TEXT FLY WITHIN THE BOOK ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_150293

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
Call No. 301.1523 Acc.No. 25705
M98S
Murry, R.W.
Society problems

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 301.1523 M985 Accession No. 25705

Author Murry, R.W.

Title Social Problems.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below

10 1964

31 OCT 1964

4 AUG 1978

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Imprimi potest:
JAMES A. BURNS, C.S.C., Provincial
Province of the United States

Nihil obstat:
ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S.T.D.
Censor Librorum

Imprimatur:
✠ PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES
Archbishop, New York

New York, August 19, 1938

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

by

RAYMOND W. MURRAY, C.S.C.

Professor of Sociology
University of Notre Dame

and

FRANK T. FLYNN

Assistant Professor of Social Work
University of Notre Dame

F. S. CROFTS & CO. NEW YORK 1946

COPYRIGHT, 1938, BY F. S. CROFTS & CO., INC.

First printing, October, 1938
Second printing, February, 1941
Third printing, May, 1944
Fourth printing, June, 1946

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

No part of the material covered by this copyright may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE CORNWALL PRESS, INC., CORNWALL, N. Y.

PREFACE

THE firm stand of Catholic teaching on many contemporary American social problems has made it plain that a book by Catholics, done in the light of Catholic ethical doctrines, would be welcome both to Catholic students who seek a clear statement of current problems from the Catholic point of view and to non-Catholics who are interested in Catholic social thinking and teaching. At best, this book will be no more than that. It follows in general plan the organization found in the average text on social problems, but with the following notable deviations: (1) there is no separate section on the family, as the authors feel that this central unit in social organization is best treated in integration with the population problem in which the family so largely figures; (2) more than customary emphasis is laid on international relations, on the assumption that recent crises in Europe and the Orient have aroused a new interest in the causes and prevention of war; (3) the increasing apprehension of thinking men everywhere over our approaching population decline has been met with a full and detailed account of the population problem. In connection with this last point an attempt has been made to deal with the problem of birth control from a new point of view. The authors have generally endeavored to choose problems which have significant importance for human welfare and which are likely to remain major problems for several decades. It is hardly necessary to add that the intelligent citizen will wish to understand and to think through such problems.

Though the book is presented primarily for the college student enrolled in a course in social problems or social pathology, the general reader can follow it with ease and profit. It should prove to be a good background text for those who intend to take up social work. In those colleges where Murray's *Introductory Sociology* [1] is now in use this book may either follow or precede that text. Although the same topic is touched upon occasionally in both texts (almost a necessity in any two sociology books covering such broad fields), the authors have made an effort to avoid needless overlapping by discussing in this book only what is necessary in order to present a complete picture of a problem, some aspects of which may be dealt with in the earlier text. Thus the

[1] Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *Introductory Sociology* (F. S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1935).

two texts remain distinct, the earlier one dealing largely with pure or descriptive sociology, and this with applied or practical sociology. Chiefly for the general reader and the student whose sociology is confined to a social-problems course, an introductory chapter explaining the nature of sociology and the social sciences is given. Since no two teachers at present will agree as to just which problems should be studied in the social-problems course or as to the relative weight to be given to different problems, some teachers will probably prefer to expand, and others to hurry over, certain parts of this text. Fortunately, there is plenty of free and low-priced pamphlet material available for supplementary class use.

As in most collaborations, each writer is chiefly responsible for certain sections. The senior author, however, besides contributing Parts One, Two, and Three, has edited the entire manuscript. In doing so, he has continually submitted his viewpoints to the judgment of the junior author (who has written Parts Four, Five, and Six) in order to present the social worker's point of view as well as the sociologist's. Both writers realize full well that a book of this nature is essentially a synthesis; but both believe that a litany of footnote references discourages the average reader. They have therefore avoided footnotes wherever it could be assumed that the teacher would recognize obvious sources. And they here express their thanks to the many authors of special treatises on poverty, criminology, child welfare, social work, population, immigration, and the Negro whose materials were used in the preparation of this text. Quotations, of course, have been duly credited. Selected bibliographies are provided at the end of certain chapters, but mention of a publication therein does not imply that its ethical viewpoints are endorsed. The writers are grateful to fellow faculty members, Mr. Francis J. O'Malley and Mr. Thomas J. Stritch, for assistance in the preparation of the manuscript, and to the staff of the university library for the help they gave whenever they were called upon. The senior author also wishes to thank Dean Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C., of the College of Arts and Letters, who managed to find time to read most of the manuscript, and Mr. William B. Murray, who arranged the index. The junior author is especially grateful to his wife, Elsie Gobel Flynn, for constant assistance and encouragement. Both authors are grateful to the confreres who used most of this material in mimeograph form in their classes and so were able to make some very practical suggestions.

R. W. M.
F. T. F.

CONTENTS

PART I. THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

I. Social Problems and Catholic Social Principles 3
The Study of Social Problems 3
Catholic Social Principles 9

PART II. POPULATION MOVEMENT

II. Migration and Immigration 31
Types of Human Migration 32
The Emergence of Mass Immigration 34
America Restricts European Immigration 39
Asiatic Immigration Restricted 45
Effect of Immigration on American Stock 48
Effect of Immigration upon Native Growth 52

PART III. POPULATION GROWTH AND DECLINE

III. The Blending of Nationalities in the United States . 57
The Colonists 57
Colonial Culture 60
The Old Immigrants (1783–1882) 66
Renewed Opposition to Foreigners 71
The New Immigrants (1882–1924) 73
IV. Our Recent Immigration Problems 86
The New Hostility to Immigration 86
Americanization 89
The Jewish Question 96
Immigration and the Future 111
V. The American Negro Problem 116
The Negro's Rise from Slavery 116
The Negro Today 121
The Negro and the Future 138
VI. The American Population Problem 151
Historical Background 151
Alleged Danger of Overpopulation in America 162
Social Effects of a Declining Population 169
The Optimum Population 175
VII. Are We Dying Out Naturally? 186
Population Maturity Laws 187
Involuntary Sterility in Individuals 190

VIII. The Effect of the City and Its Standard of Living on Population Growth 198
The Growth of Cities 198
An Inflated Standard of Living 219
IX. Effect of Low Wages and Women's Wages on Population Growth 231
Low Wages and the Birth Rate 231
Greater Freedom for Women 246
X. Effect of Antifamily Attitudes on Population Growth 253
The Frivolous Attitude towards Marriage 253
The Childless-Marriage Ideal 257
Conclusions Concerning the Chief Causes of Population Shrinkage 267
XI. World Population Problems 272
World Growth and Decline 272
New European Population Policies 286
XII. Population Policies and the Future 293
America's Present Policy 293
"Population Problems" Are Chiefly Economic 295
International Relations in a Christian Civilization 296

PART IV. POVERTY AND ITS TREATMENT

XIII. Poverty: The Problem and Its Effects 309
The Problem 309
The Effects 318
XIV. Poverty: An Examination of Causal Factors 337
Individual Factors 337
Socioeconomic Factors 344
Cultural Factors 355
XV. The Treatment of Poverty 363
Historical Backgrounds 363
The Modern Period 372
Emergency Programs 378
Other Federal Programs 388
The Social Security Act 396
XVI. The Treatment of the Dependent Classes 403
The Aged 404
The Sick 409
The Disabled 415
The Mentally Disordered 419
The Mentally Deficient 424
The Epileptics 429
The Blind 431
The Deaf 432

PART V. CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

XVII. CRIME: ITS NATURE AND CAUSES 441
The Nature and Extent of Crime 441
The Causes of Crime 449
XVIII. CRIME AND PUNISHMENT 478
The Schools of Criminology 479
The Story of Punishment 481
Penal Institutions Today 489
XIX. THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE 505
The Police 505
Problems of Detention 508
Steps in Prosecution 509
The Criminal Courts 512
Probation 515
Parole 521
XX. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY 531
The Juvenile Court 532
Institutional Care 541
Prevention 553

PART VI. CHILD WELFARE

XXI. A SURVEY OF CHILD WELFARE PROBLEMS 565
The Present Status of Children 565
Infant and Maternal Mortality 568
The Dependent Child 573
The Illegitimate Child 585
Child Labor 587
Educational Problems 593

INDEX OF NAMES 605

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 608

PART I

THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES

In taking up the study of social problems or social pathology the student is dealing with applied sociology. In some cases he will have had a previous introductory course in general or pure sociology; in other instances the social-problem course will precede the general course. It matters little which sequence is followed; some instructors believe that it is best to capture the interest of the beginning student by having him study the more practical problems before attempting to emphasize principles.

I. The Study of Social Problems

In case there has been no previous orientation course in social sciences, it might be well to explain here that sociology, of which applied sociology is a part, is one of the so-called social sciences. Unfortunately, there is still considerable confusion as to what is meant when a student says he is interested in the field of social science. On the other hand, if one speaks of the "physical sciences," an immediate mental association suggests such phenomena of the inorganic world as are studied in physics, chemistry, astronomy, or geology. "Biological sciences" likewise indicate a very definite association with particular organic or living phenomena. Unfortunately "social science," dealing with the phenomena of the superorganic or social world, is sometimes used incorrectly as a synonym for sociology, and in other instances as a synonym for economics. Many teachers believe that the term is most helpful when used to include sociology, economics, and politics. If we judge by the various groups affiliated with the Social Science Research Council, "social science" includes not only sociology, economics, and politics, but history, psychology, anthropology, and statistics as well. The broadest classifications include ethics, law, human geography, social work, and comparative religion in addition.

Although social life is a unity, for purposes of intensive study it has

been found best to segregate certain human activities and to study them under a special title. In this way the different social sciences have evolved. While the field of the various social sciences is being defined gradually by custom almost as much as by logical division, the student will find that economics (also called political economy), for example, studies the production and distribution of wealth and the problems involved in earning a living, while politics (political science) has to do with the science of government. At certain points one social science will overlap another, thus indicating the closeness of their relationship. In other instances a single problem will be studied by two or more social sciences, though usually from different viewpoints. Thus unemployment, chiefly an economic problem, may be touched upon in sociology as well. In the one the emphasis will be upon the causes and possible remedies for this economic maladjustment; in the other the social effects of unemployment will be emphasized.

I. SOCIAL PROBLEMS DEFINED

Some years ago it was customary for American authors to speak of "the" social problem rather than of social problems. In doing so they had in mind the grave economic disorders which had appeared in our *laissez-faire* industrialized society. Many European writers still use the same phrase. Thus Pope Pius XI, though using the phrase in the plural, had in mind chiefly these same economic disorders when he urged Catholics to greater zeal "in the solution of social problems," in the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*. This, however, is not the sense in which "social problem" is used in American sociology today.

It is easy to understand the limited meaning which is commonly attached to the term "social problems" outside American sociological circles. Surely our economic disorders are problems of the greatest social concern. Furthermore, the economic disorders of modern society are so far-reaching in their social effects that one may easily regard them collectively as "the" problem of modern society. When one recalls that about one fifth of the entire American population was living on either federal or local relief money in February, 1936, it is easy to imagine the effects of the basic economic problem upon what are generally regarded as the chief social problems of American sociology, namely, poverty, vice, crime, divorce, desertion, juvenile delinquency, and the like. Because of this interrelationship the student of sociology should be well grounded in economics.

Just as an analysis of the derivation of the name "sociology," from the Latin *socius* (companion) and the Greek *logos* (science), fails to

throw very much light upon the nature of modern sociology,[1] it is likewise true that brief definitions of social problems are so inadequate that some books on social problems do not even attempt to furnish definitions. This unfortunate situation has resulted from the fact that the selection of the particular social problems to be dealt with in sociology has been the result of accidental and historical developments rather than of strict logical divisions and distinctions. Because of this fact we do not find uniformity in the problems treated in the various social-problem texts, nor do we find entire agreement as to which belong to the domain of pure or general sociology rather than to applied sociology. One of the briefest definitions is that of L. K. Frank: a social problem "appears to be any difficulty or misbehavior of a fairly large number of persons which we wish to remove or correct." [2] According to a recent analysis of definitions by James H. S. Bossard, social problems consist of the following six elements: "(a) social situations, (b) which are a product of group life, (c) involving a substantial number of persons, (d) characterized as constituting a threat to social well-being, (e) as defined by the mores of the group, and (f) which must be dealt with in an organized and concerted way." [3] Because the recognition of a social problem depends in many instances upon the social standards accepted in a particular community (the mores), a rise in the standards of a group may at first seem to increase the number of its social problems. On this account statements about the alleged rise in the extent of certain social problems in recent years must be accepted with caution.

2. VALUES DERIVED FROM STUDYING SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Apart from mental discipline, each college course should contribute some specific value to the student's mental or emotional equipment. What are the special contributions to be derived from the study of social problems or applied sociology? Before we proceed to answer this question, it may be well to point out that a distinction is usually made between the study of social problems and social work. Social work is an art or technique in which the student learns to make use of the contributions of many fields—medicine, psychiatry, law, statistics, economics, and politics, as well as sociology—in attempting to bring about

[1] For a description of the nature and scope of sociology see Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *Introductory Sociology* (F. S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1935), Chapter I. For additional material on the nature and study of social problems, see Harold Phelps, *Contemporary Social Problems* (1938), Chapter I and Part IV.

[2] "Social Problems," *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 30, January, 1925, page 463.

[3] *Social Change and Social Problems* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1938), page 3

a harmonious adjustment between a maladjusted person or group and the surrounding social environment. Applied sociology, on the other hand, is supposed to be a science, even though it is concerned with practical problems and purposes.

Bossard has described nine possible contributions made by applied sociology.[4] These are given here not merely to suggest motives for the study of social problems, but also to help the student to see the close relationship between the study of social problems and what is called pure sociology. Bossard believes that applied sociology must revitalize much of pure sociology. Since the college student usually takes more than one course in sociology, it is well for him to know some of the criticisms of pure sociology which are made by specialists in applied sociology.

Bossard's analysis of the contributions of applied sociology and of some of the weaknesses of pure sociology may be summarized briefly as follows: (1) The scientific study of social problems should help the student to develop an "objective attitude" towards any social problem, just as the study of psychiatry helps him to become objective in analyzing his own mental and emotional problems. Although complete objectivity is seldom achieved in either instance, without some degree of this quality of emotional control one cannot *see* maladjustments clearly, whether they be personal or social in nature. (2) In addition to clarity of vision the study of applied sociology should furnish the student with an "objective description" of a social problem. Without an accurate picture of the chief facts involved in any social problem one cannot proceed very far in ameliorating it. (3) The study of social problems, since it is more concerned with real life situations than with the development of technical concepts, should help the student to a better understanding of the "causes" of social disorganization. (4) The study of social problems should point out proper remedial procedure and show that the "short-cut" solutions of many social reformers, aimed at surface symptoms rather than basic causes of social ills, are predestined to failure. (5) The student of social problems can utilize many of the concepts developed by the pure sociologist in order to throw light upon the genesis of social problems. W. I. Thomas's "four wishes," for example, may be utilized by showing how a wish for new experience, security, recognition, or response frequently operates in the development of a criminal career. (6) Applied sociology can develop a broad comprehensive program of reform embracing all social needs, rather than limit its study to those specific problems which happened to ap-

[4] *Op. cit.*, pages 33–34.

peal to certain social-work groups in the past. (7) The scientific study of social problems and the observation of social experiments should lead not only to a correction of social evils, but also to a knowledge of the ways and means of "controlling" the social setting in such a way as to ensure social progress. (8) In this social planning applied sociology must of necessity be concerned with "objectives." Although it must be admitted that one's estimate of progress often depends upon his particular scale of values, it is futile to attempt to improve social conditions by so-called "scientific methods" if objectives and values are thereby to be ignored. (9) Finally, by showing that sociology has practical usefulness, applied sociology can help to give pure sociology a firmer position in the university curriculum.

3. THE "SCIENTIFIC ATTITUDE"

In suggesting particular values to be derived from the study of either pure or applied sociology many writers stress the development of what they call a "scientific attitude." Likewise, they urge the use of the "scientific method" in sociology. Because of diversified concepts of what is meant by "scientific attitude" or "scientific method," a word of warning would seem to be in order here.

Sociology, like psychology and education, has in recent years become apprehensive about its prestige among the other sciences, so much so that in the effort to become more and more scientific it has attempted to borrow in full the method of the physical sciences. According to this viewpoint, the search for knowledge about man in his social relations is to be confined solely to those things which are objectively apparent. Consequently conscience, free will, and the soul may not be considered as a part of man's make-up by the "scientific" social scientist, since these are not objectively apparent to the senses. Likewise, man's future destiny in the divine order is ruled out, as are divine revelation, the moral law, and even God Himself, for these things cannot be objectively detected or measured according to the method of the physical scientist. "All preconceived notions should be abandoned by the student of sociology," it is sometimes said; with such authors "preconceived notion" often means a Christian philosophy. The study of man is thus reduced pretty much to the technique used in studying insects, for a truly scientific attitude, we are told, must exclude ideals, philosophy, and even a desire to reform, since these things might prevent pure research or color its findings. Such a "scientific" attitude in education has very aptly been described as that of the animal trainer. Certainly no one who calls himself a good Christian nor, we believe, a good

sociologist can adopt it. While Bossard inclines to view man as a mere animal in some of his recommendations dealing with eugenics, even he senses the futility of a "scientific attitude" which would ignore values and objectives entirely. All reform assumes certain goals, and goals presume definite values; consequently, a scientific attitude such as that urged by some sociologists would prevent any social reform.

A little thought should show that it is ridiculous for any social scientist to attempt to limit himself to the methods of the physical scientist. The scientific method of the physical scientist is excellent in its place, and it is to be commended as far as it is of service in the social sciences, but in dealing with human personalities, in studying human life, habits, and thought, one must, to say the least, broaden his vision if he is really to understand man and his society. The rather intangible element of "human nature" is fundamental in every social situation.

As a matter of fact, even the physical sciences are abandoning their former smugness and are now admitting that philosophy and religion are not necessarily in conflict with their findings. Many of the leading physical scientists are saying that, at least as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, the alleged conflicts of the past were not between science and the Church, but between the philosophy of some scientists and that of the Church. As Hilaire Belloc has put it, the conflict was "between that materialistic philosophy in the atmosphere of which physical science has been taught outside the Catholic Church, and the philosophy of the Catholic Church." Fortunately for true science, the materialistic philosophy "in the atmosphere of which physical science has been taught outside the Catholic Church" is rapidly breaking down. Perhaps it may be presumed, then, that social science, which has always attempted to copy the physical sciences, will soon abandon its materialism and admit that one may be guided by a Christian philosophy of life and at the same time have a scientific attitude. On the other hand, as "Exhibit A" of a recent attempt to inject the old materialistic "scientific" attitude into the solution of social problems we might take note of the organization of the National Society for the Legalization of Euthanasia, which has announced a plan to introduce bills into the various legislatures to legalize "mercy killings." Such an amazing program is neither moral nor scientific, as the editor of *America* has pointed out so well:

> From the standpoint of Christian morals, it may be said at once that there is no such thing as a "mercy killing." To kill a sick man, either at his own request or against his will, is plain murder, a crime that calls upon God for vengeance. The individual is obliged to prolong his life by caring for his

health and by using all reasonable means to regain it should he fall ill. Nor can the state kill a man, simply because he is ill and, in the opinion of physicians, incurably ill. The state may take life only for the commission of crime. Hence the state cannot authorize either the physician, the public executioner, or any individual or society to terminate the life of a sick man. Nor may the individual give this authorization, for the simple reason that authority here resides solely in God.

