrs. William Schwienher and Raymond McAuley edited weekly a one-page mimeographed sheet, *The Parcel Poster*, giving the latest information about the drive, together with addresses and postal regulations. These sheets are sent to the various Socii in America, for redistribution to the houses of their Provinces.

To keep up with the regulations, changing from week to week, one of the theologians assumed the task of studying and interpreting these changes. He subscribed to the *Postal Bulletin*, issued twice weekly by the Department in Washington. Now the shoe is on the other foot—some postmasters in this area have consulted him about the latest variations. When postmasters in other parts of the country were still holding up the packages, mainly because of the rapidity of changing postal regulations, the Central Bureau contacted the Postmaster General, asking him to issue a summary of the latest rules in the *Postal Bulletin*.

In a letter of November 14th, Very Reverend Father Zacheus Maher, constituted St. Mary's the Central Bureau of Information for the American Assistancy. With several departments already geared to specialized activity, the CBI naturally fell into a bipartite organization—one division would gather the information, another would send it out.

Jesuit Chaplains Aid

The fact-gathering department has already contacted the Red Cross to learn how we might be able to send out larger shipments through them, how to reach countries not yet serviced by Parcel Post, and to enlist their cooperation in seeing that our packages reach their destination. This department is also in touch with Jesuit chaplains abroad to find out the specific needs of the various communities, and to have those communities send us their addresses and needs. This is especially important for Austria and Germany, where we cannot get a letter or package through until we have a request coming from them.

At present the fact-relaying department is forwarding gummed addresses and instructions to those desiring such information. Recently it shipped out a thousand such stickers to Father John McAstocker on the West Coast, and several other thousands to various sections of the country. It is also handling cablegrams and letters from Europe which name benefactors, whose packages have gotten through, by tendering them thank-you notes.

Working under the CBI is a package department, directed by Messrs. Fabian Johnston and Frank Hogan. With the assistance of volunteer groups of theologians, postal forms are filled out, and packages made up and shipped out daily. The department makes sure that its every article is useful; for example, when it sent a batch of rubber soles to Father Victor LeCocq in Brussels, it enclosed a French translation of the English directions for use.

Though still snapping shut a cuff link and smoothing its tie, the Bureau is formally dressed to meet the needs of those desiring its help. Under its directors, Father O'Connor and Messrs. Costelloe and Martin Hasting, it will gladly supply data to anyone on how and where to send packages. In turn, it will appreciate any information and methods that will help facilitate the drive.

POSTAL REGULATIONS

CONTENTS?—"The packages are to contain only such essential items as clothing, shoes, sewing kits, powdered or evaporated milk and soap. No writing, printed matter, perishable foods, tobacco in any form, cigarette lighters or lighter fluids, or matches of any kind, may be sent in these packages." From a special bulletin of the Post Office Department of October 31 with regard to packages for Italy.

HOW OFTEN?—One per week from one sender to one addressee. (To Greece: one every two weeks.)

WEIGHT?—Up to eleven pounds. Better to have weight of package a few ounces under the 11 pound limit than returned from the Post Office for overweight.

POSTAGE?—Fourteen cents per pound to most foreign countries.

FORMS TO BE FILLED OUT?

1. **Dispatch Note:** form 2972.
2. **Customs Declaration:** form 2966.
   Two customs declarations are required with each package for Belgium.
   Form 2966 and a special French customs declaration are required for packages for France. No customs declaration required for packages marked "Gift Parcel" for the Netherlands (Holland)—"Postal Bulletin" for October 12. "Postal Bulletin" for October 12.
3. **"International Parcel Post" label.** To fill this out to best advantage have the address of another house in the same country to fill in. If you haven't the address of another house, write "ou R. P. Minister" and repeat the address you are using.
   "Gift Package" should be plainly marked on parcels.

Mail packages from the MAIN POST OFFICE to insure correct handling. Changes are being made, relaxing restrictions.

Packages should be tied with strong string. Nothing in glass containers should be included.

LABOR (from page 4)

reports accepted, this one also cautions that "nothing in this report is intended in any way to recommend compulsory arbitration, that is, arbitration not voluntarily agreed to by the parties."

Reports Rejected

Two reports, one a Management statement and the other from the Labor members, were turned in by each of the other three committees. In each case both reports were rejected by the Conference. Yet, in the mind of the present writer, these conflicting reports are an important part of the conference's accomplishment. They reveal specific areas of disagreement and show that the delegates were sincere and frank enough not to cover over real differences by submitting only such points as could be agreed on or by presenting a merely verbal or apparent agreement.

Thus, the two reports from the Committee on Collective Bargaining are identical in 14 of the 18 topics discussed. Both reports agree that "collective bargaining on wages, hours, and working conditions should be a process by which an employer and the duly chosen representatives of workers negotiate in the interest of effecting a transaction mutually advantageous to the employer, employees, and to the public served by the enterprise of which they are a part"; that it "involves a determination to resolve disputes and conclude an agreement"; that it is "required by law . . . approved by the public . . . is and must be accepted by employers, employees, and their representatives in every instance where workers choose to organize"; that "the parties to the practice of collective bargaining . . . may find it desirable, as collective bargaining relationships are established on a satisfactory basis, to jointly engage by mutual consent in other activities which hey may regard as mutually advantageous"; that "extravagant demands" impede the process of full and genuine collective bargaining, while the object of such bargaining, i. e. voluntary agreement, is aided by temperateness of approach; that "there is a duty . . . to bargain sincerely and in good faith," which means to have "regard for all relevant facts and intent that agreement reached shall be observed"; that "full and genuine collective bargaining may result in disagreement."

Similarly, in the second section of the two reports, on adherence to the terms of agreements, there are recommendations to the effect that the agreements be reduced to writing and a grave responsibility assumed by both parties to see to it that the mutual rights and obligations assumed are thoroughly understood by the individual members of both parties.

And on the third section as a whole there is perfect agreement on the action needed by unions and employers to control their members for conduct in violation of an agreement: this means that each must "require that their respective officials refrain from encouraging or engaging in contract violation" and "must establish and enforce such regulations as may be necessary . . . to insure absolute unqualified adherence to the contract commitments made"; that, further, "the customary provisions incorporated in collective bargaining agreements which permit management to discipline any employees, subject to their right of appeal through the grievance machinery . . . for any violation . . . are desirable and necessary for the proper administration of the agreement."

Divergences Itemized

The labor delegates would apparently have been content to let the report be approved with only the points just summarized, since their report limits itself to these items of agreement. The management report, on the other hand, gives four additional recommendations, which it considers so essential to a clear-cut understanding of collective bargaining that without them even the many points of apparent agreement cease to be a real meeting of minds, and "collective bargaining" becomes a catch phrase meaning quite different things to the different parties involved.

Regarding the first section on collective bargaining itself, management insists that collective bargaining must be conducted in an atmosphere free of any compulsion or force, so that the obligation to bargain ceases when an "ultimatum" has been issued or actual strife in the form of a strike or other disorders has already occurred. Similarly, management would exclude from the definition of bargaining the presentation of any absolute demand with the supposition that the other party must at least compromise or offer counter-proposals.

They object also to the principle that "union security, protected by the collective bargaining agreement, strengthens the process of collective bargaining," a principle which is not in the labor report but which undoubtedly came up in the committee meetings, and which management probably correctly interpreted as meaning the closed shop, union shop or maintenance of membership. They would refuse to "acquiesce in restrictive measures which may deprive individuals of freedom of choice."

As regards responsibility for performance, management wanted "equality before the law" for labor and management, by which was meant that "both parties to a labor agreement be equally answerable as entities in judicial proceedings for conduct in violation of contracts or legal requirements." They argued that just as "for years, in the public interest, legislation and governmental regulations have controlled the activities and defined the responsibilities of employers," so too "the activities of labor organizations should be controlled and their responsibilities appropriately defined to assure equality of status before the law."

Labor's Position

The labor delegates seemed willing to have unions assume responsibility for its own officials and their individual conduct, and were willing also to take punitive action against rank and file members who violated contracts, or to allow the employer in certain circumstances to discharge the individual, and finally to do all in their power to train individual union members to a sense of responsibility and to discourage any action in violation of contracts. But, they claimed, with unions organized as they are on a broad democratic basis, they cannot possibly have the control over their membership that a manager has over his immediate subordinates.

A union official is an elected representative of the workers, which is not the relationship which prevails between a manager and his office force. Further, unions are not in as favorable a position financially as are large business organizations for paying fines, supplying bonds which might be forfeited because of the actions of a few individuals, or otherwise supplying the "effective guarantees" of a financial character which is demanded by the management proposal. The strength of a union is in its human membership rather than in its financial standing, and it can afford to take punitive action against members in the form of layoffs or even dismissals, much better than it can afford to give money compensation to a company for losses the company may have suffered because of the unjust actions of individual members of the union.

Labor, further, fears governmental regulations and control, which is what the management proposal calls for, just as management fears yet further control than is had now; and the one will lead to the other, this step will lead to that, until the end will be a form of state socialism. Both groups, then, recognized "that responsibility under collective agreements was necessary and desirable and in many cases obtained"; both agreed that "the maximum success of the endeavor depends primarily upon the self-imposed voluntary discipline of the parties"; management alone would have this voluntary discipline implemented by "appropriate" regulatory legislation and

financial guarantees, such as already characterize commercial contracts.

Management's Rights

Committee II, on *Management's Right to Manage* also submitted two reports. The management report gives a fairly precise list of "matters which are clearly the functions and responsibility of management and are not subject to collective bargaining." These include, in addition to several which we are omitting: "the location of the business, including the establishment of new units and the relocation or closing of old units" (though consideration should be given to impact on employees); "the determination of financial policies"; "prices of goods sold or services rendered to customers"; "the selection of employees for promotion to supervisory and other managerial positions"; "the determination of job content . . . (and) . . . the size of the work force"; "the allocation and assignment of work to workers"; and "determination of policies affecting the selection of employees."

A second list is added of matters regarding which "it is the function and responsibility of management to make prompt initial decisions . . . but . . . subject to review by grievance procedures." Among these items are: "discharge of employes for cause; the application of seniority provisions of contracts; and penalties imposed as a result of disciplinary action."

