RESTRICTED

1279

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION

24 January 1949

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION--Major Stanley McLay, USAF, Faculty, ICAF..... 1

SPEAKER--Reverend Brother Justin, Chairman, Department of Labor Management, Manhattan College..... 1

GENERAL DISCUSSION..... 10

Publication No. L49-74

THE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

RESTRICTED

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION

24 January 1949

MAJOR McLAY: This morning we have the first lecture in the manpower series dealing with intangibles. Up to this time most of the other lectures have dealt specifically with the tangible aspects of manpower and labor economics. I know that many of the things that Brother Justin is going to say this morning will leave us with a great deal of mind searching. Why are we thinking about these things? Perhaps we shall have some of the answers this morning.

Brother Justin is the Chairman of the Labor Management Department of Manhattan College in New York. In teaching this subject he takes his students to the actual scene of action; so that what he says and what he teaches them are real things. Therefore in his discussion of the social aspects of industrialization, all his observations will be on the basis of experience and practice.

So without wasting any of your time, I take great pleasure in introducing to you Brother Justin.

BROTHER JUSTIN: It is not too difficult for a monk to talk to you folks here, because there is very little difference between us, except, I think, in our uniform and maybe in one or two little changes in regulations. But we have very much in common and I guess we have somewhat the same type of mind.

Now, in trying to get around to some of the problems in this field of the social aspects of industrialization, I really didn't know what particular problems we would deal with or select. The thought came to mind that I am pretty much in the situation of a group of German Bible scholars who were doing a new edition of the German Bible. They went from Genesis to Ecclesiastes. Somebody came along and said, "Boys, how are you doing?" "Pretty tough." "Don't you ever get stuck?" "Yes." "What happens then?" "Well, when we don't understand what we are working with, we sit down and explain it to one another." Maybe that is what we will be doing this morning. Maybe we will be explaining these things that we don't understand.

When we start industrialization, I wonder if we could get a few bearings on time. Ordinarily when talking about the industrial period, we can go back to 1760. That is the year when George III came to the throne in England, the first member of the House of Hanover who was born in England. The others were Germans. That is just a facetious remark from an Irishman trying to get our English observers to rise. So we can take 1760; or if you don't like that, we can accept 1815, the year of the fall of Napoleon, and regard everything after that as really

the industrial era. In the century and a quarter which has passed sinc then, Western man changed his ways radically from those of his ancestor

Our world has so completely changed that sometimes we don't realiz that for century after century there was very little change in Western man. He had been born into an agricultural civilization and culture ar that was all there was to it. Whereas a century and a half after the defeat of Napoleon we have a world that is radically different, due to the changes, I would say, in transportation and the changes in communic tion and those mechanical advantages that are being brought forth stead What we would call, at least in my part of the country, an average brea fast, consists of coffee and milk or cream, sugar, and two pieces of bread or what-have-you. The ordinary person sees nothing stupendous in that; yet one of the richest women in Europe in her time, if not the richest, Queen Elizabeth, couldn't have such a breakfast. All she coul have was a flagon of ale and lamb stew. I don't know if that is a tribute to her digestive qualities. It certainly is an awe-inspiring breakfast, or to me it is. Maybe you people wouldn't mind it.

We have had this great development which we call industrialization and it adds up to magnificent living. We would hate to see a revolutio come. We would hate to see this thing broken apart and thrown back the way things have been thrown back in Europe. Yet there has been a seamy side to our industrialized society, and I think we have to be fair about that. Much of this seaminess has not been as some of the people on the left might try to tell us--planned misery. I think much of it was due to ignorance.

For example, I think one field where man is quite benighted at the present moment is in the field of money. We have had a tremendous revolution in our own lifetimes in the nature of money. There has been a silent revolution, in which we have seen the end of that ancient concept that money is either gold or silver. Today our concept of money is that of a piece of printed paper.

How much money should a nation have in circulation? We can't be too sure of a thing like that. Just take your old books on economics of, say, a generation ago. They were positive that they had the right answer. Today, no; we don't know if that money which we have is the right money to have. We hope it is. But down through the nineteenth century, because we were depending upon gold and depending upon silver, money was very scarce. As money was kept scarce by that reason, wages were very low and we had an economy which was, I suppose, what you would call an economy of want or scarcity rather than an economy of plenty. We have seen that change, and I think the change will continue. I think you will see great developments in that particular field. But I put down a lot of that hardship to nothing else but just ignorance.