To Christians the case is clear, but it may be viewed from another angle. "Euthanasia" means the death of an individual, but it implies far more. It spells the death of all progress in medical science. A disease will remain "incurable" as long as we do not try to cure it. The medical profession has stored up knowledge by trying to cure sick people, not by killing them out of hand. The second process is probably easier, and is certainly quicker. But it is the easy way out, and easy ways bring skill and knowledge to no profession. It is the sworn duty of the medical man to use every means at his disposal to prolong life, and to the degree that he neglects this duty he is faithless to his profession, and guilty of murder, should death result.[5]

II. Catholic Social Principles

Father C. C. Martindale, S.J., laments the fact that there is a certain fluidity and instability in modern social relations as a result of which people and nations are ceasing to attach a value to one's "word of honor." In fact, there is growing a tendency to cease to attach value to anything, he says, a condition which can result only in personal and group demoralization. Father Martindale believes that not the least of the causes of this singular condition is the way of work forced on modern man by industrialization. The modern man no longer makes anything—machines do that; he does not even conceive of a "whole," since what he does is so minute a part of it. He can therefore attach no value except a wage to what he does; and he naturally transfers this attitude to all his living. This tendency of our times is one which Catholics must be on guard against, for their lives revolve around fixed values. Catholics, whether they live under a guild or a mass-production system, must constantly refer to objective moral principles both in their social relations and in their inner personal conduct. Out of this situation there has developed in every age a body of Catholic social principles. In describing the development of modern Catholic social principles, which will be the work of the rest of this chapter, we shall treat the subject under the following four headings: (1) Sociology in Catholic Colleges, (2) Catholic Socioeconomic Principles, (3) Catholic Action, and (4) The "Christian Sociologists."

[5] "Mercy Killings" (editorial), *America*, Volume 48, January 29, 1938, page 396. Used by permission.

I. SOCIOLOGY IN CATHOLIC COLLEGES

Frequently the question is asked, "How does sociology as taught in Catholic colleges differ from that taught in secular schools?" Obviously, Catholic college teaching takes a firm stand on such matters as divorce, birth control, sterilization, and euthanasia, whatever may be taught on these in secular colleges. The remedies proposed by Catholics in the study of such problems as poverty, overpopulation, domestic discord, unemployment, crime, and mental deficiency will also be based on and guided by the moral law of the Church. When we consider the scope of the problems just mentioned, it becomes apparent that Catholic principles must invade a very large part of the study of social problems. If we recall also what has just been said concerning the use of "scientific method," the stand of the Catholic becomes clear in the face of much modern sociological thought. It is this whole situation which has given us Catholic, in contradistinction to secular, sociology in America. Though at one time there might have been a Protestant sociology which also differed from secular sociology, the disintegration of any particular philosophy which may be called distinctly Protestant today finds us with no sociological viewpoint which is accepted by all Protestants.

Basically, the contrast between sociology as it is taught in Catholic and in most secular schools is nothing more than the contrast between Catholic and secular education in general. Catholic education is very much concerned with the development of a consciousness of spiritual values and a respect for fixed ethical principles, along with the imparting of traditional secular knowledge. Catholic sociology insists, therefore, that along with the various approaches to sociology—psychological, cultural, ecological, methodological, and philosophical—sound spiritual and ethical values must be interwoven also. Secular education tends to overemphasize working hypotheses and experimental procedure, since it recognizes no unchanging spiritual or ethical principles; Catholic education insists on the retention of spiritual values and ethical principles in the use of the hypotheses and in the evaluation of the results of experimentation.

So closely are spiritual and ethical values interwoven with the fabric of social problems that as a matter of fact no sociologists can avoid them altogether, even though many secular sociologists claim to do so. In practice such values must be faced and either affirmed or denied. For this reason there is a wide difference between the materialistic-atheistic viewpoints injected into the sociological writings of Harry Elmer

Barnes and the generally Christian positions reflected by Emory S. Bogardus, to take only two non-Catholic sociologists. In classroom lectures and discussions on sociology, where the professor feels even greater freedom in expressing his personal viewpoints on religion and philosophy, the acceptance or the rejection of particular spiritual and ethical principles must of necessity characterize his viewpoints in the study of social problems, problems which usually involve vital human relationships. Catholic sociology is frank, both in its statement of Christian principles and in its resolution to adhere to them in dealing with problems of social relations. Secular sociology is evasive in its philosophy, which usually turns out to be only that held by a particular writer at a particular time. Catholic and secular sociology differ also in their fundamental conception of the very nature of society itself. In comparing the Catholic idea of society, as described in the encyclical *On the Reconstruction of the Social Order* by Pope Pius XI, with that of secular sociology, Dr. Clarence J. Enzler showed that the latter viewpoint includes only the ideas of man's social nature and need of temporal earthly happiness, while denying that which Catholics insist upon in addition, namely, authority in religion and the need of eternal happiness.[6] On this account it has been said that the postulates of a Christian sociology include all the basic tenets of religion and morality. Claiming to ignore religion and morality, secular sociology attempts to view man from what it chooses to call a purely scientific viewpoint, namely, as an intelligent animal whose problems are entirely material. On this account it probably could be said that Communists are the most logically-minded secular sociologists, since their sole aim is the material satisfaction of the greatest number. Although some secular sociologists will say that sociology in Catholic colleges is unscientific because it is colored by Christian theology and philosophy, Catholic sociologists reply that it *is* scientific just because of that mixture.

2. CATHOLIC SOCIOECONOMIC PRINCIPLES

At those points where sociology touches upon economic and political reform, and they are many, secular sociologists are wholly disunited. A few are still inclined towards "rugged individualism" or *laissez faire* in industry ("economic liberalism"); many more are for drastic legislative reforms to correct the abuses of the present order, while not a few incline rather strongly towards either socialism or communism. Although there was no "Catholic policy" relative to the economic prob-

[6] "Sociology in the Catholic College," *The Catholic World*, Volume 143, July, 1936, page 423.

lems created by the industrial revolution until 1891, even before the middle of the century a number of Catholic leaders had commenced to attack *laissez faire* and to point out that Christian principles of justice and charity were being violated by most industrialists. Among these leaders were Fredrick Ozanam, Ville-Neuve-Bargemont, and Count Albert de Mun in France, Bishop von Ketteler in Germany, and Cardinal Manning in England. At this time it is interesting for us to note that these early critics of industrial abuses were often frowned upon and regarded as radicals not only by non-Catholics but even by ultra-conservative Catholics, who were either blind to the existing abuses, or too closely associated with the excessive profits derived from them to want to see. In 1891 Pope Leo XIII shocked the latter groups by endorsing most of the viewpoints advocated by these so-called radical Catholic leaders, in his now famous encyclical *On the Condition of Labor,* which branded *laissez faire* industrialism as unethical and laid down principles upon which Christian social reform must proceed. Since 1891, therefore, it may be said that there have been certain clearly defined general principles of ethics governing industrial relations which good Catholics must accept.

In recent years some confusion has been caused by the failure of many American Catholics to understand that the encyclicals addressed to the world could not do much more than assert basic moral principles bearing upon economic problems. It would be impossible in such documents to attempt to cover every minute detail involved in achieving social justice throughout the world. Furthermore, it might be imprudent to attempt to do so, for the concrete measures which will embody the ideals expounded in the encyclicals are more the work of the economist than of the theologian. As Archbishop Stritch said in the opening sermon of the National Catholic Social Action Conference at Milwaukee in May, 1938, "The Church fixes the moral principles to which free social and economic behavior must conform and she states these principles in terms of contemporary social and economic practice." Consequently, in the encyclicals only general suggestions are made, since the details of the economic reforms necessary to bring about social justice are not always clear even to modern economists and in many instances can be perfected only by experimentation. Catholics, therefore, should not expect to have a simple program of economic reform outlined to them by the Church or even to find complete agreement among Catholic leaders concerning various proposed economic measures merely because the social encyclicals have defined sound ethical standards. However, as Father John F. Cronin, S.S., points out, Cath-

olics should not take the ridiculous position of espousing in theory the teachings of the encyclicals but nullifying this position by talking vapidly about the "American way" (which is that of rugged individualism) and remaining indifferent to all detailed measures of economic and political reform. He says:

> After principles and objectives have been stated, then comes the problem of clear, objective economic study. If this study is complete and thorough, we shall have before us the practical means of realizing the Pope's ideal. . . . In working out details there may be genuine disagreement as to the wisdom of certain means. This is quite another thing, however, from the blanket condemnation of all efforts to improve the economic system. This latter practice is an expression of pure individualism, a philosophy severely denounced by the Popes.[7]

While the Catholic industrial relations code rejects both socialism and communism, it agrees with both of these in branding many of the practices of modern industry as vicious and unjust. Since many of the propositions in the Catholic code of social justice, laid down by Pope Leo XIII and expanded forty years later by Pope Pius XI in the encyclical *On the Reconstruction of the Social Order,* are treated elsewhere in this text, they need not be repeated here. Their explanation in detail must be reserved, of course, to special treatises on economics or social ethics. A good brief summary of Catholic socioeconomic teaching which reflects the principles of the encyclicals is contained in the following excerpt taken from a recent report of the National Catholic Welfare Conference:

> 1. Develop strong labor unions and employers' associations not only for collective bargaining but for their joint guidance of all industry so as to obtain the standards of the Encyclical on income, prices, work, and ownership; and do the same for farming and the professions (that is, develop the vocational group system of the Encyclicals).
>
> 2. Pass laws for the regulation of unfair competition and monopoly; for the protection of labor and for some public ownership; but at every opportunity have the laws throw the power of self-government upon democratically organized industries and professions so they will grow and develop.
>
> 3. Cooperate in international economic life in the same manner and spirit.
>
> The aim is a new cooperating society, at home and abroad, obtaining peace and plenty for all.[8]

Recent Emphasis Upon Encyclicals

The study of the social encyclicals mentioned above has been stimulated greatly by the recent insistence of Pope Pius XI upon the estab-

[7] "A Living Wage Today," *The Sign,* Volume 17, June, 1938, page 651.
[8] *Communism in the United States,* 1937, pages 30–31. Used by permission.

lishment of the *social* reign of Christ in modern society, to be brought about by Catholic lay apostles working with the hierarchy. Unfortunately, however, the two encyclicals, variously referred to as the "labor encyclicals" and the "social encyclicals," have not been widely known even among Catholics, outside courses in economics and social ethics in Catholic colleges, until very recently. In this connection it might be said that, though such American pioneers as Monsignor John A. Ryan and Father Joseph Husslein, S.J., and their pupils have been lecturing and writing for many years on the doctrines of Leo XIII, chiefly for educated groups, the majority of the Catholic and non-Catholic masses probably heard of the encyclicals for the first time through the early radio speeches of Father Charles E. Coughlin. No doubt the sudden popularity of Father Coughlin was due as much to the popular appeal of the fundamental justice inherent in the doctrines of the social encyclicals, the need for which was awakened by the depression, as to his unusual oratorical ability. Catholic economists should ever be grateful to Father Coughlin for those early sermons which did so much to make the labor encyclicals more widely known. In striking out so courageously at the evils of the existing economic order Father Coughlin was, after all, but following in the footsteps of Monsignor Ryan, who at an earlier date was commonly regarded a "radical" and "socialist" by certain Catholics who were unaware of the contents of Leo's encyclical. In criticizing the Catholic neglect of Leo's message Monsignor Ryan said in 1931:

> The use of the encyclical (Rerum Novarum) has been too timid, too general, too greatly lacking in courageous and pertinent application to contemporary conditions. Had the injunction laid upon the clergy and laity in the concluding paragraphs of the document been heeded to a degree that was easily possible, we should have in the world today a greater measure of social justice, deeper and more general friendship for the Church on the part of those without, and fewer defections from the Catholic body.[9]

According to the dynamic Father J. F. T. Prince, we have been slow in bringing about the reforms advocated by the social encyclicals largely because of our failure to recognize the fact that our post-Reformation society has retained only an ever-diminishing spiritual influence.[10] As a result of this lack of a virile spiritual influence, by slow and subtle measures there has finally come to be instituted in our midst a pseudo-ethical cult in which Mammon is retained under the guise of a religion. For those humane souls who see the terrible abuses of modern finance

[9] "Some Effects of 'Rerum Novarum,'" *America*, Volume 45, April 25, 1931, page 59. Used by permission.

[10] *Creative Revolution* (The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1937).

capitalism with its smug lip service to Christianity, and who unfortunately fail to distinguish true religion from its modern counterpart, it is only natural, he says, that "Christianity" should seem to have failed since to all practical purposes it appears to them to merit the charge of Marx and Lenin, that religion is "the opium of the people."

The failure of Catholics to bring about a creative Christian revolution which will overthrow this Mammon parading as religion has, says Father Prince, made many long-suffering people turn to communism or fascism. It would have been far better, he believes, if the original substitution of Mammon for religion had come about frankly and violently, for in that case no one would have been deceived and we should not have had the ridiculous situation in which the Church is regarded by many chiefly as the divinely appointed guardian of privilege and property. Father Prince insists upon an immediate bloodless revolution against the modern materialism in our economic philosophy, a revolution which will go deep enough to reach and transform the souls of men. While it is probably true that some of our good priests have as yet failed to see clearly the violations of social ethics which have moved Father Prince and others to such forceful language, there is ample evidence today that through special summer institutes on economics and industrial ethics for the clergy, and by other means, both clergy and laity are rapidly catching up with the "justice first" programs outlined by our great Popes Leo and Pius.[11]

3. CATHOLIC ACTION

Closely paralleling the recent spread of the ideas contained in the "social encyclicals" of Leo and Pius, there has been another movement known as Catholic Action. Since the American literature on Catholic Action written before Cardinal Pacelli clarified the term for us in 1930 is very confusing and sometimes leaves one with the false impression that Catholic Action is, among a great many other things, a sort of "brass-band Catholicity," it will be well to go back a century or so and examine the circumstances which form the background for the present Catholic Action movement, in order that we may understand just what it is.

[11] Pope Pius XI has quoted with approval a letter which Pope Benedict XV wrote to the Bishop of Bergamo in 1920, a section of which reads as follows: "Let no member of the clergy suppose that activity of this kind is something foreign to his priestly ministry because the field in which it is exercised is economic. It is precisely in this field that the eternal salvation of souls is imperilled. Therefore it is Our will that priests consider it as one of their duties to give as much of their life as possible to social science and social action, by study, observation and work." Quoted in *Pope Pius the Eleventh* by Philip Hughes (Sheed & Ward, New York, 1937), page 277.

For some time there has been a constant struggle between what may be called the spirit of secularism and the spirit of Christianity. Rulers, jurists, economists, philosophers, scientists, discoverers, poets, and artists have step by step been excluding religion from the social order. Through these various converging influences a great gulf has been placed between God and His people, while two worlds, one secular and the other religious, have been set up, each apart from the other. In this gradual process of secularization religion has been pretty much driven out of civil society, and out of the family, the trades, the professions, and world affairs as well. The idea is now widely accepted in non-Catholic circles that religion is a private matter and that consequently religious teachings must be ignored in all group activities conducted outside the four walls of a church. It was against this spirit of secularism that Pope Pius XI directed his encyclical *Ubi Arcano Dei* in 1921. It decreed a general mobilization of the Catholic laity for a united campaign against this dangerous anti-God tendency. This religious movement, which was called Catholic Action, was defined by Pope Pius as "the participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church."

While it is a dogmatic truth that apostolic authority to teach, preach, and baptize passed to the successors of Peter and the Twelve, that is, to the Pope and the episcopacy, the laity were always expected to collaborate with this apostolate. Since the laity, at least in English-speaking countries, have always co-operated with the clergy when called upon to do so, perhaps it might be said that the new Catholic Action movement aims chiefly at re-emphasizing this traditional laity-clergy association and at stimulating it to greater achievements, especially in those European countries where this tradition has been somewhat forgotten. Essentially, therefore, Catholic Action involves nothing more than a rejuvenation. As Pope Pius himself has said, "There is nothing new in Catholic Action." Lay co-operation in the Catholic apostolate is particularly necessary today in all countries for at least two reasons: first, the numerical insufficiency of the clergy; and, second, their status, which prevents them from penetrating into many present-day social situations and institutions, since of necessity the priest is segregated from secular occupations. On the other hand, in his daily work the Catholic professional man and the working man need the support of religion if they are to resist the appeal of secularism. It is on this account that properly organized lay activity, known as Catholic Action, can enter the picture as the right arm of the Church. The student who recalls the close association between work and religion in the medieval

guild can appreciate by contrast the unfortunate change which has taken place in this relationship under modern industrial conditions.

Catholic Activities, Catholic Social Action, and "Catholic Action"

Experience has shown that wherever strongly organized Catholic lay groups exist there is always a danger that the viewpoint or methods of a single group be mistaken by others for the official attitude of the Church. This problem is particularly embarrassing to the Church when situations involving nationalism or political activities are involved. To avoid being misrepresented in just such situations where laymen may not be fully acquainted with Church doctrines or policies, the Church makes a rather fine distinction between Catholic activities and Catholic Action. The splendid work of most of the Catholic lay societies in America, even where it involves much more than the personal sanctification of its members, is as yet, technically speaking, "Catholic activity" rather than Catholic Action, chiefly because this work neither has nor, perhaps, needs any special episcopal commission. "Catholic social action" is confined often to the application of the social encyclicals to our economic order. Only when the united Bishops have given a commission, as to a national organization, or when the local bishop has approved a society confined to his diocese, can it be said that a society engaged in apostolic work is so "maintained by the authority of the Bishops" that its work may be called Catholic Action in the strict sense. The apostolate of Catholic laymen under episcopal guidance, or Catholic Action, has been defined by Pope Pius XI as follows:

> Catholic Action consists not merely of the pursuit of personal Christian perfection, which is, however, before all others its first and greatest end, but it also consists of a true apostolate in which Catholics of every social class participate, coming thus to be united in thought and action around those centers of sound doctrine and multiple social activity, legitimately constituted and, as a result, aided and sustained by the authority of the Bishops.

Catholic Action has been organized more effectively in some of the countries of Europe than in England or America. Perhaps this is because it was more necessary there, where in some instances an unfortunate tradition had gradually shunted the clergy into the sacristy and altogether out of contact with many of the practical problems confronting Catholic laymen, meanwhile neglecting to organize the latter in order that they might protect their own interests. The Belgian J.O.C. or *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* (Christian Labor Youth Movement) might be cited as an outstanding example of how properly organized and directed Catholic laymen can offset secularism through what is

properly classified as Catholic Action. The J.O.C. is open to young workers of both sexes from 14 to 25. Though primarily an organization of young workers, it aims at being a workers' school as well, training its members in Christian philosophy and morality, in addition to providing vocational guidance, recreation, and social service. Through the pressure which it has been able to effect as the official representative body for young workers it has been able to obtain improved moral conditions in places of work, as well as wage increases, factory inspection, and government subsidies for its summer camps. The ambition of this organization is to reconquer the world of labor for Christ. Its dynamic force comes from inner circles of leaders who attempt to do apostolic work among their companions, working always under the guidance of priests who have been appointed as their spiritual guides by the hierarchy. Leaders are taught that they must begin by improving their own spiritual condition. The J.O.C. publishes several journals and employs its own paid propagandists and organizers. Its parish sections meet monthly, and its leaders each week, in study circles. They have annual retreats as well as a national congress. The members are kept together under Christian influences from the time when they leave school until they enter the associations for adults. In this way they are able to advance their own economic interests while protecting at the same time their lives and the lives of fellow-workers against the influences of secularism. This movement has stemmed the former tendency under which young graduates of Catholic schools lost all contact with their faith during the first year of their working life. By the same token it has diminished the influence of communism among workers. In brief, the barrier which once separated the Belgian worker from his clergy has been broken down effectively through this new organized Catholic lay action.

