

Cox, Ignatius W.
Social or anti-social...
ADM 6643

777663

Social or Anti - Social Wages?

By

I. W. COX, S.J.

*Professor of Ethics
Fordham University*

54



*First Printing
Fifth Thousand*

**THE AMERICA PRESS
NEW YORK**

REFERENCES

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Nell-Breuning: *Reorganization of Social Economy*. Tr. by Dempsey, S.J. (Bruce.) This book is considered one of the best on the Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno."
- J. A. Ryan, D.D.: *Distributive Justice*. (Macmillan.)
- J. A. Ryan, D.D.: *A Living Wage*. (Macmillan.)
- J. A. Ryan, D.D.: *Social Reconstruction*. (Macmillan.)
- J. Husslein, S.J.: *Work, Wealth and Wages*. (Matre.)
- J. Husslein, S.J.: *Democratic Industry*. (Kenedy.)
- J. Husslein, S.J.: *The World Problem*. (Kenedy.)
- J. Husslein, S.J.: *The Bible and Labor*. (Macmillan.)
- Ryan-Husslein: *The Church and Labor*. (Macmillan.)
- I. W. Cox, S.J.: *Liberty—Its Use and Abuse*, Vol. II. (Fordham.)
- H. Parkinson, D.D.: *Primer of Social Science*. (Devin-Adair.)
- L. McKenna, S.J.: *The Church and Labor*. (Kenedy.)
- Joseph Och: *Primer of Political Economy*. (Columbus, Josephinum College.)
- Lorenzo, Dardano: *Elements of Social and Political Economy*. (Dublin, Gill.)
- Joseph Clayton: *Economics for Christians*. (Herder.)
- L. Watt, S.J.: *Capitalism and Morality*. (London, Cassell.)
- L. Watt, S.J.: *Catholic Social Principles*. (London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne.)
- J. C. Harrington: *Catholicism, Capitalism or Communism*. (St. Paul, Lohman.)
- Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.: *Catholic Ideals in Social Life*. (London, Art and Book.)
- L. Garriguet: *Social Value of the Gospel*. (Wagner.)
- J. E. Ross: *Consumers and Wage Earners*. (Devin-Adair.)
- C. S. Devas: *Key to the World's Progress*. (Longmans.)
- F. J. Haas: *Man and Society*. (Century.)
- J. Bampton, S.J.: *Christianity and Reconstruction*. (Herder.)
- B. Elder: *A Study in Socialism*. (Herder.)
- J. C. Kelleher: *Private Ownership*. (Dublin, Gill.)
- D. A. McLean: *Morality of the Strike*. (Kenedy.)
- E. Schmiedeler, O.S.B.: *Introducing Study of the Family*. (Century.)
- Muntsch, S.J., and Spalding, S.J.: *Introductory Sociology*. (Heath.)
- E. J. Burke, S.J.: *Political Economy*. (American Book Co.)
- M. Cronin: *Primer of the Principles of Social Science*. (Benziger.)
- G. Metlake: *Christian Social Reform*. (Dolphin Press.)
- A. J. Hogan, S.J.: *Economic Recovery*. 5c. (America Press.)
- J. A. Smith: *Social Reconstruction*. 5c. (America Press.)
- J. F. MacDonnell, S.J.: *An Approach to Social Justice; and Religion and the Social Revolution*. 5c each. (America Press.)

(Continued on page 24)

Imprimi Potest:

JOSEPH A. MURPHY, S.J., *Provincial Maryland-New York*.

Nihil Obstat:

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S.T.D., *Censor Librorum*.

Imprimatur:

✠ PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES, *Archbishop of New York*.

July 24, 1937.

Copyright, 1937, by THE AMERICA PRESS.

Deacidified

Wages and Our Immoral Economic Order



EVERY individual man has the absolute right from nature and nature's God, to a use in sufficiency of the material goods of this world.* This truth is undeniable in the light of the nature of man and the nature of material goods.

God puts every individual into this glorious universe with a solemn obligation to develop himself physically, intellectually, above all, morally. Virtuous living is the supreme end of man in this world, in order that by virtuous living man may win everlasting happiness in the world to come. Now for the fulfilment of each man's duty on earth, a sufficiency of material goods is a normal necessity for man. No less an authority than the standard bearer of Catholic theologians, St. Thomas Aquinas, points out the close connection between material goods in sufficiency and the life of virtue demanded by the natural and moral law.

Here are the very words of St. Thomas:¹ "For the good life of man two things are required, of which the principal one is to act in accordance with virtue. Virtue is that by which a life is well led. The other thing is secondary and as it were instrumental, namely, a sufficiency of material goods, which is necessary for virtuous living." Again the great theologian declares:² "A superabundance of riches and beggarly poverty must be avoided by those who wish to lead a virtuous life, in so far as both are occasions of sin. Abundance of riches furnishes occasion for pride: and poverty is the occasion for thieving, lying or even perjury."

These were the sins occasioned by poverty in the mind of the great Doctor of the Church. I wonder what St. Thomas would say today, if he were to behold the spectacle, occasioned by poverty, of the widespread and wholesale frustration of one of man's noblest and most powerful instincts, the family instinct. I wonder what he would say at the spectacle of so many Christians, even Catholics, either unable to understand, or indifferent to the close connection

* These articles were first given as broadcasts over the Paulist radio station WLWL.

¹ *De Regimine Principum*, L. I, C. XV, about the middle.

² *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 40, a. 3.

between a sufficiency of material goods and virtuous living for the masses. I can well imagine the amazement of this brilliant intellect, at the smug, smooth satisfied way in which so many followers of Christ accept our immoral economic order, nursing but one fear—a craven fear of Socialism, a fear that makes them spit out that word, Socialism, to blast with it every attempt at reform. I know that the great Doctor, in his simple, powerful and telling words, would point out in a way beyond my ability, how wrong it is, how immoral, how utterly indefensible, that so many millions should be denied the minimum sufficiency of those material goods which are necessary for virtue, and *that* in an era when human ingenuity can produce a sufficiency for all.