Then we must remember that some of the seamy things that took place in this era were just simply due to another form of ignorance. We were coming out of an agricultural civilization. We had not yet

become accustomed to machinery, to factories, and the impact of a machine world on the human being. People had grown up on the farm. On the farm you went to work at sunup and you left work at sundown. Therefore people went to work in the factories at sunup and worked until sundown. People knew little or nothing about hygienic conditions in factories or any of those things. They were utterly strange to them, utterly unknown. So they raised the greatest crop of tuberculosis, I suppose, in the history of the world. Whole areas died out as a result.

But I think as man became better developed and able to think more, he got away from those things. Sunup to sundown has been changed now to a 40-hour week. We no longer allow children to go into the plant and work at four years of age, which was a common starting age in England, the United States, and France in the early days of the nineteenth century. I think we also have a little better wages now than we had in those days. For a 14- to 15-hour day a man would get 40 cents, a woman 20 cents, and those 4-year-old kids used to draw, I think, the equivalent of 8 cents. John L. Lewis would have a real picnic with somebody in that area if they brought those things back again today.

Another background that I think we ought to take into consideration is that in the nineteenth century, man, in emerging as a great industrialist, was a revolutionist. There had been a change, and that is all that revolution means--a change. That change was in the area of the soul or in the area of the spirit. Up to the seventeenth century it was generally accepted in Western Europe that we were subject to ethical controls which stopped us from being too acquisitive. Let me repeat that; I think it is very important. Man up to the seventeenth century had accepted such a thing as this ethical restraint, governing the conditions under which he might charge interest for the loan of money, and so forth.

You know, Calvin was one of the sternest people on that subject. Martin Luther was very stern on it too. The fact of the matter is that the group which, shall we say, was a little bit human or lax was the Catholic theologians. They thought they saw some reason for charging interest. There is an extremely fine study of this change, written by R. H. Tawney, "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism." Some of you may have read this book. I think it is the best thing we have in the English language on that terrific revolution which came over Western man; a revolution man didn't seem to understand.

And so you went into the nineteenth century with people devoid of any accepted ethical restraints when they were concerned with the field of acquisitiveness. We took up as our slogan, "Business is business" and anything which was done in the name of business was honest and was just, as long as you made a profit.

Those are some of the backgrounds that we had in the world in which our industrial revolution occurred. I think if we recall having read about the last one, that man in the nineteenth century was a rebel,

that he took unto himself complete control, we can start seeing things a little more clearly. I don't think there is anything so important today as really to try to understand the things we are talking about, to have a definition, so that we know really and truly what those words mean. Beyond that I think a very important thing is the development of historical perspective, so that we will not get excited at changes. Sometimes somebody, some Chief Executive, will say: "We ought to do this. The country ought to do that. This should be our program." If you listen to some observations on some such proposed changes you would be lead to believe we are knee deep in communism.

Ask somebody what is the definition of communism and you find it is something he doesn't like. It is something he is against. In class in trying to put that point across I usually use as an illustration the famous revolution in England known as the Chartists Revolution. You read that the Duke of Wellington was summoned out of retirement, when he was an old man, to lead 170,000 clerks in London who were sworn into the service for the emergency. The Duke of Wellington and this army patrolled London. Why? A revolution was at hand. Let me review just what these people wanted in that revolution: universal manhood suffrag annual election of Parliament, equal election districts, votes by ballo removal of property qualifications for members of Parliament, and, fina payment for members of Parliament. Those were the six demands on the part of the Chartists. These six demands brought the old Iron Duke of Wellington out of retirement with a special army of 170,000 men who wer raised to keep law and order. Today we don't see anything particularly revolutionary in that program. Maybe a century from now some of the things that upset us may be looked upon as being very conservative demands rather than revolutionary.

Now, having discussed that background, what problems should we take up today and explore? The three problems that I had the nerve to select for our little exploration are these: (1) To see if we can get some new ideas of our changing concept of property or our changing concept of private ownership; (2) security--what unions plan to do to promote security; and (3) a short review and visit in the field of industrial relations themselves, to see if we can get some aspects of that problem which may give us some light.