The labor report of the same committee notes that "there has been resistance by some managements to a full recognition of all the items that are properly the subject of collective bargaining," but also frankly grants that "during the past few years, efforts have been made by certain unions to extend the scope of collective bargaining to include other matters and operating problems involving the function of management to direct the operation of the business." It explicitly states that "the functions and responsibility of management must be preserved if business and industry is to be efficient, progressive, and provide more good jobs." But, because of the complexities of the relationships, the conditions, customs, and practices which have developed in various industries over long periods of time, the labor delegates "think it unwise to specify and classify the functions and responsibilities of management."

It would be foolish to try to "build a fence" around the functions of either labor or management, since "experience of many years shows that with the growth of mutual understanding the responsibilities of one of the parties today may well become the joint responsibility of both parties tomorrow." The labor members grant that "there is need for a more widespread realization and thorough understanding of the significance and importance of the management function in modern industry," but, they believe, "in the main, this will follow, rather than precede, the development of sound industrial relations."

Labor Delegates Silent

To this second committee was also referred the problem of the unionization of foremen for collective bargaining. The labor members, in their report, stated that they felt "it would be inappropriate for the Committee to make any recommendations on the matter . . . while cases involving this issue are pending before the National Labor Relations Board."

The management members, however, in their report, contend that management must be defined to "include all levels of managerial and supervisory personnel," since otherwise "management cannot properly function," and that "it is . . . fundamental that there be no unionization of any part of management." Hence, the word "employee" in the Wagner Act should be defined, either by the NLRB or by Congress, "to exclude all persons holding full-time managerial and supervisory positions."

Committee III was also given two assignments. The first of these concerned the use of the NLRA for settling disputes about the collective bargaining agency that is to be recognized. The labor report simply recommends the prompt utilization of facilities provided by the NLRA or by state agencies, and that "all parties should accept the result and abide thereby." It further recommends that "no union should engage in striking or boycotting against or in protest of the result reached . . . and no employer should resort to court action for the sole purpose of delaying collective bargaining." However, "the right to strike shall remain inviolate."

The management report accepts the principles of the NLRA, but with certain important modifications or specific interpretations. The recommendation is made that the employer be allowed at the time when a renewal of contract comes up to question the right of the union to represent its employees and thus compel it to go before the NLRB, or other agency, and gain a renewal of its certification. It would also have legislation enacted making "unfair labor practice" any interference, by strike, boycott, etc., with either the employer or the employees' certified bargaining agent, on the part of any other individuals or groups. Finally it would forbid the NLRB or any other agency to "establish as appropriate a collective bargaining unit exceeding a single establishment (such as a plant or store) unless mutually agreed to by the employer . . . and the labor organization."

According to labor, the first of these proposals could be too easily abused by employers hostile to unions, since it could mean that at the end of each year a union would lose its recognition and have to reestablish its right to bargain. The second proposal, according to labor, means a drastic revision of the NLRA, which explicitly states labor's right to strike, since it would deny this right in many important circumstances. The third proposal would, if employers so wished, force a distinct union for each plant of a large corporation, or at least force the union to bargain on a plant basis though in fact the several units are controlled through a single policy of management.

Delay on Jurisdiction

On the question of jurisdictional disputes both reports agree that there should be no interruption of work during a jurisdictional dispute between two unions. The labor report, however, believes that such disputes should be resolved by appropriate machinery set up for such purposes by the parent labor organizations, if both disputing unions belong to the same parent union, or by permanently established inter-union committees or boards, in case the dispute is between unions which belong to different or to no parent organization.

On the other hand, the labor members maintain that many jurisdictional disputes are not of labor's making but stem from technological changes and advancement. Management should assist in preventing such disputes by "conferring with all the collective bargaining agencies involved before introducing changes" and by recognizing that "the human element definitely enters into" the question of progress and the changes it causes, and hence that "human accommodations must be made respecting them."

In other words some consideration should be given to a group of men who have customarily done a certain type of work, but who suddenly find that, because of some new material or technological change which the company introduces, another group is in a position to do it better.

Solving Disputes

The management report also suggests that definite procedures be developed for resolving jurisdictional disputes, adding that the procedures be filed with the NLRB. But it adds certain stipulations which would limit the kind of decision which can be given in resolving the disputes. Thus, the decision cannot be such as to "require the violation of the terms of an existing valid labor agreement," nor should it be such that the

employer is "required to employ more employees on any operation than are necessary" or such that it will increase the cost of production or "impair or restrict the responsibility of management to direct the working forces." These limitations, labor contends, would make impossible the solution of many jurisdictional disputes, since the dispute may arise precisely out of the wording of "an existing valid labor agreement," or precisely because management in its direction of the working forces assigns tasks to certain types of labor when justice demands that another type of labor, and perhaps one with a higher wage rate, should do the work.

Finally, the management report recommends that, in case the procedures they have set forth prove inadequate, "procedures incorporating these standards should be established by legislation to accomplish this objective." In addition to its general opposition to legislation which would be restrictive or regulatory, labor is opposed to this particular type of legislation on the ground that it could be used to "freeze workers in their jobs" and is therefore undemocratic, their point being that the unions themselves should determine and with varying circumstances change their own jurisdictions rather than have what work men may do determined by legal mandates.

Such were the committee reports. The three on which there was agreement were read and accepted unanimously by the Conference in general session. And a labor and a management member of each of the other three did propose that the report of this group be accepted. It was a formality, and all these reports were rejected without even being read.

Murray Revives Wages

But the Conference was not over. Mr. Murray, freed by the change in voting procedure from the negative resolution of the Executive Committee on wage discussion, brought his resolution before the full Conference. The resolution he proposed that they adopt was rather moderate; it would have the Conference go on record as favoring a general increase in wages in order to maintain purchasing power, and so on—the usual reasons given in the CIO demands for wage increases. Mr. Murray quoted statistics from governmental agencies and other sources in an effort to prove the necessity of such wage increases. It was a foregone conclusion that his proposal had no chance of being accepted, and some of those present believed that he made the proposal for such ulterior motives as to embarrass the other labor groups (which, of course, could hardly vote against such a resolution in full session of the Conference) or to justify to the extent possible the CIO demands on the automotive and steel industries.

When Mr. Murray finished, the AFL president called for a recess, during which both the labor and management groups went into caucus. After the recess Mr. Green, speaking for both himself and Mr. Lewis, proposed an amendment to Mr. Murray's resolution, an amendment that seemed to the present writer as nothing more than a more strongly worded demand for wage increases.

Ira Mosher, speaking for the united management group, answered Mr. Murray, and by implication also Mr. Green. Like Mr. Murray he used statistics—not the same statistics but, he assured all, just as reliable. It was a beautiful case of two sets of "reliable" statistics being used by two different men to prove contradictory propositions. He concluded with an alternate resolution to Mr. Murray's, with or without the Green amendment. The resolution recommends "that the Conference not consider national wage policy," since "the extent to which industry can grant wage increases will vary from company to company," but that there be "sincere collective bargaining on wages, with full understanding that when the facts necessitate denial, genuine collective bargaining does not require concessions which either party considers economically impossible or unsound." In the end, of course, all three proposals, Mr. Murray's original resolution, Mr. Green's proposed amendment, and Mr. Mosher's alternate resolution, were rejected with each group voting yes on its own proposal and no on the other two.

Adjournment

Except for the success, of doubtful value, which Mr. Murray had in forcing a statement on wages from Messrs. Green and Lewis, and a qualified rejection from management, the whole discussion was more or less useless. After some short speeches thanking the Labor Department for its efforts, some expressions of hope that as yet undiscernible benefits that might come from the Conference, and statements of appreciation for the good will shown by the many delegates and the better understanding that resulted from face to face discussion over such a long period of time, the Conference officially closed, shortly after 6 p. m. on November 30.

The general impression of the delegates themselves, whether labor or management, was that the Conference had accomplished something, but not enough to satisfy the expectations of the President, Congress, and the American people. But, they contended, this was because the public had been led to expect too much, e. g., some short-cut formula for the prevention of all strikes and lockouts. There is honest difference of opinion on many of the questions discussed, and it was better that these differences be specified and limited to the extent possible than that they be ignored or covered over in insincere statements.

Both labor and management felt that each had come to know the other much better, that the meetings had been, as Lewis put it, "advantageously educational," and that they had, to quote C. R. Hock (Pres. of American Rolling Mills Co.), "made a real contribution to the foundation of understanding between the leaders of labor and the leaders of management," which understanding must precede the cooperation which alone will lead to the real goal.

Service Family Allowances

An article in the October, 1945, issue of the *American Sociological Review*, "Distribution of Family Allowance Benefits in World War II", gives some data about the people aided by the act. By virtue of this law servicemen's dependents received grants monthly for maintenance. Dependents were divided into two classes: Class A: wife and children; Class B: parents, brothers, and sisters.

Scale of benefits for Class A were:

Wife	$50
First child	30
Each additional child	20
Child, no wife	42
Each additional child	20
Divorced wife*	42

* The sum granted to a divorcee could not exceed her alimony grant. Grants for children were the same as above.

Scale of dependents for Class B was very complicated, since the amount granted varied for dependents who relied upon the soldier as the chief support or as a source of substantial support.

In April, 1945, there were more than 4,000,000 family allowance accounts in force. In these accounts were included some 6,500,000 dependents. The total amount paid each month is approximately $250,000,000, of which about 65 per cent is paid by the government; the remainder is deducted from pay checks.

Of the six and a half million dependents receiving aid:

37 per cent were wives.
27 per cent were children.
26 per cent were parents.
8 per cent brothers and sisters.

Publishers' Galley

THE LABOR COORDINATOR. — Prepared and published by Research Institute of America. New York and Washington. 1945. 3 Vols. $91 a year to schools.

The university student of economics usually finishes his course in labor relations rather unsatisfied. Despite several months of study, he has merely scratched the surface of the hopelessly broad and labyrinthine field. The texts used for the course, no matter how bulky, confirm him in his dissatisfaction. Because these texts have to deal in general with the multitudinous phases of labor relations, they can give only short shrift to the underlying maze of circumstances, the complexity of industrial and human facts, the very flesh and blood of human labor relations.