When, oh when, will intelligent men, God-fearing men, above all, Catholic men, see that our present economic order is a mechanism of anti-Christ for the destruction of human souls? When will the scales of blindness fall off the eyes of all, especially leaders, so they can appreciate and remedy the situation so graphically described by Pius XI:³ “Nevertheless, it may be said with all truth, that nowadays the conditions of social and economic life are such, that vast multitudes of men can only with great difficulty pay attention to that one thing necessary; namely, their eternal salvation. . . . For this pitiable ruin of souls, . . . there can be no remedy other than a frank and sincere return to the teaching of the gospel. . . . All those versed in social matters demand a rationalization of economic life which will introduce sound and true order. . . . This is the perfect order which the Church preaches with intense earnestness, and which right reason demands; which places God as the first and supreme end of all created activity, and regards all created goods as mere instruments under God, to be used only in so far as they help towards the attainment of our supreme end.” Could any philosophy be simpler, plainer, or truer?

Do you know that private property is only an instrument, a mechanism, ordained by God, in order that material goods may truly serve their purpose of being useful for all men? Do you know that by the intention of nature and nature’s God, it is through the instrumentality of private property that all men are to have the use of material goods in that sufficiency required for virtuous living? The use of

³ *Quadragesimo Anno*, pp. 297-300, America Press edition.

material things by all, individually and collectively, is the very end and purpose and reason of private property. It is on this basis that rational ethics and the Catholic Church defend private property. Listen to Pius XI in a passage I have often quoted to you before and will quote until I get it ringing in your ears, until you repeat it again and again, and hand it on and transmit it to others. It is the answer to that un-Christian, that pagan idea of private property, which is held by so many unknowing Christians and Catholics. The Holy Father declares that private property has a twofold aspect, one individual, for the good of the *individual* who possesses it, and one *social*, for the common good of *all*. He further declares:⁴ "The right to own private property has been given to man by nature, or rather by the Creator Himself, not only in order that individuals may be able to provide for their own needs and those of their families, but also that by means of it, the goods which the Creator has destined for the human race may truly serve this purpose."

So the possessors of large fortunes, the fortunate property owners in this country, possess their riches not only for themselves but for others. They are not the irresponsible owners; they are the responsible stewards of God's wealth. How can the property of individuals be for the good of others? I answer with Pius XI; the right to own property is one thing; the proper use of property is another. The rich have most grave obligations of charity, beneficence, and liberality, with regard to their superfluous income. Moreover, the State itself by legitimate laws can see to it that superfluous income is properly distributed. As Pius XI says:⁵ "It follows from the twofold character of ownership which we have called individual and social, that men must take into account in this matter, not only their own advantage, but also the common good. To define in detail these duties, when the need occurs and when the natural law does not do so, is the function of government; provided that the natural and divine law be observed, the public authority, in view of the common good, may specify more accurately what is licit and what is illicit for property owners in the use of their possessions."

⁴ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 271.

⁵ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 272.

Now all this may seem strange and revolutionary even to many Catholic ears. As a matter of fact the difference between ownership and the proper use of ownership is a logical deduction from the very nature of the institution of private property. Private property is an instrument of nature whereby not only the individual owner, but all men may have a use of material things in that sufficiency required for virtuous living. Private property is a logical deduction from the right of all free human beings to use material goods. The limitation in the use of private property, so that it may not only serve the advantage of the owner but also the common good is equally a logical deduction from the right of all men to use material goods in sufficiency. The very argument which establishes the right of private ownership also limits its extent and use.

Make no mistake about this. What I am saying is fundamental, rational, and likewise Catholic doctrine with regard to private property. This teaching comes down from the days of Aristotle, hundreds of years before the Christian era. Aristotle said: "It is evident that it is better to have property private, but make the use of it common." St. Thomas, centuries after, taught the same truth and improved it, for he tells us quite plainly that as regards the power of acquiring and dispensing material goods, man may lawfully possess them as his own: as regards their use, a man ought not to look upon them as his own but as common."⁶

Now this does not mean in the mind, either of St. Thomas or of Catholic moralists and teachers of ethics, that anyone can simply walk in and use the material goods of those who have become private owners of them. What it does mean and means most emphatically is that property owners have a most sacred and solemn obligation under God and the natural law to use their rights of property in such a way that non-owners may have access to their goods on reasonable terms. If one man or a small group of men, by what is an impossible conjecture, got legitimate control of all the land in the United States, their right of ownership, would not and could not, exclude the right of the people of this country to get access to the land or the fruits of the land, on fair and reasonable terms and by just contracts.

Today, as is evident, the only way that multitudes of

⁶ Cf. *S. T.*, II, II, q. 66, a. 2.

men can get access to the material goods they need for support of life and for virtuous living is by letting out their labor by a wage contract to property owners, that is, those who control at least ultimately, a certain amount of material goods. Remember this and keep it well in mind! All men have a right to the use of material goods in the sufficiency necessary for virtuous living. Ownership of property cannot and does not mean the right to deny men the legitimate use of these material goods. Ownership by a few to the exclusion of use by the many is indefensible. The only way that the vast majority of men can get access to these goods for use is by working for a wage.

A wage in money is nothing else under this aspect than a demand on material goods. Since all men have a right to a wage this will in reality constitute a demand on material goods in the sufficiency required for healthy and virtuous living. If employers of labor, who can do so, do not pay a wage sufficient to constitute a demand on material goods, in a sufficiency for right human and humane living, then in the light of all rational ethics, in the light of all authoritative Christian social teaching, they are depriving the wage earner of what is his absolute right. The right to use material goods in a sufficiency is an absolute right of every man; it is a right prior and antecedent to any acquired right of property. The very right of private property is founded on and established by the antecedent right of man to use material things in sufficiency.

Listen to the words of the brilliant Pontiff, Leo XIII:⁷ "The labor of the workingman is not only his personal attribute, it is necessary; and that makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of one and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required to live; and the poor can acquire it no other way than by work and wages. Let it be granted that as a rule workman and employer should freely agree as to wage, nevertheless, there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or

⁷ *Rerum Novarum*, pp. 25, 26, America Press edition.

contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice."

When we turn the pitiless searchlight of these true and undeniable principles of rational ethics and Christian social doctrine on the wage situation in our immoral economic order, what do we find? A condition which would make devils rock with laughter and bring multitudinous tears to the eyes of the guardian angels of men. For some time past, I have been studying wages by personal inquiry. What I have learned makes me suspect that there is in many quarters simply a wholesale violation of essential justice.