In this entire field of personal property the ancient concept, coming down through the centuries, was that personal property is something which we own and possess, that we have the right to dispose of. We not only own and possess it, but we control it and we have responsibility for it. So those two characteristics, control and responsibility are two things which we say must go with private property. But now that the Marxian approach to property is becoming so public, I think it is well for us to understand what the Marxians mean by personal property and what we mean by personal property or private property; and to realiz that while we have been sitting in the grandstand watching a game go on, our concepts of property have been changing.

Let me take as an example the American Telephone and Telegraph or General Motors or any other large corporation. Somebody owns one share or a thousand shares, say, of General Motors. Does he possess private property? Well, the folks in General Motors will say he does; but really and truly, no. I don't know what kind of property it is. You have a thousand shares of General Motors. You have no control over those shares. You have no responsibility. The General Motors bylaws specifically state: "Nobody may examine the books of this corporation without a vote of the Board of Directors or a majority vote of the stockholders or by direction of a statute." So a person can own, say, a million dollars worth of General Motors, but he has to take the word of the officials of the General Motors Corporation as to how his property is being handled. He has little or nothing to say about the direction of that property. He votes, but I guess we all know to what extent an ordinary stockholder can control an election. I think there are around 400,000 stockholders in General Motors. If you were to figure a three-cent stamp and two cents worth of printing to reach every one of those stockholders in case you wanted to influence an election, even before you have affected one single person, you have handed yourself a beautiful bill. So as a result people in general don't pay any attention to that investment as long as they are getting what they consider a correct return. Really what you have bought when you buy General Motors or American Telephone and Telegraph stock is not a piece of property as much as it is an annuity.

Now, if we are going to consider an annuity as personal property, all well and good. The point which I am trying to establish is that we should consider what personal property is. We are going into the realm of ideas there. We will have to explain to ourselves and others, I think, within a few years what we mean by personal property if we are going to go into totalitarianism or if we are going to have an impact of state ownership upon us. What are we defending or what are we going to defend?

Don't misunderstand me. I hold no brief against corporate entities. Still I say I am awfully sorry, but I don't intend to die to preserve corporate entities. They are not my idea of personal property. The right to private property I will defend. But I don't think corporate property falls into the category of private property in the sense in which I am using that term. I think when the agitation comes for widespread state ownership of those things, we are going to have a problem on our hands; I don't know what the solution is going to be.

The funny part of it is, people agree to this. I think most of our stockholders, as I said before, don't bother attending meetings and have very little direct influence on their corporations. What are we going to do with that problem? As I said, I don't know. I presume something will have to be done. We will have to straighten out our minds, because from the left come those strange doctrines. When you start to discuss these things in an effort to understand the laissez faire system of economics, we find the two great critics of this school of economics are the Catholic Church and Marx.

The Church is in very strong agreement with Dr. Marx in discussing the ills of the present-day society. Clearly those two doctrines go their different ways, but they agree that the patient is sick. Dr. Marx says, "Here is my medicine." The Church says, "No. Here is our medicine." They are in complete disagreement on the treatment which must be followed to restore that poor sick man to his health, but in the diagnosis that he is very sick and the cause of his sickness they are in complete agreement.

I think it would be rather interesting just to show you one or two quotations, if I may, from those two groups. Marx in his Communist Manifesto blames all the evil in life on the contest between the exploiers and the exploited. In other words, he goes back two thousand years to Saint Paul, to the New Testament, and quotes: "The love of money is the root of all evil." Marx in the Communist Manifesto a century ago diagnoses governments in these words: "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeois." Pius the Eleventh, in discussing the society of that time, said in 1931: "This concentration of power has led to a three-fold struggle for domination. There is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself. Secondly, there is this fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggle. Thirdly and finally, there is the clash between states themselves." I interpret those two quotations, one from Marx and one from Pius, to mean the same thing, both of them saying that in the modern state the government is owned by the money power. We could start a revolution on that score right now, couldn't we? That is Belloc's theory also, very well stated, I think, in his "Life of James, the Last of the Kings."

I will leave those phases with you, before we get too deeply into them.

