



SOLIDARITY

The Associate Members' Bulletin

of

The Catholic Workers' College

Vol. 8. No. 4.

February-March 1964

NEWS AND VIEWS

THE INAUGURAL MEETING of the College Management students was held here on 4 February. The Meeting was well up to the high standard of previous years. Mr J. Lynch, Minister for Industry and Commerce, Mr P. Smith, Minister for Agriculture, and the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Alderman S. Moore, were present. The large general audience was made up of leading Civil Service, business and trade union representatives in addition to our students and their friends. The Address on "The Two Nations" was given by Mr A. J. O'Reilly, General Manager, An Bord Baine. Speakers to the Address were Mr K. McCourt, Director General, Telefis Eireann, Dr T. Walsh, Director, An Foras Taluntais, and Messrs J. J. Kearney and J. I. Fitzpatrick of the College Board of Sponsors.

Peace

One of the three main points in the Holy Father's Christmas Message was his plea for world peace. What he said applied directly to peace between nations, but with little shift of emphasis, little changing of phrases, his words can be referred also to peaceful relations among men at any level of

human society. We quote here some of Pope Paul's great sentences.

"True peace is not that hypocritical propaganda aimed at lulling the adversary to sleep and concealing one's own preparation for war. Peace does not consist in persuasive rhetoric which refuses the indispensable, patient and tiresome negotiations which are the only efficacious means. It is not based on the precarious balance of opposing economic interests, nor on the dream of proud supremacy."

"True peace is based on the abolition, or at least on the mitigation, of the causes which endanger its security."

"Union of minds is the great need of contemporary man . . . Men lack unity in their principles, in their ideas and in their view of life and of the world. As long as they are divided, they will continue to be ignorant of one another, to hate and to fight against one another."

"Peace in truth, in justice, in freedom, in love. This is the peace we pray for."

TECHNOLOGY IN CONTEXT

by Fr W. Norris Clarke, S.J.

1 . . . "A first and very general principle is one which should be fundamental in any serious reflection on man and technology. It is that technology, being a partial activity of man, can be properly evaluated only if it is set in the context of the total reality and good of man, and not judged, as a self-sufficient whole, exclusively in terms of its own inner laws and dynamism. The same is true of any partial human activity, such as, for example, athletics or recreation or business. Thus it would be a dangerous distortion of perspective to say that whatever is good for the advance of athletics is good for man, just as it would be to say that whatever is good for General Motors is good for the country. The over-all balanced fulfillment of man must always be the centre of focus, and all particular activities and functions, whether of individuals or of social groups, subordinated to this primary goal.

Obvious?

"This principle may seem, perhaps, so elementary that it should be taken for granted. It is, indeed, elementary, and I feel reasonably sure that no one here would be in doubt about it. Yet it would be a great mistake to believe that in proportion as a basic truth is basic and elementary so much the more widely is it realized and practised. It is the great simple truths that are often the first ones forgotten in the hectic demands of immediate living, governed by short-range vision. It is thus all too easy for those immediately engaged in the exciting work of technology itself so to narrow their horizons that the mere glimpse of the possibility of some new technical advance can immediately trigger the decision to introduce it into the living organism of human society, without any inhibiting second thought about its over-all repercussions on the social body as a whole.

"Hence, a first essential principle for the wise use of technology is the conviction that it cannot (without profoundly disruptive effects) be made an end in itself, allowed to develop and be applied, throttle wide open, with no other guiding principle than the unfolding of its own intrinsic potentialities at the fastest rate possible."

2 . . . "One thing is clear to me. In a world of ever more rapidly changing external environment, where deliberately stimulated change is part of the very 'biological rhythm' of modern industrial society, it is essential to educate the young more consciously than ever before in the basic human skill of how to remain psychologically and morally stable in a world of external flux. Otherwise, a restless, shallow, rootless and anxious people will be incapable of making any truly fruitful use of the ever increasing cornucopia of means poured out by our technological genius. Like the over-specialized dinosaurs of pre-history, we may suddenly find ourselves ripe for extinction. Or, like so many civilizations in history, we may decay from within like rotten fruit, and be swept into the dustbin of history.

A Stable Goal

"The essential principle of education involved here, it seems to me, is a shift of emphasis from means to ends, from teaching customs or *ways* of doing things—so quickly obsolete or irrelevant today—to teaching basic values or *goals* to be aimed at steadily through the flux of changing ways and means. For it is the unique property of ends or goals, as any good philosopher can tell you, to unify and confer intelligibility on action and motion. A single stable goal can give fixed sense and meaning to a vast interweaving flux of otherwise chaotic actions. The stability of goal-orientated action derives from its single direction and point of arrival, not from its particular *path* of getting there. It is the stability of the compass for the ship, rather than that of the railroad track for the train, that must be the ideal of education for the future . . .

"The condition of any durable long-range success—possibly even of short-range survival—is that man recognize at least the general lines of his authentic nature and destiny. We can bear the responsibility, with God's help, of trying to be sons of God and stewards under Him of the cosmos that He planned and made for us. We cannot bear the burden of trying to be lonely gods of a purposeless universe we did not make, with no other place to go and no strength or wisdom but our own to rely upon."

