Librarianship: an apostolate of truth

The editors of this Review hope that Dr. William FitzGerald's article on librarianship as a profession (see pp. 357-59 of this issue) will broaden the perspectives of many Catholic college students. Vocational counselors sometimes find that a college senior, especially a young woman, has majored in general business or sociology without having any marked inclination towards the business field or social work. The same thing happens in regard to chemistry, political science, English or even education majors. Why not inquire whether such students might not be interested in pursuing librarianship as a career? In this field they could put their specialized training to very good use. True, librarianship itself requires specialized training, preferably a full year of graduate study. (Sixteen Catholic colleges for women already offer courses in library science on the undergraduate level.) Is librarianship one of those Careers That Change Your World that Fr. Kenny has called to our attention? We think that, implicitly, it definitely is. Why? Because libraries are the arsenals in the struggle for men's minds. The defenders of truth should know where to find it—every scrap of it. The opponents of error should know how to unmask it. All this requires an intimate knowledge of sources of information, some of it very inaccessible. The Church herself needs trained researchers. A resourceful Catholic librarian, no matter where he or she works, or for whom, can influence the minds of men, especially of children and adolescents, in countless ways. Qualified young men and women should give serious thought to this increasingly important career of public service.

Manifesto on MacArthur hearings

To Senator Richard B. Russell, who composed it, and to the members of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, who unanimously approved it, the Editors of this Review wish to express their gratitude for the Manifesto issued on June 27. In no way could the long and potentially divisive hearings on the removal of General MacArthur been brought to a more satisfactory close. As the statement notes: "The inquiry has pushed to its very limits a principle to which the American people jealously cling—the right of every man to say what he thinks." This exercise of democracy was not without peril, since, "in the fullest light of day, we weighed before the world our motives, our doubts, the sources of our strength and of our weakness." Nevertheless, our people should be reassured:

These hearings have increased our faith in our strength and in our ability. Mistakes may add to the measure of our sacrifices or change the form of the ordeal we may be called upon to endure, but come what may, America has the means and the will to enable us to survive.

Nor should our friends, the peoples of the free world, be confused:

The fact that we do not always speak with a single voice does not mean that we have weakened in our united purpose... We are unshaken in our determination to defend ourselves and to cooperate to the limit of our capabilities with all of those free nations determined to survive in freedom.

Let our enemies beware of misunderstanding us:

If those who threaten us take only a tyrant's lesson from differences among free men and mistake the temper of our people, they can plunge the world into war. But it would be a war they could never win and which would bring them to ultimate destruction.

This is the real voice of America.

President on health

The address on the nation's health which President Truman gave on June 22 at Bethesda, Maryland (a suburb of Washington) should go down as one of his best efforts to explain a great domestic problem. The occasion was the laying of the cornerstone of the new $60-million clinical center for basic and applied medical research at the National Institutes of Health. This center will be operated by the U.S. Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency. The press naturally played up what really formed only a small part of the address, the President's plea for a "good workable plan that will enable all Americans to pay for the medical care they need." Dr. John W. Cline, president of the American Medical Association, immediately reported that the AMA already had a "better program" than the President's proposed compulsory health-insurance system: "the American medical system, which has made this the healthiest great nation in the world." This is no answer at all. Our present medical system of itself does not "enable all Americans to pay for the medical care they need." Dr. William F. Cline, president of the American Medical Association, immediately reported that the AMA already had a "better program" than the President's proposed compulsory health-insurance system: "the American medical system, which has made this the healthiest great nation in the world." This is no answer at all. Our present medical system of itself does not "enable all Americans to pay for the medical care they need." The claim that we owe our health to the "American medical system" covers a lot of territory. Opponents of the President's plan have argued, not without some justification, that a nation's health depends on a great many factors besides its "medical system." Good food, proper housing and a number of other nonmedical factors, we were told, formed the basis of national health, and were the first things we should look to. Didn't the AMA at times also use this argument? The need of extending the insurance principle in the fields of hospital and medical care remains, so that as many Americans as possible can pay for the care that is now available to those who have the money.
... achievements and needs

The President's address dwelt mainly on past achievements and present needs in the field of public health, properly correlated with the same achievements and needs in the nonpublic field. He rightly envisioned public health facilities as ancillary to private medicine. "Our Government," he declared, "is one of the instruments through which the people achieve freedom, happiness and the good things of life." There is nothing at all "socialistic" about such a concept of the limited functions of government. During the past half-century, he recalled, American medicine has conquered the worst "killers" among the infectious diseases: pneumonia, tuberculosis, diphtheria and typhoid. This was done "through the combined efforts of private individuals and institutions and the local, State and Federal agencies." The same effort must now be directed, during the second half of the century, to win the battle against chronic diseases: chiefly cancer and heart disease. It is estimated that these afflict, "to some degree," 25 million Americans, perhaps too high a figure. The national hospital program, started in 1946, will add 65,000 hospital beds and 240 new health centers, mostly in small towns. The Federal Government will contribute about one-third of the cost. Half the 1.2 million hospital beds in the United States are occupied by the mentally ill. We need doctors, too; medical schools need the proposed $35 million in Federal aid (Am. 6/9, pp. 265-6). Public health services put Western Europe back on its feet healthwise in three years. Now, through Point Four, we must try to make inroads on the diseases which ravage backward areas "throughout the world." This is a Christian purpose: to use our medical resources for the good of "all men."

Cultural ambassadors who weren't there

Florence, Italy, has just wound up its fourteenth musical festival, called the Maggio Musicale Fiorentino. Ten Russian artists went, were seen and heard. The American cultural ambassadors were not there. The Maggio Musicale Fiorentino is a cultural event of "propaganda." At the same time, whatever attempts were made to interest private enterprise to finance such artistic representation fell through. So the Russians beat us to the cultural punch. Does it all add up to the conclusion that in this war of ideas more thought and energy might be expended on ambassadors other than dollars and diesels?

DP deadline extended

Haven in the United States was assured two weeks ago for some 60,000 DP's in Europe who have all the qualifications needed to join their 251,000 fellows already admitted to the United States. The House passed on June 22 and sent on for the President's signature a bill extending the deadline for processing DP's from June 30 to December 31. The 60,000 were in danger of being stranded because of time lost in clarifying the Internal Security Act, which for a time barred entry to anyone who had ever had "political connections," belonged to a totalitarian party, and because of a shipping shortage due in large part to the Korean war. It was touch and go for a long time whether Congress would act in time to solve the impasse (see Am. 4/28, p. 86; 5/19, p. 179). Now visas will continue to be issued. The United States manifests its determination to fulfill the moral obligation it assumed to admit 341,000 DP's. A further amendment to the new extension happily passes the 30 to December 31. The amendment did not pass without a spate of very un-American "Americanism" oratory on the part of such men as Rep. John E. Rankin of Mississippi, who wanted to know "if you want to bring people in here, why not bring in people from those countries that settled this continent in the beginning?" It's to be hoped that the 60,000 new Americans won't run into such race-tinged "Americanism" when they get here.

Congress fumbles controls

As we go to press an effort is being made on the floor of both House and Senate to beef up the fatally anemic defense production bills reported out a week ago by their respective committees on banking and currency. If this Congress (compared with which the "do-nothing" 80th looks like a beehive of activity) goes according to form, the effort to give the country a law which meets the deadly challenge of the times will pathetically fail. All signs therefore indicate that the post-Korean price rise, which has leveled off for
The past four months, will resume its upward push this fall and reach disastrous heights by the summer of 1952. The committees' most shameful capitulation to the spirit of complacency and the demands of self-seeking groups came on meat controls. After Price Administrator Michael DiSalle had gallantly whipped the beef lobby and broken the feeders' sitdown strike—with a big assist from housewives—the committees united to snatch away the fruits of victory. They countermanded the rollback orders scheduled for August 1 and October 1, which would have benefited consumers, and forbad all future rollbacks of meat prices. In fact, the House committee extended the ban on rollbacks to all agricultural products, and the Senate committee, surpassing it in irresponsibility, prohibited rollbacks on everything. Even in their greediest moments, the profiteers never dared to hope for such benevolence. The House bill extends the weakened production law for a year, the Senate bill for only eight months. Extensions of such short duration are an open invitation to the country not to take controls too seriously—which seems to be Congress' own attitude toward them. To the millions of people, especially old people, living on fixed incomes we offer our heartfelt sympathy. Hard times lie ahead.

No rights, no duties

It's hard to believe, but true. Owing to the political influence of big commercial farmers, organizations of agricultural workers are not labor unions under American law. Just as they had no legal rights under the Wagner Act, so they have none whatsoever under the Taft-Hartley Act. As human beings, farm workers have a God-given right to band together for the purpose of collective bargaining, but this right isn't worth much because big-scale agricultural operators don't recognize it and have striven over the years, not without success, to prevent their employees from exercising it. Despite these handicaps, the AFL has succeeded in organizing a vigorous, if small, union of farm workers. That was the union which started the long strike more than two years ago against the giant Di Giorgio Fruit Corporation in California. Though the strikers were pretty badly beaten, they were enjoying last week a last laugh at the expense of their employer. The United States Court of Appeals in Washington ruled that the secondary boycott which the union tried to enforce against certain customers of Di Giorgio was not an unfair labor practice under the Taft-Hartley Act, as the corporation had charged. The reason? The farm union, "being composed exclusively of agricultural workers, is not a labor organization within the meaning of the statute." It could not be bound, therefore, by the restrictions of Taft-Hartley. Although depriving farm unions of the protection of Federal labor legislation is a grievous injustice, it is at least heartening to learn that if our laws don't protect the rights of farm workers, neither do they impose special duties on them. The court said, in effect, that Di Giorgio cannot eat its cake and have it, too.

HOUSE TAX BILL

Though falling short of President Truman's request by nearly $3 billion, the $7.2 billion tax bill passed by the House on June 22 is the largest single tax increase that branch of Congress has ever voted. Should it eventually become law, the bill would bring the total of new taxes imposed since the outbreak of war in Korea to $17 billion. It would boost Federal tax revenue to an all-time high of $64.2 billion, about $20 billion above the peak reached in fiscal 1945. As a percentage of the national income, however, the $45 billion collected in fiscal 1945 is about the same—25 per cent—as the $64.2 projected for fiscal 1952. The new impost voted by the House would tap familiar sources.

Personal incomes. On all except the highest brackets, the rate would jump 12½ per cent. The highest incomes, already paying rates from 84 to 91 per cent, would understandably suffer smaller hikes ranging down to 3½ per cent. At present income levels, the new rates on personal incomes will bring in on an annual basis $2,347.

Corporation incomes. Under current schedules, corporations pay 25 per cent on the first $25,000 of earnings and 47 per cent on the balance. The House bill raises both rates by 5 percentage points—a change which has the automatic effect of upping the excess-profits tax from 77 to 82 per cent. The House bill makes the excess-profits tax stiffer in still another way. The law now applies only to earnings above 85 per cent of average earnings during the three most profitable years between 1946-49. The House bill reduces the credit to 75 per cent. The ceiling on the amount of money the Government can collect in taxes from any corporation is correspondingly raised from 62 to 70 per cent. The revised rates deepen the bite on corporations by $2,855 billion.