The second problem is security. I think it is well to get hold of some of these things, for here in the United States insecurity is becoming the great nightmare of labor leaders. Contrary to the general belief, insecurity is a thing which is growing. We are getting bigger and bigger unemployment lists. I think much of the worry in high quarters about the little recession that we are having at the moment is due to the fact that if this unemployment spreads, our house can fall down around our ears. It is a terrific fear. What is to be done about it? Here are the two plans that union leaders are working on. These are the two things that I think union leaders will be devoting their whole time to in two or three more years.

The first one is rather the simplest one of the two, that is, a guaranteed annual wage. What does that mean? The union leaders say that in certain industries, not all, things can be worked out in such a way that a man working in that industry can be guaranteed a minimum wage for the year. Maybe it can be a guarantee of 30 weeks' wages, so

that he knows at the beginning of the year: "There is one thing about this year that I can count on. I am sure of 30 weeks' wages." He can set himself a budget and give himself a basis for it. There are various forms of that plan, not extensively used, but used sufficiently to be what might be called pilot forms or pilot setups.

The second form, which I think is far more revolutionary than the guaranteed annual wage setup, is the industry council plan. The industry council plan contends that it will be possible to take each of our large industries and arrange a schedule or a plan or setup in that industry, not under government ownership but under government supervision, by which you allow management and labor in that industry and representatives of the public actually to govern the industry. Then over that entire thing would be an economic council. Don't say "Fascism." Fascism did have some of those external trends, but this is something new.

Some of you may have wondered why I spent so much time in the beginning of this lecture discussing ethical restraints; why I spent so much time telling you that we had a revolution in the seventeenth century and threw out the window the old notion that man was not supposed to be excessively acquisitive. In our twentieth century it must be made possible for man to control himself, so that he will not beat his own brains out or beat the brains of his fellow men out in an excessive pursuit of material gains, the question to be answered is, "How will that be done?"

God save us from state ownership. I think it is the worst thing in the world. Is it possible to organize an industry, under the control of the people who are working in that industry, and under the control of those whose investment is in that industry, so that those people will work together and not be dedicated to the idea of "Let us rob the public"? I don't know if that is possible. Sometimes I tell the boys in school: "It can work, but you will have to take the whole bunch of us and put us away in a concentration camp for three or four years and allow us to think in between chasing a piece of bread, and recapture this entire slant." That is a horrible thing to think of. Imagine spending three or four years like that. You folks know more about that than I do. I don't want to do it.

But sometimes you go away into these retreats just to think things out. The way our world is moving at the moment, I think you are facing very fast the necessity of moving into the decisive hours where Western man has to learn that critical thing of self-control. People will not die for the preservation of our present society, hence you will have to make our society something worth living for. How it is going to be done I don't know. The labor leaders say, "Here is the sketch; here is the plan. Use the industrial council plan" and they think they have something there. But I am afraid you can't use any law to guarantee success. Man will have to do a little changing inside. How that is going to be changed I don't know. Three years in a concentration camp might be too long.

The third problem I would like to discuss is industrial relations We can be very brief about that, because in this problem of industrial relations I think the all-important thing is to try to bring to our mi: a realization that men can get along peacefully in industry as long as they are agreed on the nature of man. That does not mean management a: labor will see eye to eye every hour. There will always be honest disagreements. But if you have an integrity and an honesty there which results from an agreement on the nature of man, you have the basis for a long-term peace.

Our industrial relations in the United States have been very, very unfortunate. Once again, much of that has been due to lack of proper information. In the early pre-Civil War days we had a grand opportunit to set up a history of fine industrial relations, but we missed it. First unions were regarded as illegal. Then, after unions had been legalized, the word went around and was pretty much accepted that unior were radically inclined and there was something wrong about them. As a result I think it is fair to say that the general attitude on the part of management was: "Knock their heads off. Keep them down. Get a two fisted fellow in there who can cut their noses off." As a result the unions did just that same thing. They had to go out and unconsciously select as their leaders not the managerial type of mind, not the fellow who could sit down with the boss and say: "Now, listen, if we go on strike, the factory is going to close. You are going to go broke and we are going to go broke. We will all lose money and we will all go on relief"; but they had to select that type of mind that we still find in large numbers in industry, and that is the fighter, the man who believe that somewhere, somehow, in every deal that management offers him there is something not too reliable; that management can't be trusted blindly That is the unfortunate thing today, I think, in our country in the fie of industrial relations. We lack that confidence, that willingness to believe that industrial relations are on the level.