A new text has been published by the Research Institute of America. The *Labor Coordinator of the RIA*, newly expanded into three volumes, is nothing if not detailed and complete. It is thorough and fluid: thorough in the extent of its subject-matter and the clarity of its analysis of that subject-matter; and fluid because the book, a loose-leaf text, can be kept up-to-date merely by adding the new pages published periodically in keeping with current news. The *Coordinator* is at once a text, a reference work, a source for past and current labor news.

The broad scope of the book's contents is evident from the following list of major headings: Wages and Hours, Labor Relations Policy and Practice, Operating with Unions, Collective Bargaining, Labor Disputes, Labor Relations Administration, State Laws (all in Volume I); Union Contract Clauses, Union Status and Rights, Wages and Workingtime, Seniority and Job Protection, Employee Welfare, Adjustment of Disputes, Management Prerogatives, Settlement Machinery, Union Practices and Responsibility (all in Volume II); Pay Policy, Job Evaluation, Increases—Incentives — Bonuses, Guaranteed Annual Wage, Employee Placement, Hiring, Veterans' Employment, and Employment Efficiency (all in Volume III).

The logical development of the entire work, and of each volume in itself, is apparent in the foregoing list of topics. For instance, the second volume treats of bargaining practice. The development proceeds from the basis of bargaining, namely the contract, through the usual demands of the union and of management, the machinery for achieving a settlement of differences, finally the makeup and policy of various unions. It is interesting to note that the section on union status and rights is prefaced with the remark: "Unions always insist on clauses aimed at protecting their organization as an entity, *separate and apart from* the individual interests of the members" (Italics supplied). Hence such provisions to continue membership as the closed shop, maintenance of membership, and so on.

The book claims to make an objective analysis of both the legal and economic factors in the various phases of labor relations. This reviewer would agree that both the objectivity and the analysis are of excellent standard. The clear analysis of most problems treated is achieved by an ordered sequence of investigation followed throughout the book. First a principle is stated. There follows an analysis of the sub-surface implications as pointed out in the RIA's *Observations*. Case histories, including various citations and references, help to make the problem more intelligible. Finally the principle is applied to the common facts of business existence.

The *Coordinator* represents a tremendous input of energy for reference work, analysis, compilation and composition. The skipped pages after each section and sub-section seem to be a fool-proof system for retaining a first-rate labor relations text continuously up to date.

Joseph B. Schuyler, S. J.
Crown Heights,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

●

HOW WE LIVE.—By Fred G. Clark and Richard Stanton Rimanoczy, New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1944, pp. 39, $1.00.

It was about time for someone to bring down to earth the essential ideas of our economics which have been floating in thin air close to the Einstein Theory, clouded in a jargon beyond the mentality of the man in the street. These authors have surely succeeded in this difficult task. Their success should be an example to others who have wished, but believed it impossible to put big, abstract ideas in simple language, in concrete forms for the enlightment of the masses who are groping in shadows hungering for the light.

By simple illustrations and in the clearest of words and sentences, the whole structure of our material life is diagrammatically portrayed. The whole cycle of producing, selling, buying, replacing, with the mighty Dollar moving in and out as the lubricant of the process, is unfolded so simply that any thinking child could understand it; and still not one vital factor of the complicated machinery is omitted.

This book can be highly recommended not only as a tool supplying an urgent need—the mental equipment of our people, but as a remarkable sample of how complicated processes and even abstract ideas can be brought into individual focus of the masses.

F. D. Sullivan, S. J.

●

AN INTERNATIONAL BILL OF HUMAN RIGHTS.—By H. Lauterpacht, New York: Columbia University Press, $3.00, x, 230 pp.

This book is the key volume for a very significant development in international relations. One of the lessons of the past war has been that the violation of human rights is the prelude to aggression. Aggressors begin by subduing their own people. The machinery of the totalitarian state rests upon internal discipline carried out by secret police. Its policies can only be carried out by eliminating all opposition, whether this comes from religious, economic or political groups.

The United Nations Charter sets up a Commission on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, thereby recognizing what the Bishops said in their comments of November 16, 1944 on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. In this declaration (which incidently is still valuable as a statement on the principles of international order) they said: "The ideology of a nation in its internal life is a concern of the international community. To reject this principle is tantamount to maintaining that the violation of innate rights of men in a country by its own government has no relation to world peace."

In this book will be found both the actual practice envisioned in the idea of an International Bill of Rights and the theoretical foundation upon which it is based. The volume is divided into three parts: The Law of Nature, the International Bill of the Rights of Man, the Enforcement of the International Bill of Rights.

Lauterpacht denies that our rights come from the state. He says (p. 86): "The denial of the proposition that the fundamental rights of man come from the State and the State only is one of the basic assumptions of the philosophy underlying the International Bill of the Rights of Man. Its very essence is to secure their survival even if the State should become minded to trample upon them."

In this position he is of course in frank opposition to the views of Justice Holmes who contended that there are no rights that are not recognized by the State. The author's basic assumption is a powerful confirmation of what Catholic philosophy has been insisting upon down the decades and which has so often

been raised by our Holy Father. It is easy to see why the American Bishops have so strongly supported the idea of an international guarantee of human rights.

Lauterpacht goes into the details of the content of such an International Bill of Rights. Freedom of religion is included. On the question of whether the Bill should take the form of a simple declaration and therefore be without legal force, or whether it should have international enforcement provisions, Lauterpacht urges the latter. He wants an instrument creating legal rights and obligations.

Without denying the difficulties inherent in such a project which involves a sacrifice of sovereignty on the part of the states, the author contends that a simple declaration would not be progress. What he wants is a substantial addition of human rights to international law. This means that human rights and fundamental freedoms should be made secure under the reign of law.

The topic of this book is pertinent to Catholics. The book is authoritative and basic. Jesuits, particularly our Ethics teachers, should have a copy available.

Robert A. Graham, S. J.
ISO
New York, N. Y.

●

THE HEART OF MAN. — By Gerald Vann, O. P., Longmans., 182 pp., $2.

It is an arguable case that a Catholic theological synthesis must precede any really effective social work Catholics will do.

It is the importance of that question that warrants the notice of Father Vann's book. It is not a great book, but its lessons on the central need of the vision of Wholeness for the Catholic may have its salutary message for the specialist likely to be overimpressed by the mountainous amount of technical knowledge the ever-expanding social sciences indicate he must assimilate if he is to consider himself competent to speak on, say, Housing.

Eric Gill has written: "You can't just demand justice for the poor and leave it at that. You must find out who are the poor and what is 'who' and what is justice that the poor should be given . . . What is man that he should be fed? . . . Is it conceivable that he is a temple of the Holy Ghost? But what the devil is that? And what kind of housing can possibly be his suitable shrine?"

The chromium-plated mind, surgically antiseptic to all save the salutary effects of statistical analysis, is not the Catholic mind. It is dubious if it is even a specifically human mind.

The above paragraph is not an invitation to fill *Napkin Box* with protests against the obscuratism that minimizes the need for information in solving complex social problems. It perhaps is no more than a hope that some day an English version of Pere de Lubac's (S.J.) *"Catholicisme: Les Aspects Sociaux du Dogme"* may appear under an ISO imprint.

E. D., S. J.

●

CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES AND NATIONAL PROBLEMS — By Anthony L. Ostheimer and John P. Delaney, S. J., W. H. Sadlier, Inc., 1945, 621 pp., $2.52.

When the New York State Legislative Subcommittee ordered the printing, in 1943, of the STORY OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS IN AMERICA, as the result of the Ives Committee report, the product looked like the last word in the field, or at least the best thing yet turned out as a high-school text in social economics.

The book under review makes the New York State text look weak and sketchy. Strangely enough, this new work is also a New York State product, inspired and sponsored by the N. Y. State Council of Catholic School Superintendents. It is the fourth of the series intended for Catholic high-school classes, the CATHOLIC SOCIAL STUDIES SERIES. The volume for first year classes is entitled CHRISTIAN LIVING IN OUR MODERN WORLD and is similar in style and makeup to the present book, although it is written in simpler language and is much more elementary. The second and third year texts are still in preparation.

Father Ostheimer, of Catholic High in Philadelphia, and our own Father John P. Delaney, S. J., organizer and first director of the ISO, have teamed up to produce a remarkable synthesis of fundamental Catholic social truth interwoven and correlated with a very accurate and comprehensive picture of the American scene, in this work designed for high-school students but well-suited for the purpose of adult education. The book is simple in style yet attains a most happy combination of sociology, law, economics, history, politics, culture and ethics. It is a picture of our America seen steadily, seen whole, seen in relation to the family of nations; and all in the light of sound Catholic principles and tradition.

There is copious use of the Papal pronouncements of Leo XIII and Pius XI. An outstanding feature is the frequent and very apt quotations cited from the encyclicals and allocutions of the present Pope, even as fresh as the words of his Christmas address of 1944.

The illustrative material is splendid, with a profusion of actual photographs, poster reproductions, pictograph charts, and simple graphs that will tempt the teacher-reader to steal them for class use.

After each chapter there are review and appreciation exercises admirably arranged. Most noteworthy of these is the little series of "tips" on further private follow-ups recommended to the student under the heading of Enrichment Exercises. They are tips on where to write for more material on the subject (with addresses given), or whom one should ask for at the State House, or the City Hall, or at the Labor Union office, or at the bank.

This book may very well serve for immediate help in the preparation of adult education classes and labor school lectures, providing a wealth of ideas and suggestions and even outlines for the teacher who is groping for a framework for a series of talks on modern problems from the Catholic standpoint.

But most certainly it is a book that should be incorporated as a text in every Catholic high-school curriculum in these United States. If this statement seems extravagant and superlative, take a look at the book and see for yourself.

Mortimer H. Gavin, S. J.
Institute of Social Studies

●

THAT YOU MAY LIVE — By E. F. Cervantes, S. J., Guild Press, 128 East 10th St., Saint Paul. pp. 176. $3.00.