Capital gains tax. The rate advances 12½ per cent, i.e., from 25 to 28½ per cent.

Excise or sales taxes. These are jumped all along the line, on beer, spirits, cigarettes, gasoline and a host of other products. Baby oils and powders are commendably removed from the tax list. So are admissions to events, other than college football games, sponsored by colleges and similar nonprofit institutions. Stiffer excises will raise an additional $1,252 billion.

An interesting innovation in the House bill is the withholding tax on corporate dividends. It is also a laudable innovation if, as the majority of the Ways and Means Committee claims, the take from this source is now about $300 million less than it should be. Another praiseworthy change permits single taxpayers who are also heads of families to enjoy half the benefit of the line, on beer, spirits, cigarettes, gasoline and a host of other products. Baby oils and powders are commendably removed from the tax list. So are admissions to events, other than college football games, sponsored by colleges and similar nonprofit institutions. Stiffer excises will raise an additional $1,252 billion. An interesting innovation in the House bill is the withholding tax on corporate dividends. It is also a laudable innovation if, as the majority of the Ways and Means Committee claims, the take from this source is now about $300 million less than it should be. Another praiseworthy change permits single taxpayers who are also heads of families to enjoy half the benefit...
WASHINGTON FRONT

This observer has, in his time, written some sharp criticisms of congressional hearings and investigations and of things said and done at them. It is therefore all the more pleasant a duty to report on a Senate hearing in which I took part last week. In fact, the hearing was unique in more ways than one. Officially, it was a hearing on S. Concurrent Resolution 21, as introduced by Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.).

The resolution itself is sufficiently remarkable: its purpose is nothing less than "the establishment of the Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government." This Commission of ten members, all drawn from private life and appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, will have as its main purpose the drawing up of "a code of moral standards of official conduct in the executive and legislative branches of the Government." The Judiciary already has its own code of conduct.

A special subcommittee of the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, headed by Democratic Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois, invited an imposing list of some forty men and women, mostly in private life, to come before it and lecture it (there seems no other word) on what they think such a Commission on Ethics ought to do. The witnesses are drawn from all walks of life: clergymen (including our own Bishops Haas and Sheil), journalists, lawyers, industrialists, labor leaders, educators, and a smattering of Congressmen and Federal and State judges and justices. When they get through talking, the printed report of the hearings will make mighty interesting reading for Government officials, and in fact for all citizens concerned about the complex processes of Federal Government. It is unlikely that any hole or cranny will be overlooked.

The very variety of the witnesses will guarantee that. For instance, the day I testified, the other two witnesses were David Lilienthal, once head of TVA and of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the newspaper columnist Marquis Childs. Lilienthal's testimony was packed with concrete instances of decency and dishonesty in government, Mark Childs' with an apparently long-pent-up set of suggestions by a man who has reported government from the outside for years.

My own testimony, if that is of any interest, was to the effect that public office is a dual ministry: it is ministerial of God and ministerial of the people. It has both a divine and a democratic origin. We must cease to think of the public official as an employe. He is the public, personified. So, "if we exalt [him] to the high status of a true minister of God and of the people... then we endow him with a dignity which he cannot surrender without a dire loss of self-respect. Loyalty, honesty, integrity, truthfulness will be prized above mere legality."

WILFRED PARSONS

UNDERSCORINGS

The 37th annual convention of the Newman Club Federation will be held Sept. 6-9 at Wentworth-By-The-Sea Hotel near Portsmouth, N. H. The Newman Club of the University of New Hampshire will be host to 500 delegates representing 400 Newman Clubs in all parts of the United States. Theme of the convention will be "Courageous Catholicism: Its Role in Secular Universities."

▶ Two foundresses of religious congregations were canonized on June 24 by Pope Pius XII. St. Maria Domenica Mazzarello along with St. John Bosco, founded the Daughters of Mary Help of Christians in 1792 at Mornese, Italy. Her congregation now numbers 14,479 sisters in 1,077 houses. Its members teach in elementary and high schools, conduct day nurseries and perform other works of social service. It has 197 sisters in 14 U.S. houses. St. Emile de Vialar founded the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition in 1832 at Gaillac, France, for all kinds of charitable work. At the time of her beatification in 1939 the congregation had some 1,000 sisters in 100 houses in Italy, Greece, the Middle East and some of the British Dominions.

▶ NC News Service and Religious News Service reported during the week various moves against the Church in Red China. Rev. Wang Liang Tso, a priest whose name had been falsely used by the Communists on the purported manifesto of an "independent" Catholic movement, was executed after he had publicly denounced this subterfuge, saying that he opposed every effort to set up a schismatical church, and telling the Reds: "You can cut off my head if you wish."

The Catholic Central Bureau, central organization of the Church in China, was closed down on June 8... A press campaign is now being directed against Archbishop Anthony Riberi, Papal Internuncio to China, demanding his expulsion.

▶ While the 82-year-old French artist, Henri Matisse, lay ill at Nice, the Bishop of that city, Msgr. Paul Redmond, was blessing a village chapel which the artist called his masterpiece. He spent the last four years decorating it as a token of gratitude to the Franciscan sisters who nursed him during the war. As a result of the four-years' work, said Matisse in a message to the Bishop, "I know now I believe in God."

▶ For the benefit of students and businessmen Placement Office of Fordham University, N. Y., has published in booklet form a series of eight career talks given by various speakers over Fordham's FM radio station. The careers treated include publishing, banking, advertising, civil service, real estate, industrial relations.

▶ How to Serve at the Altar (Clonmore and Reynolds, Dublin, Ireland, 3/6) is a short manual for servers at Low Mass, High Mass, Low Mass by a Bishop and other ceremonies.

C. K.
“We pledge our fortunes…”

Edmund Burke was perhaps the wisest political thinker the English-speaking world has ever produced. Writing about the French Revolution, after the event, he remarked how completely unaware were the French ruling classes, as they approached that cataclysm, that they were teetering on the brink of the precipice. They went their merry way, indulging in all the scandalous frivolities that were undermining the society they revered in, right up to the eve of the Revolution. The upheaval not only ruined them. It took them by surprise.

Just the opposite occurred before the American Revolution. This was what has been called a “conservative” revolution, fought in defense of ancient rights. The patriots who produced it did so in full view of what the struggle might cost. They had debated until the hour for debate had passed. They had shown themselves “more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.” When they had exhausted all peaceful means, to no avail, they were able to publish an indestructible account of their reasons for resorting to arms.

We Americans have again reached an hour—it happens to coincide with the 175th Anniversary of the Declaration—when we must ask ourselves: are we like the French before 1789, or our forefathers before 1776?

Have we assessed what is at stake in the world revolution of which we are, not spectators, but leading participants? Do we fully realize that the world we have known, the world of liberty, of our kind of capitalism, of economic security, of “the American way” is finally, after two world wars, almost marooned on our half of the Western Hemisphere?

Western Europe, with our help (amounting to only 3 per cent of its annual income, we should remember), is making a heroic stand for the essentials of human freedom. Owing to the havoc of two world wars, its peoples have had to do without some of the non-essentials, much as they prize them. Eastern Europe is gone. China is gone. Russia went long ago, and has now dragooned 800 million people into the Communist camp. India is wavering. Latin America’s future depends largely on ours. Africa’s culture has still to be decided, but it will go whichever way the world goes. Communism has crowded in on us from every side.

Only the United States, at the head of the free peoples, can push it back and ultimately destroy, not only Communist armies, but the social plagues that make depressed societies ripe for Marxist quackery. We are pushing it back in Korea. But we cannot carry through on a world-wide scale unless our people see the full dimensions of what we are up against, and individually determine to do whatever must be done to win.

Millions of Americans are trying to evade the realities by turning all their attention to the secondary question of how world communism ever reached this peak of power. They seem to entertain the foolish idea that if they can only pin the blame on Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, George C. Marshall and President Roosevelt, they will be able to sit back over their cocktails and relax.

Millions of Americans, even at this late stage in the world crisis, seem more interested in lower taxes than in finding out how much revenue their Government needs to avert the collapse of civilization itself. What could be more foolish?

The editors of this Review appreciate the hardships which higher taxes entail. They have no “secret funds.” They employ nearly thirty people who have to pay taxes and have to live on what remains. They have to buy food for a dozen people themselves. They are feeling the pinch of high prices. In view of what is at stake, that is as nothing.

The signers of the Declaration closed their monumental appeal to the judgment of mankind with this passage:

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

Here again, in 1951, we stand. Now again we must pledge “our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor”—not for national independence only, but for the independence of the human race, ourselves included. While others are “resisting unto blood” against the diabolical enemy, we cannot do less.

Masonry and “Americanism”

Catholics in the United States used to be much agitated about the anti-Catholicism of American Freemasonry. Partly because many of the rank and file of Northern Masons have shown themselves friendly and fair in their dealings with Catholics, however, we in turn have shown ourselves willing to let bygones be bygones. We have largely dropped the issue.

That many Northern Masons have, in fact, been very fair to Catholics is undeniable. The late President Roosevelt, himself a Mason, has been criticized for almost everything except being anti-Catholic. We had no trouble about separation of Church and State during his Presidency. He appointed two Catholics to his first cabinet. Catholics shared equally with all other American citizens in the National Youth Administration programs for students and in the GI bill of rights. Roosevelt refused to take seriously the charge that his sending a personal representative to the Holy See...
was a "violation" of the American principle of separation of Church and State. The President's correspondence with Pope Pius XII seemed very cordial. Like many another American citizen, his being a Mason carried no anti-Catholic implications.

On the other hand, the incessant anti-Catholicism of the Scottish Rite Freemasons of the Southern Jurisdiction, especially in the field of education, runs suspiciously parallel, even down to verbal expressions, with the anti-Catholicism of many spokesmen for religious and educational organizations—North, South, East and West. Almost every issue of the New Age, monthly publication of the Southern Masons, bears out this alarming parallel.

The June, 1951 issue could be "Exhibit A" to prove the above proposition. Its "Editorial Comments" lead off with an attack on "the unremitting attempts made by the business agents of the Vatican Church-State to weaken and ultimately destroy the public schools." (New York's Methodist Bishop Oxnam, himself a Mason, used the phrase, "so weaken public education as eventually to destroy it," AM. 1/28/50, p. 485).

Dr. Joseph M. Dawson, Baptist leader who has mastered the work of Protestants and Other Americans United, is applauded in a comment in the same issue, headed "No Government Aid for Denominational Schools." He is a 32nd degree Mason.

"Our American Heritage," by Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of the NEA Journal, appears on pp. 337-8. This is simply a reprint, without so much as a verbal change, of the same writer's editorial in the New Age Journal for February, although the reader is not notified of this fact. It was in this editorial, by the way, that the National Education Association finally came out and questioned the "wisdom" of our "segregating" Catholic children in parochial schools (AM. 3/8, pp. 635-6). The New Age and the Southern Masons certainly see eye-to-eye on the school question. Any connection?