Sometime ago at breakfast with Mr. Phillip Murray I was shocked--and I am not easily shocked--by his utter lack of belief or faith in top management. I said, "Mr. Murray, I can't quite understand that." He said, "Brother, don't forget. I went to work at eight years of age. I have seen fellows killed day in and day out back through the years because management wanted to save a nickel or save a dime. Management broke its promises to us." I think it is a horrible situation where there is no trust in the other, no mutual confidence. I think that in our industrial relations today our problem is the problem of building up some degree of mutual understanding.

Sure, labor is frequently ill informed. Aren't we all misinformed sometime or other? Labor has no monopoly on that. Some of the most irregular things I have seen in life have been on the part of management. It is a sorry thing to say, but I think it is fair to say that businessmen would rather do business with men who can be "persuaded" than with honest labor leaders. Isn't that terrible to say? That has

been my experience. I hope I have met the wrong people. They would rather do business with a crafty labor leader, a "deal guy," who will make a deal and accept a trip to Florida or a new car, because always that deal can be made and they can dictate the terms.

Cunning labor leaders are quite frequently kept in control by the collusion and the aid of artful management, incompetent management, where the unreliable labor leader will go to the boss and say, "I am having trouble with some of these fellows. When I give you the name, fire him and have him stay fired." When that chap stands up in the union meeting and questions the leadership of that man, the leader gets hold of him afterward and says, "Shut up if you want to work." If the fellow opens his mouth again and continues talking, next day he is fired, and he stays fired. You have to be quite a courageous man, I think, to go down and take that punishment just for an ideal, particularly when your wife and kiddies are looking for something to eat. Management doesn't seem to be alert to some of those things. Too frequently they fail to look at the calendar. They don't realize that this is 1949.

I will give you another illustration. I was at a meeting of the NAM last June. There was a feeling there that unions were not cooperative, and this question was asked: "What can we do? What can we do to put the unions in their place?" God only knows where their place is. We are never told.

A fellow who owns a factory in the Middle West with about 500 employees said: "Well, the only thing to do is for the businessmen of the United States to band together and have an understanding. Let us cut production by ten percent. Let us throw ten percent of our working force out into the street. That will give us control. That will bring us back to the old days and we will have no more of this disturbance from the labor leaders."

Well, I think they would have to call you fellows out with guns if they tried to do that, don't you think? I don't think people would take that. As I said before, Labor has been often misinformed; it has been radical. I think there are 110,000 people working for unions in the United States. Do you know how many of them are unionized? There are 20,000. And in their own offices at CIO headquarters over here I think they organized their own people in just the last couple of weeks. There are 600 union papers in the United States, but only seven of them are unionized papers, having contracts with the Guild. Sure, unions are frequently ill informed; but they don't hold a monopoly on misinformation. I think management has to learn to be a little bit more understanding also.

I hope I have brought out a few problems and disturbed you a bit. I have certainly enjoyed talking to you.

QUESTION: I wonder if you would care to comment on just how much economic security we could tolerate in our society without deterioratio setting in.

BROTHER JUSTIN: Let me see if I understand you. Do you mean how much economic security we could tolerate?

QUESTION: Yes. You said that one of the great fears that overhan our populace is lack of economic security.

BROTHER JUSTIN: That is right.

QUESTION: The fear that next week you may be out of a job; that you may have no means of supporting your family. This movement that yo speak of is apparently to create economic security, something that will guarantee that a man has a job, that will guarantee that he isn't going to starve, that will guarantee that he will be taken care of somehow. Would you care to comment on how far we can possibly go in that directi

BROTHER JUSTIN: I don't think anybody could give you an answer to that, say, along mathematical lines, to say "Just this far and no further." I think certainly nobody is going to say that you can have a completely regimented society and maintain the heritage that has been ours. Now, how far could this regimentation go before you would have a planning state or before you would have a state which would really become a full-blown police state? I don't know.

But we accept that idea in some fields and nobody seems to be the least bit disturbed about it. Let me give you an illustration. One hundred years ago in England and the United States there were practicall no schools except tuition schools or some schools that were endowed. Ir 1840 and thereafter the public school system came into vogue. The publi school system is Socialism. It is socialized education at work. In the year of our Lord 1949 somebody suggests having the doctors do something in the field of medicine which we have been doing for over a century in the field of education. People say "Socialized medicine. That is communism or some such thing."