In this whole matter, I am only speaking of those employers who can pay a living wage but refuse to do so. The condition of those who through no fault of their own cannot in all honesty pay more is determined by other principles. We read about a Protestant Minister with his wife and three children who is testing out the \$8.55, that is allowed for food for families on relief. The papers say that this family is going hungry with meat once a week on that amount for diet. Well, how about the families of the men who only have a total income for all purposes of \$70 a month or \$17.50 a week? And this in the midst of a country called Christian and civilized, where the privileged are uniting to defend their American rights to conduct their businesses as they please, which may well mean in the perverted mentality of some the paying of starvation wages.

What must amaze and disgust right thinking men and women in this whole wage question throughout the country is the blindness and stupidity of employers who can pay a living and generous wage, and deny it at a moment when the red serpent of Communism is stalking through the land, making trouble and seeking trouble, and waxing fat and bold on economic distress. Such employers are harvesting Communistic fodder by a denial of a living wage. As Pius XI says:⁸ "Even more severely must we condemn the foolhardiness of those who neglect to remove or modify such conditions as exasperate the minds of the people and prepare the way for the ruin and overthrow of the social order."

The *New York Times* (March 7) quoted an industrialist leader as saying in connection with the service strike that there was need of legislation to protect the public from

⁸ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 291.

irresponsible labor leaders. And I submit that there is the same need of legislation to protect the public and the workers from irresponsible leaders of capital and industry. For in the same issue of the *New York Times*, we read of a police investigation of some characters used for strike breaking. A professional strike breaker, giving his services at an enormous daily wage, to break a justifiable strike is one of the most tragic phenomena of our immoral economic order. He is a Benedict Arnold to the cause of humanity; a vulture that fixes his talons in the prostrate body of the impoverished workers, to fatten himself on the victims of injustice. What should be said of the agencies which employ professional strike breakers for such purposes?

In the meantime, it is heartening to notice that the cause of a living wage gains sympathy from the consumers and the public at large. That is a mentality that will do more than anything else to rectify our immoral economic order. The public and the consumers have in their hands the power of bringing about a true regime of Social Justice and our great task as Catholics is to propagate the correct principles of social justice of Leo XIII and Pius XI. May I ask my hearers to get and study a work called the "Social Manifesto," by Joseph Husslein, S.J., and published by the Bruce Publishing Company. In it are the texts and explanation of Catholic social doctrine. Know this book from cover to cover and inside out; talk, write and preach the principles therein contained. Let us change the mentality of the masses and the war is won. Neither perverted capitalism nor perverted Communism can resist for long a correct mentality of the masses. Ballots not bullets supporting this correct mentality on social justice will win the day. Legislators will not dare to resist the will of an aroused right thinking electorate. And there is need of quick action. Speaking of the need of an ample sufficiency for the workingman and his economic security, Pius XI says:⁹ "We emphasize them with renewed insistence; for unless serious attempts be made, with all energy and without delay to put them in practice, let no one persuade himself that the peace and tranquillity of human society can be effectively defended against the forces of revolution."

After the former King of England, Edward VIII, had paid

⁹ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 278.

a visit to the slums of Glasgow and then the new gigantic and luxurious liner, the *Queen Mary*, he turned to one near him and asked: "How do you reconcile a world that has produced this mighty ship with the slums we have just visited?" The luxury of the *Queen Mary* and the dark desolation of Glasgow slums can only be reconciled in the mentality of those who prefer matter to mind, magnitude to men. The modern mind has made a god of bigness in business, in production, in profits. To these the modern mind has sacrificed man himself as the ancient Pharaohs sacrificed an army of slaves to the bigness of the pyramids. The problem we have today is to teach the modern mind to prefer men to money and the perfection of man to a pyramid of profits. That is our task to work for man and humanity, to make man better and by better men to make a better universe.

It is of this that Leo XIII spoke in his encyclical on "Christian Democracy":¹⁰ "To make the condition of those who toil more tolerable; to enable them to obtain, little by little, those means by which they may provide for the future, to help them to practice in public and private the duties which morality and religion inculcate; to aid them to feel that they are not animals but men, not heathens but Christians, and so to enable them to strive more zealously and more eagerly for the one thing necessary; that ultimate good for which we are all born into the world."

A Living Wage and Our Immoral Economic Order

IN the preceding broadcast I said that I have been making, whenever the opportunity offered, little personal investigations as to wages paid in various industries. A week ago, I was alone in the elevator of a midtown building with the man operator. "How much do you earn, boy?" I inquired. The answer was \$22 a week. "Are you married?" I continued. "Yes," was the reply. "Have you any children?" I persisted. "No!" was the curt answer. "We can't live on \$22 a week. My wife has to go to work."

¹⁰ *The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII* (Benziger), p. 485.

For the last two broadcasts, I have been insisting on the idea that every individual has an absolute right to use of the material goods of this world, in a sufficiency for human, humane and virtuous living. I have tried to bring home to you the idea that virtuous living is the end of man's earthly existence, and that sufficiency of material goods is an instrument designed by nature and nature's God to assist man in virtuous living. I have called attention repeatedly to the fact that our present economic order is immoral because it puts so many in the condition wherein, according to Pius XI:¹¹ "Vast multitudes can only with great difficulty pay attention to that one thing necessary, namely, their eternal salvation." Of course, an immoral economic order can never justify one sin by a single individual.

In these broadcasts I have repeated and will repeat in season and out of season that the human right to use material goods in sufficiency, as a help and an instrumentality to virtuous living is a right antecedent to and prevalent over any acquired right of property. I have likewise emphasized in the words of St. Thomas that man has a right to private property but that its use should be common in the sense that others through just contracts and especially the wage contract, should have access to the material goods represented by property.

Now, who would say that the elevator operator, working for \$22 a week, was working under an equitable contract, if the wages paid for his work do not represent that demand on goods for use in sufficiency to which he has a right from nature and nature's God? Who can maintain the thesis that, provided the business for which he works is a sound and profit-making business, the elevator operator is not a victim of an immoral economic order in being forced to accept a wage insufficient to demand goods necessary for the support of a wife and family in decent and frugal comfort?

Listen to the words of Pius XI in his encyclical on "Chaste Marriage." Speaking of the occasions of sin to married couples, arising from straitened economic circumstances, the Holy Father says:¹² "So in the first place an effort must be made to obtain that which Our Predecessor, Leo XIII, of happy memory, has already required, namely, that in the

¹¹ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 297.