Here is a brand new treatment for the Doctrine of the Mystical Body. Father Cervantes has made the application of this great Doctrine as modern as the morning newspaper. Starting with Saint Paul and presenting in dramatic form the incidents that served as grounding for the great Doctrine, the book advances through modern problems and shows exactly what the Doctrine can mean in a very practical world.

Those who wish to see the social application of this most social of doctrines will feel great gratitude to Father Cervantes for a magnificent presentation.

D. A. Lord, S. J.

●

DO YOU KNOW LABOR?—By the Rev. James Myers for nearly 20 years the Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is a reprint and a revision of a book that has been out for several years. The book is an excellent primer and won the commendation of Monsignor John A. Ryan and Monsignor Luigi Ligutti. Cost: $2.00; Publisher: The John Day Company, New York City.

ISO FORUM

SHOULD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE CIVILIAN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH?

The idea of Federal subsidization of scientific research did not spring full panoplied from the head of President Roosevelt when he addressed his now famous letter on the future of science research to Doctor Vannevar Bush on November 17, 1944. Nor did it spring from the mind or from the even more famous report of Doctor Bush, *Science, The Endless Frontier*, which he submitted to President Truman on July 5 of this year. In various ways almost from the beginning of the Republic the Federal Government has indirectly and directly subsidized the advancement of scientific knowledge in many fields. Into the Constitution itself is written the patent clause which gives to Congress the power to "promote the progress of science and the useful arts, by securing, for a limited time, to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries..." Exploration of the western lands and the investigation of our natural resources have been aided by Federal subsidies from the beginning.

As science progressed through the years, the aid given by the Government to various fields of scientific endeavor has slowly increased in quantity and scope. The military exigencies of the first World War gave tremendous impetus to Government interest in and support of scientific effort.

As a result of his experiences with science and scientists President Wilson at the conclusion of World War I determined to retain some of the scientific advance achieved during the war by perpetuating the National Research Council which had been established at his recommendation by the National Academy of Sciences in 1917.

Council Becomes Model

Although the Council made little advance in the succeeding years, it formed a model for the Science Advisory Board which President Roosevelt established in 1933 to recommend fields of research and adequate appropriations for their execution.

During the years of President Roosevelt's administrations, government interest in science steadily increased. Various departments of the Government, especially the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior had long before been supporting scientific effort. Thus the Department of Agriculture had set aside for each state large tracts of land to maintain the "land-grant" colleges, and had increased this support by assistance which ultimately totaled $30,000 annually. Similarly the Department of Interior had supported private scientific activities carried on under the United States Geographical Survey and other subsidiary offices.

In 1937, before the inauguration of the National Defense program, the total assistance given by Government to all kinds of research activities amounted to $68,000,000 a year. Participating in this program were the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Navy and War, as well as independent offices and semi-governmental organizations.

War Increases Aid

This total of $68,000,000 jumped tremendously during the next seven years, and in 1944, according to a report of the Sub-committee on War Mobilization, the sum expended on research came to the staggering total of $706,000,000. While the bulk of this tremendous increase was spent by the Departments of War and Navy, as well as the Office of Scientific Research and Development, each of the other organizations that had previously sponsored scientific activity had increased somewhat the total of its expenditures.

Nor is the idea of an organized program for postwar scientific research to be attributed exclusively to either President Roosevelt or Doctor Vannevar Bush. Whatever may be said for the merits or demerits of legislation which he has introduced, the present program is very largely due to the wisdom of Senator Harley M. Kilgore who, as a member of the Senate Sub-committee on War Mobilization and as sponsor of one of the bills for Federal aid to science now under consideration, has been a most active proponent of Government subsidization of research.

It must be remembered that the present Kilgore-Johnson-Pepper Bill which was introduced last July is an amended version of the original version which Senator Kilgore introduced more than three years ago, on October 22, 1942. Not only has he had the vision to recognize how important scientific research will be for the future of our country, but he has written into his bill a plan of investigation for a survey of the entire field of scientific knowledge to discover what *lacunae* there are and has provided means for filling in the gaps. This over-all survey is a phase of scientific activity, which apparently, none of the other bills submitted to Congress has thus far considered.

Five Bills Proposed

To date five bills are before the Senate, all of which are concerned with Federal aid to science. Four of these were introduced originally into the Senate, those namely, of Senators Kilgore, Magnuson, Fulbright and Byrd. In addition to these the May bill originally presented to the House and now before the Senate, is being considered. These bills, it might be worth noting parenthetically, should not be confused with the Thomas bill (S. 1316) for Federal support of scientific education in secondary schools nor with the Ball bill (S. 1557) or the Johnson bill (S. 1463) for the control of atomic energy.

Although only two of these bills, Kilgore's and Magnuson's, are now receiving serious consideration, it might be well briefly to review the provisions of all five.

May Bill

Mr. May's bill (H. R. 3440) authorizes the National Academy of Sciences to organize a Research Board for National security and to authorize expenditures not to exceed eight million dollars annually to individuals, educational, and scientific institutions and other public and private agencies to conduct such research as the board may approve.

Byrd Bill

Senator Byrd's bill (S. 825) is more detailed. It establishes a research board for National Security as an independent Government agency. The board, which is to be formed of 40 members, half military and half civilian, is to formulate and authorize scientific research relative to problems of national security. The fields of science in which the board may work are unlimited. The board, however, is obliged to safeguard certain classified kinds of information. The sums of money to be appropriated for the board are not specified; funds for military purposes are kept separate from amounts appropriated for other types of scientific research.

Fulbright Bill

Senator Fulbright's bill (S. 1248) sets up within the department of Commerce a Bureau of Scientific Research. This bureau is authorized to use the facilities of the National Bureau of Standards and other Government facilities as well as the laboratories of private establishments, for research largely devoted to *commercial* advancement. Senator Fulbright's bill contains further provisions about patents and licenses as well as provisions for restricting and disseminating research findings.

The two bills which have taken almost exclusive attention in the public mind and in Senate hearings, those of Senator Kilgore (S. 1297) and Senator Magnuson (S. 1285), are even more comprehensive.

Kilgore Bill

The present version of Senator Kilgore's bill is an amendment of that introduced some three years ago. It creates a National Science Foundation whose director, appointed by the President with a salary of $15,000 a year, has complete authority over approval of research projects and allotment of subsidies. The bill organized two research committees, one for National Defense and one for Health and Medical Sciences, whose approval the Director must secure for research in these two fields. Senator Kilgore's bill is unique in as much as it provides that half the members of the National Science Board (eight members), the majority of the National Defense Committee and three members of the Health and Medical Sciences Committee must be *ex-officio* Government representatives.

There are no restrictions upon the director as to the organizations which may benefit by its assignments, except that all research must be conducted under contract, and at least 50% of the funds must be allocated to non-profit educational institutions and research institutions. The findings of research are to be made available, except when classification is necessary for national security. All inventions and discoveries become the property of the United States and will be available through licenses.

Magnuson Bill

Senator Magnuson's bill (S. 1285) is based very largely upon recommendations of Doctor Vannevar Bush's report which will be considered in just a moment. Authority under the Magnuson bill is vested in a board of nine members all of whom are selected by the President "on the basis of their demonstrated interest in, and capacity to promote the purposes of the Foundation." The Office of Scientific Research and Development, of which Doctor Bush, the present Director, is transferred to the Foundation, which is directed to promote "a national policy for scientific research and scientific education."

Subsidiary divisions for National Defense, Medical Research, the Physical Sciences, Scientific Personnel and Education, and Publications and Scientific Collaboration are established with advisory committees. The Foundation supports research through grants to private agencies or Government organizations for the conduct of any kind of scientific research which the board considers appropriate. Persons who are assisted by grants for scholarships and fellowships are enrolled in a National Science Reserve whose members are available for call by the Government in times of national emergencies.

Important Differences

The principle differences between the Kilgore and the Magnuson bill are: 1. Senator Magnuson vests the authority of his foundation in a non-governmental board, rather than in a presidentially appointed Director; 2. No members of the board and of the advisory committee (with the exception of two members for the National Defense committee who are appointed by the Secretary of War and Navy respectively) are *ex-officio* members; 3. Senator Magnuson makes no iron clad provisions for patents, as does Senator Kilgore's bill; 4. The Director of the Foundation, under the provision of Senator Magnuson's bill is designated by the board. If the wording of Section four is to be taken literally he need not even be chosen from among the members of the board itself; 5. The Magnuson bill does not attempt to survey and control the research of all Government-financed activities.

Origin of Report

Finally a word must be said about Doctor Bush's report which has perpetuated the widespread discussion of this question. On June 27, 1940 the Council for National Defense, with the approval of President Roosevelt created the National Defense Research Committee and appointed Doctor Vannevar Bush as its chairman.

By a presidential order the committee was reconstituted on June 28, 1941 as an advisory board to the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development which was established by this same presidential order. Dr. Bush was named Director of OSRD. The duties of the OSRD were to initiate and support scientific research first on the mechanisms and devices of warfare; and secondly, on medical problems affecting national defense.

On November 17, 1944, President Roosevelt addressed to Dr. Bush, as Director of the OSRD, a letter concerning the future of scientific research in the United States. In this letter the President asked four questions:

"1. What can be done, consistent with military security, and with the prior approval of the military authorities, to make known to the world as soon as possible the contributions which have been made during our war effort to scientific knowledge?

2. With particular reference to the war of science against disease, what can be done now to organize a program for continuing in the future the work which has been done in medicine and related sciences?

3. What can the Government do now and in the future to aid research activities by public and private organizations?

4. Can an effective program be proposed for discovering and developing scientific talent in American youth so that the continuing future of scientific research in this country may be assured on a level comparable to what has been done during the war?"

Questions Considered

To facilitate his consideration of the four questions, Dr. Bush submitted each question to a committee of eminent scientists. The committees returned their findings to Dr. Bush between January 9 and June 4 of this year, and the findings

were incorporated into a report which Dr. Bush presented to President Truman, together with the original committee reports, on July 5, 1945.

Dr. Bush's report, *Science, the Endless Frontier*, is divided into six chapters: 1. an introduction, which considers the role of science and government's interest in its growth; 2. medical scientific needs; 3. science's contribution to our national welfare; 4. the development of scientific talent; 5. the transfer from military to peace-time scientific endeavor; and 6. the agency needed to achieve a national scientific program.