In the United States the National Catholic Welfare Conference is the official center for Catholic Action, which is to be carried on nationally, although the individual bishops determine the particular programs to be carried on in their dioceses. Certain programs are gradually becoming somewhat unified nationally—for examples, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, the boy's and girl's Youth Programs, and the Legion of Decency. In establishing the N.C.W.C. in Washington, D.C., our bishops provided a Department of Lay Organizations in order to co-operate more effectively with Catholic organizations which wished to be official vehicles of Catholic thought. By becoming affiliated with the N.C.W.C. any lay organization may be certain that its program actually represents the mind of the Church.

The importance of presenting a single front of virile Catholicity, whether it is to be called Catholic Action, Catholic social action, or merely Catholic activity, in which all members and ranks of the Church are banded together, cannot be overestimated today. The united front has been the key to the success of such contemporary movements as nazism, communism, and fascism in Europe. While the different members of the Church have always been united in the form of Christ's Mystical Body, this union needs to be re-emphasized in a new unity of group activity. In this action there must be such a fusion of ideas, wills, and programs as to present to our opponents a single front. It is only by such concerted action that American Catholics can resist those products of secularism which are attempting to cripple religion in those European countries where, alas, Catholic Action, if not Catholic social action, was too long delayed. It is not any particular man in Europe, but materialism and its creed that "might makes right" which is undermining those traditions of government which formerly guaranteed religious liberty. Catholic laymen in every country need to be aroused and guided to combat this spirit.

4. THE "CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGISTS"

Inspired in all probability by the social encyclicals and encouraged by the Catholic Action movement, there has arisen in recent years a small but zealous group of Roman and Anglo-Catholics who would have us abandon the existing conciliatory attempts of Catholic sociologists to adapt the principles, methods, and programs of secular sociology to Christian principles, in favor of a more positive and thoroughly Christian attack upon social problems. This new social Catholicism, "new in the sense that it demands a return, with a new loyalty, to the old truths which have characterized the teachings of the Church and the lives of the saints in every age," seems not to have originated in any one place, but to have sprung up spontaneously and unexpectedly in several sectors. This new movement reflects the attitude of militant Catholics who have become disgusted with both the materialism of the average social reformer and the timidity of Catholics, who, they believe, should be leading rather than merely following in social-reform measures. Several periodicals have sprung up in the last six years to serve as foci of this new movement. Among these in the United States we have *The Catholic Worker, The Christian Front,* and *Liturgy and Sociology.* Canada has *The Social Forum;* England, *The Colosseum;* and France, *Esprit.* In addition there is an Episcopalian literature reflecting very similar viewpoints.

Personalism

Considering first the Roman Catholic branch of this movement, we find among its American leaders the sociologist Father Paul Hanly Furfey, who, in his *Fire on the Earth* (1936) and *Three Theories of Society* (1937), urges that we discard what he describes as the pragmatic, compromising attitude which necessarily saps the vitality of the Church's effort in the field of social reform, in favor of a frankly supernatural sociology based upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. Though Father Furfey, like the authors of the social encyclicals, recognizes the fact that a certain amount of social legislation is necessary in order to correct the present maladjustments of society, he believes that devotees of the new social Catholicism, or the "personalists," as he calls them, must constantly emphasize by the character of their own lives the fact that "these legal measures do not represent the sum total of Catholic social thought." In describing "personalist social action" he says:

> There remains the question which ever haunts the personalist, "What can *I* do *today?*" There are many things that *I* can do today to protest against the unfair distribution of wealth. The most urgent of these things is that I personally should keep myself free from any contamination with unfair business methods. . . . I can introduce into my own life a simplicity of living which will be a sincere and effective protest against those who make money their god. When I speak of voluntary poverty, I do not mean a poverty which will involve any real suffering or any notable hardship. . . . can we not at least strip ourselves of some of the completely useless superfluities which many of us may possess? If every one of us should become deeply convinced of the evil of avarice, deeply resolved to show in his or her own life an ostentatious contempt for the luxury and display which this world loves, then our lives would form little centers of diffusion from which the sane and salutary Catholic doctrine on the use of money would gradually seep into the lives of those around us. This is what we mean by personalist social action.[12]

Many of Father Furfey's ideas are similar to those of Emmanuel Mounier and others, which are reflected in the French magazine *Esprit.* The particular viewpoint of this group is called "personalism." The personalists argue that it is useless to try to correct individual or social disorders until we have come to an agreement in answering such questions as "What are we trying to make of man?" and "How are we to judge whether we are proceeding in the right direction or not, unless we know what man is, what he is made for?" Personalism

[12] "The New Social Catholicism," *The Christian Front,* Volume 1, December, 1936, page 183.

derives its name from its emphasis upon the human personality as a spiritual being and upon its claim that the modern materialistic and capitalistic world is against man thus conceived as a person; its novelty seems to consist in its lively expression, its formulas, and its mysticism.

Personalism might be described as a dynamic religious approach to social reform, based upon the conviction that Catholic social philosophy in the past has appealed too much to logic alone and has allowed the Socialists, Communists, and others to steal the affective forces and to capture the imagination. Catholic social ideology must also be revolutionary, they say. Personalism begins with a violent criticism of the established order, whether it be the finance capitalistic system, Fascism, Nazism, or Marxism, since all these are held to ignore man conceived as a person or spiritual being. The personalist program would abolish the principle of the fecundity of money, substituting for it a system of mutual credit. The powers of the state would be so decentralized that it would play the role of a mere regulator. The personalist revolution must start within the individual; after this initial reform has taken place, the personalist is expected to work for a social revolution based upon Christian principles, rather than merely to sit back and oppose in turn the various rising revolutions, each of which ignores man's spiritual dignity.[13]

Fellowship in Worship

The "Christian Sociologists" are interested also in restoring the liturgy of the Church, the public expression of our faith, to what they regard as its proper place in Catholic life. It is felt that by actively participating in groups at the sacrifice of the Mass and in other common acts of worship Catholics throughout the world will be brought closer together in a common social expression of Christian ideals. The modern recitative or dialogue Mass is an outgrowth of this movement. Father Virgil Michel, O.S.B., regards the liturgical movement as a means of combating the excessive individualism of recent centuries. Through "co-operative" prayers, he says, man can learn to break down that exaggerated "every man for himself" spirit which leads to cut-throat competition and brings jealousy, envy, suspicion, and distrust in social life:

> This individualism is in our blood to a rather great extent, since it has been the general atmosphere we have been reared in. It is so much in our blood that it has entered into our very religious life, and its effects can be

[13] Abbé Jacques Leclercq, "Personalism," *The Catholic Digest*, Volume 2, November, 1937, pages 7–9 (translated and condensed from *La Cité Chrétienne*).

seen in the religious actions of ever so many Catholics. It shows itself, for instance, in the fact that when Catholics are assembled together for corporate or cooperative worship in Church on Sundays, many say prayers of their own individual choosing, prayers that are entirely unrelated to the prayers of their fellow worshipers, even entirely independent of the prayer-action performed by the priest at the altar in behalf of all the assembled congregation and of all the Church. It shows itself, moreover, in the fact that many Christians pray only for themselves alone and not for the common brotherhood, and again that they pray almost exclusively in words that ask favors from God for themselves. They think only of what they can get out of God, each for his own satisfaction, and not at all of what they themselves can and should give to God: praise, thanks, adoration, atonement. And yet the original model of Prayer, the *Our Father* given to us by Christ, naturally divides into two parts of which the first is a giving unto God for His own sake, while only the second requests favors of God; and the whole of it is a *we* and *our* prayer and not at all an *I* and *me* prayer. It starts with "Our Father" and not "My Father," and asks later "give us our daily bread" and not "give me mine." [14]

It is said that the basic idea of the liturgical movement is nothing more than the traditional Christian concept of "the fellowship of souls united in Christ as their Head, which fellowship is called the mystical body of Christ."

Pacifism

Most of the leaders in the "Christian Sociologist" group take the position also that, in the matter of warfare, there can be no such thing as a just cause for war under modern conditions, thus lending their support to Pax Romano, an international Catholic group which is seeking to combat warfare by conscientious objection. Pax, according to *The Catholic Worker,* "is not a group of pacifists who condemn war absolutely, but is made up of thinking men and women who hold that the conditions under which modern war is waged exclude the possibility of a just war, and so they soundly and rightly can take up the position of conscientious objection." [15] Some Catholic critics have attempted to belittle the enthusiasm and pacifism of the "Christian Sociologist" group by regarding them as impractical and overemotional. On the other hand, Father James M. Gillis, C.S.P., editor of *The Catholic World,* defends the new movement by protesting that the time for purely academic discussions and intellectual approaches to our social ills is over, and by pointing out that the Gospel itself is no Stoic philosophy:

[14] "The Co-operative Movement and the Liturgical Movement," *Catholic Rural Life Objectives,* 240 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, 1938, page 14. Used by permission.

[15] May, 1938.

The Apostles did not aim to produce an intellectual and emotional equilibrium. Quite the contrary. They went out to throw the world off balance, to turn it upside down. It mattered not to them, rather they thought it to their advantage that the world was old and tired and disillusioned, that man in general and the intellectuals in particular thought that everything had been said that could be said and all had been done that could be done and that the only fit occupation for a philosopher was to wait quietly for the ultimate catastrophe. "Nonsense!" said St. Paul to the Areopagites, "the world is born anew. I preach the Resurrection." So they called him mad and let it go at that.[16]

The attitude of the "Christian Sociologists" towards war seems almost to have received episcopal endorsement in a pastoral letter of Archbishop John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati, which was read in all the churches in southern Ohio during the 1938 Lenten season. A passage in the letter read as follows:

Governments that have no fixed standards of morality, and consequently no moral sense, can scarcely settle the question of war on moral grounds for Christians, who see and know the injustice of practically all wars in our modern pagan world. There is the very practical question for informed Christians who acknowledge the supreme dominion of God and the Divine toleration of governments that reject and ignore God: Will such Christians in our country form a mighty league of conscientious non-combatants? The organization of such a league deserves the serious consideration of all informed Christians who have the best interests of America at heart.[17]

Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day of *The Catholic Worker,* prominent members of this new and enthusiastic group, favor in addition our emphasis of Catholic farming villages as one of the best means of bringing society back to the old medieval communal spirit in which mutual helpfulness rather than individualism was the keynote. The establishment of a "Christian Sociology" is also being urged by a group in the Episcopalian Church, reflected in such publications as Ralph Adams Cram's *Walled Towns* (1919) and Bernard Iddings Bell's *A Catholic Looks at His World* (1936) in America, and the magazine *Christendom* in England. Other names frequently associated with the "Christian Sociology" movement are G. K. Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc, Francis H. Drinkwater, Bede Jarrett, Vincent J. McNabb, Arthur J. Penty, and Eric Gill; the list might be greatly extended if we included Christopher Dawson, Jacques Maritain, and others who

[16] Editorial, *The Catholic World,* Volume 145, October, 1937, page 2. Used by permission.

[17] Quoted by the Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., in his N.C.W.C. feature in *The Catholic Transcript,* Hartford, May 19, 1938. Used by permission.

have analyzed our modern culture in the light of medieval religious and philosophical principles.

By way of conclusion it might be observed that the term "Christian Sociology" is a source of some confusion in American academic circles, where the field of sociology is fairly well defined and where the study of sociology is now departmentalized in most universities, Catholic and non-Catholic. As the term is used by the "Christian Sociologists," sociology is understood in a very broad sense, characteristic of European rather than American schools, to include *all* phases of social life (diplomacy, business, politics, philosophy, and art) as well as the narrower phases of group life studied by the American sociologist. Perhaps it may come about eventually that what is now called "Christian Sociology" by the new group will become established finally as a subject of organized study in the philosophy or religion departments of American Catholic universities, leaving sociology to its present field. From a course or courses taught in either of these older departments under such titles as Christianity and Society, or Catholic Social Principles, a wholesome influence might well extend outward into many other courses and departments, including sociology proper.

Although teachers of pure and applied sociology in Catholic colleges have always tried to present these subjects in a manner consistent with Christian principles, they have often felt that many social principles which would be of great value in dealing with modern problems were still locked in the tomes of St. Thomas and other Catholic philosophers. It would seem likely, then, that, as Father Virgil Michel, O.S.B., and others continue to show the bearing of Thomistic principles upon modern difficulties, not only sociology but economics and politics as well will receive a new life if not a different emphasis in Catholic colleges.

References for Further Reading

1. General [18]

Beach, W. G., and E. E. Walker, *American Social Problems,* Stanford University Press, Stanford University, California, 1934

Bossard, J. H. S., *Social Change and Social Problems,* revised edition, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1937

Bruno, Frank J., *The Theory of Social Work,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1936

[18] Nearly every chapter may be supplemented by readings from *The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, The Social Work Year Book, Recent Social Trends,* and the *Proceedings* of the National Conference of Social Work and of the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

Callcott, Mary S., *Principles of Social Legislation,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932
Dow, Grove S., *Society and Its Problems,* revised edition, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1937
Elliot, M. A., and F. E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1934
Gillin, J. L., *Social Pathology,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1933
Gillin, J. L., *Poverty and Dependency,* revised edition, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1937
Gillette, J. M., and J. M. Reinhardt, *Current Social Problems,* revised edition, American Book Company, New York, 1937
Guild, June P., and A. A. Guild, *Handbook on Social Work Engineering,* Whittet and Shepperson, Richmond, Virginia, 1936
MacKenzie, Findlay (editor), *Planned Society,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1937
Mangold, George B., *Organization for Social Welfare,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934
Phelps, Harold A., *Contemporary Social Problems,* revised edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1938
Queen, S. A., and others, *Social Organization and Disorganization,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1935
Wagner, D. O. (editor), *Social Reformers,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934

2. CATHOLIC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES [19]

Bandas, Rudolph G., *Modern Problems in the Light of Christian Principles,* Loyola University Press, Chicago, 1937
Brehmer, R. C., *Social Doctrines of the Catholic Church,* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1936
Briefs, Goetz, *The Proletariat,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1937
Cahill, E. J., S.J., *The Framework of a Christian State,* M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., Dublin, 1932
Civardi, Luigi (translated by C. C. Martindale, S.J.), *A Manual of Catholic Action,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1936
Confrey, Burton, *Original Readings for Catholic Action,* Magnificat Press, Manchester, New Hampshire, 1936
Confrey, Burton, *Readings for Catholic Action,* Magnificat Press, Manchester, New Hampshire, 1937
Crofts, A. M., O.P., *Catholic Social Action,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1936
Deploige, Simon (translated by Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C.), *The Conflict between Ethics and Sociology,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1938

[19] Additional readings may be found by making use of the most recent issues of *The Catholic Bookman* (Detroit) and *The Index to American Catholic Pamphlets* (Catholic Library Service, St. Paul).

Drinkwater, F. H., *Seven Addresses on Social Justice,* Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1937
Fallon, Valère, S.J. (translated by John L. McNulty), *Principles of Social Economy,* Benziger Brothers, New York, 1933
Garriguet, Leon P., S.S., *The Social Value of the Gospel,* Joseph F. Wagner, New York, 1925
Gillis, James M., C.S.P., *The Church and the Depression,* Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana, 1935
Glenn, P. J., *Sociology,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1935
Haas, F. J., *Man and Society,* The Century Co., New York, 1930
Husslein, Joseph, S.J., *The Christian Social Manifesto,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1931
Jarrett, Bede, O.P., *Social Theories of the Middle Ages,* Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1926
Jerrold, Douglas, *The Future of Freedom,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1938
Kerby, William J., *The Social Mission of Charity,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921
Lapp, John A., *Justice First,* The Century Co., New York, 1928
Lugan, Alphonse, *Social Principles of the Gospel,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928
Martin, Paul R., *The Gospel in Action,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1932
McEntee, Georgiana Putnam, *The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927
Metlake, George, *Christian Social Reform,* Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, 1938
Meyer, James, O.F.M., *The Social Ideals of St. Francis,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1938
Michel, Virgil G., O.S.B., *Christian Social Reconstruction,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1937
Michel, Virgil G., O.S.B., *St. Thomas and Today,* Wanderer Printing Company, St. Paul, 1936
Moon, Parker T., *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921
Muntsch, Albert, S.J., *The Church and Civilization,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1936
Muntsch, Albert, S.J., and Henry S. Spalding, S.J., *Introductory Sociology,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1928
National Catholic Educational Association, *A Syllabus on Social Problems in the Light of Christian Principles,* Chicago, 1932
Nell-Bruening, O. von, S.J. (translated by Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J.), *The Reorganization of Social Economy,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1936
O'Grady, John, *An Introduction to Social Work,* The Century Co., New York, 1928
O'Hea, Leo, S.J., *Catholic Social Action,* Catholic Social Guild, Oxford, 1932
Parkinson, Henry, *A Primer of Social Science,* revised edition, P. S. King and Son, London, 1936
Plater, Charles D., S.J., *Catholic Social Work in Germany,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1909

Ring, Sister Mary Ignatius, S.N.D., *Villeneuve-Bargemont,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1935

Ross, Eva J., *A Survey of Sociology,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1932

Ryan, John A., *A Better Economic Order,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935

Ryan, John A., *Declining Liberty and Other Papers,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927

Ryan, John A., *Distributive Justice,* revised edition, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927

Ryan, John A., *Questions of the Day,* The Stratford Company, Boston, 1931

Ryan, John A., *Seven Troubled Years,* Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, 1937

Ryan, John A., and Joseph Husslein, S.J., *The Church and Labor,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1920

Schumacher, H., *The Social Message of the New Testament,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1937

Smith, Thurber M., S.J., *The Unemployment Problem,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1932

Spalding, Henry S., S.J., *An Introduction to Social Service,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1923

Spalding, Henry S., S.J., *Social Problems and Agencies,* Benziger Brothers, New York, 1925

St. John's Abbey, *Social Concepts and Problems,* Collegeville, Minnesota, 1936

Walsh, Mary E., *Saints and Social Work,* Preservation of the Faith, Silver Spring, Maryland, 1937

Watt, Lewis, S.J., *Catholic Social Principles,* Benziger Brothers, New York, 1930

Will, Joseph, S.J., and Kilian J. Hennrich, O.M. Cap., *Catholic Action Handbook,* Joseph P. Wagner, New York, 1936

PART II

POPULATION MOVEMENT

CHAPTER II

MIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION

At first sight, now that the United States has practically eliminated immigration, an American might be inclined to regard immigration as a dead question, and so beyond the scope of a book on modern social problems. A little thought will show that this impression is far from justified. First of all, there are still many problems of immigration assimilation confronting us here, and intelligent solutions to these problems usually demand some knowledge of the backgrounds of different immigrant groups. Secondly, there is the fact that our present immigration law, supposed to be permanent when it was passed in 1924, has so many defects that its change is only a matter of time. Necessarily, the whole immigration situation will have to be reconsidered when these changes are made. Finally, and most importantly in these days of international crises, it is gradually becoming apparent to many students of international affairs that world migrations, like world trade, must be subjected to some international control in the future if we are to have permanent peace. Some Americans have urged that we remove our existing immigration barriers in order to admit those who are being ejected from Nazi Germany.

Though the recent growth of intense nationalism in Europe and Asia, combined with the apparent collapse of the League of Nations, may make it seem utterly futile even to consider a new international policy based upon less nationalism, it is also easy to see that unchecked growth of blind nationalism must lead eventually to bigger world wars and the ultimate collapse of Western civilization—unless education prepares the way for a change in the present trend. That international agreements concerning movements of people are not beyond the realm of reasonable hope is suggested by the fact that by March, 1938, Secretary of State Hull had negotiated seventeen trade treaties with other nations in spite of the world tendency towards selfish nationalism. At the same time agreements for currency stabilization had been reached among the United States, France, England, Belgium, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. Both these types of international agreement were worked out quietly without our membership in the League of Nations. It is likely that the extension of this give-and-take program to

include population movements will raise a host of new difficulties; nevertheless, if such treaties will help to avert future wars, most people will admit that they are worth serious consideration.