Masonry, of course, is "undenominational." Wallace Ruff says so (pp. 343-4). C. I. McReynolds runs the risk of blurring this proposition in his "Theosophy and the Brotherhood of Man" (pp. 345-6). If the New Age itself followed the lines of Dudley Bunn's "What Has Freemasonry to Do with Religion?" (pp. 355-6), it would not have to say: "Let us again assert that the New Age is not an anti-Catholic publication . . ." (p. 357). It is, however, opposed to "clericalism," a term immediately applied solely to "the Roman church" (pp. 359-60).

Paul Blanshard, of course, is "100 per cent correct," according to a reviewer (p. 373). In fact the books selected for review prove that the New Age has an obsession against Catholics.

Anti-Catholicism, in the South, goes arm-in-arm with anti-Negro prejudices. So the New Age reprints a Jackson, Mississippi, editorial opposing Federal aid to education. On what grounds?

It would be cramming social equality down our throats. It would mean Negro children in white schools . . . It would mean wholesale miscegena-

tion and eventual breaking down of all social barriers and distinctions.

Graham A. Barden, you know, is a Mason. The Barden bill was tailored to fit Southern Masonic anti-Negro, as well as anti-Catholic, stereotypes—a fact Mrs. Roosevelt seems to have overlooked. "Bardenism" is what Masons down there mean by "Americanism."

Perhaps our Northern Masonic friends ought to take a look into this tie-in of Southern Masonry (is it only Southern?) and anti-Catholic, anti-Negro policies. May we ask them to do so?

**Malik's armistice proposal**

UN circles received Jacob A. Malik's Korean armistice proposal of June 23 with mingled hope and suspicion. Was the Soviet bloc merely whooping up another of its characteristic peace campaigns, or did Malik really propose an end to hostilities?

While speaking on a UN radio program, later re-broadcast over national and international hook-ups, Malik stated that the war in Korea, "the most acute problem of the day," could be settled:

The Soviet people believe that as a first step discussions should be started between the belligerents for a cease-fire and an armistice providing for the mutual withdrawal of forces from the Thirty-eighth Parallel.

Withdrawal behind the Parallel, thought Malik, was not too great a price to pay to achieve peace in Korea. Malik's proposal needed clarification. On June 27 Russian Deputy Foreign Minister, Andrei A. Gromyko, informed U. S. Ambassador Admiral Kirk that the armistice should be arranged by the North Korean and UN military commanders. He implied that discussion of Formosa's political future and Red China's admission to the UN would be expected to follow the military settlement. If these are to be conditions for a cease-fire, the UN cannot honorably accept them.

It is quite conceivable that Malik's proposal is merely a camouflage whereby the Communists hope to gain a military advantage by placing their armies in a better position, once the UN withdraws behind the Parallel. The Soviet move could easily be a subterfuge masking military settlement. If these are to be conditions for a cease-fire, the UN cannot honorably accept them.

Perhaps our Northern Masonic friends ought to take a look into this tie-in of Southern Masonry (is it only Southern?) and anti-Catholic, anti-Negro policies. May we ask them to do so?
of air bases encircling the Soviet Union. The free world has never before confronted the threat of aggression with such solidarity.

Furthermore, a cease-fire at the Parallel would mean that the UN had fulfilled its military objective in Korea, which, in the words of the Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950, was "to repel the aggression and restore peace and security in the area." When Secretary Acheson testified on June 26 before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on a proposed $8.5 billion aid bill to strengthen free nations against Russian aggression, he pointed out, as he had indicated in the MacArthur hearings that a Communist withdrawal behind the Parallel could be considered "a successful conclusion to the conflict."

Although we had to intervene in Korea, that peninsula is not the strategic place to meet the Soviet threat by force of arms. If we have a chance to pull out with honor, we should do so in order to husband our men and equipment for the final showdown, if and when it comes. A negotiated peace at the Parallel would enable us to do so.

The Communists may temporarily retreat in Asia. Their over-all objective, which is world domination, will not change. Even though an acceptable armistice is offered, we must not relax our efforts to build up the coalition of free nations against the next possible Soviet aggression. As Mr. Acheson pointed out before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "the supreme test of our ability to survive is our ability to win if war is forced upon us." To do that we must have strong allies.

A dangerous amendment

As we commemorate this week the stirring events which led to the nation's founding, it is peculiarly fitting to ponder a proposed amendment to the Constitution which has attracted considerable support.

First advocated in 1938 by a group called the American Taxpayers Association, Inc., this amendment would repeal the sixteenth amendment (which permits the Federal Government to levy progressive taxes on incomes, gifts and inheritances) by placing a 25-per-cent curb, it could not possibly make a significant reduction in the national debt. It could do so, that is, if it continued to rely principally on deficit financing (which would therefore become an annual drain on a country's capital) rather than a tax ceiling. The only alternative to perpetual deficit financing would be to pay off the principal during normal times. In normal times, however, the Government might conceivably be able to balance its budget under the 25-per-cent limit in effect, it would go up much more. (The proposed amendment does permit suspending the 25-per-cent ceiling, but only during wartime.)

With the debt piling up during emergencies, the only way to escape perpetual deficit financing would be to pay off the principal during normal times. In normal times, however, though the Government might conceivably be able to balance its budget under the 25-per-cent limit, it could not possibly make a significant reduction in the national debt. It could not do so, that is, if it continued to rely principally on the personal and corporate income tax as presently employed.

That brings us to the other horn of the dilemma. The only alternative to perpetual deficit financing under the proposed amendment would be the adoption of a very heavy sales tax and a broadening of the income tax base by lowering allowances for dependents, by disallowing exemptions for State taxes, by making it impossible for businesses to carry back losses, and by adopting other equally unpalatable expedients. The inequities of this alternative are so obvious that no Congress would vote them.

In addition to the Treasury arguments, it should be noted that the amendment would widen the gulf between rich and poor. It would give the greatest benefits to big corporations and the 40,000-odd individuals with incomes in excess of $50,000 a year. It would hurt, not help, the 50 million people who make $5,000 a year or less.

The proposed amendment is a wealthy man's amendment conceived in self-interest and brought forth in distrust of democracy. It's hard to see how so many State legislatures could have fallen for it.
What is "Americanism"?

Robert C. Hartnett

With "loyalty" to the United States an important question today in American life, the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence is a good occasion on which to ask ourselves, "What do we mean by 'Americanism'?

Growth of American Self-Consciousness

In the period immediately preceding the American Revolution it became fairly common to refer to the British colonies on this continent as "America," though Benjamin Franklin himself used the term to mean the "new world" as a whole. That Franklin felt himself "different" from the British is shown by a letter he wrote from London in 1768 in which he remarked that the English thought him "too much of an American." At the same time, when the colonists first mobilized resistance to acts of Parliament which they regarded as tyrannical, they appealed to the "ancient rights of Englishmen" in justification of their cause. Only later, as many writers have shown, did they resort to the fundamental rights of man as the basis of their complaints.

In those early days, and for some time afterwards, actually, the feeling of American nationality was not strong, even among our leading early statesmen. John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, for example, referred indifferently to the United States as a whole and to their individual States of Massachusetts and Virginia as "my country." Jefferson, indeed, continued to use this expression to mean Virginia to the very end of his life. During the Revolution, when he composed his Notes on Virginia, he even called his State his "nation," the way he would speak of the Cherokee Indians as a "nation." One could hardly say that the feeling of being an American, as contrasted with that of being an Englishman or a Frenchman, was particularly strong before the Federal Union was formed.

Thomas Paine, on the other hand, was devoid of any fondness for one locality over another because this pamphleteer of American independence had been born in England and had come to our shores only in 1774. "Our great title," he wrote, in his effort to over-ride the spirit of localism that stood in the way of national unity, "is AMERICANS—our inferior one varies with the place" [or State each lived in].

Several European writers, as a matter of fact, inadvertently promoted American self-consciousness by broadcasting the theory that the American climate produced an inferior breed of animals and men. The controversy, which cut the early inhabitants of America to the quick, sharpened their feeling of national pride.

The Concept of a "Unique People"

The vast expanse of land embraced by the American Union was beautified by towering mountains, ample rivers, innumerable lakes and the endless stretch of the Atlantic Coast. It was endowed, too, with a fertile soil and great mineral wealth. These assets gave citizens of the new Republic plenty to be proud of and to love. Moreover, they fondled the hope, since brought to fruition, of adding to their country many times the territory of the original States.

Looking back on their two centuries of slow growth from the first landing at Jamestown, Va., to the final consummation of national independence, the American people had cause to thank Almighty God for the special Providence which had brought them through the trials of colonialism, revolution and national weakness to the threshold of greatness as a new nation. The concept of being a "unique people" naturally took hold of them.

This vision of a special destiny for America had warmed the deliberations over the new Constitution. Alexander Hamilton had opened his great plea for ratification in New York by declaring that . . . it seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force . . . a wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind (Federalist, No. 1).

A decade later, when the new Constitution had been successfully put in motion under George Washington as President, the American people could with justice proclaim that their country had become the great "asylum for the oppressed" of all other lands.

This was no idle boast. They had established a unique political society—a Federal Union of thirteen "sovereign" States. They had discovered a way to hold in sure balance the God-given liberties of the people and the necessary, and also God-given, authority of the State. They had devised a way to make their government strong ("adequate to the exigencies of the Union") while keeping it responsible to the electorate.

It was not perfect, of course. Nobody was more
acutely aware of the imperfections of the handiwork of the Founding Fathers than they themselves. Like every great political construction, the Constitution had been made possible only through compromises. At least one of the compromises stood in direct contradiction to the majestic truths of the Declaration. This was the agreement, without which there would have been no Union, not to disturb the "peculiar institution" of the Southern States—human slavery—and even to permit the continued importation of slaves until the year 1808.

Those who cite the ringing phrase of the Declaration that "all men are created equal" as the basis of their "Americanism" often overlook, among other things, the plain fact that "Americanism," as a working system, included human slavery from the very beginning. Unfortunately, those who, even today, idealize "Americanism" and point proudly to the exalted principles of the Declaration as its basis often fail to insist that loyalty to our original manifesto of freedom is inconsistent with the status quo in race relations. The Declaration is still a challenge to the after-effects of the compromise the Founding Fathers were forced to make. Unless "Americanism" clearly rules out discrimination against all minorities, religious and racial, it cannot pretend to sum up our Declaration of Independence.

MEANINGS OF "AMERICANISM"

As applied to politics, the term "Americanism" was used as early as 1797. Writing to Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, Jefferson referred to the acrimonious debates in Congress over foreign policy in these terms:

The parties have in debate mutually charged each other . . . with being governed by an attachment to this or that of the belligerent nations, rather than the dictates of reason and pure Americanism.

(The word itself was not altogether new at that date, since John Witherspoon, president of Princeton College, had used it to describe American forms of expression as early as 1781.)

The emergence of "Americanism" as a political term took place at a time when party divisions had become very sharp. The new nation was split down the middle in the controversy over peace and war which arose in 1793. The Jeffersonians sided with the French in their war with the allied Powers. The Federalists (quite properly, it seems) were convinced that a policy of neutrality was absolutely necessary to save the very existence of the infant Republic. "Americanism" was from the first a partisan slogan, used to accuse political opponents of wilful neglect of the real interests of the United States.