Interest Roused Slowly

The nation at large was slow in becoming aware of the momentous events. Neither the Bush report nor the introduction of two new bills on Federal aid to science roused much interest. But the two bombs which destroyed great areas of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as well as a pitifully large number of Japanese civilians and the last of Japan's rapidly waning will for war, brought science and one phase of science's activity sharply to the public mind.

Science rode in on a wave of relief at the conclusion of the Pacific war. Science was on every editorial page and in every news broadcast. The Smyth report, *Atomic Energy for Military Purposes*, skyrocketed into the best-seller lists, and Dr. Bush's report, less spectacular though it was, followed not far behind.

Interest in the Senate hearings on the five bills grew as more and more scientists indicated their views on the question and more and more laymen realized the epochal significance of the matters being discussed in the committee hearings. How important these hearings are we can realize when we reflect that the fields of science which the bills would involve impinge upon the lives of all citizens of the country. The medical aspects of the question alone will have almost incalculable social implications.

Forum Prepared

Because the whole question is so important, the BULLETIN considered it to be well within the scope of its interests. Consequently we asked The Reverend Dr. James B. Macelwane, S. J., director of the Institute of Geophysical Technology of Saint Louis University to formulate a question for us which we could present to lay and Jesuit scientists for comment.

In addition to the opinions presented here, our readers might be interested in reconsidering the letter addressed by a group of scientists to President Truman on November 24. President Isaiah Bowman, of the Johns Hopkins University, invited a group of persons to discuss the proposed legislation. The 43 men present constituted themselves a Committee Supporting the Bush Report, and in their letter enunciated eight principles upon which, in their opinion, sound legislation must be established. The eight principles, briefly summarized, are:

1. The members of the administrative board should be chosen by the President on the basis of merit;
2. They should not be subordinated to a director who has supreme authority;
3. The administrative director should be chosen by the board and should be its agent;
4. Responsibility should be distributed to committees;
5. There should be no mandatory provision for *ex-officio* members.
6. The board should not have over-all control of government scientific programs;
7. Scientific legislation should not concern itself with the patent laws;
8. The social sciences should not be included in the provisions of legislation for the natural sciences.

The question, then, is:

SHOULD THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE CIVILIAN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH?

o

PROFESSOR ALLEN

On leave from Saint Louis University as a Senior Geologist with the United States Geological Survey, Dr. Victor T. Allen, who has completed his work with the U. S. G. S., will return to the University next month to resume his position as Professor of Geology and Director of the Department. He will also be a member of the administrative board of the Institute of Geophysical Technology. Professor Allen believes:

All who foresee the growing importance of scientific research in the world of tomorrow will answer this question in the affirmative. Since everyone will share in the results of the scientific research and since the cost and scope will be beyond that which can be carried on adequately by limited groups, financial support for civilian scientific research should be furnished by the Federal Government.

The supporters of the proposed measure could be increased manifoldly if complete agreement could be reached instantaneously on these questions: What kind of scientific research is to be financed? Who is to administer the grants? Who is to carry on the research?

A remark often overheard is, "Practical science is great, but pure science is highbrow hobby." Actually, the boundary between pure and applied science is far from sharp. The basic science of today is the foundation of the applied science of the future, as hundreds of inventions in daily use testify. Long-term fundamental projects will bring the desired results if they are properly integrated.

The administration of the financial support should be free from political pressure, from the waste and inefficiency of the military, and from the control by individuals lacking in perspective. Some scientists are excellent administrators, and understanding of the principles and of the scope and applications of each unit of scientific research is necessary as a basis of sound administration. The administrative group should be small but should represent all fields of science so that all phases of the problems can be investigated and the results coordinated.

The fullest possible use should be made of existing research organizations. Laboratories in universities, research institutions, and government agencies are already set up and partially equipped to carry on units of research. Funds are needed to encourage an expansion of productivity by trained scientists on the staffs of these institutions. With adequate planning and integration of a national program by a small central group and financial support of the research of our present institutions the results for each dollar invested would be greater than if a large research foundation were organized to take over the whole program.

Wisdom in planning, in administration, in encouraging, and in supporting the scientific research of the future will be needed if our country is to contribute its share of scientific advancement for the good of humanity.

•

DR. BUSH

Since it was largely the report, Science, the Endless Frontier, *which precipitated the question of Federal aid to civilian scientific research, we sought the opinion of its eminent author, Dr. Vannevar Bush, director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development and president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Because of the heavy duties entailed in his work Dr. Bush saw little opportunity of preparing even the brief statement we suggested, but sent us as an alternative a copy of his report to the President and called our attention particularly to pages 3, 17, and 25. Because the report may not be at your elbow as you read, we reprint two brief passages here:*

The Government should accept new responsibilities for promoting the flow of new scientific knowledge and the de-

velopment of scientific talent in our youth. These responsibilities are the proper concern of the Government, for they vitally affect our health, our jobs, and our national security. It is in keeping also with basic United States policy that the Government should foster the opening of new frontiers and this is the modern way to do it. For many years the Government has wisely supported research in the agricultural colleges and the benefits have been great. The time has come when such support should be extended to other fields.

The effective discharge of these new responsibilities will require the full attention of some over-all agency devoted to that purpose. There is not now in the permanent Governmental structure receiving its funds from Congress an agency adapted to supplementing the support of basic research in the colleges, universities, and research institutes, both in medicine and the natural sciences, adapted to supporting research on new weapons for both Services, or adapted to administering a program of science scholarships and fellowships.

Conclusion

Therefore I recommend that a new agency for these purposes be established. Such an agency should be composed of persons of broad interest and experience, having an understanding of the peculiarities of scientific research and scientific education. It should have stability of funds so that long-range programs may be undertaken. It should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried on. It should be fully responsible to the President and through him to the Congress for its program.

●

PRESIDENT CONANT

When we asked President James B. Conant of Harvard University for an opinion on the question, he transmitted to us a copy of the statement he had read before the Senate joint hearings. President Conant's manifold qualifications to speak on this subject were increased by his chairmanship of the National Defense Research Committee and his membership on the committee on Publication of Scientific Information designated by Dr. Vannevar Bush to consider President Roosevelt's first question. President Conant believes:

The measures proposed would have been desirable even if there had been no war and no consequent deficit in our scientific and technical manpower. To the extent that we fail to cure this deficit in the next few years by proper governmental action, to that extent a Federally supported scholarship and fellowship program is even more essential.

Arguments

The arguments in favor of Congress providing for such a program and making adequate annual appropriations can be summarized as follows:

1. The welfare of a free society in an industrial age depends on a continuous advance of science and the application of the new knowledge to useful ends.

2. Both the advance of science and the application of science to industry, to medicine, and to agriculture depend on the quality and quantity of scientists and engineers available in a nation.

3. The supply of men depends on the number trained and the innate ability of those who undertake the special training.

4. The scientific professions in question require a long and expensive education beyond high school.

5. This education is of such a nature that it can be given at only a relatively few centers in every state.

6. Therefore, unless a student lives in one of these centers, his professional training must be costly, for he must pay for room and board away from home as well as other expenses.

7. The consequent financial barrier now prevents many boys and girls of high ability from going on with an advanced education. Much talent is lost to the nation by this educational waste.

8. To right the balance, a Federally supported scholarship and fellowship program is required.

I have followed with interest the discussion which has been going on about the relative merits of a single administrator directly responsible to the President, or an independent board. It seems to me that to some extent the proponents of the two schemes have had different ends in view. If this Bill is for the establishment of another governmental agency which is going to operate in the usual way, then there is much to be said for a single responsible head to provide efficient administration.

But if, on the other hand, we are here embarking on something new, which is the way I read the proposals, then the argument by analogy breaks down. As I see it, we are proposing to have the Federal government undertake functions hitherto carried on largely by private foundations, namely, the support of fundamental research and the allocation of scholarship funds. We may as well admit that there will be difficulty in providing for the wise expenditure of this money. Human nature being what it is, in government, in education, in industry, anywhere, there will be pressure for money to flow here and to flow there for reasons that are not valid in terms of the objectives of the Bill.

Now, I am not one of those who feel the government cannot do this job, that anything that the Federal government touches is bound to be so political as to be ineffective and inefficient. Quite the contrary. I believe if properly organized the Federal government can do as effective a job as a private foundation. But I underline the phrase "if properly organized." And I am fearful that this proposal may be so administered as to give aid and comfort to those who hold the views I mentioned a moment or two ago.

It seems to me obvious a board will be more likely to take an impartial view than a single administrator, less likely to be subject to the harassing pressure of constituents who quite properly turn to their elected representatives every day in Washington. I am very much afraid that the scheme will be a failure if a single administrator is provided; with a local board we stand a much better chance. University presidents are not unaware of politics and pressures. I feel it most fortunate that in my university I have little or no power to act alone. Only a board has the authority to act and a board, unlike an individual, is hard to get at and harder still to push around. That applies to a government, I take it, quite as much as to education.

I have heard it said that the proposal for a Board is wrong because it introduces a novel procedure into Government. I submit the whole idea of having the Federal Government make "grants in aide" to promote fundamental research is novel, and therefore justifies a special type of organization. A Board rather than a single administrator has been found the best procedure by foundations with long experience with just such tasks; therefore, whether or not the procedure is novel in Government, it is one that has been tested by experience.

●

FATHER COOPER

The Very Reverend Dr. John M. Cooper, professor of anthropology at The Catholic University and editor of Primitive Man, *presents his opinion on the question of Federal aid to civilian scientific research:*

Within the last half decade we have come to a keen realization that if we, the American people, are to maintain our peace and well-being both at home and in the society of nations, we must

mat least keep abreast of other nations iin industrial and military invention and cachievement, and in medical progress. TThis means that we must devote a consiiderable measure of our resources in ppersonnel and finance to research not conly in the natural sciences but also in tthe social sciences and many of the hhumanities.