JOBS AND OVERTIME

an editorial from AMERICA

THE MOST RADICAL of President Johnson's proposals to cure and prevent poverty is his suggested crackdown on overtime work. After the blunt announcement in his State of the Union address that he rejected the 35-hour week as a means of opening up job opportunities to the unemployed, Mr Johnson went on to say that he was "equally opposed to the 45- or 50-hour week in those industries where consistently excessive use of overtime causes increased unemployment.

Penalty Rate

The President made it clear at once that he was not thinking in terms of a wholesale legal ban on overtime. What he was aiming at was the pattern of overtime work that has come to prevail in certain industries, such as automobiles—one that is obviously reducing employment opportunities. Even in those industries the President would not absolutely forbid overtime. He would merely penalize it financially, so that employers would find it more profitable to hire new workers than to order overtime work. As Mr Johnson told Congress:

"So, therefore, I recommend legislation authorizing the creation of a tripartite industry committee to determine on an industry-by-industry basis as to where a higher penalty rate for overtime would increase job openings, without unduly increasing costs, and authorizing the establishment of such higher rates."

Presumably the tripartite committee would have representatives from industry, labour and the public. Presumably, also, decisions would be made by majority vote, since otherwise nothing much would be accomplished. Only infrequently would the industry and labour representatives agree on the use of overtime and its effect on jobs. Furthermore, although

the President mentioned no penalty rates, the legislation, if it is to be effective, would have to stipulate at least double time for all hours worked beyond 8 in a day and 40 in a week. The present penalty rate of time-and-one-half is obviously not high enough to deter many employers from paying it as an alternative to hiring new employees.

Reactions

In their public reactions to the State of the Union address, a number of top industrialists praised the stress on frugality and the accent on tax reduction. They were significantly silent on the proposal to discourage overtime. There can be no doubt that they are opposed to it, if for no other reason than that it represents additional government interference with business decision-making.

Most unions, notably those in the mass-production industries, where job security has become a battle cry, may be expected to support the President. Some of them, in fact, anticipated Mr Johnson by calling upon Congress to penalize overtime so heavily that no employer would resort to it. Nevertheless, a minority of unions probably sympathize with employers on this issue. Many rank-and-file workers surely do.

Although a law of the kind Mr Johnson has in mind would not be easy to administer, it does appear to be in the public interest. It is scarcely conducive to justice and civic peace that a minority of fortunate employees should consistently receive large amounts of overtime payments while thousands of workers able and willing to do the job remain unemployed. While the payment of overtime may spare employers much inconvenience, not to mention the expense of payroll taxes and various fringe benefits, this advantage is clearly outweighed by the physical and mental suffering of the jobless. Congress ought to give serious and expeditious attention to the President's proposal.

ON SOCIALIZATION

by Domenico Cardinal Tardini

“ . . . **T**HE CHANGES that have occurred since 1945 indicate a development in the direction of an ever-wider ever-deeper socialization. Not only economic and political structures, but also a whole network of customs, of ways of life, of voluntary or legal institutions envelop the individual, sustain and guide him. The advantages implicit in this state of affairs, in the economic and social order as well as in the cultural domain, are undeniable. Besides developing a sense of co-operation and solidarity, socialization permits satisfaction of social needs of first importance: for example, the need for housing, medical care, social security; the need for education, work, leisure.

Dehumanization ?

On the other hand, socialization expands the bureaucratic apparatus enormously, makes the legal regulation of human relationships ever more detailed in all sectors of life in society, and uses methods that incur a serious risk of what is characterized in one word: ‘dehumanization.’ Modern man sees that the sphere in which he can think for himself, act on his own initiative, exercise his responsibilities, and affirm and enrich his personality is, in many cases, restricted to an excessive degree.

Does it follow that the process of socialization is impossible to control and that, increasingly constantly

in breadth and depth, it will one day inevitably reduce men to the role of automatons? Certainly not. For socialization is not the result of forces of nature acting according to a determinism that cannot be changed. It is the work of man, of a free being, conscious of his acts and responsible for them. Therefore, on the one hand, one ought to be able to profit from its advantages but, on the other, one ought to know how to defend the person against the serious threats that its excessive and disorderly development could bring to bear upon him.

Intervention

An important principle is that which gives to the state, in this field, a function called ‘supplemental’ or ‘subsidiary.’ Pius XI, in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, stated it in these terms:

‘Just as one cannot take away from individuals and transfer to the community the tasks they are capable of accomplishing themselves, so also it would be an injustice—and at the same time a harmful disturbance of the social order—if one were to remove from groups of a lower order functions they can exercise themselves, and entrust them to a wider collectivity of a higher order. The natural objective of any intervention in social matters is to assist the members of the social body, not to destroy or absorb them.’ ”

“The people lives from the fullness of life of the men who make it up, each of whom, in his place and in his own manner, is a person conscious of his own responsibilities and of his own convictions.”—Pope Pius XII

FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION AMONG THE ASSOCIATE MEMBERS AND STUDENTS OF
THE CATHOLIC WORKERS' COLLEGE
SANDFORD ROAD, DUBLIN 6.