But let us get back to one of my earlier statements. Let us try to see these things clearly. In the field of education, we do not call Sta aid socialization; we just call it public education. Why change the nam when we move it into medicine? I don't know how far that answers your question.

QUESTION: Brother Justin, I wonder if you would comment on the effect of industrialization so far as concerns the less educated Negro in the country sections moving into the city; and also the effect of the GI Bill or Rights, the fact that so many less educated people are moving from the farm lands into the cities because they can get treatment, medicines, welfare workers, and so on, rather than starve on the farm.

BROTHER JUSTIN: I think you have left out one individual from that and that is the shrewd politician like Marcantonio. Many of those people who come into the cities are brought into the cities under political leadership. In exchange for moving into the city they secure maybe the first crack at a housing project or other such services. They give in exchange their vote; at least one vote, maybe several. Now, there is the background that we have. Was there some question of what effect that would have? Is that the question?

QUESTION: The question is about the trend. For example, in some of our cities where we had 16 to 17 percent Negro population before the war it has now jumped to 23 and 24 percent. Is there a threat there in industry for the skilled trades? These people come from various communities where either the states or local communities will not recognize the schools for GI training, and yet the municipalities must recognize the school. As a result we have the Negroes and the less educated moving into the cities, causing big slums in Atlanta, Memphis, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. They are moving all the way. The trend is for the ignorant Negro to get some training for industrial work. They are more and more being employed.

BROTHER JUSTIN: The biggest danger there, as I see it, is the growth of one of the most horrible worries in this entire area and that is the growth of the proletariat; that is, those people who really possess no stake in society. I think it is fair to say that as long as a person is living in the country, no matter what agricultural slum he is living in, he is a little bit closer to the soil, a little bit closer to normal living, than a person who piles into one of our city slums. City slums are tough places. You haven't much to live for there. It is from the city slums that the social revolutionary armies have always come. Take all the European outbreaks and I think you will find that it was the city slums that gave those people those trigger-happy hunches, this tough and awful jealousy and hatred. You see some minor illustrations of that in some of these clashes between groups and races in a city like New York. It is a terrible headache.

QUESTION: I believe you made the statement, sir, that our people are at the point where they are not willing to die for our society. I wish you would clarify that just a little bit. I didn't get the meaning of your statement.

BROTHER JUSTIN: I mean just that. For a nation to continue to live, its people must be reasonably contented. They must be reasonably in love with the country and the society in which they live. Consider the people, say, in Harlem. There you are up on the East Side about 116th Street, and you have that blend of the Italian, the Puerto Rican, and the Negro. It is a pretty tough one. I think that is the worst slum I have ever seen. Go three blocks over and you are on Park Avenue.

Now, what is there in that Harlem area to cause a person to thrill to the whole prospect of living? Here you have visible the riches and the swank, you might say, of Park Avenue and Fifth Avenue. If in that area somebody comes along and says, "All this will I give you if you will only follow me," I think they will follow him. That is what I mea by that. I don't think those people are sufficiently interested in our society as it is now constituted. I think in the hands of a leader the would run wild. I have been down to some of their meetings. It is the most scary thing in the world to see some of those meetings and to list to those people under the leadership of a spellbinder. Those people really can be taken in and made to do anything which the leader wishes. That goes for the thousands that you see standing in the streets. I think that if a leader came along and said, "Come, follow me, the town is ours," they would follow him.

QUESTION: What percentage of our society do you think constitutes that group?

BROTHER JUSTIN: That group is what we call an economic slum strictly on a cash basis. We have another group in our society that is very weak. That is not the people from the economic slum, but people from what you might call an intellectual slum. They represent that drifty, starry-eyed, foot-loose type that we label under the preposterous name of "liberal." They are the ones that are going to lead the hungry people. What percentage are they? It depends. Maybe at the worse, 50 percent of a college faculty. Don't look at me. We are described as Irish Fascists. They are the real Fascists.

QUESTION: Sir, you brought out the mutual distrust and hostility that have characterized the relations between capital and labor. I wonder if you have some suggestion as to a program to correct that. Someone will have to do something in order to change that situation. There seems to be no more reason for mutual hostility between capital and labor than between consumers and producers. Consumers and producers have mutually antagonistic ideas about the price of the product, and yet manufacturers spend tremendous sums cultivating the consumers through consumer research to find out what makes them tick. Some agency is going to have to do that in order to eliminate this mutual hostility and mutual suspicion. Who is going to do it?