On the one hand, other great powers, —the British Commonwealth and Russia iin particular,—are expending large sums ffrom public funds for this purpose; on tthe other, the probabilities that private ffunds will be forthcoming in sufficient wolume in the United States to meet eadequately our own great and urgent nresearch needs are slight indeed, to judge ffrom the evidence assembled in the Bush nreport. In a word, we are faced with an eextremely grave emergency, an emerggency furthermore that promises to last aa long time to come.

Scientific research, to be effective on tthe whole, must be free. Spontaneity is iits life-blood. If private science accepts llarge funds from the Federal Governnment, it no doubt incurs a risk of some nregimentation, of some hampering of its ffreedom. Qui paye commande. Faced aas we are, however, with the grave emerggency in which our country finds itself, tthe better choice in our dilemma seems tto be that of urging generous federal aid while at the same time taking every ppossible precaution to safeguard freedom aand spontaneity.

There is after all no practical way of just playing safe. The amazingly rapid iindustrialization of Russia, with her vast mmanpower and mineral and food resourrces, has opened our eyes to the real hhazard—within the next 25 years she will have, it is calculated, a population of 250,000,000 at least, as against our 160,000,000 at most, and her relatively untapped mineral resources are in all probability as great as or greater than our own.

India, Indonesia and the Far Orient, with their teeming tens of millions and with their great natural resources, will probably soon choose the industrial path that Russia has chosen, and may well, as she has done, go down it like a thunderbolt. Peoples can lose their freedom as easily by industrial as by military conquest. We, the American people, have no guarantee of immunity from such loss.

Of two hazards, as of two evils, it seems wise for us to choose the lesser. The lesser in our present emergency appears, to many of us at least, to be that of Federal Government aid to civilian scientific research.

DR. DARROW

Although Dr. Karl K. Darrow is Secretary of the American Physical Society, he indicates in the covering letter which accompanied his statement that he speaks "just as a physicist." Dr. Darrow:

Few people refuse money offered from any lawful source for a worthy object; and it may seem obvious that research cannot suffer by accepting money from the Federal Government, although the taxpayers may suffer through the waste of money so appropriated to incompetent investigators. However there are possibilities of danger which ought to be carefully examined before the question is answered with a *yes.*

The question might not have arisen, but for the taxation policies recently pursued by the Federal Government, aptly described by the once-current phrase "soak the rich." Rich men have made gifts to research in the past, and owing to these, together with appropriations by state legislatures to their universities and by industries to their research laboratories, research has prospered in this country. Present taxation schedules take away the surplus income out of which the wealthy made such gifts.

I should like to speak for a restoration of former policies; as a temporary compromise, gifts from income might be made entirely free of income tax, instead of being free of tax only up to 15% of total income as at present. It must be conceded that even if this were done it might not be sufficient, because the equipment for research has become much more complicated and expensive than it used to be.

It may be thought that federal subventions would simply be added to private gifts, the latter continuing as before. However, few people give money for building post offices or for paving streets, because it is felt that government will attend to all that. A similar feeling about research might lead to a sharp diminution in private gifts, so that in time nearly all research not carried on by industry would be supported by government.

This makes it specially pertinent to think of the dangers of government control. One of the chief among these is the possibility that the distribution of funds would be assigned to an incompetent administrator. I am not suggesting that the administrator might be corrupt; I am only suggesting that he might be a man of good will who would have wrong ideas about the nature of research.

It is often hard to explain to a layman that the abolition of the common cold might not be promoted by appropriating a billion dollars to that specific purpose, and might on the other hand be promoted by some discovery made by a scientist working on quite another problem. Roentgen discovered X-rays, but he discovered them in the course of researches on electricity in gases; he had not been subsidized to discover how to see bones, how to diagnose indigestion or how to treat cancer, and if he had been hired for these purposes it is extremely unlikely that he would have found the X-rays. Private endowments may follow mistaken policies in this regard, but there are many of them and there is only one Federal Government. Furthermore the Rockefellers and the Carnegies have not stayed around to supervise the use of their gifts; the Federal Government will always stay around.

Another delicate question is that of patent policies. The patent policies of the Government have been associated with the unrivalled growth of American industry and prosperity; they should not be altered without careful consideration, and especially they should not be altered as an incident of a Federal programme for subvention of research. Some proposals for Federal subvention of research do involve grave changes in patent policy, and therefore cannot be properly considered as if their effect on research were the only thing that mattered.

PROFESSOR HERZFELD

Professor of physics and head of the department of physics at The Catholic University, Dr. Karl F. Herzfeld has been the recipient of honorary degrees from Loyola College, Baltimore and Marquette University, as well as of the Secchi medal from Georgetown University in 1938. Dr. Herzfeld observes:

One very important form of the proposed subsidy is the granting of scholarships for persons going on for advanced degrees and research careers. Since the influence of science in public life is bound to increase, this scholarship plan is particularly important for Catholics as it may lead to an increase in the number of Catholics in scientific research. This number is at present pitifully small. The scholarships would supply the funds for those who were kept out of this field for financial reasons, and the fact that Federal scholarships are offered might lend to science enough prestige to attract still other Catholic boys.

A second point in favor of government support is this. Research apparatus has become so expensive that unless such support is forthcoming, there is a danger of concentration of research in a few

rich institutions. The present plans recognize that good men should not be handicapped by the fact that their institutions do not have sufficient money for research equipment.

The most important point, however, is the following. Just as the first World War was accompanied by the development of chemical industry and a great demand for chemists in industry, so this war has brought the need for physicists and research engineers to the attention of many industries old and new. These industries pay salaries with which the universities cannot compete. A good man may receive in industry, before he has obtained his doctor's degree, a salary of $3,000; and five years after his degree, a salary of $5,000 or more. Such salaries far outstrip those which most universities can at present afford to pay.

Should the universities not be in a position to offer other attractions, there may be the danger that only those physicists, chemists and research engineers remain in academic positions who are not good enough to get offers from industry. Fortunately there are a number of men who are willing to sacrifice a good bit of money for freedom in an academic atmosphere.

In present academic practice, however, a considerable portion of the time of research men is wasted. Minds that make first-class research men are so rare that it is a crime to have such men waste their time writing letters in long-hand, washing their own laboratory glassware, and building equipment at a lathe. In industry all these tasks would be taken care of by secretaries and technicians. A very important feature of the pending legislation proposes to supply grants for such technical assistance.

●

PRESIDENT JEWETT

In addition to his statement for the ISO FORUM *on Federal aid to scientific research, Dr. Frank B. Jewett, president of the National Academy of Sciences, sent us his prepared statement read at the joint hearings of the Senate committees concerning a post-war program for scientific research. President Jewett was a member of the National Defense Research Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. President Jewett's statement:*

Scarcely a person today but who is aware of the practical values in scientific knowledge and research. Medicine, agriculture, industry, the winning of the war, all emphasize the possibilities inherent in technology. No one questions, therefore, that the future of science and the advancement of scientific research in America are of paramount importance,—not alone to our standard of living, but likewise to the very life of the nation. It is of prime national concern, as we turn from war to peace, to consider wisely and deliberately how best to promote and support scientific research.

Every private individual, industrial organization, and educational institution lives on the products of man's labor. In the future, as in the past, science will receive its support from such activity, be it applied directly or through the manipulations of the tax collector. Men of substance here in America have always been liberal in aid of fundamental science, and I have no reason to think that any present diminution of personal gifts is necessarily permanent.

Industry, too, has been increasingly alert to its obligation to fructify the fundamental science which is its life blood. My whole experience leads me to the conviction that in this field public interest is best served by encouragement and continuance of the tried and traditional American method of support by private funds.

One of the great benefits which accrue from this method is the large number of individuals and public-spirited trustees who give their time and thought to the disbursement of funds they hold in trust. Another benefit accrues from the wide freedom of research and experimentation which these grants have always accorded the research scientists. It is this kind of support which has taken American science and technology to the highest pinnacle man has ever achieved,—a pinnacle of living which, while it can be much improved, is nevertheless the envy and goal of all mankind,—a pinnacle from which came victory in two wars over nations which boasted of their power through another method of controlling science.

There are some who argue that we cannot return to the old method and that therefore the tax collector must step in and give aid to fundamental research. These people maintain that the present trend of diminishing endowments from private philanthropy will inevitably continue, and that there is no alternative to levying taxes to support science. To this line of thinking I do not subscribe, for the government through appropriate legislation can reverse any downward trend of endowments and thereby remove any necessity, real or imaginary, for federal support.

There are at the present time under consideration by special committees of the United States Congress, numerous bills which propose in their several ways to vest in the Federal Government the responsibility of promoting scientific research. Chief among these bills are those sponsored by Senator Kilgore (S. 1297) and by Senator Magnuson (S. 1285). What do these bills offer in place of the traditional support of research? As I see it, they boil down to this: to take from individuals and corporate organizations through federal taxation, thereafter to disburse the proceeds through a government agency appointed by the president.

To such procedure I see two major objections: first, such an agency can never be free from political control, in fact no amount of ingenuity can make it free; and secondly, a single agency, even though it be composed of men of highest calibre and the most patriotic motives, cannot hope to exercise the breadth of vision and diversity of understanding which has been brought to bear in the past by a multitude of individual and free-thinking benefactors.

I believe, therefore, that we should continue with the traditional American method of private support of fundamental research. If there is evidence at any time that funds from gifts are diminishing, the Congress can readily augment the tide by a slight change in the tax exemption of such gifts, either personal or corporate. In this manner we shall assure that support which, over the past century, has carried American science and technology to a height which is the envy of all mankind; and shall preserve it free from the dangers of political whim and bias.

●

FATHER SCHWITALLA

The Reverend Dr. Alphonse M. Schwitalla, S. J., Dean of the Saint Louis University School of Medicine, replies to the question:

Theoretically, my answer to the question as formulated by Father Macelwane would be an emphatic, "No." Practically speaking, I have committed myself in several letters and published statements to the acceptance, if it becomes available, of government subsidies of scientific research in the St. Louis University School of Medicine.

Both the question and the answer are far reaching. Theoretically, my answer is "No" for many and important reasons. Government support or government subsidies do not make for the promotion of personal initiative and independent action. Control is a necessary corollary of government support or subsidy. Examples are abundant in education, in public welfare, in industry, to illustrate the process by which governmental interest is translated all too quickly and easily into governmental dominance.