The Jeffersonians in 1800 managed to wrest control of the Federal Government from the Federalists who had planned the new system and made it a "going concern." "Americanism," as used by the victorious Jeffersonians, meant "an individualistic democracy, an experiment designed to realize at home the natural rights of all men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," as Merle Curti has written, "and to point the way by example to the achievement of these values all over the world." From 1800 to 1824 we really had a one-party system in this country. "Americanism" therefore became synonymous with what that party (the Jeffersonian Republicans) stood for: the era of "good feeling," of laissez-faire, based on an agricultural economy and "States' rights" at home and a somewhat complacent, self-contained nationalism in our relations with other countries. Only the broken thread of slavery remained to cause our national unity, at a later date, to unravel.

On the eve of the Civil War, "Americanism" changed its meaning and again became a fighting word. The American ("Know-Nothing") party, reacting against the teeming influx of immigrants, especially Irish Catholics, made "nativism" and absolute separation of Church and State burning issues in American politics. "Americanism" came to have the strong Protestant tinge which it has never wholly lost. In 1888 a new American party, now allied in spirit with the American Protective Association (A.P.A.), revived this sort of "Americanism," as the National party did in 1896. Paul Blanshard and Bishop Oxnam are perhaps the chief contemporary exponents of "Americanism" in this traditional anti-Catholic, though not necessarily nativist, sense. Archbishop John Ireland, in his famous address of August 11, 1913, on "Catholicism and Americanism," refuted the then current charge that the two systems of belief were in conflict. He did so by taking both terms in their proper meanings.

Theodore Roosevelt was a vigorous apostle of "true Americanism" before and during World War I. He condemned "hyphenated Americans," perhaps somewhat overstressing the necessity of being "an American and nothing else." Still, T. R. came close to the true meaning of the term and associated it with his "Square Deal" for all, including industrial workers. He vigorously condemned as "un-American" all discrimination based on race, creed or color.

Rooseveltian "Americanism," however, was rather nationalistic, expansionist and imperialist. In fact, this connotation has been associated with the word throughout our history. Patriots have used the phrase "Manifest Destiny," first coined in 1845, to express their determination to spread the blessings of American institutions outside our borders—if need be, by armed force. Since World War I, "Americanism" has more often drawn in its wake a penumbra of isola-
When the American Legion was founded in 1919 it stood for "100-per-cent Americanism," which it promotes both by positive welfare programs among youths and (especially on a local scale) by opposition to whatever its officers regard as "un-American." Oddly enough, the Farmer-Labor Party in 1920 also came out for "100-per-cent Americanism," which it understood as calling for the "repeal of all so-called 'espionage,' 'sedition' and 'criminal syndicalist' laws ... " The very same term, in the very same year, was therefore used to convey quite opposite meanings, since the Legion took a strong stand against all manner of sedition.

In 1916 Woodrow Wilson ran for President on a Democratic national platform which carried a long plank on "Americanism." This plank is probably as widely acceptable an expression of what the term might mean as can be found in our history. More usually the word has ideological overtones. Herbert Hoover, for example, describes his own brand of religious, economic and political individualism as "the American idea." However General MacArthur conceives of "Americanism," he exalts it above all other gifts. "I humbly give thanks to Almighty God," he has declared, "the divine Father of us all, for the greatest of all blessings, the birthright proudly to say—I am an American!" What William Randolph Hearst means by "Americanism" is too well known to require unfolding.

There is also a special brand of Masonic "Americanism," characteristic of Scottish Rite Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction. Its hallmarks are an obsession against Catholicism and a reactionary insistence on "white supremacy" (see editorial, "Masonry and 'Americanism,'" pp. 345-46 of this issue).

**Conclusion**

It is a great pity that such a noble word should be overlaid with so many connotations unacceptable to many Americans. Words get their meaning, however, from the way they are used and from the people who use them most. What strikes me about "Americanism," as most frequently used, is not so much what it says as what it leaves unsaid. It seems to suppose that there must be some easy way out of the problems that plague us, some release which will not cost us much. It certainly doesn't suggest the wide sweep of Catholic social teaching, on a national and international scale. Yet we know that we cannot make headway against the chaos that surrounds us unless we meet it on all fronts.

Lastly, as the ideological opposite of communism, "Americanism," has one irremediable defect: it is provincial. Communism makes its appeal to all peoples. "Americanism" cannot appeal to Asians, let alone to Europeans, Latin Americans and Canadians. "Americanism" can be understood in a good sense among ourselves, but its usefulness to convey what we have to offer the world is very limited.

**MacArthur hearings wind up**

*Vincent S. Kearney*

**WHEN THE** Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees opened up their hearings on the MacArthur ouster on May 3, they had a list of 100 potential witnesses. Eight weeks and two million words of testimony later, the sharply divided Senators apparently recognized the futility of piling up witnesses. On June 25 they therefore stopped at the thirteenth, Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, former commander of the air-bomber arm operating in Korea. As Chairman Richard B. Russell (D., Ga.) put it, no matter what the outcome of the hearings, opinions of committee members for and against President Truman's action in dismissing General MacArthur, or on the wider issue of the Administration's China policy are not going to change as a result of the hearings—so why prolong them?

Two broad issues have emerged: the issue revolving around MacArthur's Korean war strategy and the issue of the Government's general Far Eastern political policy. By the time Secretary of State Dean Acheson took the stand, the first had faded into the background. Republican Senators trained their sights on our China policy since the Yalta Agreement of 1945.

When General MacArthur appeared before the joint meeting of Congress on April 19, he made a startling statement which, if true, would have cut the ground from under those who were responsible for his dismissal. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, according to the General, shared the very views for which he had been relieved of his command. It came out during his testimony that both MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs had proposed 1) an intensification of the economic blockade of China, 2) preparation for a naval blockade of the China coast, 3) removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance over Manchuria and China and 4) use of the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa.

The Joint Chiefs, emphasized MacArthur, had never, to his knowledge, taken any other position, the implication being that the President, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense had overridden their views.

The Joint Chiefs themselves had a different story to tell. MacArthur referred, explained General Bradley, to a tentative directive sent him on January 12, 1951, which outlined sixteen courses of action (including the four mentioned by MacArthur). These were to be followed only in the event that the UN armies were forced to evacuate the Korean peninsula, or in the event that the then apparently dangerous situation of our troops became "stabilized." When General Collins, Army Chief of Staff, returned from his hurried trip to Korea on January 17, however, he reported that the
situation of the Eighth Army was improving daily. There was therefore no need to put into effect the tentative proposals.

Furthermore, as Bradley pointed out, a military decision to strike deep into China would also involve a political decision. Both he and the Joint Chiefs believed that certain political factors could not be ignored. In brief, the Joint Chiefs felt that MacArthur's plan of action threatened global war. They therefore disagreed with his proposed strategy.

By the time Secretary Acheson took the witness stand on June 1, the Administration seemed to have won the dismissal argument, hands down. At least Republican Senators seemed leery of challenging the views of the country's top-rank professional soldiers any further. Emphasis in the hearings suddenly shifted to the Administration's past China policy. Mr. Acheson, on Republican admission, came well prepared for this shift. In fact, he came so well prepared that his critics seemed to realize that if they were to attack his exposition of our China policy successfully, they would have to do it through subsequent witnesses.

If any witness came to the hearings qualified by his past reputation to be an anti-Administration ace-in-the-hole, it was Lieut. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, successor to General Stillwell as Commander of American Forces in the China theatre. His reports on China and Korea, originally withheld, have been quoted and referred to ever since our China policy first came under fire. On the question of aid to China, Wedemeyer made a sharp distinction between material and moral aid:

We Americans did not give China all the aid we might have given, even taking into consideration other global commitments or possible commitments... We seemed to begrudgingly give our assistance, and it is moral aid that is more important in my judgment than the material aid.

Asked by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson (D., Tex.) precisely what had caused Chiang's defeat, Wedemeyer answered: "Primarily lack of spirit. It was not lack of equipment."

The morale of the Chinese Nationalists, added Wedemeyer, suffered because the corruption and maladministration of their Government were criticized by too many people, "and you are looking at a man who also emphasized these things, perhaps disproportionately."

Rear Admiral Oscar C. Badger, our Naval Commander in the Far East during the period just after World War II, characterized the Truman Administration's efforts to aid Nationalist China as generous though "haphazard." According to Badger, a five-month delay in sending arms to General Fu Tso-yi in North China in 1948 led to the collapse of eleven Chinese armies numbering 110,000 men. When the aid finally arrived at Tientsin it was found to represent but 10 per cent of the $16-million appropriation which had been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the China Aid Act. Worse still, the matériel was defective.

Thereupon Major General David G. Barr, head of a United States military mission to China in 1948, took the stand and openly contradicted the Admiral. 1) The so-called defective matériel did not come from the United States, but from MacArthur's command in Tokyo. 2) The Chinese had exaggerated the ineffectiveness of the weapons and the missing parts were replaced by air within two or three days. 3) No amount of weapons, asserted Barr, could have saved Fu. The Chinese simply lacked "offensive spirit." American military advisers persistently urged Chiang to adopt a strategy of maneuver. He refused to accept the advice.

One of the weak points of Secretary Acheson's exposition of our Far Eastern policy was his defense of the Yalta Agreement. Major General Patrick J. Hurley, retired, Ambassador to China from November, 1944, to November, 1945, attacked it as an "immoral and cowardly" act of weakness, made while President Roosevelt was "a sick man."

Time and again Hurley accused Acheson and the State Department of "appeasement" of communism in China. Yet his own past statements, admitted by him to be authentic, robbed his testimony of some of its sincerity. In December, 1945, Senator Brien McMahon (D., Conn.) pointed out, Hurley had testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the Chinese Government "should be willing to make the liberal political concessions to the Chinese Communist party."

What have the MacArthur hearings proved? As far as our China policy is concerned, page after page of conflicting testimony demonstrates that our relations with Nationalist China have not been so simple and uncomplicated that the blame for Chiang's collapse can be laid entirely at any particular doorstep. President Truman cannot wholly explain away the calamity, as he attempted to do in a speech in Tennessee on June 25, by saying that "China was taken over by the Communists because of the failure of the Nationalist Government to mobilize the strength of China to maintain its freedom." On the other hand, neither can the Administration's critics put the blame entirely on our "bungling" State Department. Nationalist China fell through a combination of mistakes, some China's, some our own. Yalta, which gave Russia a foothold in Chinese territory, was one mistake. The Chinese Nationalists' unwillingness to correct the corruption and maladministration within their own Government was another. Both contributed to the success of communism in China. How we could have prevented this calamity, even whether we could, are unanswered questions.

The defense had rested its case on the MacArthur issue as far back as June 10, when Secretary Acheson left the stand. Whether or not the President was justified in relieving the General of his command remains a matter of prudential judgment. Should the country place its confidence in a theatre commander, professedly ignorant of global strategy, advocating a course of action that could lead to global war; or in the nation's highest military commanders, the Joint Chiefs, whose business it is to plan global strategy? The answer should be self-evident.

AMERICA JULY 7, 1951
EMIGRANTS TO THIS COUNTRY seem to enjoy a most enviable position. From all I read in papers and magazine articles, life is simply perfect. They have cast off the weight of the Old Country and revel in the wonders of the new. They are full-blooded Americans, it seems, before you can say Yankee Doodle.