¹² P. 38, America Press edition.

State such economic and social methods should be set up as will enable every head of a family to earn as much as according to his station in life, is necessary for himself, his wife and for the rearing of his children, for 'the laborer is worthy of his hire.' To deny this or to make light of what is equitable is a grave injustice and is placed among the greatest sins by Holy Writ. Nor is it lawful to fix such a scanty wage as will be insufficient for the upkeep of the family in the circumstances in which it is placed."

All this ought to be as clear as the noonday sun to the Christian and Catholic mind. All this follows from the right of all men, based on the clear intent of nature and nature's God, to a use in sufficiency of the material goods necessary and appropriate for human and humane, decent and virtuous living. On what principle are the higher-ups in a given sound and profit-making industry entitled to enormous salaries, as long as the lower-downs are deprived of a living wage? There is nothing in rational ethics or Christianity that can defend this practice.

And yet we find Catholics so unconsciously the victims of the perverted Capitalistic ideas in which all of us have been brought up that they defend or smooth over or do not vividly realize the utter iniquity and wrongfulness of the situation. When a strike for a living wage was at its height, a Catholic professional man, educated and intelligent, who would never refuse any appeal I made to him in the name of charity, sat in my room and expressed the opinion, when I was condemning the wages paid to the workers, that they did not deserve any more. "Deserve any more!" I exclaimed. "Can this large industry run its business without the aid of the workers?" This is one of the essential points of this whole matter of a living wage. In the words of Leo XIII, "Capital cannot do without labor, nor labor without capital."¹³

The product of so insignificant a thing as a household pin is the output of a thousand hands all engaged in a social, a cooperative work, to produce goods for the use of all. Capital cannot do without labor and labor cannot do without capital. And in this social and cooperative work in which labor is engaged, the normal able-bodied laborer is entitled as a result of his labor to a demand on goods for

¹³ *Rerum Novarum*, p. 11.

use in the sufficiency necessary for human and humane living. Call that demand on goods, wages, or money, or what you will, but if the laborer does not get as a result of his labor, use of goods in a sufficiency, he is being deprived of what is his human right for the part he plays in what is a cooperative and social work. A sufficiency of goods for use in human, humane, frugal and decent living is the due of every laborer working for a going concern. In the words of Leo XIII:¹⁴ "To defraud anyone of wages that are his due is a crime which cries to the avenging anger of heaven."

Let us look into this matter a little deeper. Why is every able-bodied worker for a going concern entitled to a wage which in reality constitutes a demand on goods sufficient for human and humane, decent and frugal living? And here we must examine a difficulty raised by the school of economic liberalism of *laissez faire* on which our modern perverted capitalistic system is founded. Liberalism and *laissez faire* stand for freedom. If the laborer freely agrees to work for a given wage, even though that wage is not a living wage, has not the employer satisfied all the demands of justice by paying him the wage agreed upon? This age-old and hoary objection is being raised today.

In answer, I say there is a twofold aspect to labor. One is a personal aspect. If you look at labor as a merely personal thing, the laborer is free to work for any wage, or no wage, or not to work at all. But labor, besides being personal is a necessary thing. It is necessary for man to labor in order to preserve and develop his life to that perfection demanded by a strict command of the natural law. Without labor man cannot preserve and develop his life physically, intellectually, and morally, and thus glorify God by virtuous living. Hence labor is necessary for man and the reward of this necessary labor is by natural right the necessary material goods without which human development and perfection, especially moral, is normally very difficult.

All this is contained in the words of Leo XIII, answering the principles of economic liberalism or *laissez faire*:¹⁵

To labor is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life, and most of all, for self-preservation. "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread." Therefore, a

¹⁴ *Rerum Novarum*, p. 12.

¹⁵ *Rerum Novarum*, pp. 25, 26.

man's labor has two notes or characters. First of all, it is personal. Secondly, a man's labor is necessary; for without the results of labor a man cannot live; and self-conservation is a law of nature, which it is wrong to disobey. Now if we were to consider labor merely so far as it is personal, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages. But, the labor of the workingman is not only personal, but it is necessary and that makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required to live; and the poor can acquire it in no other way than by work and wages. There is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions, he is the victim of force and injustice."

Could anything be more clear cut and convincing than this rebuke by Leo XIII to the perverted capitalism of his day in its denial of a living wage? Liberty of contract in the wage engagement is the cry of the advocate of *laissez faire* and economic liberalism. Liberty of contract in the wage engagement is the very basis and foundation upon which the wrong-thinking capitalist finds it possible to deny a living wage. A denial of a living wage based on liberty of contract is both immoral in such a denial and immoral in the basis and foundation assigned for it.

The acceptance by the worker of a non-living wage in the so-called liberty of wage contract is neither based on the free contract of the workingman nor the free contract of the employer. It is not based on the free contract of the workingman; for the workingman is no more free in the acceptance of a non-living wage than the innocent wayfarer who hands over his purse to a bandit at the point of a pistol. The workingman at the point of the gun of economic necessity hands over the true price and value of his work to the unscrupulous employer, not by a free contract, but because he is forced to do so for fear of a greater evil.

Nor does a denial of a living wage by a so-called free contract represent liberty of contract on the part of the employer. No man is morally free to make an immoral contract. Such a contract is not liberty but license. Liberty unrestrained by moral law and justice is the license of a bandit, not the liberty of a free and moral man. The employer in the wage contract who denies a living wage, when

he is capable of paying one, is engaged in the same kind of license displayed by the footpad in holding up an innocent wayfarer. If the individualist hopes to satisfy his own conscience or to defend himself before the bar of righteous public opinion in the persistent denial of a living wage, he will have to think up some better defense than the hoary and exploded myth of liberty of contract.

Pius XI, forty years after Leo XIII, gives us principle after principle by which to demonstrate that the workingman has a right to wages, constituting in fact a demand on material goods in a sufficiency necessary for human and humane and decent living. He shows how States grow rich not only by the toil of employer and employed but also by the beneficence of the Creator in His liberal grant of natural resources. Then he shows how through private property these natural resources are to be for the benefit of all. "Now, the natural law, or rather, God's will manifested by it, demands that right order be observed in the application of natural resources to human needs; and this order consists in every thing having its proper owner." Then the Holy Father shows how private property should work to the benefit of all:¹⁶

Hence it follows that unless a man apply his labor to his own property, an alliance must be formed between his toil and his neighbor's property; for each is helpless without the other. . . . It is therefore false to ascribe the results of their combined efforts to either party alone; and it is flagrantly unjust that either should deny the efficacy of the other and seize all the profits.