While fortunately, in this country, such dominance has not produced major cultural crises, nevertheless, it has acted as a curb on initiative and independence and has remained potentially a menace to American liberties. It is true that state support, as distinguished from federal support, has more frequently menaced freedom than has federal support. Nevertheless, state support of private activities is more readily controlled than is federal support.

Freedom at Issue

In the field of scientific research, the fullest freedom must be guaranteed to the research worker. Research by direction or by command is regarded by the research worker as an unjustifiable curb not only upon his freedom of action but particularly upon his freedom of thought, his freedom of expression, his freedom of publication. Much more so will these unsatisfactory effects follow when financial subsidies accompany "suggestions" for the investigation of a particular problem or the investigation of a problem in a particular way or for a particular purpose.

Viewing the question against still wider horizons, the subsidization of research imperils not only the freedom of science and the freedom of thought and the freedom of the pursuit of truth but also threatens political and personal freedoms in every avenue of life. This thesis is too far reaching to be amplified here. Historically, we have seen exemplifications of it not only in foreign countries but also in the modes of expression of even some of our American institutions.

Despite all of this, at the present time I have counselled the acceptance, if they become available, of government subsidies for research and I have worked for the passage in Congress of the Magnuson Bill, S.1285. There are numerous circumstances today which would seem to make the acceptance of federal support for research imperative. The logic of Mr. Vannevar Bush's report is hard to controvert. His conclusion is not only far reaching but probably entirely cogent. "For many years, the government has wisely supported research in the agricultural colleges and the benefits have been great. The time has come when such support should be extended to other fields," (Science, the Endless Frontier, page 4).

During the war, this School of Medicine conducted research under the Office of Scientific Research and Development. The costs of the research were to be borne by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. The Committee on Grants for Research of this University, however, thought it wise to finance its own researches not out of any deep rooted convictions that we desired to refuse government aid but probably out of the spirit of patriotism and in a desire to make an additional contribution to the objectives and purposes of the war.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there was an undercurrent of feeling rather than of conviction in the position taken by the Committee. Perhaps, even subconsciously the Committee was proud of its ability to underwrite its own expenses. Is it possible, however, to take such attitudes indefinitely? Research is costing more and more money; the costs of medical education and of scientific education are mounting; endowments, income from endowments, earned income and income from gifts, none of these or all of them taken together are keeping pace with the general costs of education. The threat to the continuance of scientific research is obvious. Is it better to reduce research activities to the modicum permitted by available funds or to the minimum absolutely necessary to keep one's faculty on the alert, or shall we now make a strong plea to the federal government to supply what is so badly needed in our scientific institutions to further the progress of education in scientific fields? That is the alternative confronting every educational administrator who has a responsibility for an institution in which the pursuit of science is an obligation.

S. L. U. Policy

As far as this School is concerned, one of our professors was a member of the investigating committee which held meetings in various parts of the country. He returned from his experiences convinced that majority opinion among the scientists favored the acceptance of government aid for scientific research, but he returned also with the conviction that the scientists of the country would rather dispense with government subsidies if their acceptance implied even the faintest enslavement of the scientist's horizons. And this thought pervades the memoranda which were sent by the School's Council, its Faculty Board and its Administrative Board to both the Senate and the House Committees which have the responsibility for the various Bills now pending before the Congress in support of federal aid to scientific research.

Of course, this question has significance for us Catholics. Not only is the freedom of research involved but there are involved in this question also, that multitude of questions which arise from any threat to the freedom of education, the freedom of religion and the freedom of the individual. We should be paying an enormous price for the pittance of a subsidy if through a federal grant we should have to sacrifice the freedom of administration of our colleges and universities or the freedom of investigation of any single investigator. It is only because we at the St. Louis University School of Medicine hope that curbs on freedom can be minimized and perhaps completely removed through the proper organization of a national foundation such as is contemplated in the Magnuson Bill that we have committed ourselves to an endorsement of the subsidization of scientific research by the federal government.

FATHER SHANNON

The Reverend James I. Shannon, S. J., is professor of physics and director of the department at Saint Louis University. Having been a member of the faculty since 1909, Father Shannon is active on many of the administrative boards of the University. Father Shannon writes:

Let us take a look at the background of the present discussion. In November 1944, President Roosevelt commissioned Dr. Vannevar Bush Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development to find out what the Government could do now and in the future to aid research activities by public and private organizations. Dr. Bush appointed a number of committees to study the question. The results of their labors were embodied in a report made to President Truman on July 5, 1945.

This report proposes the setting up of a National Research Foundation which "should develop and promote a national policy for scientific research and scientific education, should support basic research in non-profit organizations, should develop scientific talent in American youth by means of scholarships and fellowships . . ."

The substance of this report was embodied in a bill (S-1285) introduced into the Senate by Senator Magnuson. Another bill proposed by Senator Kilgore (S-1297) calls for a national research foundation for federal aid to science but advocates a quite different organization for accomplishing this. These bills are under consideration by a committee of the Senate.

Should some such plan, after careful consideration, be adopted? Let us look at the general situation in which science finds itself in this country:

General Status

1. At the present time there is a dearth of teachers of science in high school, college and university and a still greater scarcity of advanced students capable of beginning research and filling graduate fellowships. The armed services have drawn (and continue to draw) into their ranks the great majority of young potential scientists. Though some of these are now returning, they cannot in general prepare themselves for a career in teaching or research without a measure of financial aid. But they could be developed by the help of scholarships and graduate fellowships.

A few figures may be here in order. In 1941 the number of Ph. D. graduates in physics in this country was 191; in 1944 it was 55 (71 per cent less); in 1945 it was only 20 per cent of the number graduated in 1942. Students entering medical school in 1946 will be approximately one-half of the normal number. The total enrollment in engineering schools for the whole country in 1944-45 is only one-fifth of the normal number; in classes above the freshman only one-tenth of the normal.

2. For some time there has been a falling off of private benefactions to scientific research. There has been a decline also of the funds in the hands of the great foundations which have done so much to subsidize research.

3. The marvellous programs of scientific research carried on during the war have given us the atomic bomb, radar, and many other discoveries, all of them developed with a view to their military value. It is imperative that the principles of atomic power, particularly, should be further studied so as to adapt it to peace-time uses, and to the enrichment of life, rather than to its destruction. This cannot be done properly and quickly without the aid of a group of talented workers, not greatly inferior to those who developed these war wonders.

4. There is need of continuous research in all matters pertaining to public health and to improved methods of agriculture. From the fruits of agriculure our rapidly expanding population nust draw support for their physical life.

Government Function?

But is it proper that the Federal Government should embark on this program of fostering civilian scientific research? The support of research is no new activity of Government, as can be seen from the extensive programs of research carried on in various departments, such as the Geological Survey. It is now proposed that, for the common weal, it should extend aid to civilians for the purpose of promoting the basic sciences. It is to be asked to assist research even in pure sciences, even though it may not be at all apparent at the time how this research can be turned to practical account.

The history of science shows clearly that the abstruse findings of today may issue as a widely useful instrument tomorrow. The radio and radar of today have stemmed directly from the mathematical speculations of Maxwell and the pioneer experiments of Hertz in 1888. Quite apart, however, from their practical utility, these studies make for the education of citizens and the training of minds to grapple with the problems of life.

Difficulties

No one will deny, I suppose, that there will be great difficulties in administering public funds for civilian research. One danger to be avoided is the allotment and use of such funds under political control towards a regimentation of the workers and a direction of their research with a fine regard to the ideology of the authorities. Scientists are quite generally individualistic and could not be induced, short of force, to accept such direction as this. The best workers would withdraw from such a program.

It would seem, therefore, necessary to allow within certain limits the fullest possible freedom in selecting the problem of research and the methods of attacking it. The results of the research should, too, be admitted to free publication and discussion.

On the other hand, however, the money to be spent is public money and it is unthinkable that Congress would be willing to appropriate it except under a reasonable guarantee that it will be spent for the public good. This will demand some supervision over the plans and procedure of the research workers. Even they are not infallible and will stand in need of guidance and encouragement from sympathetic minds and wills.

Another danger to be avoided is the favoring of public over private institutions and schools. There should be no discrimination against schools, colleges, and institutions that are under the control of some religious body or denomination. The sole criterion for the allotment of grants should be the ability of the institution or the individual to advance knowledge and research.

Wisdom Needed

Both Congress and the body which it commissions to carry out the terms of any bill that may be enacted, will be in need of great wisdom so as to steer a safe course between the two rocks of undue interference with the freedom of research and of *laissez faire* methods which would run the risk of getting little return.

The plan of administration proposed in the Magnuson Bill would seem to be safe. It places the responsibility for the program in the hands of a national science or research board of scientists and laymen appointed by the President without reference to political affiliation and entirely on the basis of interest in and capacity to promote scientific research and education. This board is responsible for the appointment and supervision of the chief administrative officer. He is not to interfere with the committees appointed by the Board, since he is to be merely the agent of the Board.

Quite naturally there has been in many scientific quarters a fear of accepting aid from any government. There is a not unfounded suspicion that he who pays the piper will soon insist on calling the tune. And so the precious freedom of research will be endangered. Against this it may be said that after all the scientific worker exists for the public good and should find his highest satisfaction in serving this. Also, the history of scientific men who have been working in government research has not been unfortunate, though naturally enough, they are subject to some restrictions.

Hopeful Verdict

The story of scientific research during the War shows that many men of very diverse antecedents and education worked together harmoniously in a great cause. No doubt this often called for submission of private views and for great exertion of body and mind. Why should we not count on a reasonable measure of these same happy conditions in a labor of peace? Undoubtedly much will depend on the character and temperament of the men who are responsible for the administration of a program of civilian research. It is part of the genius of America that when the din of conflicting opinions and views has spent its highest force and when the hour of decision arrives, a middle course avoiding violent extremes is nearly always adopted. So we can hope that if this plan of federal aid for civilian research is launched, a tolerably safe course will be charted.