Any analysis of the possibilities of future international control of migration will call for a study of the causes underlying population movements of the past, as well as of the problems created by such migrations. Since the greatest mass migration of all history moved towards the United States within the last century, an analysis of the causes which prompted this particular migration, as well as of the problems involved in absorbing the migrants here, will be a most important preliminary to an understanding of the possible issues involved in multilateral control of migration. No nation has been such a center of experiment in race and nationality relations as the United States. A. M. Schlesinger, the historian, has said that the story of the successive waves of immigration and their adaptation to the social and physical conditions found here is the central theme of United States history. Nowhere is this association more obvious than in the history of social work. Unfortunately this "central theme" is often missed by the student of American history because of its mixture with a multitude of other details. Unhappily, too, national, racial, or even religious prejudices sometimes present immigrants to the student in an unfavorable light.

Before proceeding to consider the successive immigration arrivals in the United States, we must realize that, apart from numbers, the immigration which came to America was not a new phenomenon in man's history. Although history shows that man has close attachment to his homeland, it also shows him as a frequent wanderer. Migratory tendencies are clearly indicated in the prehistoric and the early historic, as well as in the recent, periods of his story. Though anthropologists are uncertain about man's place of origin, very early migration routes have been traced westward out of Asia and northward out of Africa. It is pretty generally accepted that early man migrated from Asia to the Americas by way of Alaska, crossing over either the Aleutian Islands at the southern end of Bering Sea or the Diomede Islands in Bering Strait, thus giving us the first Indian and Eskimo residents of America.

I. Types of Human Migration

Population movements have taken several different forms. Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild has classified them conveniently under four headings: invasion, conquest, colonization, and immigration.[1]

[1] *Immigration* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925), Chapter I.

1. INVASION

During the early centuries of European history there were several invasions, or forced mass movements of peoples into areas occupied by peoples of higher culture. In these invasions, which may be regarded as types of warfare, whole tribes moved in so that they might participate in the benefits already enjoyed by the more advanced groups. Classic examples of such invasions were the migrations of the semi-barbaric tribes, the Goths, the Huns, the Vandals, and later of the Magyars, into southern and western Europe.

2. CONQUEST

Conquest might be called the reverse of invasion. In conquest, people of a more advanced material culture take the offensive, conquer a less advanced people, and place them under their political power. Very often the culture of the conquering group is also imposed upon, if not voluntarily accepted by, the conquered people. Ancient Rome provided the outstanding example of this type of migration; only soldiers, traders, government officials, missionaries, and perhaps a few stray migrants came to live in the conquered land. So also, in some respects the career of the British in India in more recent times might be called conquest. Although Italy's subjugation of Ethiopia may be regarded as a possible exception, the era of conquest or frankly military subjugation gradually came to an end when the great voyages of discovery during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries opened up new and immense territories for commercial exploitation in which military subjugation mattered very little. Distant lands, formerly inaccessible, could now become commercial termini since the oceans had become world highways. The vast superiority of European material civilization over that of the primitive tribes in the new lands made practical domination possible with a minimum of military conquest. On this account colonization and immigration began historically to succeed invasion and conquest as migratory movements. Through this colonization and immigration such great movements of European peoples took place that in 1930 it was estimated that one eleventh of the earth's population consisted of Europeans by blood who were living elsewhere.

3. COLONIZATION

Colonization usually follows hard upon discovery. This is a population movement from the stronger country to the weaker: groups of citizens are organized in the one and sent out to "take over" the other.

In some cases, such as England's North American colonies and New Zealand, the land of the new country is divided up into small free-labor homesteads, to which large numbers are attracted from the mother country; in other instances, such as Java, Jamaica, Brazil, and to a large extent Puerto Rico under the present American occupation, plantation colonies are established in which native labor is used under foreign white supervision and varying degrees of compulsion. In this latter type only males, as a rule, migrate from the mother country, and these not permanently; hence very little mingling of races results. Although there were some later discoveries and changes in colonial ownership, the treaty of Paris (1763), which determined the boundaries of Europe's original colonial possessions, is supposed to have marked the end of the great period of colonial expansion.

4. IMMIGRATION

Immigration, unlike colonization, results from the spontaneous decision of individuals or families to migrate, rather than from state enterprise. Though governments like that of Italy have encouraged migrants at times, the migratory group is always a loose association of independent individuals who on their own account have decided to go to a foreign country. According to the definition of the United States Bureau of Immigration, an immigrant is an alien officially admitted into the United States, whose last permanent residence was in some foreign country, and who comes here with the intention of remaining permanently. With improved transportation and means of communication, individuals can move quickly and safely from one part of the world to another today without troubling their governments for aid or protection. So many emigrants have left European countries since the middle of the last century that their departure may be described as a mass movement.

Although all forms of migration are usually voluntary movements, some have been involuntary. Anti-Semitic feeling has led to the expulsion of Jews from various European countries; in addition twelve million Negroes are in the United States chiefly because their forefathers were forcibly brought here from Africa by slave traders. Similarly, convicts have been sent to America as a form of punishment.

II. The Emergence of Mass Immigration

As far as the total of migrants involved is concerned, nineteenth-century immigration was a far more important population movement

than the colonization of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Since 1800 various forces have combined to make immigration the largest movement of population in history. Several factors contributed to this. An increased food supply, the social changes effected by the technological advances accompanying the Industrial Revolution, and the gradual conquest of disease led to an increase in population and to its greater mobility. The end of serfdom and the greater freedom of Europeans following the French Revolution had already paved the way to the removal of many of the legal obstacles to emigration. With increased means of communication and improved transportation facilities, the victims of Europe's periodic economic depressions soon learned about new lands of greater opportunity, and how to emigrate to them. By 1840 emigration from northwestern Europe had become a mass movement. Later in the century, when improved economic and political conditions in northwestern Europe made the Americas less attractive by comparison, steamship companies were able to interest the agricultural workers of southern and eastern Europe in the opportunities of the Americas and so to continue the great migration movement started earlier in the century.

I. UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION STATISTICS

Among the immigrant-receiving countries of the world the United States easily ranks first, having received a little over 60 per cent or about 38,000,000 of the total world immigration during the period from early in the nineteenth century to 1930. Of the other countries receiving large numbers of immigrants, Canada with about 11 per cent ranks second and Argentina with over 10 per cent next, followed in order by Brazil, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. These figures, which indicate gross immigration, need to be adjusted to emigration rates, however, if one wishes to determine exactly the numerical changes in population through immigration. Unfortunately, exact figures on international migrations were nonexistent until somewhat recently. For the United States, where it is believed that about 70 per cent of immigrants have remained permanently, it has been estimated that during the period from 1820 to 1930 the net population increase from immigration was about 26,000,000. In 1931 and for several years during the depression, the number of aliens leaving this country exceeded the number of arrivals. In 1933 not only was the permitted quota of about 150,000 immigrants unfilled but emigration exceeded immigration by 93,074. However, the proximity of the problems brought about by earlier and heavier immigration is suggested by the fact that in 1930

our "foreign stock" (foreign-born and native-born of foreign or mixed parentage) constituted more than a third of our white population, over 14,000,000 of these being foreign-born.

It is difficult to make a clean-cut distinction between the "original colonists" and the immigrants in early America. Technically, immigration commenced in 1776 with the Declaration of Independence, for after that date all comers were foreigners. Yet people other than the English commenced to immigrate to the English colonies before that date. They came from Holland, France, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, and Switzerland long before the original colonies became a new nation. In 1776 all classes of white population in the American colonies totaled about 2,000,000. Although the new nation welcomed immigrants, since they would be of value in providing security against foreign invasion and in winning the region west of the Alleghenies from the Indians, it was not until after 1840 that the annual immigration reached 100,000.

The largest number of immigrants came to the United States during the eighty-year period between 1840 and 1920. The first big wave arrived in 1842; the 100,000 mark was then reached for the first time. Thereafter the tides of immigration rose and fell in sympathy with economic and political conditions in the United States, with the exception of a few occasions brought about by special crises in the home country. The periods of the Mexican, Civil, and World Wars caused a considerable falling off in immigration, as did the panics of 1843, 1873, 1893, 1908, and certain other years. These were but the troughs, however; between the recessions enormous waves of immigration reached our shores—427,000 in 1854, 788,000 in 1882, 1,285,349 in 1907, and 805,288 in 1921. In six different years, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1910, 1913, and 1914, the total number of immigrants exceeded a million. The high-water mark of the whole period of immigration was the first two decades of the present century.

2. MOTIVES FOR IMMIGRATION

Many different motives prompted immigration to the United States. In some cases religious persecution at home was the chief cause; in others, political persecution. The desire to escape compulsory military service and the urge for adventure also figured as motives. Some came to escape punishment for crime, and others were sent here as a punishment for their crimes. Yet in the great majority of instances economic motives either were mixed in with these other motives or constituted the sole motive. While it is generally recognized that the American

immigration of recent decades has been due almost entirely to economic motives, it is sometimes forgotten that this motive was by no means missing among the colonists and the immigrants of the colonial period. Exaggerated praise of the earlier settlers has sometimes left the impression that they were prompted to come here solely by the desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences or because of a great love for political freedom. Such statements are far from the truth, as Professor Donald R. Taft has pointed out:

> At all periods of immigration, economic factors have predominated. The popular view that early Puritans came with higher ideals than the modern migrant can hardly be more than half true. But relatively political and religious factors were somewhat more important then, than in the case of the bulk of twentieth century migrants, though not more so than in the case of very many Jews and recent Russian refugees.[2]

The importance of the economic motive is further suggested by the fact that immigration has always fallen off during our periods of depression. As already indicated, we lost more through emigration than we gained by immigration during the recent economic depression. It was the economic pull of the new country which populated America. As a destination for European immigration the United States had to compete with South America and Canada. If we drew the largest numbers it was chiefly because we seemed to offer better economic opportunities. At first it was the fertile free lands which attracted; after the Civil War the demand for factory labor and for such labor as is used in building and in other construction acted as the magnet. The promised economic advantages in the new country had to exceed considerably those of the old, in most cases, if people were to break home ties forever. For this reason the immigration groups were usually made up of people who had not been very successful in their own lands. When economic opportunities in any nation nearly equaled those of the United States, very few immigrants came here from that nation. After our best free land had been taken up and economic opportunities here nearly approximated those in northwestern Europe, the immigration from that area immediately fell off. Because at that time the landless farm workers and poor urban dwellers of southern and eastern Europe could still better their economic conditions considerably by coming here, they picked up the slack caused by the falling off of immigration from the north. The economic appeal was at all times enhanced, of course, by the belief in Europe that this was a free land of religious

[2] Donald R. Taft, *Human Migration* (The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936), page 73.

tolerance, liberal government, and free institutions where a spirit of equality and fraternity prevailed.

3. SOURCES OF OUR IMMIGRATION

When we consider the countries of immigrant origin, a decided shift from the north to the south of Europe is seen during the eighty-year period of maximum immigration extending from 1840 to 1920. During the first decade of this period (1841–1850) 93 per cent of our immigrants came from the north and west of Europe, those from the south and east of Europe constituting less than 1 per cent. By the time of the last decade (1911–1920) the ratio from these nations had shifted to such an extent that only about 17 per cent were coming from the former countries, while about 60 per cent were coming from the latter countries. This change in country of immigrant origin commenced to take place in 1882. During the eighty-year period of maximum immigration small numbers of immigrants also arrived from continents other than Europe. The percentage of our immigrants from Canada and Newfoundland increased from about 2 per cent during the first decade (1841–1850) to nearly 13 per cent in the last decade (1911–1920). Our Asiatic immigration averaged a little over 2 per cent during most of this eighty-year period, while the percentage of immigrants from Mexico, the West Indies, and "other countries" usually remained less than 1 per cent for each of these groups. From 1840 almost to the end of the century immigration from either Ireland or Germany exceeded that from all other countries, with England ranking next in order; commencing with the 1890 census and extending up to the end of the second decade of the present century either Italy or Austria-Hungary led, with Russia usually ranking third. After 1920 a new American immigration policy reduced the total amount of immigration and restricted especially that from the south and east of Europe. As a result of this law, immigration from Canada and Newfoundland increased to over 22 per cent of the total during the 1921–1930 period, while that from Mexico exceeded 11 per cent.

If we go back further and consider our total immigration from 1820, when the federal government first began to collect statistics on immigration, up to 1930, we find that about 85 per cent of our total immigration has come from Europe, nearly 8 per cent from Canada and Newfoundland, and about 2 per cent each from Asia, Mexico, and all other areas. The countries which have contributed a million or more immigrants during this period rank in order as follows: Germany, Italy, Ireland, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Canada, England, and Sweden.

Unfortunately, this last information does not give us very exact knowledge about nationalities or peoples, since classification by "race and people" rather than country of origin was not introduced until 1899. For example, it is believed that the Poles constituted the most important element in the immigration from Austria-Hungary, while the Jews made up a considerable part of the immigration from several countries. Various countries contributed nearly 2,000,000 Jewish immigrants during the period from 1899 to 1930, when the Jews ranked second in number to the Italian immigrants. Classified according to country of last residence, 68 per cent of these recent Jewish immigrants came from Russia and Poland, and about 14 per cent from Austria-Hungary.[3]

III. America Restricts European Immigration

During the long period of heavy immigration the United States had surprisingly few laws to regulate its quality or numbers. One reason for this was the question, long undecided, whether the federal or state governments possessed the power to regulate immigration. After the Supreme Court declared the control of immigration to be a federal function in 1875, Congress made its first attempt at sorting immigrants by excluding the Chinese in 1882. In 1885 contract-labor exclusion took place, in order to prevent American corporations and others from exploiting laborers brought here under fixed-rate employment contracts, usually to the detriment of American labor. At about the same time laws were passed excluding certain undesirable persons, such as the incompetent, idiots, the insane, epileptics, the diseased, felons, prostitutes, polygamists, anarchists, paupers, and those "likely to become public charges." Yet all these provisions, when summed up, had scarcely any effect in restricting the size of the waves of immigration that came to our shores each year.

1. INTRODUCTION OF A NEW EUROPEAN POLICY

Though the demand for restriction in the numbers coming here was repeated for several sessions of Congress, it was not until 1917 that those who made this request were able to get action. It may be said, therefore, that our present American immigration policy, as expressed in law, began to evolve in 1917 when the literacy-test law was finally passed, after having been vetoed by three Presidents. This test barred the entrance of "All aliens over sixteen years of age, physically capable

[3] Maurice R. Davie, *World Immigration* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936), pages 116 and 145.

of reading, who cannot read the English language or some other language or dialect including Hebrew or Yiddish." This law was significant not so much for its obvious attempt to set up a new quality test for immigrants as in indicating the first legal step in the direction of making our immigration policy restrictive as well as selective in its application to Europeans. Since most of the immigrants coming from southern and eastern Europe at this time were believed to be illiterate, it was felt that this test would greatly reduce the total number of immigrants, in addition to favoring aliens coming from the more literate northwestern Europe.

This law was never tested, however, since America, after the World War, seemed threatened with a deluge of European immigration, and Congress hurriedly passed a new and frankly restrictive law in 1921. The restrictions in this law were based on what is known as the quota principle, by which a definite percentage (3 in this law) of the number of foreign-born persons of each nationality resident in the United States as determined by the last available decennial census figure (1910) were to be admitted annually. In practice this law permitted the admission of only 357,000 quota aliens, thus ending the former eras of mass immigration, which had passed the half-million mark many times and the million mark on six occasions. Since three of these immigration waves of more than a million, made up chiefly of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, had come here too late to be recorded in the 1910 census, it naturally followed that the 3-per-cent quotas of the new law allotted much smaller numbers to the nations from which these recent immigrant groups had come than would have been the case if the new 1920 census figures had been available for use. While the law of 1921 definitely achieved the numerical restriction aimed at in the 1917 literacy test, its discriminatory phase, that is, the preference which it gave the nations of northwestern Europe, was somewhat accidental.

2. THE EXISTING LAW

After the passage of the 1921 law, sentiment against immigration continued to grow and reached its climax in the 1924 Congress, which passed two drastic measures against immigration, one of them being our present national-origins law. The first measure passed by the 1924 Congress, which body, incidentally, was made up to a considerable extent of "professional Americans" elected by Ku Klux Klan backing, was a temporary immigration law which not only pushed the restrictive feature forward to new limits, by reducing the quotas of the previous law from 3 per cent to 2 per cent, but openly discriminated

against southern and eastern Europeans by making the census of 1890 rather than that of 1910 or 1920 the basis for its quotas. It was provided that this law should remain in effect until such time (actually April, 1929) as new quotas could be worked out for a "permanent law," also defined in its main features by this 1924 Congress. This latter law, called the national-origins law, has been in effect since 1929 and provides that the total immigration in any year shall be about 150,000, quotas from the various countries of Europe being determined by the proportions of these national stocks believed to be present in this country in 1920.

On the surface the new national-origins law purported to avoid all discrimination by attempting to keep the future distribution of immigrants in harmony with the ratio of nationalities already existent in the United States of 1920. In effect, the national-origins principle worked out as those who introduced the measure in 1924 are said to have foreseen, that is, not only as a restrictive measure but also as one which would discriminate against immigration from southern and eastern Europe. The earlier 1921 law had cut down the proportion of southern and eastern European immigrants from the prewar 75.6 per cent (1913–1914) to 27.2 per cent; the national-origins law reduced this ratio further to 14.3 per cent, meanwhile jumping the ratio from northern and western Europe from its prewar 20.8 per cent to 83.3 per cent. The reasons given for this discrimination will be taken up shortly. In arranging the different national quotas for the countries to the west of us, Congress fixed the minimum at 100. The quotas are available only for persons born within the respective countries and racially eligible for United States citizenship. These quotas are as follows:

NATIONAL-ORIGIN IMMIGRATION QUOTAS [4]

COUNTRY OR AREA	QUOTA	COUNTRY OR AREA	QUOTA
Afghanistan	100	Belgium	1,304
Albania	100	Bhutan	100
Andorra	100	Bulgaria	100
Arabian Peninsula (except Muscat, Aden Settlement and Protectorate, and Saudi Arabia)	100	Cameroon (British mandate)	100
		Cameroon (French mandate)	100
		China	100
Australia (including Tasmania, Papua, and all islands appertaining to Australia)	100	Czechoslovakia	2,874
		Danzig, Free City of	100
		Denmark	1,181
Austria [5]	1,413	Egypt	100
		Estonia	116

[4] *Immigration Laws* (United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1937), page 105.

[5] The present German quota is the sum of the Austrian and German quotas given above.