I am very skeptical about all this.

I am an emigrant from Britain, and so is my wife. We have not found life so charmingly divided into black (which is England) and white or rosy (which is America). Truth to tell, we are in a quandary. It is quite demoralizing.

For two years we have lived here—two wonderful, unforgettable years, with all manner of kindness shown us, and gains and advantages which we know we would never have had in England. We like the people. We respect and admire them. The country around us—the Pacific Northwest—is unbeatable anywhere. And yet we cannot say honestly that we have taken root here.

Unlike some of the other emigrants we read about, we are not political refugees. We knew no Iron Curtain. We were free people, breathing a pure political air.

We look back and recall the English scene when we left. There was no adventure, no spirit of enterprise, no challenge to young people to carve their own niche. The general atmosphere was somber, apathetic—a great let-down after the years of dreaming and waiting for "after the war." Newly married, we surveyed the housing situation, and it was truly depressing. The chance of launching out on our own was whittled down by shortages and Government restrictions wherever we looked. The burden of high taxes, low wages and general austerity pressed ever more heavily on us. We sought freedom and opportunity in America.

And so, after two years, with myself in an average job, we have an old car and a new house. Neither would be possible for us in the England we left. We eat at least twice as well here. In all respects we are living in a material world that is just a dream to Britons. Our new house and its big garden, the faithful old car, the refrigerator and all the rest stand in mute testimony of our betterment. But they are not enough to make us absolutely happy.

"Man does not live by bread alone." There is our problem. For we find we have gained so much here, and have at the same time lost plenty. Please do not fall into the easy trap of dismissing as homesickness the symptoms I shall mention now. I believe it is something deeper. For we both feel acutely the difference between a new land, settled for only a hundred years, and an ancient one.

I wonder if I can convey my meaning to you? If you had been with me one day as we walked by Hereford Cathedral, you would understand. It was late summer. The long twilight was slowly dying. There was a hint of mist, the merest breath of it, in the air. A full moon was adding its silver strength to the evening, till the cathedral was like a ghost and all the solemn, serene beauty of the place sighed out to you. Long centuries were mingled and blended in a moment of exquisite enchantment.

In England there are hundreds of such places—nature, serene, graceful arbors of beauty. The point that matters to me is that while they are all, or nearly all, man-made, they were built so long ago that the very earth has accepted them as part of itself. The cathedral and the trees and the rolling hills were all one. I have seen villages in Devon in the spring with the old thatched roofs nestled in a foam of apple blossoms, so that the roofs and gardens and hills seemed expressly united, and meant to be wedded as they were.

In the United States, particularly in the Northwest, we are always aware that man is here by nature's permission. We have only scratched the surface. We cling precariously to the topsoil, and the cities and towns and buildings look temporary as well as new. How could they be otherwise? There is matchless natural beauty here, but the land lacks that character which is put there by men, not one generation, but perhaps ten.

Because we come from an old country, and think of home in the way we do, you will understand that we still feel unsettled. Home to us means a mixture of maturity, mellowness, a kind of sweet tranquillity and permanence all rolled into one. If that sounds stuffy it is my own fault, for our dreams are not stuffy. They are reposèd. Here we do not feel restful. This is an urgent, dynamic, exciting land. There is a throng of industry that beats across the country, the mighty heartbeat of the world's mightiest nation.

The people here are naturally affected by this vital environment. We find Americans full of nervous energy to the point of being restless. The English, for all the upheavals of the last decade, are much quieter. American social life seems a very strenuous way of relaxing.

I also want to say here that we find the general American social pattern refreshing in a way Americans themselves will hardly understand. To be pigeonholed at once by your accent, treated accordingly, employed accordingly, as in England, is a very dreary obstacle, and one I have always hated. Were it not my fortune to be classified in Britain as "well-educated," I should doubtless resent her social discriminations even more.
An exhilarating breeze of true democracy freshens American social life as I have seen it.

If we feel unsettled here in the United States, why do we stay? Why not return to all the serenity and grace and atmosphere we love so well and do honestly so much miss? The questions lead to the very heart of our conflict. We hear regularly from friends and relations in different walks of English life. Their letters keep us posted on the changing aspects of the English scene. These letters, I am sorry to say, become more depressing. They do not dwell lovingly on the English atmosphere, nor on the golden tapestry that drapes the land each autumn. No, they rant about one pickled egg per man per week, lower standards of living, Government controls, political ructions and economic crises. Ordinary everyday life means drab austerity. The daily routine absorbs their minds and hearts. They are tired people, not too hopeful, and I think they are dangerously resigned.

Perhaps if we went home we would be so depressed and overwrought by merely existing that all the advantages of atmosphere and environment and old beauty would be canceled out. We have had our appetite for material comfort whetted by being satisfied. We would miss "the little things" (or is good food "a little thing"?) so much more than our friends in England, who have never tasted our kind of luxury, already missed them. We want to eat our cake and have it, and cannot for the life of us decide what to do.

A trip home? That would probably cure us forever, one way or the other. Most people, English and American, think we would be scurrying out here again by the next fast boat. They may be right, but I cannot afford to go back and find out.

I have tried to be honest, so I should add here that the incentive to go home and take active part in the country's struggle against economic dangers moves me not one jot. Neither does the idea thrill me of being there and witnessing the slow, majestic recovery of the English nation. Nothing remains of that insistent urge which during the war brought me back from the then-peaceful Far East to join the great fight against evil.

The essential conflict does remain. We are still not at home here, and yet we are not at all sure we want to leave. Perhaps we expect too soon to feel ourselves part of the land we adopted after a quarter-century in another. Maybe time alone will round off the edges of loneliness. Or never, perhaps, shall we be free of the sense of exile, but only less conscious of it as years go by, as men will live with ill health and hardly notice it. A sobering thought.

But whatever does happen—and who can tell?—I think we need above all the understanding and sympathy of our friends here and in England. When kind Americans ask me when we expect to take out our citizenship papers, for example, I would like them to appreciate my hesitation. I am in a great, a sincere dilemma. My wife and I are proud members of this grand family, and thankful to be here. But before we sign up for life we must be on firmer ground.
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AMERICA JULY 7, 1951
He never was convinced. Yet you never gave up trying.

It was in this year of our relationship as student and professor that our friendship began. The age you understood and loved so well gradually became clear to us, so vivid that even today figures like Roland and Tristan and the Nun’s Priest and King Horn are more integral to my thinking than the people I see and talk to every day. For the first time I heard the names of Augustine, Dante and Aquinas. And I began to see that the Middle Ages were very far from being the dark, dismal, unproductive times that nineteenth-century historians, enamored of the violent color and glamor of the Renaissance, thought they were.

Paradoxical as it may seem in the light of the ways we have taken now, I learned from you, Maggie, to love the Middle Ages because in them there was no art, no music, no literature that was not a direct product of faith. It was a time when men stood close to God, and knew it. It was three centuries in which men held a unified vision of their lives and destinies. Their intimacy with God gave to the art and literature they produced a freshness and purity that compensated for whatever technical gloss they lacked.

The next year I “sat in” on your Chaucer seminar. Chaucer’s works seemed to me then the most significant literary expression, at least in English, of his age. I heard you interpret them in the light of the literature that preceded them: monastic documents, ecclesiastical histories and humble books of churchly memoirs and practices, as well as courtly literature and tradition. I saw that those early days were basic to all we cherish today in our writing.

All this time I, like many of my fellow students in those uncertain years, was afflicted with an intellectual dichotomy. With one hand we worked avidly for every sort of passionate “cause”—the Scottsboro boys, Loyalist Spain, the longshoremen’s strike, the Student Union, parades on May Day, leaflets, oaths, demonstrations. With the other we gladly accepted the wealth of ecclesiastical histories and humble books of churchly memoirs and practices, as well as courtly literature and tradition. I saw that those early days were basic to all we cherish today in our writing.

All this time I, like many of my fellow students in those uncertain years, was afflicted with an intellectual dichotomy. With one hand we worked avidly for every sort of passionate “cause”—the Scottsboro boys, Loyalist Spain, the longshoremen’s strike, the Student Union, parades on May Day, leaflets, oaths, demonstrations. With the other we gladly accepted the wealth of ecclesiastical histories and humble books of churchly memoirs and practices, as well as courtly literature and tradition. I saw that those early days were basic to all we cherish today in our writing.

This is what I want to write, at long last, Maggie. Ten years stand between those years and this year. For me they were filled with jobs and war, marriage and children, and in those years, beginning always in your scholarly inspiration, I have acquired a faith—unlike yours, indeed, but every bit as intense. It is this faith of mine that has given me understanding of yours.

For certainly you are no comic-strip Communist. You are a woman of deeply-involved sympathies for your fellow men. Your recent act of abdication of the world you know and love proves that there is no taint of parlor-pink smart talk or fashionable radical palaver about your opinions. They were never meant to be exhibited but to be acted upon.

You have faith in communism because you think it will bring happiness to mankind on earth. Your faith is in man’s power for man. And here, my dear friend, is where your former student must stand and wonder. Does not your intellect, so clear about other things, show you that such faith is doomed from the first, that no mortal plan has ever brought man happiness or peace for very long, that the very imposition of any such plan (with its terrible accompaniment of all the mechanics of power) dooms it from the beginning?

But I began to see when I first read the lives of medieval mystics and saints, that the more man cultivates his interior vision, the more he leans into the monastic core of himself that is his lonely and solitary soul, the closer he comes to lasting peace. Communism holds as its ideal the abnegation of this interior man, the destruction, in fact, of the man, in the economic and political interests of all men. But communism is meager food for the soul. One surrenders oneself to the god of the machine and the laboratory and loses, in so doing, the God that sustained and nourished the medieval man, and sustains and nourishes us today.

We have come more than 600 years through time from the age of your studies. Luther and Calvin, Marx and Lenin, Darwin and Sigmund Freud have lived and died. We have watched man pit his little self against God (nailing manifestos to His door), against his fellows and his governments, against himself and his parents and his own subconscious self. In all those six centuries we have come to this—that peace exists nowhere but in the souls of men blessed with God’s grace and sanctified by Him; that equality among men exists nowhere but in the common acceptance and practice of a humble faith; and that the conflict in men’s minds is resolved, not in the clinic or on the couch, but more often in the confessional and before the altars of God’s Church.

Yes, Maggie, we are farther apart than Iowa and Poland. We worship at opposite altars—yours revised to man and his pitiful, corruptible will, mine to God and His single, unfailing power. Your faith seems to be deep and sincere, your willingness to defend your faith certainly more tested than mine. The tragedy is that you will find your gods to be dust and your faith an illusion that is blowing across the world and will reach you one gray day.

I can do nothing for you but pray—pray for the old, loving, gentle comrade who introduced me to belief. I can ask God to bring peace to your honest heart, to keep you from falling bodily into the clutches of the little foxes and the pretenders and the frauds of your political faith. I can pray that He will help you to the haven I know, where all your great gifts can be preserved and strengthened and amplified by His grace—and to His greater glory.  