After this Pius XI is led to a discussion of the just distribution of the wealth socially created by the cooperation of capital and labor. Listen to the vigorous words of the fearless Pontiff:¹⁷

Each class must receive its due share, and the distribution of created goods must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good and social justice. For every sincere observer is conscious that the vast differences between the few who hold excessive wealth and the many who live in destitution constitute a grave evil in modern society. . . . The immense number of propertyless wage earners on the one hand, and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few on the other is an unanswerable argument that the earthly

¹⁶ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 274.

¹⁷ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 276.

goods, so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism are far from rightly distributed and equitably shared among the various classes of men.

Then Pius XI, from the vantage point of the Vatican, solemnly declares, that unless these reforms are attempted "with all energy and without delay, let nobody persuade himself that the peace and tranquillity of human society can be effectively defended against the forces of revolution."¹⁸ There is the answer to those Catholics who are so ardently tilting against Communism and not at all interested in the reform of our immoral economic order. In what shall the reform consist? Listen to Pius XI:¹⁹ "Every effort must be made that at least in the future a just share only of the fruits of production be permitted to accumulate in the hands of the wealthy, and that an ample sufficiency be supplied to the workingmen."

And how is this distribution to take place? In the mind of Pius XI by a rightful and living wage. Listen to his words:²⁰

This program cannot, however, be realized unless the wage earner without property be placed in such circumstances that by skill and thrift, he can acquire a certain moderate ownership. . . . But how can he save money except from his wages and by living sparingly, who has nothing but his labor by which to obtain food and the necessaries of life. Let us turn, therefore, to the question of wages which Leo XIII held to be "of great importance," stating and explaining where necessary principles and precepts.

And the principles of Pius XI of course are the same as those of Leo XIII:²¹

Every effort must be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs. If in the present state of society this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee to every adult workingman just such a wage.

That it has been feasible in the past and is feasible today for many American industries to pay just such a living wage, I think is self-evident from the high salaries and high profits in many American businesses. That such a wage has not been paid is because our economic and financial order

¹⁸ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 278.

¹⁹ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 277.

²⁰ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 278.

²¹ *Quadr. Anno*, pp. 279, 280.

is immoral, is organized not for human need but for human greed. If our American economic and financial order was organized for human need, it would fulfil the ideal laid down by Pius XI:²²

For, then only will the economic and social organism be soundly established and attain its end when it secures for all and each those goods which the wealth and resources of nature, technical achievement, and the social organization of economic affairs can give. These goods should be sufficient to supply all needs and an honest livelihood and to uplift to that higher level of prosperity and culture, which provided it be used with prudence, is not only not a hindrance, but is of singular help to virtue.

I think all will agree with me that here in America we have the wealth and the resources and the technical achievement to develop the better economic order proposed by Pius XI. Instead of that we have developed an immoral economic order which is not only not a help but a hindrance to virtuous living. If we look for the reason, we find selfishness, unbridled and sordid greed, an almost universal departure from sound rational and Christian ideas on the end and purpose of property and economic production. We are not organized economically for production but for profit, not organized primarily for man and morality but for the madness of mere money making. And this false and pagan organization of our economic life, this immoral economic order is the occasion of the pitiable ruin of human bodies and souls alike.

In the words of Pius XI:²³

How universally has the true Christian spirit become impaired, which formerly produced such lofty sentiments even in uncultured and illiterate men. In its stead, man's one solicitude is to obtain his daily bread in any way he can. And so bodily labor, which was decreed by Providence for the good of man's body and soul, has everywhere changed into an instrument of man's perversion; for dead matter leaves the factory ennobled and transformed, where men are corrupted and degraded.

If we are to save men's bodies and souls, we must change our immoral economic order by changing the pagan mentality of men with regard to the end and purpose of property and production. I am bold enough to say we must change

²² *Quadr. Anno*, p. 281.

²³ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 299.

most radically the mentality of many Catholics and Catholic leaders, and make the mentality of Catholics a Catholic mentality with regard to the purposes of property and production.

In the *Commonweal* I read: "Every Catholic editor is painfully aware of the strong and unfortunately, sometimes bitter divisions among American Catholics on the subject of Social Justice and the papal teaching on that supremely important of all temporal problems." The apostolate of clergy and laity in our present pagan society is an economic apostolate. Therein lies the salvation of souls purchased by the life blood of the heart of Christ. Pius XI urges the clergy to seek diligently and to select prudently and to train fittingly lay apostles for the principles of social reconstruction among workingmen and employers. And he says: "No easy task is here imposed upon the clergy, wherefore all candidates for the sacred priesthood must be adequately prepared to meet it by intense study of social matters."²⁴

The end and object of these broadcasts has been to arouse interest in the social teaching of Catholicism. I have received words of encouragement and approval from prelates, priests, the laity and even from non-Catholics. Words of approval have come from Prince Edward Island in Canada in the extreme east and from California in the far west. For this interest I am grateful and by it I am immeasurably encouraged. Let us form a great brotherhood of prayer for Social Justice. No human power can change our immoral economic order. Only God can send us the fearless and wise leadership we need. In the meantime, each of us, you and I, will carry on for God and country. We cannot fail, if we rely on God and true Christian principles.

Anti-Social Wages and Our Immoral Economic Order

I HAVE advanced over and over again the principle that every human being has an absolute right to a use of material goods necessary and appropriate for right human living. Such right human living is virtuous living, or living the

²⁴ *Quadr. Anno*, p. 304.

good life, which is the happy life, by which man prepares himself for eternal happiness in the life beyond the grave. Use of material goods in sufficiency is an instrumentality for the good, happy and virtuous life. Private property is a mechanism of nature, designed by nature and nature's God that all men, and every man, may have an ordered sufficiency of material goods.