COUNTRY OR AREA	QUOTA
Ethiopia (Abyssinia)	100
Finland	569
France	3,086
Germany [5a]	25,957
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	65,721
Greece	307
Hungary	869
Iceland	100
India	100
Iran	100
Iraq (Mesopotamia)	100
Irish Free State	17,853
Italy	5,802
Japan	100
Latvia	236
Liberia	100
Liechtenstein	100
Lithuania	386
Luxemburg	100
Monaco	100
Morocco (French and Spanish Zones and Tangier)	100
Muscat (Oman)	100
Nauru (British mandate)	100
Nepal	100
Netherlands	3,153
New Zealand	100
Norway	2,377
New Guinea, Territory of (including appertaining islands) (Australian mandate)	100
Palestine (with Trans-Jordan) (British mandate)	100
Poland	6,524
Portugal	440
Ruanda and Urundi (Belgian mandate)	100
Rumania	377
Russia, European and Asiatic	2,712
Samoa, Western (mandate of New Zealand)	100
San Marino	100
Saudi Arabia (Hejaz and Nejd and its dependencies)	100
Siam	100
South Africa, Union of	100
South-West Africa (mandate of the Union of South Africa)	100
Spain	252
Sweden	3,314
Switzerland	1,707
Syria and the Lebanon (French mandate)	123
Tanganyika (British mandate)	100
Togoland (British mandate)	100
Togoland (French mandate)	100
Turkey	226
Yap and other Pacific Islands under Japanese mandate	100
Yugoslavia	845

Defects in the Present Law

The relative merits of the discriminatory feature of the national-origins law will be taken up later, but it may be pointed out here that the law is at least mechanically defective in that it is based upon the false assumption that it was possible to determine approximately the nationality of each 1920 resident, so as to fix the present quotas. The formula to be followed in determining our "national origins" in 1920 was prescribed in the 1924 law: "Such determination shall not be made by tracing the ancestors or descendants of particular individuals, but shall be based upon the statistics of immigration and emigration, to-

[5a] The present German quota is the sum of the Austrian and German quotas given above.

gether with rates of increase of population as shown by successive decennial United States censuses, and such other data as may be found to be reliable." While this method may have sounded simple enough to some in 1924, the difficulties encountered in working out these computations are suggested by the fact that there was no federal census until 1790, no record of immigration by nationality until 1820, no listing of resident foreign-born by country of origin until 1850, and no record of the foreign background of those born here of foreign-born parents until 1890. On top of these difficulties there were complications provided by the intermarriage of different nationalities.

These difficulties were recognized officially, even before the law went into effect, when three members of the President's Cabinet, including Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, reported as follows concerning the evidence available for determining the national quotas: "The statistical and historical information available raises grave doubts as to the whole value of these computations as a basis for the purpose intended." Because the basis for the existing quotas was necessarily so inaccurate, both the Democratic and the Republican candidate for the Presidency advocated the repeal of the law in 1928. Nevertheless, the law is still in operation, chiefly because legislators fear the intense national, racial, and religious feelings which are likely to be aroused if Congress makes a move towards amending the defective law. Yet it would seem as if the gross inaccuracy of the existing quotas, even if there were no other objections to the law, would suggest that the law should be changed. When a change is attempted, we may be sure that the whole immigration question will be discussed again throughout the nation.

Regulation of Other Migrants

In addition to the highly controversial quotas of the present immigration law, the law introduced other routine features in order to provide for the entrance of those not regulated by the quotas. Government officials and their families, alien seamen entering temporarily, aliens in continuous transit through the country, traders, and temporary visitors are not regarded as immigrants. However, a person admitted on a temporary basis can never under any circumstances remain permanently without leaving the United States and then obtaining the proper type of visa from the American consul in a foreign country. In addition to the groups mentioned above, another class, known as "nonquota immigrants" and freely admitted, is made up as follows: the wife of an American citizen, or the husband of one prior to July 1, 1932, and the

unmarried children under 21; unmarried women who lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien before September 22, 1922; teachers and ministers and their wives and unmarried children under 18; students 15 years of age and over who are to attend a school approved by the Secretary of Labor; and immigrants previously admitted who are returning from a visit abroad. As a sort of afterthought the law provides that "preference" shall be given to two groups in making up the quotas of each nation: (1) immigrants skilled in agriculture, together with their families: (2) the fathers, mothers, and husbands of citizens who are over 21 years of age, and to a lesser degree the wives and unmarried children of aliens.

Neither the above nor subsequent laws apply to natives coming here from Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo, and the independent countries of South and Central America. With the restriction of European aliens, immigration to the United States from other American countries, chiefly from Canada, Newfoundland, and Mexico, became important, making up nearly 37 per cent of our immigration from 1921 to 1930. Mexican immigration was reduced during the depression under the old "likely to become a public charge" clause of a former law, but a return to prosperity, which will nullify the operation of this clause, is likely to bring renewed agitation for the extension of the quota system to Mexico, if not to all other American countries. The migration here of those born in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, territories of the United States, is not regulated by quota.

With the passage of the Philippine Independence Act in 1934, immigration from that country, formerly unrestricted, was limited to an annual quota of 50. This quota is to be changed again after 1944, when complete independence is to be proclaimed. It has been said that the granting of independence to the Philippines was not undertaken because of altruistic motives towards them. Rather, the independence was designed to overcome the legal complications which formerly prevented us from barring as immigrants these residents of American territory and to stop the free importation of sugar and other products which competed with American industries. Another indirect effect of our recent restrictive immigration legislation was the stimulation of Negro migration from our southern states, this also in response to the demand for cheap labor in the North to replace that which formerly came from Europe.

Since the passage of our recent restrictive immigration laws many aliens have been smuggled across our borders, especially by way of Mexico, Canada, and Cuba. In addition to these unlawful entries there

are sailors who desert in port and alien visitors who remain without authorization. It has been estimated that as many as 100,000 enter the United States each year in these illegal ways, some of them being Orientals. Not long ago there was uncovered at San Jose, California, an illicit traffic which smuggled Chinese across the Mexican border in specially constructed compartments beneath the seats of automobiles, at a fee of $250 each. All who enter the country illegally are deported, if detected. In addition, resident aliens who are found to be feeble-minded, criminal, or immoral may be deported. In 1934 more than two thousand aliens were deported for offenses involving criminality or moral turpitude. It has been said that the threat to expose aliens who have entered the United States illegally is a lucrative source of blackmail.

IV. Asiatic Immigration Restricted

It is through accident rather than through premeditation that American discrimination against Asiatics seems to go all the way back to 1790. In that year our first naturalization law provided that "any alien being a free white person" might become a citizen. The phrase "free white person" was used because the only colored aliens considered in the United States at that time were the Negro slaves. When citizenship was finally extended to the Negroes in 1870, the old qualifying phrase was extended to "aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent," no thought evidently being given to the possible naturalization of Orientals, who at that time were confined almost entirely to the Far West. As a matter of fact, some Asiatics had already been naturalized by that date on the assumption that as non-Negroes they were included originally under the term "white race." It was not until 1922 that a Supreme Court decision finally settled this question by determining that the Japanese cannot be naturalized under the old "white persons" clause, nor, according to a decision of the following year, can Hindus. The restriction of Oriental immigration rather than mere citizenship was brought about deliberately.

Our first Asiatic immigration, that of the Chinese, commenced after the discovery of gold in California. It aroused so much hostility in California that international difficulties soon arose, and as a result the United States concluded with China a series of treaties, ending in 1858, whereby Chinese immigrants were promised protection here in exchange for trading privileges accorded to the United States in China. Agitation and violence against the Chinese continued, nevertheless, and finally resulted in the murder of many Chinese by American mobs. In

1882 the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed, denying Chinese citizenship and barring future immigration of Chinese laborers. This anti-Chinese policy has since been extended to protect the insular possessions of the United States. It may be said, therefore, that our first restrictive and discriminatory immigration law, passed in 1882, was aimed solely at the Chinese.

OUR POLICY TOWARDS JAPAN

Much of the present Japanese hostility to the United States was generated by our immigration policy, especially by the tactless methods of the 1924 Congress. In 1906 prejudice first began to be manifested here against the Japanese, who only a few years before had started to migrate to California. Soon international complications began to arise, especially when a group of Japanese scientists who had come to observe the effects of the San Francisco earthquake were insulted, in spite of the fact that Japan had contributed more than any other foreign nation for the relief of the earthquake victims. After first opposing discriminatory legislation introduced into Congress to prohibit the immigration of Japanese labor, President Theodore Roosevelt, out of consideration for the feelings of the sensitive Japanese nation, proceeded to bring about this restriction through diplomatic channels. He alleviated the international tension quietly by means of an executive agreement with Japan, which, unlike a foreign treaty, did not need the approval of the then belligerent United States Senate. By the terms of this "gentlemen's agreement," made effective with Japan in 1908, the latter promised to refuse passports to laborers coming to the United States. Later, of her own accord, Japan extended this agreement to include immigration to Hawaii.

While the "gentlemen's agreement" prohibited the immigration of Japanese laborers, it permitted those who were already here to send back to Japan for their wives. Since marriage by proxy was legal in Japan, as in many other countries, many American Japanese selected their wives-to-be through pictures sent to America, later marrying these women by proxy. When large numbers of these "picture brides" began to arrive in this country, and when as a result of these marriages the Japanese population of California began to increase, agitators against the Japanese charged that the spirit of the "gentlemen's agreement" was being violated. It was said in addition that the clause in the "gentlemen's agreement" which permitted the immigration of children adopted by a family was also being violated by the "adoption" of grown-up children, referred to as the "Yoshi system." In response to

these new protests the Japanese government promised to issue no passports to "picture brides" after 1920 and to refuse passports to an adopted child unless such adoption had been registered for at least five years before and then only if there was no other child in the family.

In its 1917 and other immigration regulations Congress had always recognized the existence of the "gentlemen's agreement" with Japan. The act of 1917, which attempted to restrict European immigration by means of the literacy test, also provided for the complete exclusion of Asiatics (except for certain classes such as government officials, travelers, merchants, and professional groups) who came from an area known thereafter as the Asiatic barred zone. This area, defined by degrees of latitude and longitude, includes India, Siam, Indo-China, parts of Siberia, Arabia, Afghanistan, and all the Asiatic islands, including those of the East Indies, except the Philippines and Japan. The Chinese, of course, had already been excluded by name in the act of 1882. Out of deference to the ambitious Japanese people, who did not wish to be put on the same basis as these other Orientals, the regulation of their immigration was left in 1917 to the existing "gentlemen's agreement."

In spite of Congressional tradition in regard to the Japanese, the 1924 Congress suddenly proposed to ignore the existence of the "gentlemen's agreement" by barring all immigrants not eligible for citizenship, a classification which included the Japanese. The more conservative members of this Congress, who realized that a measure placing the Japanese in the same category with the Chinese and other Orientals would arouse resentment in Japan, protested vigorously. The Japanese ambassador in Washington went so far as to send a note to the Secretary of State explaining that such a measure would "seriously wound the proper susceptibilities of the Japanese nation." Prompt offers were made by Japan to change the "gentlemen's agreement" in any way which we might designate, but it was all to no avail. The superpatriots of the 1924 Congress had their way, and the offensive act was enacted. Besides offending the Japanese, this law immediately shut the door to her people without consideration for family ties, which are often more binding to the Japanese than they are to us. As a result more than four thousand children in Japan were prevented from joining their parents living in California, and several hundred parents were prevented from joining their American-born minor children. Finally, since California and neighboring states had already prohibited the intermarriage of whites and Orientals, in many instances the unmarried Japanese here were unable to secure wives.

The Japanese people, who up to 1924 had idealized America as a land

of justice and liberty, regarded this law as an inexplicable act of cruelty as well as a deliberate affront to their national honor. Public sentiment against the United States ran high. The Japanese Diet condemned the measure, placards were displayed advising the Japanese to hate everything American, and American missionaries were advised to leave. Japanese militarists made the most of this wave of bitterness, urging the Japanese to make large appropriations to prepare for a future war with the United States. In brief, American-Japanese friction, previously confined chiefly to California, was given an international status which may lead some day to serious complications, mainly because of hasty, unnecessary federal legislation. Commenting upon the effects of this 1924 law, Professor Maurice R. Davie wrote in 1936: "So long as the law continues in force Japanese antipathy toward the United States will remain, making true goodwill between the two countries impossible." [6]

V. Effect of Immigration on American Stock

Many people believe that some races are innately superior to others, either in intelligence or in freedom from pathological conditions, and so more desirable as immigrants because of their superior biological contributions to our "native" stock. Since our European immigrants are of three different racial, or, more properly, subracial, stocks—Nordics from the north of Europe, Alpines from the central areas, and Mediterraneans from the south—this matter of ethnic evaluation has always entered into discussions of our immigration policy. The importance of race, as it bears upon our immigration problems, may conveniently be considered here under three headings: (1) the claim of Nordic superiority; (2) the tests of innate racial mental ability; and (3) differences in undesirable abnormalities among races. Cultural differences among racial groups will be considered later.

1. THE NORDIC SUPERIORITY CLAIM

The theory of Nordic superiority is an importation, developed in northwestern Europe during the latter half of the last century by the Comte de Gobineau and H. S. Chamberlain. According to these writers the racial stock of this area of Europe is innately superior to that of other parts. These Nordics, who are supposed to constitute the major part of the western and northern European stocks, are described as of fair complexion, rather tall, long-headed, with light eyes and light wavy

[6] *Op. cit.*, page 327.

hair. Because of their supposedly purer racial heredity they are alleged to be more intelligent than the mongrel people of the other subracial types and to possess in addition superior qualities of courage and initiative. Those who belong to this supposedly superior stock are variously referred to as Aryans, Anglo-Saxons, and Teutons, as well as Nordics. At present the doctrine has assumed fanatical proportions in Nazi Germany, where the terms *Nordic* and *German* have come to be regarded as synonymous, to distinguish this royal lineage from "biologically inferior" Semites (Jews) and other races. In his attempts to dramatize this alleged German racial purity and national continuity from prehistoric times Hitler is trying to revive the pagan religion of the primitive Teuton tribes as the religion of Nazi Germany. Some of the rites of this amazing religion of "blood and soil," which are to supplant Christian feasts in modern Germany, were described in the New York *Times* recently under the title "Nazi Christmas."

To the ancient pagans, who reckoned their months by phases of the moon and cycles of the sun, the Winter solstice was held to be a major celebration. It marked the time when night had reached its maximum length and the solar year was at the change.

Last Tuesday marked this year's Winter solstice, and on a hundred hills in Nazi Germany, where the pagan rites have been renewed, a hundred sacred fires blazed in the night. Around them gathered converts to the religion of "blood and soil," bearing torches. A stentorian voice called, "Comrades, bearers of the torches, be of good German faith," and in answer they chanted, "Our souls are pure fire, fit only for the noblest use."

A modernized litany, revived from the legends of Thor and Wotan, was intoned and a speaker extolled the virtues of the Teuton blood and excoriated those who had "stolen" the pagan festival and "perverted" it into the Christian Christmas. This firelight ceremony, the speaker declared, was the true festival of brave Teuton men, who remember their illustrious past and pledge themselves to an even more illustrious future. The torches were flung into the fire, and cheers for the Fuehrer and for Nazi Germany rose in the smoky starlight.[7]

Though Nazi Germany is probably the first nation to attempt to translate the idea of Nordic superiority into a religion, it should not be forgotten that American immigration legislation passed by the 1924 Congress (and that, of course, includes our existing national-origins law) was based to a large extent upon an assumption of that same Nordic superiority. In the United States Nordic fanaticism, propagated under the guise of "100-per-cent Americanism," was directed largely against the new immigration. According to Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, and

[7] *Weekly News Summary*, New York *Times*, December 26, 1937. Used by permission.

a few other American writers who reflected the ideas of Gobineau, our recent Mediterranean, Alpine, and Slavic arrivals are essentially inferior to the older Nordic immigration, differing not only in obvious physical characteristics but also in innate mental and emotional qualities as well. The national-origins law was, then, enacted largely as anthropological therapy to preserve the blood of the supposedly superior old American stock, though its secondary purpose was to reduce the total amount of immigration. Recently one of the Nazi officials attempted to belittle President Roosevelt's expression of sympathy for the Jews expelled from Austria by reminding us publicly that Americans also discriminated against races in their immigration laws.

The idea of Nordic superiority, whether applied in Germany, in the United States, or in any other nation or area, has been thoroughly ridiculed by all modern anthropologists. One of the simplest refutations of this idea is a biological fact: no present-day race or subrace is pure-blooded. Furthermore, the belief that any race or subrace was at any time superior EFFECT OF IMby its very nature is branded by anthropologists as a pure[illegible]tion. The historic success of certain racial groups can be explai[illegible]ner easily on grounds other than the biological.

2. INNATE MENTAL ABILITIES OF RACES

The American advocates of Nordicism have attempted to utilize various psychological tests in order to prove their theory that immigrants from southern Europe are inferior to the older immigrants in native mental ability. Naturally, if immigrants as a group, or recent immigrants in particular, are innately inferior to the older immigrants in mentality, our national stock is deteriorating. In considering this question the 1924 Congress was considerably influenced by a report on the intelligence of European immigrants published by Carl C. Brigham two years before. According to Brigham's conclusions, which were based upon "group tests" given to recently drafted American soldiers in the World War, the native intelligence of immigrants from northwestern Europe exceeded that of those from the southern and central parts. In addition to the army group tests, some of the individual tests given about this time seemed to point to the same conclusions.

Later analysis of the army group tests and of the individual tests of that period disproved the case against the southern and central European. Professor Thomas Garth, who has made a comprehensive study of the methods pursued in the older tests, says that nearly all of them failed, chiefly because the important influence of cultural environment upon mentality was underestimated. In this connection it is interesting

to note that the recently improved Binet (individual) tests have failed to discover the variations in racial groups indicated by the earlier tests. Brunner, for example, found that there was little difference in the intelligence of rural school children whether of native or foreign-born parentage, nor did it matter whether their foreign-born parents were from the north or south of Europe. In 1930 even Brigham abandoned his former viewpoint and explained that later discoveries about the technique of giving mental tests had shown that the conclusions based upon his earlier studies were without scientific foundation. Furthermore, recent studies by Garth and others fail to find any substantial differences in innate emotional tendencies or any other personality characteristics which would make immigrants as a class, or any particular group of immigrants, inferior to others. It has been found that so-called racial and emotional differences in temperament are caused by cultural influences and tend to disappear in the second generation of our foreign-born. Whatever deficiency there may be in our present knowledge of native ability among racial and national groups, there is nothing to sustain the beliefs which were so widely held by members of the 1924 Congress and which are still reflected in our present law.

3. PHYSICAL DEFECT AND RACE

What is to be said of the charge that recent immigrants are ruining American stock because of their high percentage of pathological hereditary traits? Are recent immigrants "the scum of the slums of Europe," as some have maintained?

Some light is thrown upon the general social status of what is called the "new immigration" by a report, submitted in 1911, of the United States Immigration Commission:

> The present emigration from Europe to the United States is for the most part drawn from country districts and smaller cities or villages, and is composed largely of the peasantry and unskilled laboring classes. . . . The present movement is not recruited in the main from the lowest economic and social strata of the population . . . [but] represents the stronger and better element of the particular class from which it is drawn.[8]

Dr. H. H. Laughlin of the Eugenics Record Office attempted to prove that these immigrants were unique in that they suffered from an altogether disproportionate share of hereditary defects which threatened to corrupt older American stock. Laughlin's study, which has since come to be regarded as a notorious example of faulty social research, was for a long time quoted with approval in almost all articles written

[8] Quoted by Maurice R. Davie, *op. cit.*, page 269.

on immigration. Laughlin failed to consider the weight of various factors familiar to the trained social statistician—for instance, the fact that any latent tendency towards insanity is apt to be brought out under conditions of stress and strain such as are involved in the problems of adjustment to a new country, strange conditions, or an unknown language, so that recent immigrants would be expected to have a high insanity rate. Nor did Laughlin stop to realize that people settled here in cities and on the lowest rungs of the economic ladder will manifest a higher statistical insanity rate than do contented rural dwellers. Perhaps the Laughlin evidence which impressed the 1924 Congress so favorably can best be disposed of here by pointing out that Professor Taft apologizes for treating it at such considerable length in his recent work on immigration, explaining that he reviews it "not because of its scientific value, for it is almost completely devoid of such, but because of its great influence upon policy and because, for a time at least, it served as a sort of bible to restrictionists." [9] As far as really scientific evidence of pathological hereditary traits stands today, we have little or nothing upon which to base an immigration policy.