DORIS GRUMBACH
Librarianship:
American profession

William A. FitzGerald

WITH OVER 20,000 paid members, the American Library Association is the oldest, largest and the most influential library organization in the world. Its Chicago Conference of July 8-14 celebrates the ALA’s 75th anniversary. In 1876, at the Philadelphia Centennial, about 100 librarians, including one from England, founded the organization “for the purpose of promoting the library interests of the country and of increasing reciprocity of intelligence and good will among librarians and all interested in library economy and bibliographical studies.”

Some of the best scholars, library administrators, bibliographers and pioneers in library publicity and library education were at the first annual meeting. Justin Winsor, of the Boston Public Library, presided. Melvil Dewey, at that time librarian of Amherst College, served as secretary. Such outstanding leaders as Charles Evans, William F. Poole, Charles A. Cutter, R. R. Bowker and A. R. Spofford participated. The Library Journal, then brand new, served as the sounding board for the infant association.

WHAT THE ALA HAS ACCOMPLISHED

The ALA, besides improving libraries already in existence, initiated the public library movement and raised librarianship into an important modern profession. It helped to develop book classifications, such as the Dewey decimal system and the Library of Congress system, codes of cataloging, cooperative cataloging (as evidenced in the Library of Congress catalog cards), union lists of library holdings (i.e., central lists including every title available in any library whatsoever), periodical and book indexes and other bibliographical tools, and publications concerning the organization and administration of books and related materials.

(See Dr. FitzGerald writes from a very wide experience in the field of librarianship. Since 1948 he has been Director of the Library School, a professional division of The Graduate School, of George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee. He combined teaching and librarianship at Brooklyn Prep (1928-1945) and was librarian of St. Louis University School of Medicine (1945-48). His academic degrees are from Boston College (A.B., M.A.), Columbia University (B.S. in Library Science) and Fordham University (Ph.D.). He is at present Chairman of the Committee on Library Education of the Southeastern Library Association and a member of the Board of Directors of the Medical Library Association.)
credit schools fulfilling such standards. The setting up of training standards has led, in turn to greater emphasis on the recruiting of candidates for the profession. Schools of library science, usually at the graduate level, are on the lookout for young persons of native intelligence, general competence (initiative, resourcefulness, reliability), broad cultural background, pleasing personality and, wherever possible, knowledge of some specialized subject. For such persons, librarianship offers an interesting career.

As a profession, librarianship aims at service. Only those persons should be encouraged to enter the field who are interested at least as much in opportunities to help others as in a suitable salary and satisfactory conditions of work. Librarians-to-be should, of course, like books. They should know something about books. They should also like people and be able to work well with people. Good physical health and a certain amount of vitality are also required.

Candidates who are young in spirit, resourceful, energetic, and show promise of becoming community leaders can find openings today. Opportunities for persons of varied interests have greatly multiplied in libraries in our own country and in foreign service. Libraries also need directors, as well as librarians of specialized collections. Public libraries need reference librarians and readers' advisers to answer the "who-where-when-why" questions people are asking more frequently every day.

Librarianship as a career has room for a wide variety of personal qualities and individual interests as any other vocation. Most people think library service consists only of dispensing books at the circulation desk. This is an illusion. Opportunities for interesting and exciting work behind the scenes abound in all but the smallest libraries. Cataloging, for example, is a branch of service calling on all the intellectual qualities of a scholar. The cataloger is responsible for analyzing and cataloging books in such a way as to interpret the collection to anyone using the library. Facility with languages, broad cultural knowledge and principles of logic play a strong part in this type of work.

UNLIMITED OPPORTUNITIES

At present there are unlimited opportunities for libraries to make available for recreation, inspiration, reference and research the contents of books and allied communication media. The demand for subject specialists who are also trained librarians is acute. Medical libraries and, in fact, all kinds of science-research libraries, such as those in physics, chemistry and biology, are crying for librarians who have a knowledge of languages, a background in the appropriate sciences and familiarity with the bibliography or literature of specialized fields. Many students would therefore do well to add professional training in librarianship to their knowledge of a specialized field. The law librarian who is a lawyer as well as a trained librarian can give greater service to his library and interpret its collections better than a non-lawyer librarian. The same is true of librarians who are themselves trained in the social sciences.

People who like to work with children and adolescents have unlimited openings as things stand, and no end of opportunities in the future. This holds true especially on the elementary level and in departments in the public libraries for children and young people. Dealing with teachers and children and young people, helping them to select the materials related to the school curriculum, guiding young minds in reading for recreation and inspiration are some of the joys of this work. Allied activities, such as story telling, preparation of exhibits and displays and participation in and planning for radio and television programs enrich the life of such a librarian. A teacher who, as a trained librarian, can also function as a full-time or part-time librarian in a school will be able to correlate and integrate classroom instruction with library materials.

The training required for librarianships in schools—high schools, junior high schools and elementary schools—is increasing, especially in those States and cities which have library supervisors. The elementary-school library is in its infancy. With the present rapid growth in elementary schools the demand for elementary-school teachers who also are trained librarians will also grow.

The person who has administrative abilities and some business background can aim at the position of director of a college, university or public library. A director is entrusted with the preparation of annual budgets which, in the larger institutions, can run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. The handling of large staffs and the application of the principles of organization, administration and management play a great part in the lives of the busy present-day directors of college, university and public libraries. In universities and colleges the librarian ordinarily has faculty rank. He works with all departments and all divisions of the university and is usually responsible directly to the president of the institution. A doctorate in a subject field plus a degree in library science, or a doctorate in library science is more and more becoming a requirement for university librarians.

Those who like to roam the countryside can become bookmobile librarians. Here, too, a candidate must fulfill the general requirements for any librarian. Bookmobile librarians, ordinarily serving rural communities, provide reading guidance, answer questions of all kinds and furnish all the joys of Christopher Morley's bookman in Parnassus On Wheels.

The research librarian is more important than ever before in universities. He has a task in investigating a subject as a college research is building up of all sorts of specialized centers. As a result, the same is true of librarians who are themselves trained in the social sciences.

All colleges and universities, for example, demand librarians who are also trained librarians. These libraries had standards with regard to requirements for library school, but they do not have curricula. The fact and the opportunity are here to enable the professional and social worker to increase his value and his prestige.

Selection of a candidate for such a school is another matter. He must be able to think in terms of organizing and attitude, he must be a book lover and also a leader in his professional field. To decide which of the candidates to accept as a student is a difficult task. The student will be expected to be analytical and to work in teams. His desire to give to others gifts, to a community and to a profession, must be present.

The ideal candidate is available. As a rule, he is an ambitious and resourceful young man or woman. Many of these are college librarians. The decision of whether to invest in such a man or woman is the responsibility of the college library. The selection of one is a task which can be given to no one else. It is the director's privilege to do so.
from the American Library Association who with an eye on the future are giving thought to the needs of libraries and the collection of materials to meet these needs. One of the most pertinent problems today is the selection of books and related materials for a library—another specialized form of librarianship—is a highly developed art. It calls for a broad erudition, critical attitudes and competent awareness of the present-day book demands of one's public. The acquisitions or order librarian, as he is called, therefore has an interesting career, especially in university and public libraries. To decide what books, periodicals and other materials to buy requires a systematic business approach and an analytical and discriminating mind. The order librarian works constantly with publishers, booksellers, jobbers. His duties include deciding on the use to be made of gifts, the handling of exchange materials and the supervision of the budget and of bookkeeping records.

The kinds of work librarians do are almost innumerable. Audio-visual librarians, for example, select films and recordings, often operate rental film services, direct servicing of equipment and conduct film forums. Many large libraries also have public-relations directors. They conduct newspaper columns or radio and television programs on books, edit library publications (such as reports, booklists and other publicity aids and releases) and keep closely in touch with community leaders by appearing on platforms of local clubs and other civic groups.

Government service offers expanding openings for librarians. Opportunities to work in information centers throughout the world are growing for those who have a knowledge of foreign languages. These information centers work closely with the Department of State and help to interpret the American way of life to foreign peoples. Our armed forces have civilian sections devoted to librarianship, in camps both in this country and in occupied territories abroad. Many departments and agencies of the Federal, State and local governments have their own libraries. They need librarians who are qualified both in library science and in the particular field in which the department or agency works.

CHALLENGES OF LIBRARIANSHIP

Librarianship is a challenge to every college graduate, whatever subject he majored in, because he can combine librarianship with any subject interest, from art to zoology. Librarianship is a profession on which all other professions depend because the librarian serves all types of persons—doctors, teachers, lawyers, journalists, theologians, engineers, merchants, soldiers, social workers, industrialists, labor groups, government officials, students and homemakers.

As our national interests continue to expand, our libraries will continue to grow. More and more people have been educated to use and depend on library services at schools, in their communities and at universities. Libraries have become a part, not only of our "cultural" lives, but of our day-by-day professional and business lives.

The growth in popular use of libraries gives evidence of this growing importance of the people who work in them. At present 7,400 public libraries, with a total of over 125 million volumes, serve more than 100 million people in their communities. Each year these libraries add 7 million new volumes to their holdings, circulate over 35.5 million volumes among their patrons and spend over $265 million to carry on their activities. They employ over 40,000 workers, of whom over 15,000 are professionally trained. Comparable figures can be tabulated for the ever growing libraries of schools, colleges and universities. Add to these the ever expanding government services, at home and abroad. More States are developing regional libraries on the bookmobile basis all the time. Many city and county library systems are trying out the same experiment. Librarians are in demand—all types of librarians for all types of libraries offering all kinds of services. The librarian is a key person and the demand for key persons steadily grows. This is particularly true of librarians who are subject specialists, or who have special capabilities such as administrative training or knowledge of foreign languages. Although most librarians are women, the field is promising for men.

ALA has made the world conscious of the need for well-trained librarians to direct the important, even indispensable, services libraries provide. If it had done no more than this, its contribution to the greatness of America would merit an accolade.
Why, then, two books on Anderson? Not because of him in particular, but because he is one item in our methodical, almost painstaking mid-century analysis of our relation to the half-century now past. Mr. Schevill is interested in Anderson partly for personal reasons (his father was a close friend of Anderson's) but primarily because Anderson himself was interested in "the conflict between material reality and creative imagination in the United States." He presents this conflict as the theme which unites all of Anderson's life (with its rejections, its longings, its tentative answers and its repeated disappointments) and all of his art. Because of the autobiographical basis of everything that Anderson wrote, the biographical approach to his work is the most useful. On this level, Mr. Schevill's book is readable and informative.

Nor is Mr. Howe's book necessarily a sign of reawakened interest, for the central chapter of which it is a part has been organized independently of past or projected revivals. This is not the place to enlarge upon the distinctive merits of the whole American Men of Letters Series, but readers of the earlier volumes will welcome this work as a further indication that the series is the most important scholarly work on American literature now in progress. If Mr. Schevill's biography provides us with all the materials necessary for a final evaluation of Anderson's art, Mr. Howe's volume provides that evaluation. The central chapter on Winesburg, Ohio is the most important and compelling piece of Anderson criticism to be found, and so much superior to the chapter on D. H. Lawrence that the publisher's directive to the latter "brilliantly written passage" is puzzling. The difference between the fine early work, like Winesburg, Ohio, and the distraught freakish failures, such as Many Marriages or Beyond Desire, is both disturbing and puzzling. Anderson had uncanny intuitive perceptions of the loneliness of the sensitive person amid the constraining pressures of the small town. His presentation of the grotesque consequences in character frustration are still completely and valuably readable for two reasons: his love for his characters is that of great charity, and his language is that of Twain's native idiom now faithfully and sensitively refined. While Anderson was content to reflect his own merits too, but, as both biographers assure us, there isn't much to go on.