●

DOCTOR SHAPLEY

Dr. Harlow Shapley is director of the Harvard College Observatory and is a member, among many other societies, of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, from

which he received in 1941 the Pope Pius XI award. Although the pressure of work made it impossible for Dr. Shapley to prepare a statement on the question, the brief expression of his opinion contained in his letter of regret is of special interest because Dr. Shapley served as a member of the committee on Discovery and Development of Scientific Talent summoned by Dr. Vannevar Bush to consider the fourth question in President Roosevelt's letter. Dr. Shapley:

Naturally I am in favor of government support of civilian scientific research. To me it seems absolutely essential, if we are to keep our place in the rising activity throughout the world in the discovery and use of scientific ideas and products.

Only a few of my colleagues seem to fear the growth of government interest in a subject that has been a bit amateurish and private heretofore; but scientific research in America has not been as private as many of these practitioners think. And whether the control of the funds of science are in the hands of philanthropists and industrialists or in the hands of the representatives of the people (government), we must go ahead, continually aware of the necessity of struggling for individual freedom in our research and in our publication of the results of research.

●

FATHER STECHSCHULTE

. Professor of physics and director of the Seismological Observatory at Xavier University, Cincinnati, the Reverend Dr. Victor C. Stechschulte, S. J., takes a larger view of the question:

It would be hard enough to answer the question as to whether the Kilgore Bill (S1297) should be passed, or the Magnuson Bill (S-1285), or any other bill that may be drawn in order to give effect to the recommendations of the Bush Report on "Science, the Endless Frontier." It is largely this report that has precipitated the question proposed. To answer the broader question, as stated, is still more difficult. However, any answer, it seems to me, should be based on the social and political values and implications involved, rather than on what it means to science and scientists as such.

Since the publication of the Bush report, some have already argued for an all-out national organization of scientific endeavor, much on the Russian model. The Report itself certainly is against such a procedure and warns against dangers to freedom that must be avoided. Inherent, too, in much of the thinking in the matter is the consideration of scientific military preparedness. But it does not follow that a procedure that works and is of value in war is desirable in times of peace.

If the government is to go into scientific research (beyond what is already being done in many Departments and Bureaus),—and the whole momentum of events would seem to be carrying us in that direction—then I believe it better that the research be under civilian auspices, federally financed in whole or in part, rather than be done directly by government agencies. If that step be taken, however, it will be very difficult to stay within the bounds indicated in the Bush Report, both as to amounts to be expended and as to fields of research. Surely pressure will be brought—voices have already been raised—for extension to other fields, and soon we may have government-sponsored research in all fields from anthropology to zoology. We are on a one-way street in these matters. Initial steps should be tentative and limited.

The question can rightly be raised whether greater benefit can accrue to the common good, given proper legislation in the field of patent rights, from the "practical" applications of scientific discoveries if these be made by government-financed research rather than in our growing commercial or other laboratories working entirely on their own. It is, I feel sure, the applications and use (with attendant production of jobs, etc.) that are sought as an ultimate, if not explicitly affirmed, objective in the research proposed by the Bush Report. I don't know the answer to the question.

If the program can be held within the limits set by the Bush Report and made effective by a properly amended version of the Kilgore and Magnuson Bills, I am willing to say Aye to the question. Otherwise—.

●

PROFESSOR WILLIS

Dean of American geologists and Professor emeritus of geology at Stanford University, Professor Bailey Willis has this to say of the proposed legislation:

My response to the question "Should the Federal Government Finance Civilian Research" is an unqualified negative.

My conclusion is developed from 18 years in the conduct of research in the U. S. Geological Survey, 13 years experience in research as grantee of private foundations, and 20 years as a university professor directing research among students.

This wide experience has demonstrated positively that research is pressed successfully forward in general only when the student, young or old, is spurred on by an inexorable demand for results within a reasonable time. In ten years the Carnegie Institution of Washington discovered that only ten per cent of carefully selected grantees had been fruitful. The reasons are inherent in human nature and unavoidable human vicissitudes. The unfortunate effects can be avoided only by tactful personal control, with absolute authority to continue or terminate any particular project. That authority should never be given to a government official, subject as he inevitably is under our system of administration to political influence and considerations of personal advantage and security.

Were a Bureau of Financial Aid to Research officially organized it would promptly be swamped by applications for grants from which the Director and his staff would be obliged to cull a favored few. The wisdom of Solomon would not suffice to achieve more than an occasional success or to ward off the attacks that would be made through Congress by disappointed applicants. Mediocrity and eccentricity would soon crowd around the public trough.

Beware the numbing, deadening grip of bureaucracy. Keep American research free to advance by individual initiative in open competition.

●

FATHER ROONEY

His position as Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association gives an especial weight to the opinion of the Reverend Dr. Edward B. Rooney, S. J.; in consequence, we disturb the alphabetical arrangement of the Comments to give him the final say. Writing more from the viewpoint of the educator and administrator than from that of a scientist, Father Rooney observes:

The question under discussion in this issue of the ISO BULLETIN is probably less debatable now than it was some months ago. The Bush Report published in July 1945 gave an emphatic affirmative answer to the question and offered weighty reasons for its answer.

For some eight months the best minds of the country had studied this and similar questions regarding the place of scientific research in postwar America. This study was the result of a request made in November 1944 by President Roosevelt to Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Committees of specialists had been appointed to examine various phases of the problem. On the findings of these committees and on their conclusions and recommendations Dr. Bush

based his report, *Science the Endless Frontier*.

Among the conclusions reached by the Report are the following:

1. That basic research is at a low ebb in America.

2. That if applied research is to advance in America, basic research must also advance. We can no longer depend, as we did in the past, on basic research in Germany.

3. That the place to do a large part of basic research is in the colleges and universities of the country.

4. That the sources of private support for research are drying up and are in no way adequate for needed expansion of research.

5. That there is definite need of federal assistance for the furtherance of scientific research if America is to take its place in basic research and maintain its place in applied research.

Magnuson Approved

My own opinion on the question asked in the title of this discussion is that the Federal Government should finance civilian basic scientific research, but that it should support it by the method recommended in the Magnuson Bill and not that in the Kilgore Bill. My reasons for favoring federal support of basic scientific research are the entire Bush Report and the facts brought to light by the Kilgore Report. My reason for supporting the Magnuson Bill as opposed to the Kilgore Bill is because I think the Magnuson Bill avoids the dangers of federal control and the Kilgore Bill does not. The principles involved here are largely the same as those involved in the question of federal aid to education in general. Federal support of science is a form of federal aid to education.

For well over twenty-five years many leaders in education, prominent among them Catholic educators, have fought against federal aid to education. The long battle has taught us to be wary of all federal aid bills. The opposition to federal aid to education has been based on the fear of two dangers, the danger of federal control and the danger of discriminatory legislation. Early federal aid bills were open to the danger of federal control and discrimination. Since 1936 federal aid bills have sedulously provided against the danger of federal control of education, but most of them have been discriminatory in their insistance on limiting their provision for aid to public schools alone. That this is the basis of our opposition is clear from our attitude toward the two current federal aid bills. We oppose the Thomas-Ramspeck Bills, (S. 180, H. R. 1296) because they discriminate against private schools. We are in favor of the Meade-Aiken-Lesinski Bills, (S. 717, H. R. 3002) because, besides avoiding federal control, they are, for the most part, not discriminatory in character.

Now, in regard to federal assistance to basic scientific research I feel that the Magnuson Bill avoids federal control and is in no way discriminatory. While not discriminatory, the Kilgore Bill puts scientific research too much under federal control.

Before making its recommendations the Bush Report set down basic principles that should underlie a program of government support of scientific research if it is to be effective and at the same time avoid certain evils. Among these principles are the following (pp. 26, 27):

"The agency to administer such funds should be composed of citizens selected only on the basis of their interest in and capacity to promote the work of the agency. They should be persons of broad interest in and understanding of the peculiarities of scientific research and education.

"The agency should promote research through contracts or grants to organizations outside the Federal Government. It should not operate any laboratories of its own.

"Support of basic research in the public and private colleges, universities, and research institutes must leave the internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of the research to the institutions themselves. This is of the utmost importance.

"While assuring complete independence and freedom for the nature, scope, and methodology of research carried on in the institutions receiving public funds, and while retaining discretion in the allocation of funds among such institutions, the Foundation proposed herein must be responsible to the President and the Congress. Only through such responsibility can we maintain the proper relationship between science and other aspects of a democratic system. The usual controls of audits, reports, budgeting, and the like, should, of course, apply to the administrative and fiscal operations of the Foundation, subject, however, to such adjustments in procedure as are necessary to meet the special requirements of research."

In keeping with these principles the Bush Report and the Magnuson Bill recommend the establishment of an independent governmental agency known as the National Research Foundation. Control is to be by a nine-man board of members, not otherwise connected with the Government and who are to serve without compensation. The entire organization emphasizes civilian control and provides for the freedom from influences that would hamper the work and progress of science.

Kilgore Opposed

The Kilgore Bill, on the other hand, would establish a National Science Foundation to be headed by a director, appointed by the President, and a National Science Board under the chairmanship of the director and composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, the Attorney General, the Federal Security Administrator, and eight public members appointed by the President. Two standing committees are to be appointed: a Research Committee for National Defense, consisting of a chairman appointed by the President, and nine members designated by the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Director; a Research Committee for Health and Medical Service also consisting of a chairman and nine members. Three members of this committee would be designated by the Federal Security Administrator.

It seems to me that the organization called for by the Kilgore report is too closely tied up with government. It exposes scientific research to the danger of governmental control and to political influence.

The question of federal support of scientific research is important but so too is the question of the method of such support. It would not do to further scientific research if the very means chosen were to lead to a loss of American traditions of freedom of research. It is not without significance that the great majority of eminent scientists, particularly those in universities and colleges, favor the Magnuson Bill and are opposed to the Kilgore Bill.

ISO BULLETIN

Published by The Institute of Social Order, 3742 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Mo. Editor, Daniel A. Lord, S.J. Associate Editors, Edward Dowling, S.J.; Edward Duff, S.J.; Francis J. Corley, S.J.; Contributing Editors, J. Roger Lyons, S.J.; Aloysius J. Heeg, S.J.; Herbert O'H. Walker, S.J. Leo P. Wobido, S.J.; Secretary to the Editor, Marian Prendergast.