Some have objected to immigration, particularly that of southern and and eastern Europeans, on the ground that it will lead to race mixture in the United States, a thing which they conceive to be bad. Whatever opinion breeders of animals have concerning the mongrel, our best biologists are in no way alarmed at the prospect of an additional crossing of the European subraces here. In fact, many students of human biology maintain that a healthier physical type results from such crossings. Those who are so much concerned about preventing "race crosses" forget that all the human races and subraces have long since ceased to be "pure." Indeed, it could much more easily be maintained that migration and the consequent crossing of subraces have preceded some of civilization's greatest spurts. Isolation and inbreeding, which are essential preconditions for a temporary status of relative racial purity, usually result in a retarded culture.

VI. Effect of Immigration upon Native Growth

An old argument against immigration is that immigration has resulted in a large-scale decline in the rate of increase of our native stock. On this account, it has been stated, immigration has not increased the total population of the United States but has merely substituted foreign-born for native stock. The basis for this theory is the belief that the

[9] *Op. cit.*, page 216.

native, forced to compete for a job with the foreigner and his lower standard of living, had to postpone marriage and reduce the size of his family in order to maintain his old standard of living. The fact that a decline in the native-born birth rate paralleled the rapid increase in immigration and that this decline took place most rapidly in those areas where the greatest number of immigrants located seemed to give statistical backing to the argument.

All students agree that the national birth rate, which had been high up to 1860, thereafter fell steadily. However, most modern authorities on population attribute this decline to factors other than the arrival of large numbers of immigrant competitors. They explain that before the period of mass immigration the country was new, possessed abundant free lands, and provided exceptional opportunities to all. Such new countries have always had high birth rates at first, but the rates decline when the frontiers have been absorbed and former opportunities restricted. Furthermore, the rapid industrialization and urbanization of this country, which were taking place at the same time that large waves of immigrants were arriving here, constituted a second important factor which should be considered in any analysis of the decline in the birth rate. Both these processes are usually correlated with a decline in the birth rate. Finally, the assertion that immigrants frequently forced the native-born to accept a lower wage is questionable. Taft is of the opinion that the scale of living of most native workers was raised, rather than lowered, by the coming of the immigrant. The native worker, he thinks, tried to raise his old standard of living, not merely to maintain it, and it is this which accounts for the decline in births.

The fact that the declining birth rate was most marked among the middle and upper classes, who were seldom in direct competition with immigrant labor, would seem to bear out Taft's observation and to place the blame for the native decline on their new ambitions, or upon some other factor which accompanies living on a higher social plane, rather than upon any threat to the old standards. If immigration had any effect at all upon the decline in the growth of the native population, its responsibility would seem to be indirect, at most, and to rest chiefly in the fact that it hastened the absorption of the frontier and stimulated industrial and urban development. In the next chapter we shall consider the most important effect of immigration—its effect upon the culture of our nation.

At the end of this chapter, in which we have witnessed the steady march of different European groups to our shores, from colonial times to date, the following picture of the biological product of this con-

tinuous European invasion, namely the "average" or "typical" white American of today, as described for us by one of the chief statisticians of the United States Bureau of the Census, may be of interest, even though we must realize that it is only an estimate:

> The average or typical white American would be about 37 per cent English, including a small admixture of Welsh, 8 per cent Scotch, 11 per cent Irish, and 17 per cent German. The rest of the blood in his veins would be of very mixed origin, derived from many countries with no one country predominant, Italy, Poland, and France each contributing about 4 per cent of the total, Russia, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands, and Sweden about 2 per cent each, Norway 1.5 per cent, and no other country as much as 1 per cent.[10]

(See the references at the end of Chapter IV.)

[10] Joseph A. Hill, "Composition of the American Population by Race and Country of Origin," *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, page 184.

PART III

POPULATION GROWTH AND DECLINE

CHAPTER III

THE BLENDING OF NATIONALITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

ANY shifting of population from one country or area to another naturally makes vital changes in the life of the area to which the shift is made. Some of the likely biological effects which the infusion of immigrant stocks may have exerted upon the pre-existing American stock have already been considered. No less important are the social effects of such immigration. In which special ways has the culture of the United States been changed or modified through immigration? Obviously this is a question of great social importance; obviously whoever would measure and judge American culture will have to consider such questions as these: Who came? Where did they come from? Where did they settle? What were their cultural backgrounds? What kind of culture did they find upon their arrival here? It is logical to consider first, of course, the make-up of the American population before its nature was changed by the great waves of later immigration. This we shall do.

I. THE COLONISTS

Since the so-called Indians, themselves migrants from Asia, were the first Americans of the historic period, it should be explained that we are concerned here only with the culture of transplanted Europeans as that culture existed in the thirteen American colonies before 1783, when the treaty of peace was signed with England. The majority of these colonists had simply migrated from Great Britain to one of her possessions. However, paralleling and following closely upon the heels of this colonization, immigration came from other countries such as Germany, the Netherlands, France, and Belgium.

It is popularly believed that the great majority of the two million whites resident in the thirteen American colonies in 1776 were of English origin. The fact is that there never was a unity of nationality in this country. Almost from the start of the American colonies non-English immigration had been paralleling colonization. Among the earliest of these foreign infiltrations were that of the Dutch to New York and

northern New Jersey and that of the Swedes along the Delaware River. The utter lack of records on immigration, population, fecundity, and other matters in the prewar period makes it impossible to determine exactly the relative strength of the national groups settled here in 1776. Recently Professor J. Franklin Jamieson suggested that the most likely proportions are as follows: English, 60 per cent; Irish and Scotch-Irish, 17 to 18 per cent; Germans, 11 to 12 per cent; Dutch, 7 to 8 per cent; Scotch, French, and other groups, 2 to 5 per cent.[1] This estimate, as we shall see, reduces the percentage of English considerably below the two earlier American governmental estimates on the same subject.

The gross inadequacy of early information concerning the national origins of the colonial population is illustrated by the objections raised against a report of the United States Bureau of the Census, *A Century of Population Growth,* issued in 1909. In this report an attempt was made to give the distribution of nationalities here at the time of the first census in 1790, based on the names of the heads of families which appear on the 1790 census schedules. Since there was very little immigration between 1776 and 1790, this report, if correct, might have given us a fairly accurate picture of the national origins of colonial America prior to the period when all newcomers were regarded as foreigners. The national distribution of the white population in 1790, according to this 1909 study, was as follows:

English	2,345,844	or 83.5%	of the whole
Scotch	188,589	or 6.7%	of the whole
German	156,457	or 5.6%	of the whole
Dutch	56,623	or 2.0%	of the whole
Irish	44,273	or 1.6%	of the whole
French	13,384	or 0.5%	of the whole
Hebrew and all others	5,078	or 0.1%	of the whole
Total	2,810,248	100.0%	

This report was severely criticized by Professor Jamieson, by experts employed by the American Council of Learned Societies, and others.

STATISTICS ON THE COLONIAL IRISH

The 1909 census report relative to the Irish alone was made the subject of at least two critical studies by Michael J. O'Brien, historiographer of the American Irish Historical Society.[2] In his *A Hidden Phase of American History* Dr. O'Brien showed that, whereas the 1790 census

[1] Quoted by Donald R. Taft, *Human Migration* (The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936), page 71.

[2] *A Hidden Phase of American History* (Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1919) and *Pioneer Irish in New England* (P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York, 1937).

schedules in Connecticut and Pennsylvania showed a total of only fifteen persons with certain selected Irish names, including men, women, and children, the rolls of the revolutionary army alone in these two states showed that there were 223 soldiers bearing these same Irish surnames. In Connecticut, selected for special study by O'Brien because of a long-accepted belief that its early settlers were almost wholly of English stock, the census of 1790 showed only one family of three persons by the name of Murphy. Yet O'Brien found that nine men with this surname were enrolled with the Connecticut forces in the French-English war and a dozen in the revolutionary forces. In addition, a search of the state marriage records indicated eight other men of this name who had children born to them before 1790. In a more recent volume, *Pioneer Irish in New England* (1937), Dr. O'Brien showed that Irish Catholics were even more numerous in colonial New England than his first study indicated, even though they were persecuted there if they attempted to practice their religion. In the preface to this last book Father Patrick J. Temple cites as evidence of the heavy Irish immigration to the colonies the fact that for the eighteen years 1733–1750, 138,900 Irish arrived at Philadelphia alone, 64 per cent of these coming from ports in Catholic Ireland and 36 per cent from ports in Ulster.

The O'Brien studies are worthy of special attention, first, in view of such statements as that of Madison Grant to the effect that immigrants did not come here from the Catholic parts of Ireland until after 1840, and second, on account of the objections to the existing quotas of the national-origins immigration law, objections based upon the claim that there is a lack of adequate factual data for fixing such quotas. O'Brien says that many names arbitrarily listed as English in the 1790 census were really those of Irishmen who had been forced to change their names in Ireland. In 1927 O'Brien wrote on this point as follows:

> In assuming the national origins of those recorded in the Census of 1790, the compilers of the racial tabulations failed to take into account the fact that numerous Irish families bear names that are no indication whatever of their nationality. It is entirely probable that they knew nothing of the law passed by the English Parliament in the reign of Edward IV, which compelled Irish families living within the then military jurisdiction of England to change or translate their names, or adopt names from trades, occupations, colors, objects or places; so that natives of Ireland bearing the name of "Śmith" or "Johnson," for example, may be of as ancient Irish origin as if they bore the original family name, "MacGowan" or "MacShane," which means literally "the son of the Smith" and "the son of Shane (John)" respectively. Besides the changes made compulsory under the operation of that law, numerous other Irish names have become so anglicized that to anyone not versed in the

history of Irish nomenclature they were unrecognizable as of Irish origin. The preponderance of such names in the Census, the false conclusions such as those drawn from the racial tabulations in "A Century of Population Growth," have made such an impression upon the American imagination as to result in the strange belief held by numerous descendants of Irish immigrants to this country that they are of English blood! [3]

The further Anglicization of Irish and other names by immigrants after their arrival here, along with the deficiencies in official records already indicated, would seem to make it impossible at this late date to do more than roughly approximate the respective percentages which different Old World national or racial groups contributed to the population of colonial America.

Statistical Guesswork

On account of the widespread criticism of the 1909 report, *A Century of Population Growth*, it was decided to reduce the proportion of the original native stock credited therein to Great Britain and northern Ireland by 10.4 per cent, and to distribute this amount among the other nationalities represented in the white population of the original thirteen states in 1790 before making up the quotas of the national-origins law. This clumsy change only emphasized the fact that the data which had to be used in arriving at the present quotas are very inexact. It showed in addition how little we really know about our colonial population. According to the estimates finally used in figuring out the quotas of the national-origins law, the distribution of the several national white stocks in 1790 was as follows: Great Britain and northern Ireland, 77 per cent; Germany, 7.4 per cent; Irish Free State, 4.4 per cent; Netherlands, 3.3 per cent; France, 1.9 per cent; Belgium, 1.5 per cent; non-quota countries (chiefly Canada and Mexico), 2.3 per cent; and the other countries less than one per cent. Possibly we are reasonably sure of only one point in the make-up of the colonial population: the largest group of non-English were the Negroes, estimated in 1790 to be 757,000, or 19.3 per cent of the population, but classified then as slaves rather than as immigrants or colonists. The total population of the nation in 1790 was 3,929,000.

II. Colonial Culture

Only the briefest of summaries can be made here of the culture of colonial America. Something will be said about each of the following high points: the social status of the first migrants, religious unity and

[3] *The Immigration Act of 1924*, report of the American Irish Historical Society, New York, February 8, 1927.

toleration among them, and the degree of cultural uniformity which prevailed among them.

Two sound reasons prompt the discussion of these points. In the first place, the early colonial settlers have by their descendants—not unnaturally, perhaps—been held up as models of principled humanity, tolerant, high-souled, and magnanimous. This view has been assumed in much of the history, political and social, of America; its basis should be inquired into. In the second place, students must secure the proper historical background, must understand how long these problems of immigration have faced the nation and how their nature has changed.

I. SOCIAL STATUS

Some light is thrown upon the social status of the colonists by the fact that during the colonial period more than a quarter of a million persons were indentured servants. Davie says that "probably one half" of the colonists came here under some special plan of transportation made necessary by their poverty and the high cost of oceanic transportation.[4] The whites who came to America under the system of servitude known as indentured service were of three main classes: first, those who signed a contract which permitted the shipmaster to reimburse himself for the cost of the passage by selling their services to the highest bidder upon arrival here; second, those who signed no contract with the shipmaster but after arrival indentured themselves to a bidder who agreed to pay transportation costs; and third, involuntary servants who were either convicts, vagrants, paupers, or persons kidnaped for sale in America. It has been estimated that as many as 50,000 criminals were sent here from the British Isles during the sixty years preceding the Revolutionary War, and 10,000 persons are said to have been spirited away from England in one single year. According to the records of the time, the ship *Goodfellow* disembarked in 1654, at Marblehead, Massachusetts, 550 southern Irish "stollen from theyre bedds." The indentured servants, whose period of service was usually four years for adults or until the age of twenty-one for children, were used chiefly to prepare the forest lands for cultivation, a task which called for a large number of hand workers capable of prodigious physical labor. For this purpose the white semislave was more efficient than the Negro slave. This system of labor exploitation died out gradually or was succeeded by Negro slavery during the early part of the nineteenth century on account of a combination of three factors: improved economic conditions

[4] Maurice R. Davie, *World Immigration* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936), page 35.

in Europe, lowered transportation costs, and the increasing use of machines in America.

The facts pointed out above, along with comments by contemporaneous European observers, suggest that the colonial Americans were far from being the social "blue-bloods" that some of their descendants would have us believe. Of the so-called Scotch-Irish of colonial days one observer of the time wrote: "Those who have emigrated have been for the most part the idle and worthless, loose, unemployed, disorderly people whose departure was no loss to Ireland." Some idea of the degree of refinement among the colonists is suggested by the comment: "Hardly one of these Americans of 1775 would have seemed to us clean. . . . Even in favored Boston we find Cotton Mather . . . advising young candidates for the ministry that it is a good thing each morning to wash the face." [5] The alleged social superiority of the colonists over those who came here later is far from self-evident or even probable. People of wealth and refinement seldom go to a pioneer country to live. The migrants are as a rule those who live near the bottom of the social-economic ladder. As Taft says, "At all periods of immigration, economic factors have predominated. The popular view that early Puritans came with higher ideals than the modern migrant can hardly be more than half true." [6]

2. RELIGIOUS UNITY AND TOLERANCE

Some of our modern writers give us the impression that, rather than being split by religious differences as we are today, colonial America was characterized by a unified Protestantism. Furthermore, it is said that colonial America was tolerant when contrasted with the widespread intolerance and religious persecution of contemporaneous Europe and that separation of Church and State was the colonial ideal. Though it is true that the majority of the colonists were Protestants, theirs was far from being a unified Protestantism. Protestants were divided pretty nearly on national lines as follows: for the most part the Germans were Lutheran and German Reformed; the Scotch-Irish were Presbyterians or Scotch Covenanters; the French were chiefly Huguenots. There were also several other groups: the Anglicans in the South, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, the Puritans in New England, and smaller sects, such as the Dutch Reformed, Swedish Lutherans, Mennonites, Dunkers, Moravians, and Jews.

[5] Quoted by Donald R. Taft, *op. cit.*, page 72.
[6] *Ibid.*

Everywhere there was a tendency to combine Church and State and to prevent the entrance of alien religious sects into settled territory. Though most of the residents of colonial America were Protestants, sectarian differences among them were regarded much more seriously then than they are by Protestants today. For example, New England (with the exception of Rhode Island) and Virginia tried to keep out the Quakers. When the Presbyterian Scotch-Irish tried to settle in Massachusetts, they found a State Church to which they had to conform if they wished to enjoy citizenship. Some were tolerated on the western border of New England, where they acted as a buffer against the hostile Indians, but the majority chose to seek complete religious freedom by going farther west, where they established what are now Ulster and Orange counties, New York. Pennsylvania was the only colony, with the exception of Maryland (until 1715), that did not persecute Catholics. At a much later date, when tax-supported schools began to be established in America, Protestant prayers were introduced along with the reading of Protestant Bibles as a part of the required curriculum for all students. The protest made against this practice later by Catholics, on the ground that this was contrary to the doctrine of separation of Church and State, aroused additional resentment against Catholics. It is only in comparatively recent times that this compulsory Protestant service has been abolished in the great majority of American public schools. Some idea of colonial intolerance of Catholics may be gathered from the situation in New Hampshire, where the state constitution still records discrimination against Catholics.

New Hampshire which in 1679 required the oath of Supremacy and in 1696 imposed an obnoxious test oath on its citizens, retained in its constitution, adopted in 1792, many intolerant provisions. It provided for the support and maintenance of the public Protestant teachers, and required that the governor, counsellors, senators and members of the House of Representatives were all to be Protestant. Not until 1876 was this discrimination against Catholics removed, while even to the present day the clause empowering towns to provide for the maintenance of public Protestant teachers is obstinately retained, for although an attempt was made to repeal it in 1889 the act failed of ratification and the repeal did not take effect.[7]

In commenting upon this official union of Church and State so long preserved in the New Hampshire constitution, Father Joseph Francis Thorning says that this instance is but a reminder of a similar situation in others of the thirteen original states, where, he says, the idea of the

[7] Rev. Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925), page 56. Used by permission.

separation of Church and State was never regarded as a part of Protestantism.

It is the convincing refutation of the recent statement, put out under the signature of President Hoover (1930), that separation of State and Church was the product of the Protestant Revolt. If for no other reason than to catch up and commemorate a great deal of social history, the words "Evangelical" and "Protestant" in the New Hampshire Constitution, though a blot on the fair name of the State, are instructive for the nation. They illustrate that the only thing wrong with the so-called American Protestant doctrine of the separation of Church and State is that it is neither American nor Protestant.[8]

3. ANGLO-SAXON CULTURE

Because English is the American language, and English law the basis for our own, the impression is sometimes conveyed that colonial America was a "little England," with a uniform Anglo-Saxon culture, until this condition was spoiled by unassimilable non-English immigrants. English writers have constantly emphasized an alleged similarity between English and American culture; but to many Americans their motives are suspect, especially since the publication of the will of Cecil Rhodes, the master English propagandist, whose stated aim was "the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire."

The variety of nationalities from outside the British Isles in colonial immigration—people from Germany, the Netherlands, France, and Belgium, to mention only those continental nationalities that are commonly estimated as constituting more than one per cent of the colonial stock—itself suggests that there was unity neither in culture nor in language at the time of the foundation of the country. It has been said that Manhattan was a melting pot of some eighteen different languages as early as 1643. The language known as Pennsylvania Dutch, a dialect of English and German, is still spoken in parts of Pennsylvania. The two largest groups, next to the English, to come from the British Isles, the Scotch-Irish and the Irish, were non-British in spirit if not in historical fact. Many of the Irish spoke Gaelic rather than English. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland did not exist in 1603 when James I was crowned, and the English Parliament of that time represented only England and Wales. For the next century Scotland was regarded as a foreign country by Englishmen, and Ireland as a half-foreign dependency. It was years after James I had encouraged the Scotch migration to northern Ireland, by giving them the land he had

[8] *Religious Liberty in Transition* (Catholic University, Washington, D.C., 1931), pages 230–231.

confiscated from the native chiefs of Ulster, that thousands of the so-called Scotch-Irish of Ulster were forced to leave Ireland because of a new English commercial policy which injured Ulster as well as the south of Ireland. It has been estimated that, of the 200,000 Scotch-Irish who left Ireland in the half century just preceding the American Revolution, the majority came to America, where they were scattered over practically all the colonies. The injustices which they had suffered at the hands of the English made them, like the southern Irish, willing recruits for the armies of the War of Independence.