BOOKS

THOEDORE DREISER

By F. O. Matthiessen. Sloane: American Men of Letters Series. 267p. $3.50

With two main exceptions, so far as studies of length are concerned, much of what has been written about Dreiser has consisted in the passing of favorable or unfavorable judgments about his view of life. Beginning with Sister Carrie he has been a controversial figure, but most of such controversy has been literary criticism in the formal and strict sense. Since Dreiser's death Elias has published a competent and sympathetic biography. Matthiessen's primary objective, however, has been to provide a critical analysis of Dreiser's writing.

Despite the fact that this critic did not live to revise his completed manuscript, this is the best overall study of Dreiser as author. At first sight the prose of this novelist might not seem to offer much opportunity for the kind of steady and careful analysis in which Matthiessen is proficient. That the effort was successful points up not merely the competence of the critic but indicates as well an unexpected dimension in Dreiser. In some respects the first chapters are the weakest. They fail at least to convey the full feel of Dreiser's early search for fame and material success. In other places, however, Matthiessen's passing observations are very sound. He is aware that more than one of Dreiser's problems in personal relationships arose because, "I was very difficult to deal with." The critic is concerned, however, with Dreiser's biography and personality mainly, if not entirely, as an aid in understanding his work. Still, a statement about Bernice in The Stoic will indirectly say something of importance about the novelist as well:

She seems hopelessly tainted by the kind of specious religiosity that has seeped into Dreiser's consciousness during his years in
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California. Although he means us to view her sympathetically, her version of yoga is inescapably that of Hollywood.

In this indirect kind of criticism Matthiessen shows his capability when discussing The 'Genius' and Wilts's art:

In a way that Dreiser did not realize, Wilts was impossible as an artist. One can just manage to be a writer by main force as Dreiser did, but one cannot be a painter without continual training in his craft.

But after pointing out the shortcomings of Dreiser's knowledge and taste, Matthiessen carefully demonstrates that the novelist in one respect thought quite coherently about the native realism he attributed to Wilts. A judgment of this book must, however, rest on the fact that it is concerned with criticism. Each of Dreiser's novels is examined with skill and competency. There can be disagreement with this or that individual judgment, but the general impression of sound, critical workmanship remains even when such disagreement exists.

Take the question of tragedy in Dreiser's most famous novel, An American Tragedy:

... if in a sense Cowperwood was above tragedy, Clyde is below it, since there can be no real drama without conflict. He [Dreiser] sees man so exclusively as the overwhelmed victim that we feel hardly any of the crisis of moral guilt that is also at the heart of the tragic experience. Yet if there is not tragedy in this novel, there is power which the critic must explain. Matthiessen concludes, therefore:

Dreiser has not shaped a tragedy in any of the traditional uses of the term, and yet he has written out of a profoundly tragic sense of man's fate. He has made us hear, with more and more cumulative power, the 'disastrous beating' of the Furies wings.

This careful distinction between writing tragedy and writing from a tragic sense comes close to answering this critical problem. I say, "comes close," for ultimately to have such a "tragic sense" of life means to gaze fixedly into the abyss of scepticism and say of it, "This is!" The Furies wings are heard to beat disastrously only at the edge of the void.

Nevertheless there is a truth here. One can rightly hold that man is bound to no tragic fate, and yet that very affirmation forces one to be the more keenly aware of the tragic sense life has for those confused but often sympathetic minds who behold man only thus. EDWARD J. DRUMMOND
upon, the Society was affiliated with the Franciscan Order.

God did not spare Father Paul the heavy crosses so often given to religious founders. Despite opposition from members of the church he had left and even from some in the Church he had entered, he accomplished an incredible amount of good. His outstanding achievement is undoubtedly the octave of prayer for church unity —now called the "Chair of Unity Octave"—which he first proposed while yet an Anglican. Due to his constant zeal, the Octave eventually came to be observed in all parts of the Church.

Father Paul was also responsible for the missionary Union-That-Nothing-Be-Lost, was co-founder of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, and encouraged the "Ave Maria Hour" when this radio program first originated from Graymoor in 1935. Probably the success of all these activities must be traced ultimately to The Lamp, a magazine which he began in 1903 and which he dedicated to the cause of church unity.

The present biography is the first to be written since Father Paul's death in 1940. The documents from which it publishes have special historical importance because they reveal for permanent record the exact truth on certain disputed points. A very realistic portrayal of Father Paul adds much to the value of the book. His human failings, little eccentricities and occasional mistakes of judgment do not take away from his stature. Instead, they make his saintliness all the more understandable and imitable, since it is viewed against the background of his particular temperament.

His life's story now in printed form should give renewed impetus to all brotherly efforts to welcome Christ's "other sheep" back into the fold. For those outside the Church, Father Paul gives re assurance that they will find reassurance that they will find comfort in the love and forgiveness which he showed them. For Catholics the book adds much to the value of the book. His human failings, little eccentricities and occasional mistakes of judgment do not take away from his stature. Instead, they make his saintliness all the more understandable and imitable, since it is viewed against the background of his particular temperament.

The secret of the atom bomb. It is at a point in the lives of the people of this country at which it is necessary to make good intentions effective.

Should any of my readers doubt this, let them think back over their lives. They will surely recall cases where good Christians, firm believers in the Golden Rule, made a mess of personal relationships because they lacked natural virtues and the blessed ability to deal with people.

On the other hand, social scientists dismiss too easily the basic ethical aspects of human relations and the religious motivation which is so frequently absent from them. Without good will, without a change of heart, human relations in industry become merely a matter of techniques at the service of self-interest. On such a patently insincere foundation, no successful labor-management policy can ever be firmly erected. I suspect there is more to the picture at Inland Steel Container than met the social scientist's eye. Did Messrs. Gosset and Novy, the management spokesmen, and Messrs. Shafer, the labor leaders, ever kneel down at night and ask God to give them strength and light?

Benjamin L. Masse

Leader toward unity

FATHER PAUL OF GRAYMOOR

By the Reverend David Cannon, S.A.
Macmillan. 372p. $4

This book deserves to be listed among the major Catholic biographies of the year. As the story of one of the most striking religious careers of our century, it describes the mission of Father Paul James Francis, convert and founder of the Chair of Unity Octave.
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His life's story now in printed form should give renewed impetus to all brotherly efforts to welcome Christ's "other sheep" back into the fold. For those outside the Church, Father Paul gives reassurance that they will find as he did peace and the fullness of truth. Catholics can learn from his pre-conversion attitude how it is possible for the Church's claims to be misunderstood in good faith, and how necessary are prayer and good example and Christian kindness in order "that all may be one."

One suggestion: the life of Mother Lurana, foundress of the Sisters of the Atonement, ought to be written as a companion volume in order to record her work in aiding Father Paul first as an Anglican and later as a Catholic nun.

Francis L. Filas, S.J.
The CENTER OF THE WORLD, by Richard Tobin (Dutton. $3). This first novel concerns young Doc Fawcett and his eventful life in a small town. Eva Ross found it rich in its depiction of everyday life. Readers will forget the mannered style of the first few pages as they become absorbed in the story.

NOW . . . THE WHOLE STORY OF THE Sacred Heart Devotion

THE BOOK WHICH, devoted not to merely this or that phase or personality, gives the complete history of that great devotion given the Church by Christ Himself. Outstanding personalities, struggles and movements in that history. From Gerrtrude to Eudes, from Margaret Mary to Ramire, from Leo XIII's Annum Sacrum to Josefa Menendez. The Plague of Marseilles and today's First Friday Clubs. The work of De la Colombière and the 20th century's world-wide Sacred Heart Radio Program. The viciousness of Jansenism and the glory of the Feast of Christ the King. The growth of devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the story of Fatima.
called in an exuberant studio publicity release) unhook demolition charges from their backs, fasten them in place with wires unwound from around their waists and, having set a time fuse, swim to a rendezvous point whence they hoist themselves back into the still speeding launch with the grace and precision of ballet dancers. Near the end of the picture they add an oxygen tank to their equipment and spend a water-logged fifteen minutes—calculated to leave the audience gasping for breath—engineering the destruction of a submarine pen.

The story on which these fabulous exploits are hung concerns the problems encountered by the team's new commander (Richard Widmark) in trying to fill the shoes of his hero-worshipped predecessor. It is adequate to the occasion and is flexible enough to accommodate itself to the action sequences which are the real business at hand. Small and not-so-small boys should find the picture and its all-star cast (Dana Andrews, Gary Merrill, etc.) particularly up their alley but it has a lot of genuine excitement for everyone. (20th Century-Fox)

ACE IN THE HOLE takes what the newspapers would call a human interest—situation—the efforts to rescue a man trapped by a tunnel cave-in somewhere in rural New Mexico—and turns it into a full-scale exposition of man's inhumanity to man. The newspaperman (Kirk Douglas) who discovers the accident is several varieties of a heel who has been black-listed by every reputable newspaper in the country. In the story of the entombed man (Richard Benedict) he sees an opportunity for riches, fame and a big city by-line which he exploits utterly without moral scruple. He makes a deal with the corrupt sheriff (Ray Teal) to bar other reporters from the scene in return for a big press build-up. He engineers a $1,000-a-day wire-service contract for himself and then black-mails the foreman of the rescue crew into abandoning a simple and fast method of reaching the trapped man in favor of a more spectacular operation calculated to take several days. Posing as a sympathetic friend he tricks the victim and his family into personal admissions which he distorts into sensational newspaper copy.

Not content with its corrupt reporter and politician, the picture also presents the victim's wife (Jan Sterling) as the epitome of heartless, faithless women and spells out in gruesome detail the reactions of the throngs of morbid sensation-seekers who always gather at the scene of a disaster and the atmosphere of carnival commercialism which follows in their wake. All of this is recorded with a suitable amount of antiseptic distaste and with the benefit of fine performances, biting dialog and superb direction by co-author Billy Wilder. Individually its horrid people and situations ring true but this reviewer felt that the long, closely connected chain of them had its weak links and that as a consequence the picture's plausibility snapped at about the midway point. In any case it is a provocative movie for adults with strong stomachs. (Paramount)  

MOIRA WALSH

THEATRE

COURTLIN' TIME, with Joe E. Brown starred in the leading role, is a humorous story of middle-aged romance that describes the round-about way a farmer goes in getting a wife. James Russo and Michael Ellis, in association with Alexander H. Cohen, are the producers who present the comedy at the National. William Roos is the author, and Jack Lawrence and Don Walker, respectively, embroidered his story with lyrics and music. George Balanchine staged the dances. The fine print discloses that the comedy is based on an earlier play by Eden Phillpotts. The fine print also reveals that Ralph Alswang designed the sets and light scheme while Saul Balandi is responsible for the costumes. Every one rating a credit in the playbook has done so commendably job—except starred or featured members of the acting company, whose contributions are singly and collectively excellent.