Private ownership, therefore, has a twofold aspect; it is designed for the good of the individual, who possesses it, and also for the common good of all. The greatest of Catholic theologians, St. Thomas says that as regards the power of acquiring and dispensing material goods, man may lawfully possess them as his own; as regards their use man ought to look on them, not as his own, but as common.²⁵ The use of privately owned goods becomes common in one way when the property owner permits others to have access to them by just contracts, especially in our day, by the wage contract. Since every able-bodied worker has an absolute right to a use of material goods in sufficiency for human and humane living, for the good, happy and virtuous life, his wage contract should represent a demand in reality on material goods sufficient for such a life.

Now what is an equitable wage calculated in terms of a bare sufficiency of material goods necessary for human, humane, happy and virtuous living? According to Prof. Broadus Mitchell, of Johns Hopkins University, in his book, *A Preface to Economics*:²⁶

In August, 1919, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics made a study of the cost of maintaining the family of a government employee (husband, wife and three children below fourteen) in Washington at a health and decency level. This involved the making up of a "quantity budget" of the actual items the family would need, and ascertainment of the prices which would have to be paid for these items at the time. The government agents, in composing the budget, meant to have it provide: enough food to maintain health, particularly the children's health; housing in low rent neighborhoods and in the smallest number of rooms consistent with decency; the upkeep of household equipment, but with no provision for purchase of furniture; warm clothing of lasting quality, with good enough appearance to preserve self-respect; street-car fares for work and shopping; a modest amount of insurance; medical and dental care; contributions to churches, unions, lodges; simple amusements, such as moving pictures once in a while, occasional street-car rides

²⁵ Cf. S. T., II, II, q. 66, a. 2.

²⁶ Published by Henry Holt & Co., 1932, p. 299.

for pleasure, some Christmas gifts for the children and so on. This budget does not include many comforts which should be included in a proper American standard of living. Thus no provision is directly made for savings other than insurance, nor for vacations, nor for books and other educational purposes. This budget it was found, would cost at market prices \$2,262.47.

This minimum use of goods in sufficiency expressed in terms of money at its current value, for happy and holy living, would seem to fit in with the minds of the two great social Popes, Leo XIII and Pius XI, except that they also demand the possibility of savings so that the worker may become a property owner. A denial of this minimum sufficiency in material goods to a family would seem to be the denial of a social wage. As Pius XI says in his Encyclical on *Christian Marriage*:²⁷

So in the first place an effort must be made to obtain that which Our predecessor, Leo XIII, of happy memory, has already required, namely, that in the State such economic and social methods should be set up as will enable every head of a family to earn as much as, according to his station in life, is necessary for himself, his wife, and for the rearing of his children, for "the laborer is worthy of his hire." To deny this or to make light of what is equitable is a grave injustice and is placed among the greatest sins by Holy Writ; nor is it lawful to fix such a scanty wage as will be insufficient for the upkeep of the family in the circumstances in which it is placed.

Pius XI in *The Reconstruction of the Social Order* says:²⁸

Every effort must be made, therefore, that at least in the future a just share only of the fruits of production be permitted to accumulate in the hands of the wealthy and that an ample sufficiency be supplied to the workman. The purpose is not that these become slack at their work, for man is born to labor as the bird to fly, but that by thrift they may increase their possessions and by the prudent management of the same may be enabled to bear the family burden with greater ease and security, being freed from that hand-to-mouth uncertainty, which is the lot of the proletariat.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1918-19 investigated the cost of living in ninety-two industrial centers, ranging from New York City to small towns in forty-two States. The average number of persons in the families investigated was 4.9. The total average earnings per family were \$1,513.29 per year. As Professor Mitchell says in this connection:

²⁷ P. 38.

²⁸ P. 277.

This study, when compared with others made at the same time, showed that the vast majority of these families were not receiving enough to live at a health and decency level. More than three-fourths of them did not receive, from all sources, enough income to equal the \$1,760 found necessary by Professor Ogburn, and ninety-one per cent were under the \$2,262 set up for the budget for a minor government employee in Washington.

Now let us turn to the year 1929, ten years later. I have before me a book entitled *America's Capacity to Consume*, prepared by the Brookings Institution, of Washington, D. C., and published in 1934. In this book we read: "A family income of \$2,500 was in 1929, and despite the decline of prices, still is, a very moderate one. It permits few of the luxuries of life, even for families of only two or three persons" (p. 119). The Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture has estimated the costs of three types of diet, to supply the physiological needs of an average family, the adequate diet at minimum cost, \$500 a year, the adequate diet at moderate cost providing more balance and variety, \$800, and the liberal diet, providing still greater variety and better quality, \$900 per year. On the basis of the 1930 census there were 27,474,000 families in the United States consisting of more than one person. Of these families nearly 6,000,000, or more than twenty-one per cent, had incomes less than \$1,000. If they spent \$500 for the minimum adequate diet, they would have \$500 left to meet all other expenses. Twelve million of these families, or forty per cent of families in the United States, received less than a yearly income of \$1,500. If they spent \$500 a year for diet, they would have \$1,000 a year for all expenses. Twenty million of the total 27,000,000 families, namely, seventy-one per cent had less than \$2,500 a year, which would only demand a supply in goods for moderate sufficiency, whilst forty-two per cent fell below that money income capable of buying goods in that moderate sufficiency required by a social wage. And notice this, one-tenth of one per cent of the families in the higher brackets of income received as much as the forty-two per cent in the lower brackets. To make it more concrete, 11,653,000 families received in annual income \$10,000,000,000, whilst 36,000 families received approximately the same income of \$10,000,000,000. Is not this a fairly good illustration of the words of Pius XI: "For every sincere observer is conscious that the vast differ-

ences between those who hold excessive wealth and the many who are in destitution constitute a grave evil in modern society."

I have been making for some time newspaper clippings of wages paid in various industries and services. Let me cite a few of these. From the *World-Telegram*, July 2, 1935: "Minimum wages ranging from \$8.64 to \$14.40 a week for women employees of hotels and restaurants were recommended in a report submitted today to State Industrial Commissioner Elmer F. Andrews, by the Hotel and Restaurant Wage Board." It is to be noted that the minimum wage recommended represents 449.28 a year; the maximum, \$748.80 a year. This was before the declaration of the unconstitutionality of the National Recovery Act. Commenting on this report to Commissioner Andrews, the *New York Times* said editorially on May 10, 1935:

It contends that the hotel and restaurant NRA codes are being so extensively ignored that they give little protection while employers are still able under those codes to make heavy deductions for uniforms, laundry, meals, lodging, and fines. In a New York City hotel for example, "a chambermaid listed as receiving \$12.51 a week may actually receive \$4.76 for a forty-five hour work week, or about 10.2 cents an hour, including wages and tips, subject to deductions for uniforms or supplies." In one restaurant a waitress stated that she was charged two dollars for breaking a plain glass water pitcher. The Commissioner concludes that unless the State exercises its authority to establish minimum rates to safeguard the health and well-being of the workers, as well as to protect the reputable employer, it is likely that conditions will deteriorate, rather than improve.