While dislike for English policies tended to unite all colonial groups here as 1776 approached, there was much dissimilarity on other points. Native languages and Old World customs and ideals were maintained in what in the modern terminology would be called foreign colonies, especially on the frontiers. The so-called process of Americanization, of which much was said a few years ago, took place very slowly. "Americanization is not a matter of nationality or racial capacity," says Professor Lawrence Guy Brown. "It is a matter of the social situation and the process of interaction that goes on. . . . Isolation and segregation of immigrants were just as much facts during the colonial period as they are at the present time." [9] It would seem that most of the modern situations and problems created by immigration existed from the start. The colonists tended to make a distinction between themselves and their immigrants, regarding the latter as inferior "foreigners"; most of the colonial migrants were poor and came here to better themselves economically; many of the later arrivals were exploited by their colonial employers; the earliest immigrants were usually poor, uncouth, and far from being social "blue-bloods"; the different religions found among the immigrants aroused the hostility of old residents and threatened to overthrow their state religion; finally, the "melting pot," in which assimilation seemed to take place all too slowly, existed from the start.

We see on a smaller scale in the America of 1776 most of the immigration problems which were to continue down to date. Perhaps it may be said that, apart from the somewhat changed ratio of the new to the old inhabitants, the chief difference between the immigration of recent times and that of colonial times lies in the fact that jobs were always available to the colonial immigrant. We shall see that the scarcity of jobs, more than any other single factor, led finally to the restriction of immigration, even though nearly every other objection raised against immigration in recent times existed from colonial times onward.

[9] *Immigration* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1933), page 48.

III. The Old Immigrants (1783–1882)

Even though people from many lands came to live in the territory of the colonists before the recognition of American independence, technically it must be said that American immigration commenced in 1783 when the treaty of peace with England was signed. It may be assumed that the number of migrants between 1776 and 1783, the period of the war, was negligible. From 1783 until 1820, when the first federal statistics on immigration were collected, the annual number of immigrants is estimated to have been less than 10,000. The federal immigration statistics, though relatively incomplete until recent years, indicate that only about 8,000 immigrants arrived in 1820. This number rose gradually with each decennial census (23,322 in 1830, 84,066 in 1840) until it passed the 100,000 mark for the first time in 1842 (104,565), the 200,000 mark in 1847, the 300,000 mark in 1850, and the 400,000 mark in 1854. After 1854 there was a recession until after the Civil War, when immigration rates again averaged about 200,000 a year until 1881, when they suddenly sprang to a new high of over 600,000, to be followed by another increase, to 788,992, in 1882.

During the period which extends from 1783 to 1882, generally referred to as that of the "old immigration," the number of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe (henceforth to be referred to here as the "new" immigration) was so small that we say that practically all our European immigration during those years came from the north and west of Europe. As already pointed out, in the latter part of the 1830's the number of immigrants began to increase rapidly, and, though we have no exact record of their country of origin, most of these arrivals must have been picked up in our first census of the foreign-born in 1850. In this census the Irish (from all of Ireland) constituted 42.8 per cent of all the foreign-born, the Germans ranking second with 26.0 per cent and the British third with 16.9 per cent, an order which remained unchanged until about 1875, when the Germans again took the lead from the Irish. Since the five chief immigrant groups during the entire period extending from 1783 to 1882 were, in order, the Irish, Germans, British, Canadians, and Scandinavians, something of the nature of each of these groups, as well as their places of settlement in the United States, will be given here.

1. THE IRISH

In discussions of early American immigration it is customary to refer to the people from southern Ireland as the Irish and to those from Ulster

or northern Ireland as the Scotch-Irish. Although, as we have seen, many Irish, like the Scotch-Irish, came to America during colonial times, their numbers were not sufficient to constitute an immigrant "wave" until 1847. It is customary to associate the heavy migration which commenced at this time with the failure of the Irish potato crop. The Irish potato crop had frequently failed, and in 1846 a blight of the whole crop led to a terrible mortality from starvation and disease. Naturally, those who could escaped to other lands, chiefly the United States. In many instances it was cheaper for authorities to defray the cost of their passage to America than to support them through taxes in Ireland.

Although several factors contributed to the uprooting of the Irish from their homeland, they may be classified generally under the heading of English oppression. Persecuted originally because they refused to follow the mother country in Protestantism, the Catholic Irish eventually became the victims of a system of taxation and absentee landownership which kept them in continuous poverty, a situation strongly suggestive of the tenant-farming areas in the South and West of our country today. The significance of lack of landownership in the plight of the Irish of that time and the effect of a famine which resulted were pointed out recently by James Fitzgerald in his presidential address to the National Conference of Catholic Charities:

> As a result of that famine the population of Ireland was reduced from nine millions to three in less than a century. That famine was not due to a lack of food; export of food went on from Ireland all through it. It was due to the lack of ownership of the land. Back in the seventeenth century, the Irish peasants were dispossessed of their land; they became tenants of "the garrison" (the absentee landlord class) and by 1845 the produce of the farms, all except the potato crop, went to pay rents and the masses lived almost entirely on that one crop. That crop failed by blight and there was a famine.[10]

The fact that the Irish farmer had lost his ownership of land also explains in a large measure his willingness to leave Ireland when a crisis arose, with no desire to return. Once the heavy emigration had started, it continued, and for more than half a century from one to three per cent of the entire Irish population migrated overseas, a ratio of emigrants to home population which is believed to have been equaled in no other country during historic times. From 1847 to 1854 an average of 200,000 a year emigrated from Ireland, chiefly to the United States. Though Irish immigration reached its peak in the 1850's, it continued heavily for the rest of the century. Most of the Irish settled in the Mid-

[10] *The Catholic Charities Review*, Volume 21, October, 1937, page 242.

dle Atlantic area (New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey), with New England receiving the next largest proportion. Two reasons are said to have impelled them to settle in these areas: their extreme poverty, which made land settlement farther west more difficult, and a religion which differed from that of most of the American farmers. Because of the lack of housing regulations in the cities of the eastern seaboard at that time, the Irish were often forced to live in slums which have scarcely been duplicated since in America. With the improvement of economic conditions and a changed English policy in Ireland, especially of landownership, migration to the United States gradually fell off during the latter part of the century. By 1900 the Irish immigrant group, which had led in numbers all the way from 1840 to 1860, had dropped down to fifth place. The total number who came to the United States from all of Ireland from 1820 to 1930 was 4,578,941.[11]

2. THE GERMANS

Although they ranked second to the Irish in the period of the old immigration (1783–1882), the Germans contributed more immigrants to the United States (5,907,893) during the longer period from 1820 to 1930 than any other nation. Russia, Canada, Brazil, and Argentina have also received large numbers of German immigrants, but the great majority of those who left Germany in the last century came to the United States. We have already seen that they, next to the Scotch-Irish, also made up the most important stream of immigration in the earlier colonial period. During the first half of the nineteenth as well as in the eighteenth century, most of the German immigrants came from the Palatinate, a state of the old German Empire which is now a part of Bavaria. This area of small peasant farms had become so subdivided through increased population that it was difficult for a family to subsist even in good years. When the crop failed, especially if it was the leading staple food, the potato, mass migrations often followed. At the end of the last century the landownership situation in Germany again forced wholesale migration.

Political and economic developments of the last century in Germany are reflected rather precisely in the United States immigration records. For a long period Germany had been the scene of internal wars. Disappointment and political unrest in 1848, following the frustrated plan for a single German nation, is recorded in the increased number of

[11] In the statistics of immigration from the British Isles during this period a group of 793,741 is listed as "not specified." Davie (*op. cit.*, page 61) believes that most of these were from Ireland.

immigrants received here soon afterwards. In the latter part of the century, when manufacturing replaced agriculture as the predominant German industry and the German cities began to absorb the surplus population, Germany began to export goods to America instead of men. From that time onward German immigration to the United States depended upon the appearance of periodic German business depressions rather than upon crop failure and other conditions. From 1860 to 1890 Germans ranked numerically first among our immigrant groups, but later, during and following the first decade of the present century, they failed to place among the first five groups. However, on account of their heavy immigration near the end of the last century, the Germans constituted the largest single group of the foreign-born here at the time of the World War. Unlike the Irish, most Germans settled in the five east-north-central farming states (Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio), the Middle Atlantic area receiving the second largest group.

3. THE BRITISH

The non-Irish immigrants from the British Isles made up the third largest group of the old immigrants. From 1820 to 1930 the English, coming here chiefly after the middle of the last century, made up by far the greatest group, 2,619,435, those from Scotland totaling only 729,887, with 85,659 from Wales. As with most of the other immigrants, a number of factors, chiefly of an economic nature, acted as motive forces in impelling their emigration. After a certain point had been reached in industrial development, it was found that the introduction of additional labor-saving machinery created unemployment, especially when boys and women took over operations formerly performed by skilled men. Since these successive changes took place in English industries without any provision for those thrown out of employment, America, the "land of opportunity," attracted many of the victims, especially when propaganda organized by various American public and private groups urged emigration and in some instances even assisted it. In some periods of social distress the British government made grants to assist emigrants as a form of unemployment relief, a method already pointed out in connection with Irish immigration. After having occupied either second or third position among our immigrant groups continuously from 1840 to 1890, the British dropped below fifth place in the last decade of the century, although they revived considerably during the decade from 1910 to 1920 by taking fifth place and exceeding both the Irish and the German immigration of that time. While the largest number of the

British, like the Irish, settled in the three Middle Atlantic states, the next largest group went to the five east-north-central states.

4. THE CANADIANS

Ranking fourth among the old immigrant nations, Canada has been one of our most constant sources of immigration. Though herself an immigrant country, Canada has ranked among the five countries furnishing us with the greatest number of immigrants continuously from 1840 to date, with the exception of about twenty years between 1890 and 1910. If we extend this span to include the entire period from 1820 to 1930, we find that Canada has given us even more immigrants than England. At the time of our first federal census of the foreign-born in 1850, Canada ranked fourth; in 1930 it ranked third, there being more than a million Canadians residing here, or a little more than one tenth of the population of Canada. A number of European immigrants have entered the United States by way of Canada. Furthermore, a considerable portion of the Canadian immigration has been made up of French-Canadians, who are said to be nearly nine tenths French. Most of our Canadian immigration, however, has been made up of English-speaking Canadians, originally of British origin.

On the other hand, Canada and the United States have constantly exchanged their native-born. The undeveloped resources of Canada, a country which is slightly larger than the continental United States exclusive of Alaska, have attracted many of our farmers. The total number of emigrants from the United States to Canada during the period extending from 1881 to 1930 was almost equal to the number which Canada received from the United Kingdom, her chief source of immigration, during the same period. The rich lands of Canada have attracted our farmers; the greater opportunities in industry and business in the more populous and highly developed United States have in turn attracted many Canadians. The shoe factories and the cotton and woolen mills of New England have absorbed the great majority of the French-Canadian immigrants to the United States.

5. THE SCANDINAVIANS

The total number of Scandinavians admitted to the United States from 1820 to 1930 was 2,346,069, of which considerably more than a million came from Sweden, about 800,000 from Norway, and less than half of this number from Denmark. Although the Scandinavians did not begin to come in considerable numbers until the Civil War, from 1860 to 1890 the immigration from Sweden ranked fifth among national

groups, the peak of this immigration movement being reached in 1882, the only year in which as many as 100,000 Scandinavians were admitted. The Scandinavians seem to have come here almost entirely because of economic reasons, but this motive was not founded in poverty or oppression at home. Since they came here chiefly because they felt they would have access to more profitable occupations, the annual amount of immigration depended more upon economic conditions here than upon conditions in the Scandinavian countries. The relationship between emigration and population growth is said to be especially noticeable in the Scandinavian countries today. On account of an earlier emigration in which young men predominated, these countries have been left with an excess of women and with fewer married people, a factor which is believed to have contributed greatly to the reduced birth rate of Sweden and Norway. In this country the majority of the Scandinavians have settled in the west-north-central states (the Dakotas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri), and the next largest group in the east-north-central states. Since 1910 there has been a remarkable increase in the numbers going to the Pacific states and to the Alaskan fishing centers.

The date of the peak of the Scandinavian immigration, 1882, may be regarded as marking the end of the period known as that of the "old immigration." The year 1882 also marks the transition from agriculture to manufacturing as the predominating American industry, and the practical exhaustion of the good land formerly available to settlers on easy terms. During the next era the economic character of our nation changed essentially, and with it the chief sources of our immigrants.

IV. Renewed Opposition to Foreigners

Looking back over the period of the "old immigration" (1783–1882), we find that most of the stock objections made to "foreigners" in the colonial period are repeated. Nevertheless, the "melting pot," already established in colonial days, continued to boil, and as a result each succeeding group gradually came to be regarded as Americans. Only one objection to foreigners was new. During this period American laborers began to complain that the low-wage competition provided by the immigrant kept their wages down. This protest lacked adequate expression, however, largely because manufacturers were able to prevent the organization of strong labor unions through the continued importation of cheap labor.

The Irish and the Germans, the most numerous immigrant groups of

this period, were the chief targets of the criticism of aliens, especially from about 1835 until the Civil War. Most of the poverty-stricken Irish, before the Civil War, settled in the eastern manufacturing cities, where their presence in the slums and their competition for jobs made them especially conspicuous and annoying to the older Americans. Many of the Irish were employed also outside the cities in building railroads and canals, where they were forced to live in rough camps and to work for miserable wages. Mistreated occasionally by their employers, they took the law into their own hands, as they had been accustomed to do in Ireland, and so came into further disrepute here. They had been so long deprived, by English exploitation in Ireland, of both an education and a decent livelihood that their manners and ways of living were not always the best upon arrival here. On this point Professor Dow has made the following comment:

> Ireland had been under a system of burdensome taxation, by which the farmer was taxed for every visible form of wealth. If he had stock he was taxed for it; hence came the temptation to keep the pig in the parlor, where the assessor would not be likely to find it. If he improved his property or wore decent clothes, he was assumed to be prosperous and was taxed accordingly.[12]

While large numbers of German immigrants of this period became farm laborers, many of them settled in the large cities of the East and Middle West. In either place their "foreign" language immediately made them targets for ridicule and abuse. This unfriendly attitude on the part of older Americans only accentuated the tendency of the Germans to settle in "colonies" for mutual protection, whether in the city or in farming areas. Subsequently, the slowness with which many of these German communities exchanged their mother tongue and native customs for those of the new land aroused the suspicion and ire of some of the older Americans. Furthermore, the Germans, like the Irish, brought ideas of Sabbath observance and temperance which clashed with the Puritanical ideals of New England and the Western Reserve country. It might be well for the modern descendants of these early Irish and German immigrants to recall the charges made against their own ancestors before criticizing the recent immigrant.

One of the greatest causes of opposition to the Irish and Germans was the fact that so many of them were Roman Catholics. It is said that the erection of Catholic churches, convents, and parochial schools actually terrified many Protestant Americans, who saw in this development a

[12] Grove S. Dow, *Society and Its Problems* (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1922), pages 78–79.

Papal plot to "take over" America by violence. The fact that some of these Catholic parishes followed a recreational fad of the day by organizing drill teams and semimilitary organizations, which sometimes stored their rifles in the basement of the church, and that the Irish were joining the city police forces in large numbers suggested to those who suffered from Papalphobia that Catholics were quietly preparing for the slaughter of American Protestants.

Opposition to immigration, particularly to that of the Catholic Irish and Germans, began in 1835 to crystallize into political organization. First the Native Americans and later, starting in the 1850's, the Know-Nothings mixed propaganda and terrorism in a combined effort to limit officeholding to the native-born and to restrict the rights of aliens, especially Catholics, in other ways reminiscent of colonial America. In 1855 the Know-Nothing Society, also called the "Supreme Order of the Star Spangled Banner" and the "Sons of the Sires of '76," claimed six state governors and nearly fifty members of Congress. Although the slavery issue wrecked the Know-Nothing movement before it could enact its proposed anti-Catholic, antiforeigner legislation, the strength of these forerunners of the twentieth-century Ku Klux Klan may be gathered from the following observation made about them by President Lincoln in 1855.

> Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that "all men are created equal!" We now practically read it, "All men are created equal, except Negroes." When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read, "all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics." When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy.[18]

V. The New Immigrants (1882–1924)

For several reasons the year 1882 was a turning point in the history of American immigration. The passing of the frontier and the economic evolution which changed us from an agricultural nation to one which was henceforth to become predominately industrial and urban placed the immigration problem in a somewhat different setting after 1882. With this industrial-urban drift there is associated the arrival, in 1882, of the largest wave of immigrants to that date. In view of this background, it seems to be rather accidental that the "new immigration" from

[18] Albert J. Beveridge, *Abraham Lincoln, 1809–1858* (Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1928), Volume III, page 354. (Quoted by Davie, *op. cit.*, page 89.)

southern and central Europe, which had commenced to replace that from the north about this time, had to bear the brunt of new attacks on immigration and finally to submit to restrictive laws.

The change in the sources of our European immigration at this time is shown very clearly in the federal statistics on immigration. Before 1870 practically 90 per cent of our European immigrants came from northern and western Europe, while about one per cent came from the southern and eastern parts. During the decade from 1881 to 1890 the percentage from southern and eastern Europe increased gradually to over 18, and by 1910 it jumped to over 70 per cent of all immigration. It was during the era of this new immigration, when the task of absorbing the newcomers had to be assumed almost entirely by our cities, that the greatest waves of immigration arrived. From 1903 to 1914 inclusive, with the exception of two years, the annual immigration amounted to over 800,000. In six of these years it exceeded a million. Although appreciable immigration from southern and eastern Europe did not start until the 1880's, yet, because of the large numbers that came about the turn of the century, it could be said by 1930 that the total immigration from these countries (13,944,454) amounted to about three fourths of the total immigration which had come from the countries of northern and western Europe (18,331,892) during the entire period from 1820 to 1930. Before we consider the different national ratios contained in the new immigration, something should be said about the causes of this rather sudden shift in the sources of our European immigration.

A number of factors, some European and some American, contributed to the change in the sources of American immigration after 1882. At least five factors must be considered, according to Davie,[14] among which are the following: (1) the removal of many of the special causes, such as famine and political and religious persecution, which formerly stimulated emigration from northern and western Europe, accompanied by a transfer of such causes to southern and eastern Europe; (2) the invasion of isolated regions of Italy, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the Balkan states by agents of American employers and various steamship lines, who both encouraged and assisted the people of these countries to attempt the long journey to the land which was painted in glowing colors; (3) the industrialization of the northwestern countries, on account of which those who formerly might have emigrated from farms to America were attracted to growing cities and to general conditions nearly equivalent to those prevailing in America; (4) a decline in the birth rate of the northwestern countries,

[14] *Op. cit.*, pages 179–183.

a tendency which had not yet commenced in the nonindustrialized countries to the south; (5) changed economic and social conditions in America (the main reason, Davie believes). As an agricultural nation with a frontier to be opened up and new lands to be cleared, America formerly attracted rural immigrants of the northwestern countries. In the 1880's the practical disappearance of our free lands, accompanied by rapid industrial developments, created a need for miners, steel-mill hands, and unskilled factory laborers, rather than for farmers, who had always been the chief element in American immigration.