A Maine farmer, a widower with two adolescent daughters, is the principal character of the story, and he goes about the business of choosing a second wife in the same methodical manner in which he would decide whether to plant a section with hay for New England cattle or potatoes for the New York market. Looking over the field of marriageable women in the vicinity, he selects three candidates for his affection without caring a great deal about which of them will accept him. His courtship results in a flow of fascinating humor that rises toward a crescendo of hilarity when one of the ladies, a fortisy spinster, makes a production number of his proposal.

Mathews is the kinsman spinster who makes the transferred Mr. Brown restate his proposal before the guests assembled at a garden party, apparently to prove that if she remains unmarried it is not because she has never been asked. Miss Mathews, in her first musical role, incidentally proves herself a capable comedienne.
School colors? Blooming flowers?

No, you would have to look more closely to see these colors. They recently appeared trimming academic gowns at graduation time on Jesuit campuses throughout the country. They signify the branch of learning in which a degree is conferred.

Actually, you would see more colors at this time, for these four and the studies they represent, refer to only a part of the broad range of Jesuit education. Year after year, since 1789, graduates have left American Jesuit schools proficient in all fields of learning and equipped to cope with the problems and questions of their time. But, of even greater importance, these graduates have been just as thoroughly grounded in the ways of Catholic spiritual life.

In the order of the colors above, the respective branches of learning indicated are—Arts and Letters, Medicine, Law, Science.

Jesuit colleges, universities and secondary schools in the United States
Panel A:

and a versatile actress. Billie Worth, co-starred with Mr. Brown, is persuasive as the farmer’s housekeeper who enters herself as an added starter in the matrimonial sweetheats, and Effie Afton is convincingly eager as the candidate panting to say yes. Joseph Sweeney is properly repellent as a down East sour-puss and Mr. Brown’s prospective father-in-law.

Among the junior members of the cast, Gloria Patrice and Gloria Hamilton are refreshing as the farmer’s young daughters, while Peter Conlow and Earl William are convincing as their boy friends. Numerous other frisky young people help along with the dancing and singing with journeyman efficiency. They give the story bounce and effervescence in the intervals when the middle-aged romance is catching its breath.

It is fortunate that the cast includes so many talented performers, for Courtin’ Time is a script that requires enthusiastic acting to make it entertaining. A mechanical performance in any of a half dozen roles would be disastrous. Mr. Brown is so right as the principal character that it would be doubly disastrous if any other actor were handling the role.

It is not only Mr. Brown’s Cheshire cat grin, with its display of magnificent dentistry, that makes him right for the part. He has wormed himself inside the character, as if he had lived on a Maine farm all his life, seldom traveling as far in any direction as Boston. Merging his personality with his role, he makes the story plausible, lifting its humor from gags to comedy. His star-dom is well earned.

Theophilus Lewis

Panel B:

Looking for a Publisher?

Our basic policy is to encourage new authors. If you are looking for a publisher of your book, learn how we can help you. Write today for Free booklet.

VANTAGE PRESS, Inc.
220 West 41 Street, New York 18, N. Y.

NOTICES

12 cents per word
Payment with order

APARTMENT WANTED: In Brooklyn, New York. Two Catholic ladies require ground floor of Brownstone. Reasonable. Phone: President 4-3418 or write M2, AMERICA, 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.

CATHOLIC BOOKS, greeting cards, leather bindings for bibles, missals, religious art from Italy, Oberammergau and Belgium are featured in The Guild Book Shop, 117 East 57th Street, New York 22, N. Y. PL. 3-0225. Catalog on request.


IRISH BOOKS. Belleek China, Linens, Cel- tic Crosses, Rosaries, Cards, etc. Write for Catalog. Irish Industries Depot, Inc., 876 Lexington Ave., New York 21, N. Y.


MISSIONARY PRIEST struggling to build school; 115 Catholics in two counties of 85,000 population. Please help us! Rev. Louis R. Williamson, Hartsville, South Carolina.

STATUES AND CRUCIFIXES restored and decorated for Church or home. Fine work done on any size object. Estimates and references offered with pleasure. Phone MU 9-1276 or write L. R. Quigley, 308 East 79th St., New York 21, N. Y.
CORRESPONDENCE

Congressional investigations

EDenton: I should like the privilege of adding a word or two to Robert K. Carr's excellent article on "Witnesses before committees of Congress" (Am. 6/9). As is there pointed out, the investigatory powers of a congressional committee stem, theoretically, from the inherent right of Congress to form its legislative judgment. Yet, that Congress' legislative judgment was informed as to what legislation it ought to adopt to repress interstate gambling activities, the Kefauver Committee proceeded to inquire into Mr. Costello's erstwhile exploits as a bootlegger, is difficult to believe. On the contrary, it would seem that in prying into this matter the Committee abandoned the legislative field and became a sort of drumhead court martial.

I submit that the Supreme Court would be performing a real service in the important cause of informing Congress' legislative judgment if it would impose its veto on the efforts of committees to make themselves drumhead courts martial, and at the same time put the kibosh on the televising of committee hearings. Whatever is to be said of this novel practice as a propaganda device, it is an atrocious invasion of the right of privacy, and at the same time tends to divert the activities of publicity-seeking members of Congress into channels of inquiry which can yield little or no information that can be legislatively helpful. Mr. Krock put the matter in a nutshell when he said:

"Though inquiry for the purpose of framing legislation is one of the important functions of Congress ... this activity is growing to a point where the legislative function is impeded" (New York Times, June 17, 1951).

The subject of Mr. Carr's article draws attention to the Court's holding on May 21 in Tenney v. Brandhove. Brandhove was summoned as a witness before the Un-American Activities Committee of the California Senate and questioned regarding a discrepancy between statements he had made in a petition to the legislature and statements he had made as a witness before the Committee, and on refusing to answer was prosecuted for contempt. He thereupon sued the members of the Committee for damages under the Civil Rights Statutes (18 USC §§3, 4) (5), alleging that the defendants had deprived him of rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. The Court, speaking through Justice Frankfurter, sustained the Committee as having acted within the province of legislative investigative committees.

To find that a committee's investigation has exceeded the bounds of legislative power it must be obvious that there was a usurpation of functions vested exclusively in the Judiciary or the Executive.

The converse implication of this statement may turn out to be fruitful.

EDWARD S. CORWIN
Princeton, N. J.

Catholics and Negroes

EDITORS: I envy the fortunate reader who writes to you (6/23) asking that you simply supply the facts and let him draw his own conclusions.

Speaking for myself, I find that I frequently need help in making up my mind about some of the issues confronting the country. Whether that help takes the form of "decisions" you have reached and announce in America, or "opinions" that you set forth, I always welcome them. I also welcome opposing views. With the help of them all I usually (though often with much travail) reach my own conclusions.

ROBERT McWILLIAMS
Judge, Superior Court
San Francisco, Calif.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS
SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Arizona

VILLA CARONDELET
St. Joseph's Academy, Tucson, Arizona
Established 1879

Florida

BARRY COLLEGE
for WOMEN
MIAMI, FLORIDA
Fully Accredited
Conducted by the Sisters of St. Dominic
DEGREES IN ARTS AND SCIENCES
Music, Teacher Training, Home Economics, Pre-Nursing, Pre-Medical, Laboratory Technic, Social Service, Business
Beautiful campus with outdoor swimming pool. All sports.
Address: The Dean

Indiana

SAINT MARY'S NOTRE DAME
Fully accredited liberal arts college for women.
Courses leading to B.A., B.S., B.M. and basic professional courses in Nursing. Graduate Department of Sacred Books.
Aceredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

St. Mary-of-the-Woods

St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Box L, Notre Dame, Indiana
(Railroad Station, South Bend, Indiana)

St. Mary-of-the-Woods

In the inspiring environment of this accredited standard college, girls acquire cultural knowledge and career skills. B.A. and B.S. degrees. Music, art, commerce, secretarial, journalism, teacher training, speech and radio. Beautiful buildings, spacious campus. Tennis, riding, swimming.

MontREAL, CANADA

Intellectual humility
Error: It was high time that someone should speak out as you did in your editorial of June 23 on intellectual humility.

Humility, it seems, is not in fashion. What is worse, it is becoming quite common for people to scoff at facts that they do not like to hear.

Men whose writings prove them to be only amateurs in the complicated field of Asian politics think nothing of destroying the reputations of those who do not agree with them about China.

Some hate communism so much that they seem to think that the Holy Ghost will guide them in speaking about any military or political problem they discuss. The Holy Ghost does not guarantee to protect the foolish from the effects of their folly.

A wide-spread reading of the story of La Croix in the July Issue of the Catholic Mind might save Catholics in America from much trouble to come.

La Grange, Ill. C. V. HIGGINS

State and society
Error: It appears to me that Father Parsons, in his very interesting review of Maritain’s Man and the State (Am. 6/16), somewhat underestimates the “state” when he says: “the state is only one of the societies within society…” I find it difficult to see how one can separate the “political” and the “state.” Are they not approximately the same thing? The state is necessary to society, while many other societies are not so necessary. The state defines the territorial scope of any particular society, and gives it form. The state provides the political framework which holds any society together in an orderly way. The crucial point is that the state is coterminous with society, although not synonymous with it. Thus all our political relationships are within the state, but the state does not encompass all our social relationships.

The essence of democratic freedom is that the state respects these social relationships which stem from our inalienable rights, and even protects free social groups, if necessary, so that they can carry out their purposes and activities.

Politically, then, we are all within the state; so the state is much more than just “one of the societies within society.” But our vital social organizations, although within the territorial limits of the state, are not under state jurisdiction, except in so far as they own property, for example, and therefore may be subject to taxation and other regulation for the common good.

ANTHONY T. BOUNDS, Jr.
Associate Professor of Political Science
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, Calif.

Understanding the “other fellow”
Error: From long experience in teaching philosophy to undergraduates in Catholic colleges, may I submit the following points as a brief supplement to Mary C. Dodge’s fine answer (Am. 5/26) to the charge that “Catholic education narrows the student’s outlook?”

1. So much time is spent in trying to get the student to understand the “other fellow’s views”—and by “other fellow” I mean philosophers advocating opinions opposed to those held by Catholics—than practically no time is left for “domestic disputes” between Catholics.

2. So many hours are consumed on our opponents’ philosophies while making our own clear that it is impossible for any serious student not to have a fair understanding of “other” views.

3. I am confident that our students are much more familiar with the views of “the other fellow” than he is with ours. Again and again former GI’s were practically unanimous in their opinion that a college education does not begin to prepare one for the complex problems which face the modern soldier. The GI’s were not “amateurs” in the complicated field of Asian politics, nor did they have the time to read the publications of such entities as the Holy Ghost.

4. GI’s were practically unanimous in testifying to the value of their philosophy courses in discussion with non-Catholics.

5. Many parents, seeking in non-sectarian colleges a broader outlook for their sons and daughters, have found to their sorrow that the broader view was only a blur. Nothing remained in focus. Hoping to broaden the outlook of their children, they deprived them of any meaningful outlook.

J. CLAYTON MURRAY
Canisius College
Buffalo, N. Y.