And in connection with the wages of women here is a clipping from the *New York Times* for March 8, 1936:

Comparison of the records showed that 6,674 gainfully employed women in New York State were receiving home relief because their earnings were inadequate for the support of themselves and their families. In the manufacturing division, of 212 women with six dependents each, ninety-three per cent earned under \$15.00 weekly. Of 116 women with eight dependents each, thirteen per cent earned under \$5.00 weekly. In the clerical section of sixty-nine women with six dependents each, sixty-two per cent earned under \$15.00. Thus the majority of the employed women on relief received wages so low that they would not cover the barest necessities of life, even if the women had no dependents and were supporting only themselves.

I received the following figures of wages according to the Retail Trade Code from one of the administrators of the National Recovery Act. Stores open fifty-two hours a week but less than fifty-six hours, employees on a basis of forty

hours a week, minimum wage \$14.00, or thirty-five cents an hour. Stores open for fifty-six hours a week but less than sixty-three hours, employees on a basis of a forty-four hour week, minimum wage \$14.50. Stores open sixty-three hours a week or more, employees on a basis of a forty-eight hour week, minimum wage \$15.00 or 31.2 cents per hour. And notice this, junior employees, under eighteen years, \$1.00 per week rates less than the above.

Here are some statistics: Girls and women, employed in a certain chain of stores, received about \$11.45 a week for a certain type of work, for a six-day week, with the working day lasting from 9 A. M. until 6:30 P. M. Another senior had worked for a corporation controlling a series of service stations. The work was considered skilled labor. The hours were eleven hours a day for a day man and thirteen hours for night men. This was for six days a week. The men could be told to work on their day off, which was never a Saturday or Sunday. For this they received \$18.00 a week, besides, they paid for their overalls and cleaning. The uniforms change in winter and summer, and ever so often the color or style is changed completely. The men must buy these uniforms, two of each type from the company.

And so I could go on and on. And the thought occurs to me that the public and the consumers are cooperating with these companies and businesses by accepting their service. In other words, the public is the patron of businesses that are making economic slaves of their brothers and sisters and neighbors and friends. And where is the government and the courts! The New York Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the State Minimum Wage Law under which the wages of 22,000 minor employees were raised from an average of \$10.41 to \$13.42 per week. And the declaration of the Supreme Court with regard to the NRA is well known. Now remember this, I am not complaining against these decisions according to law. We must be governed by law, not by arbitrary dictatorship. But I do submit that our fundamental laws seemed to be based upon *laissez faire*, the defense of property rights, in preference to human rights.

Let me insist again in all this that I am not trying to stir up the poor against the rich: let me state again that I recognize the fact that some businesses today are not able

to pay more in wages. Nor am I putting the case for better wages here on the ground of justice. What I maintain is that the wages today in many branches of trade are anti-social and for this reason that they work against the common good in destroying the purchasing power of the masses which alone can keep the wheels of industry turning and which alone can do away with that unemployment which is destroying the morale of the American people, especially our youth. And back of all these anti-social wages is the tremendous truth that we can produce enough for all with our present equipment, and to produce enough for all seems to be a duty in the light that all men have a right to a sufficiency of material goods appropriate for happy and holy living. If we have not produced and distributed through social wages enough for all, it is because our economic life is organized primarily not for production but for profits, not for men but for the madness of money making. Proof of this seems to be at hand in the fact that many businesses are declaring profits equal to the other years, yet the employment situation and the necessities for public relief remain in the same condition.

The economic condition of the masses today, which can fairly be characterized by the name of economic slavery, is due to the anti-social attitude of employers. This attitude of employers, big and little, shows itself in two ways, both causes of unemployment: first, in extending the hours of labor and, second, in decreasing to a minimum the compensation. Increase the hours of employment for individuals and you exclude others from their right to work. Decrease compensation and you lower mass purchasing power and factories are closed, industries are curtailed, services are reduced to a minimum and unemployment extends to the millions.

I do not have to prove that man has an absolute right to a use of the material goods necessary for his connatural development, physically, intellectually, and morally, and that this right is antecedent and superior to any acquired right of property. Hence the first charge on all industrial and business operations ought to be to supply the worker with the wages which are equivalent to the goods necessary for his threefold perfection.

To say that a social wage for American workingmen and

women in whatever way they work is an impossibility is to close one's eye to elemental facts. Wages are only goods in another form and God has so blessed America that we can produce enough goods that all may live in frugal comfort and security. Production in America has not broken down; it is distribution which has broken down and broken down precisely because of a denial of a living wage. Distribution has failed because of the anti-social attitude of employers who will not share the wealth by proper wages.

If this is done with shortened hours of work, then the mass buying power of the people is increased, the products of farms and factories will be consumed, peace and security will again reign in the economic order. Let the employers, great and small, refuse this living wage with the cut it implies in their profits and there will be no economic peace.

The anti-social attitude of employers have brought about those conditions in which attacks on the freedom and sanctity of the individual are made. It is in these conditions that doctrines of Communism and Fascism flourish, the doctrine of the absolute State, of the State as God, of the State as anti-Christ of which Moscow is the sign and the symbol. Anti-Christ is in our midst in America primarily and fundamentally in the denial of a social wage.

Instead of this very simple remedy, a social wage for our economic ills, we see the advocacy, in this so-called age of science, of contraception of nature, of destruction of goods that men are in need of, on the false principle that prosperity will arise from destruction; we see the advocacy of contraception of human beings on the false principle that a lowered population will give increased mass buying power, we see the advocacy of high income taxes to provide a dole, when the tax should have been paid immediately to the worker as a reward for his labor in a living wage. Nor will an increase in the volume of money alleviate the situation unless that money goes where it belongs in adequate wages to the *worker*. The denial of an adequate wage to the worker, the economic enslavement of the worker, is at the root of all our woes, economic and moral. This is only to say, in other words, that it is by lawless unrestrained greed that "workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers."—Leo XIII.²⁹

²⁹ *Retum Novarum*, p. 2.