BROTHER JUSTIN: I would love to see that done. I would love to see an effort made by each individual in what you might call, to use maybe a harsh-sounding term, moral reform; that is, a realization by each and every person that he has certain obligations toward his neighbo and that he has to answer the question to himself, "What is the good life?" and then seek to guide himself by that answer; to get back to that notion that there is an existence of ethical restraints; that some things are good and some things are bad--the general acceptance of that. When we have that, I think we at least will have a working program. It will never become 100 percent efficient, because human beings are human

beings and they always will be falling down and scraping their knees and hurting people around them. I don't know of any other way. It can't be done by law. We can't legislate these things. Of course, we could take this trip to the concentration camp for three years, but that is a horrible prospect.

QUESTION: My question is right in connection with your last remark. Human nature being what it is, we have developed a code of laws which is generally accepted as a means of settling differences between individuals and between individuals and governments. Why do you say it is not possible to establish a code of law by which both capital and labor can agree that their problems could be settled and have it accepted on a general basis?

BROTHER JUSTIN: Possibly I misphrased my thought or maybe accented the wrong word and so confused you. What I meant to say or what I was trying to say was this: I do not put complete confidence in trying to establish man's relationship by law alone, wherein we can say, "We have the law and that is all there is to it." That law is going to be his guide. That law is going to take care of somebody who momentarily is weak, who might otherwise go out and shoot somebody; but we cannot rely on that law completely.

QUESTION: How far can we go with social security? I have a feeling that if everyone becomes completely secure economically, they will then lose all moral fiber. In other words, unless you have to fight for your existence, you become a useless person in this world. Would you care to comment on that?

BROTHER JUSTIN: Yes. I think there might be a few things to be said in that particular area. I hope we never live to see the day when we have what you would call complete 100 percent security. Offhandedly, I know of only two places in the United States where that exists. One is Sing Sing, on the banks of the Hudson, and the other is Alcatraz. In those places we have complete 100 percent security. That I don't want. Now, somewhere in between we have a happy medium, I think, in between what we call rugged individualism and Sing Sing. Can we find the location of that? I don't know. But I am 100 percent in agreement with you on that statement.

QUESTION: I have heard that they have in Mexico a very novel concept concerning the relationship between employer and employee, I assume that you are familiar with such concept. I would like to hear some comment on that.

BROTHER JUSTIN: What concept is that?

QUESTION: I hear that there is an old concept that has been handed down in Mexico that in hiring a man you accept a certain responsibility for the continuity of his employment.

BROTHER JUSTIN: Yes. You also hire his family. That is true. I think it is rather difficult to get rid of any employee who is on a personal relationship around the house. I think that has been changed a bit in industry. The old notion was that when you hired somebody, you took that entire family; and whereas the salary was ridiculously small, the local ground rule was that food, spare clothing, and all these other things went with the job. So you fed and you clothed that particular family, all on the house.

But I don't think in industry that is true. You see, the Mexican unions are completely under the domination of their Communist leaders. In industry the management and capital, I understand, have very little to say about their property. The Red-dominated unions have practically taken their property away from them. That is the setup in industry in Mexico.

QUESTION: I would like to hear your comment regarding strikes in public utilities. Do you think they should be prohibited?

BROTHER JUSTIN: Once again we will have to get a definition. A strike can never be against the common good. I am standing now in front of a group of people who I am firmly convinced should not be allowed to strike, because when a person goes into the Service, just as when a person becomes a doctor or a nurse, I think it is understood in that area that you are not forced to enter, but once you enter that area, tacitly you agree that in order to get a raise or better working conditions you will give up your right to strike. How far does that go? What are those areas? Should a policeman be allowed to strike? Should a fireman? Then we come around to school teachers and people running the utilities. I think somewhere along there, there is a line which we have to find. The people on one side of that line will not be allowed to strike; those on the other side will be. Don't ask me where the line is drawn.

MAJOR McLAY: Brother Justin has been very gracious in answering our questions.

On behalf of the Commandant and the students I thank you very much, sir.

(25 March 1949--450)S.