REFERENCES

(Continued from inside front cover)

B. AMERICA

1. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES

- The Bishops and an Economic Philosophy—R. Swing—March 29, 1919—(20/636).
- Popes' and Bishops' Labor Program—J. Husslein, S.J.—June 14, 1919—(21/248).
- The Marriage Encyclical and Wages—P. L. Blakely, S.J.—Jan. 24, 1931—(44/384).
- The Road to Recovery—P. L. Blakely, S.J.—July 29, 1933—(49/397).
- Recovery and a Human Week—I. A. J. Lawres—Aug. 19, 1933—(49/463).
- A Catechism of Collective Bargaining—G. B. Donnelly, S.J.—Sept. 2, 1933—(49/512).
- A Minimum Wage Scale—G. S. de Lorimier—Sept. 30, 1933—(49/613).
- Are All Wage Earners Human?—J. Wiltbye—Dec. 9, 1933—(50/230).
- Social Justice: Is It Good Business?—B. C. Walker—Feb. 17, 24; Mar. 3, 1934—(50/468, 490, 517).
- Looking Ahead in Labor Relations—E. B. Lyman—April 28, 1934—(51/54).
- Philosophy of a New Deal—W. Parsons, S.J.—May 19, 26; June 2, 1934—(51/126, 150, 174).

2. WAGES

- Wage System in the Gospel—J. Husslein, S.J.—Aug. 10, 1912—(7/414).
- Wages and Profits—J. H.—Sept. 12, 1914—(11/538).
- Labor and the Equitable Wage—P. L. Blakely, S.J.—Oct. 9, 1915—(13/646).
- Is the Law of the Jungle to Prevail?—P. L. Blakely, S.J.—Oct. 14, 1919—(16/9).
- Prices in the Middle Ages—J. Husslein, S.J.—March 17, 1917—(16/538).
- Just Ethics of Prices—J. Husslein, S.J.—March 31, 1917—(16/590).
- Morality of Monopolistic Prices—J. Husslein, S.J.—April 7, 1917—(16/616).
- The System of Capitalism—J. Husslein, S.J.—Oct. 13, 1917—(18/9).
- The Basis of Durable Industrial Peace—E. V. O'Hara—Dec. 29, 1917—(18/283).
- The State and Property—J. Husslein, S.J.—March 16, 1918—(18/574).
- The State and Labor—J. Husslein, S.J.—March 23, 1918—(18/595).
- The State and Wages—J. Husslein, S.J.—March 30, 1918—(18/621).
- The Church and Economics—J. A. Ryan, D.D.—April 17, 1920—(22/592).
- Economics Without Ethics—T. J. Flaherty—Jan. 14, 1922—(26/300).

3. LABOR

- The Content of the Bishops' Labor Program—W. J. M. A. Mahoney—March 22, 1919—(20/601).
The Appeal of the Bishops' Labor Program—J. Fitzpatrick—March 22, 1919—(20/604).
Labor Democracy—J. Husslein, S.J.—Sept. 13, 1919—(21/564).
Labor's Grievance Against Capital—T. J. Duffy—Sept. 20, 1919—(21/585).
International Labor Legislation—A. J. Muench—Aug. 28, 1920—(23/442).
Catholic Thought and Labor—H. Hall—Oct. 2, 1920—(23/560).
An Item from the Bishops' Program—T. J. Flaherty—March 26, 1921—(24/541).
The Menace of the Labor Spy—J. Husslein, S.J.—April 23, 1921—(25/9).
The Future of Organized Labor—J. B. Culemans—July 18, 1921—(25/199).
Labor Unions and the Law—J. A. Ryan, D.D.—July 8, 1922—(27/285).
The Lawless Labor Union—J. Wiltbye—May 27, 1922—(27/125).
Labor Needs Education—J. B. Culemans—Nov. 4, 1922—(28/53).
A Wage Scale for Unskilled Labor—M. J. Smith, S.J.—Oct. 6, 1923—(29/598).
Changes in the Labor Movement—R. A. McGowan—July 12, 1924—(31/298).
A Conversation—R. A. McGowan—Oct. 4, 1924—(31/603).
The Right to Work—J. E. Donnelly—Sept. 10, 1932—(47/545).

C. CATHOLIC MIND

- Compulsory Collectivism; Restrictive Capitalism; Distributive Ownership—J. Husslein, S.J.—June 22, 1927.
Trade Unions and Employers' Associations—S. C. Council—Jan. 8, 1930.
Industrial Relations—Hierarchy of U. S. A.—Apr. 8, 1931.
Present Economic Distress—Hierarchy of New Zealand—Sept. 8, 1931.
Justice and the Present Crisis—M. Rev. J. T. McNicholas, O.P.—Oct. 22, 1931.
Our Social Disorder and Its Cure—M. Rev. T. Corbett—Dec. 8, 1931.
Right of Private Ownership—M. DeMunnynck, O.P.—Jan. 22, 1932.
Economic Principles and Social Practice—L. Watts, S.J.—March 22, 1932.
The Negro's Right to Work—K. F. Phillips—March 22, 1933.
Solving the Unemployment Problem—F. F. Murphy, S.J.—Oct. 8, 1934.
The Mind of the Church and Social Legislation—B. J. Mahoney—Nov. 22, 1934.
The Laborer and His Hire—E. J. Coyne, S.J.—Aug. 22, 1935.
Spiritual Comfort for the Unemployed—J. Hannan, S.J.—Dec. 22, 1935.
Moral and Economic Problems of Today—R. A. Sauer—Jan. 22, 1936.
Our Immoral Economic Order—I. W. Cox, S.J.—March 8, 1936.
The Economy of High Wages—J. Clayton—June 22, 1936.
The Church's Efforts to Improve Conditions of Workingmen—Mexican Hierarchy—Aug. 22, 1936.

AMERICA

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WEEKLY

Since it began, "America" has been the fearless champion of human rights.

Since it began, "America" has defended the rights of labor.

Since it began, "America" has fought for a living wage.

Since it began, "America" has championed unionism.

Sample copy sent upon request

THE AMERICA PRESS

53 Park Place

New York, N. Y.