In attempting to analyze the national make-up of the new immigration we are confronted with the fact that until quite recently our official immigration figures referred to countries of origin, rather than to strict nationality. Thus, all who came from Russia were listed as Russians although many were Jews, Poles, and Lithuanians. The World War caused additional confusion through the creation of new national states. Only since 1919 has Polish immigration been listed, although a considerable portion of the earlier immigrants from Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia regarded themselves as Poles. The lack of adequate statistics makes accurate nationality divisions impossible, but it is clear that the three chief countries of origin for the new immigration have been Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Russia. In considering the immigrants from these countries we shall use the prewar rather than the postwar map of Europe since most of this immigraion came before the World War. Since the average student is likely to know less of the European background of these people, more space will be devoted to them than was given to the old immigrants.

I. THE ITALIANS

Stages of industrial development, which we have seen to be such important influences in the history of migration movements, explain the shift in the source of emigration in recent years from northern to southern Italy. As northern Italy began to develop industrially, protective tariffs were devised to encourage this growth, but these enactments had the effect of ruining agrarian production in the south. The low-paid peasants on the infertile and overdivided strips of farm land of the south suffered in addition because of excessive consumers' taxes on essential goods, taxes which were escaped by the owners of large estates, who were in a measure absentee landlords. These facts, coupled with the growing population and the social and political changes taking place in the south of Italy, stimulated an emigration from that section to America which made up one of the greatest movements of a

single nationality on record. In 1913 alone this exodus amounted to 873,000.

During the final quarter of the last century, before the north of Italy had become industrialized, its surplus population emigrated to Argentina and Brazil and, to some extent, to the United States, where it constituted more than two thirds of the Italian immigration group. However, the total number of Italian immigrants to the United States from 1870 until 1900 was only a million. In the next thirty years Italian immigration increased rapidly, more than 3,500,000 coming here before 1930. Of this new-century group the majority were of Mediterranean stock and chiefly from the south of Italy, including Sicily. Altogether, in the entire period from 1820 to 1930, Italians rank as the second largest immigrant contributors to our population, being exceeded only by the Germans. Because of their numbers, and because so many came in recent years, they constituted 13.4 per cent, or the largest group of our foreign-born population, in 1930.

The North Italian immigrants seem to have favored our west coast, but the more numerous recent immigrants from the south settled chiefly in the Middle Atlantic states and New England. Although a number have gone into truck farming, the majority, in keeping with our employment trends, have settled in the cities as unskilled laborers. In many instances they took over the railroad and construction work formerly done by the Irish immigrant. Italian immigration was reduced more drastically by the passage of the restrictive and discriminatory legislation, commencing in 1921, than that of any other national group. The present annual quota is limited to 5,802.

2. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

The Austro-Hungarians are the most difficult group of immigrants to classify. Before the World War they included several widely different nationalities with distinct languages, many of which the immigration records failed to classify adequately. Since the war the areas from which some of these groups came have been set up as independent nations, and the present immigrants from those areas are listed under new classifications. Present unrest in central Europe threatens now to upset the new classifications. At any rate, we know that between 1820 and 1930 the total immigration from the areas formerly included in Austria-Hungary (4,132,351) ranked next to that of the Italians in size, and that it first became numerically important here in the 1880's. For each year between 1890 and 1920 immigrants from Austria-Hungary ranked first, second, or third in the order of national groupings. Davie

ranks the chief elements of the Austro-Hungarian immigration numerically in the following sequence: Poles, Hungarians, Slovaks, Czechs, German Austrians, Jews, Croatians, Slovenians, Ruthenians, Rumanians, Serbs, and Dalmatians, besides smaller groups.

It has been suggested by Dr. Davie [15] that the best way to simplify the Austro-Hungarian hodgepodge of ethnic groups is to divide this former country into three geographic bands extending from west to east. Following this plan, we find three fairly distinct groupings consisting of (a) the non-Slavic peoples in the center, (b) the Slavic peoples in the north, and (c) another of the Slavic peoples in the south.

The Non-Slavic Group

This group was made up of the German Austrians, the Hungarians, and the Rumanians. Although the Austrians, with Vienna as their center, were the most important group culturally, in our immigration ratios they were not as numerous as some of the other Austro-Hungarian groups such as the Hungarians or Magyars, an agricultural group with an Asiatic background, about two thirds of whom were Roman Catholics. The latter came to America, partly because of their political oppression by the Austrians, but more often because of the better economic opportunities offered here. Their neighbors to the east, the Rumanians, were of the Eastern Orthodox Church and immigrated here partly because they were unpopular in Austria-Hungary, but chiefly in order to get jobs. In contrast to the Alpine Hungarians, they are of the Mediterranean type. The Jewish element in the Austro-Hungarian immigration will be treated separately.

The Northern Slavs

These people, sometimes referred to as the Western Slavs, were made up chiefly of the Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, and Ruthenians. The Czechs, composed of Bohemians and Moravians, were the most progressive people of the old empire and the first from this area to come to America. A few came here in colonial times and a larger group after the wars in 1848 and 1866. The great majority, however, came as a part of the new immigration. Though the majority of the Czechs are Roman Catholics, a number of them still follow the Protestantism of their compatriot, John Huss. Most of the recent Czech immigration came from the manufacturing cities of Bohemia. The Slovaks, closely related to the Czechs, as the name of their postwar country, Czechoslovakia, would indicate, are less advanced culturally and almost entirely agri-

[15] *Op. cit.*, pages 121–134.

cultural in a land that is hilly and infertile. As might be expected under these circumstances, they have immigrated here in larger numbers than the Czechs. Although predominately Roman Catholic, they have a mixture of Protestants and Uniates. The Uniates (meaning "union with Rome") acknowledge the authority of the Pope in matters of faith, but follow the Eastern Orthodox rites.

The Poles are the most numerous group of our Slavic immigrants. After Poland was divided up among Russia, Austria, and Prussia in 1795, the first two countries receiving the greatest number of Poles, a few came here immediately from Austria, in order to escape political oppression. The great majority came, however, after the 1880's, and chiefly from that part of Austria called Galicia (now a part of the new Poland), which had become poverty-stricken on account of excessive subdivisions of farm land. Many came from the towns also, but, whether from town or country, most of those who emigrated belonged to the landless proletariat. Practically all the Polish immigrants, with the exception of the Jews, are Roman Catholics. The same system of excessive land subdivision in eastern Galicia was a large factor in causing the emigration of another national group, the Ruthenians or Ukrainians (also known as Rusins). These particular Ukrainians, subject to Poland since the World War, are Uniates, thus differing from the Eastern Orthodox Ukrainians of southern Russia.

The Southern Slavs

This group was made up of Slovenes, Croatians, Serbs, and Dalmatians, sometimes referred to less accurately as Slavonians, Bosnians, and Herzegovinians. Since the World War these Slavs of the former empire of Austria-Hungary have been combined with their neighbors, the Serbians and Montenegrins of the southeast, to make the new state of Yugoslavia. The Slovenes and Croatians, who made up most of the American immigration from this area, are mostly Roman Catholic, while the Serbians are members of the Eastern Orthodox Church. As with so many other areas of Austria-Hungary, poverty caused by excessive subdivisions of land was one of the chief factors in this emigration.

Geographic rather than ethnic or national affinity suggests that the *Greeks,* the most important element of the Balkan immigration, be treated at this point. Greek immigration, consisting chiefly of farmers, has been prompted almost entirely by the better opportunities here. Altogether we have received almost a half million Greek immigrants, and the majority have come in the present century. Very few have gone

into agriculture or the factories here; the majority took up the operation of small stores. The Greeks belong to the Eastern Orthodox Church.

3. RUSSIA

To the United States, between 1820 and 1930, came 3,241,991 Russian immigrants, thus making our country second in importance to Siberia as a destination for their voluntary migration. Yet, strange to say, the total number of non-Russian people who emigrated into European Russia during this period, chiefly from Germany and Austria, exceeded the Russian emigration to the United States.[16] Another curious thing about the Russian immigration to this country is that only a small percentage of it has been Slavic or Russian. The most numerous of our Russian immigrants have been the Jews and Poles. In addition, the Russian immigration contained a smaller number of Lithuanians, Finns, and Germans and a sprinkling of Letts and Estonians. The Russian Slavs did not come to America in large numbers because they had a frontier of their own in Siberia. On the other hand, the other national and religious groups found emigration to America more satisfactory in times of economic stress, because of the intermittent persecution of those in Russia who did not belong to the Orthodox Church. The greatest period of Russian emigration took place about the turn of the century, chiefly on account of conflicts which arose as a result of the introduction of a new economic and social structure. The Poles, who next to the Jews made up the largest unit of the Russian immigration to the United States, had been victims of the old Polish class system carried over from the period prior to the nation's tripartite division in 1795. Under this system, in which society was divided into two distinct hierarchies, nobility and peasantry, the average landholding of the minority of peasants who owned land at all was so small, compared with the massive estates of the nobility, that emigration had to be resorted to when supplementary work could not be found. The landless peasants made up the greatest part of the Polish emigration from both Russia and Austria-Hungary.

A consideration of the localities and industries selected by the immigrants from eastern Europe upon their arrival here shows that, although some of the minor groups varied considerably, for the most part the immigrants from Russia and Austria-Hungary settled in the large industrial and mining centers. While there were some notable variations, such as the many Czechs and Lithuanians who went into the manufacturing of clothing, Bohemians who were skilled mechanics,

[16] Maurice R. Davie, *op. cit.*, page 134.

and Finns who became Alaskan fishermen, by far the largest proportion were absorbed by the steel mills or factories, where they were required to do the hardest kind of manual labor. Pennsylvania, Illinois, and New York seem today to have the largest share of Slavs from the old countries of Austria-Hungary and Russia; Chicago, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, and Gary also rank among the largest Slavic centers. Although our 1930 census of the foreign-born whites then resident in the United States is far from being an accurate index of the nationality distributions from southern and central Europe, the percentage of distribution of the chief groups by "country of birth" is given therein as follows: Poland, 9.5; Russia 8.6; Czechoslovakia, 3.7; Austria, 2.8; Hungary 2.1; Yugoslavia, 1.6; Lithuania, 1.4; and Greece, 1.3.

There has been a widespread tendency to exaggerate the differences between the new and the old immigrants, usually to the disadvantage of the former, but there are certainly broad differences for which there seems to be a statistical basis. In a comparison of the new immigration with the old the following differences are apparent: (1) males predominated in both groups, but the percentage of females was much smaller in the new immigration; (2) the proportion of unskilled workers was slightly higher in the older group; (3) the ratio of temporary immigrants was higher in the new group. We have already seen that a larger proportion of the new immigrants of necessity settled in our cities. Though it is probably true that a larger percentage of the recent immigrants were illiterate, it is possible that the number has been exaggerated, since so little attention was paid to this factor at the time of the early migrations from northwestern Europe.

4. THE JEWS [17]

The United States, with over a third of the world's Jews, contains more Jews now than any other country. As already indicated, they have come here chiefly from Russia, Poland, and Austria. With the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. the Jews ceased to be a nation. It was never correct to call them a race. Perhaps they can best be referred to now as an ancient nationality with a distinctive religion and a long tradition in which intermarriage has been all-important. It is impossible to state the number of Jews who have immigrated here because most of them were classified as members of the various European nations from which they migrated. Linfield estimated in 1927 that there were considerably more than four million Jews in the United States. Most of the Jews came here

[17] See also Chapter IV.

after 1899, and for a period they ranked second numerically to Italian immigrants. From 1820 to 1930 the number of Jewish immigrants is believed to have been about 2,500,000. Although not all the immigrant Jews spoke Yiddish, in 1930 there were in the United States 1,222,658 foreign-born whose mother tongue was Yiddish. Most of the 1930 foreign-born Jews were recent arrivals from eastern and southern Europe; the majority of the German Jews had come here about the middle of the nineteenth century, and the Spanish and Portuguese Jews had been here since colonial times.

Historic Jewish Migrations

In order to understand the Jewish immigrants we must know something of their European background. Although much more will be said about the Jews in Chapter IV, certain facts would seem to be appropriate here. While there were Jewish settlements outside Palestine before 70 A. D., the date of the fall of Jerusalem and the scattering of the Jews, all these looked to Jerusalem as their center. The Jews who left Palestine belonged to two groups, the Ashkenazim or northern division of Israel, and the Sephardic type. The latter were probably the first in Europe, having resided in Spain and Portugal ever since the days of the old Roman Empire. While the remainder of the Jews scattered throughout the world after 70 A. D., the majority of those who went to Europe had congregated in southern Germany by the third century, where they enjoyed comparative freedom for several centuries. Today they are chiefly of the Alpine type, while the Sephardic Jew is Mediterranean, each apparently showing the effect of a certain amount of intermarriage either with non-Jewish neighbors or with Jewish converts. It must be recalled that conversions to the Jewish religion have taken place in every part of the world, in the same way as they take place among the Negroes in New York City today. Just as there are black Jews in Ethiopia, there are also Jewish members of the yellow and brown races. At least half a dozen American cities have congregations made up of Negro Jews. However, since Negroes and whites do not intermarry in most countries, the Negro strain is no more pronounced among most Jews than it is, let us say, among white Baptists.

As a result of persecution in England, France, Spain, Portugal, and finally Germany, the great mass of Jews had located in Poland by the middle of the second millennium. When Poland was divided in 1795, Russia received the area which contained the majority of the Jews. In 1881 anti-Semitic riots in Russia started the first great wave of Jewish emigration to America, a wave which was stimulated again by the re-

newed pogroms of 1905–1906. Jewish migration from Austria began in 1881 also. This in outline is the long story of Jewish migrations, ending in their three successive migrations to America: first, in colonial times, that of the Sephardic Jews; second, in the middle of the last century, that of the German Jews; and finally, in recent times, the great waves of eastern European Jews who make up the majority of our present Jewish population.

The historic Jewish migrations over Asia, Africa, and Europe, with the widely different environments in the areas of temporary residence, have led to variations in the Jewish physical type as well as to differences in culture. Physically, the Jews tend to resemble the racial types of the area in which they have resided for some time. The majority of the Jewish immigrants in the United States tend to fall into three physical groups: the Spanish-Portuguese, the German, and the eastern European, none of whom correspond exactly with their ancient Semitic cousins still resident in the Holy Land. The careful observer will also notice distinct cultural differences in these three European groups, although each type still possesses enough of a common culture to be recognized as Jewish. The chief cultural traits common to all modern Jews are their religion and the language of their religion, Hebrew. Only the German and Eastern European Jews have Yiddish, a Jewish-German phonetic language, in common.

The "Jewish Problem"

It is believed that the special treatment the Jews have experienced in various lands has been a contributing factor in bringing about the cultural, if not physical, uniformity so commonly regarded as Jewish. Some of the many pros and cons of the treatment of the Jews in Europe, particularly during the Middle Ages, will be taken up later, but three keys to an understanding of the Gentile attitude towards Jews may be suggested here.

One key to an understanding of the Gentile's "Jewish problem" is found in the medieval teaching of the Catholic Church on usury, which automatically gave the Jews a monopoly in this field, since the Old Testament condemned usury or the taking of interest only between Jew and Jew, but not between Jew and Gentile. In order to understand the wisdom of the Church's regulation at that time, as well as the changed Catholic practice of today, we must realize that in the Middle Ages money was normally only a medium of exchange for articles of consumption and not, as it is today, an instrument of production. All economists recognize this changed function of money in the modern world.

The sin of usury is committed today only by exacting an excessive interest, as is the practice among the so-called "loan sharks." However, with Christians prohibited from taking interest in the Middle Ages, of necessity the Jews alone came to be associated with those characteristics embodied in Shakespeare's Shylock.

A second key to an understanding of the Jewish problem is the usual attitude which individuals and nations have towards people who are too "different." Throughout history the Jews were regarded as aliens in nearly every European country. It is related that when an eighteenth-century migration of Jews to Austria caused considerable confusion there because of the large number who came with not only one, but the same name, such as Israel or Isaac, Maria Theresa ordered all Jews to take new names. Since names already in use by Christians could not be taken, surnames were derived from flowers, minerals, and other things: Rosenbaum (rose tree), Goldberg (gold mountain), Rothschild (red sign), and others. As mankind seems to have an almost innate repugnance to people who are "different," it was rather natural that the Jews were regarded from the first with suspicion by Christians who had not yet learned to experience wide religious differences in their own ranks. In this respect the unhappy situation of the Jews probably was quite similar to that which confronted the first Catholics who invaded some of the solidly Protestant areas of colonial America. Just as efforts were made to prevent Catholics from voting, holding office, or even owning property in early America, so too the medieval Jew was forbidden in many countries to own land or to engage in agriculture. These prohibitions tended to limit the Jew to certain urban occupations, especially trading and moneylending. Generations of continued specialization in occupation and residence in urban ghettos tended to accentuate further the existing "Jewish characteristics" and the dislike for Jews among the common people, who for the most part were slow-minded farm workers and, like their modern counterparts, distrustful of the so-called "city slicker." On the Jewish businessman fell in addition the distrust which the small farmer usually has for the "middleman" and the banker.

Finally, European backgrounds partially explain the attitude of the American Jews towards fellow Jews, an attitude which ranks the German Jew next to the Spanish Jew and places the Polish and Russian Jew at the bottom of the social ladder; the social valuation is accepted quite widely by Gentiles as well. Before their expulsion from Spain the Spanish or Sephardic Jews enjoyed greater liberty and a higher social position than the Jews of other countries. They owned property,

married into the best Spanish families, and often led in science and the professions. The American descendants of these early Spanish Jews, most of whom are now wealthy merchants, bankers, and realtors, mix in the best Gentile society and are said to be rapidly intermarrying with Christians. Their New York synagogue, dating back to 1655, is said to be one of the oldest religious edifices in the city.

Though the German Jew did not enjoy the fortunate social and economic position which Jews once occupied in Spain, he came from a country which was more advanced in the 1850's than some of the countries of eastern Europe were at the end of the century. The motives which prompted his coming were for the most part economic, as was true of the majority of the other German immigrants. Although they were traditional city dwellers, the German Jews arrived here a little too early to become laborers in our great industrial plants; they spread themselves pretty widely over the nation, and from humble beginnings as urban junk men, peddlers, and small merchants, many have built up large fortunes.

The eastern European Jews, formerly crowded into the clothing and a few other urban industries in their own countries, later became the victims of overcompetition there when the peasant economy broke down in eastern Europe and forced thousands of rural non-Jews into city occupations. Once Russian persecution had started the migration of poverty-stricken Russian Jews to America, the financially distressed Jews in neighboring countries to the south began to follow suit. In coming here they were often aided by funds provided by Jews already in America, just as American Jews who wish to go back to Palestine, where an attempt is being made to re-establish the Jewish nation, are aided financially today. With a long background of commercial and specialized industrial experience, the majority of the recent Jewish immigrants settled in a few of our larger cities, where they gradually centered in the needle trades, the manufacturing of clothing, gloves, shoes, and silk goods, and in the jewelry trade and other types of small business.

Characteristics of Jewish Immigration

In concluding this analysis of Jewish immigration we may point out three features not previously emphasized. First, there is the remarkable adaptation to city life which the Jew seems to enjoy. He seems to have some physical immunity to certain diseases, an immunity difficult to explain. While hereditary selection over a period of centuries of urban living may be the best explanation, other factors such as the

Jewish temperament, self-control, and possibly early sanitary meat inspection laws may be of importance also. Nor, unlike that of his Gentile neighbors, does his birth rate seem to be reduced greatly by urban residence.

Second, the rapid economic advancement of the Jews, when compared with that of our other immigrants, is another feature which is worthy of notice. Though most of the Jews had to start at the bottom of the economic ladder here, they have achieved an altogether disproportionate measure of success when we consider the numbers from their group who have risen to the top in business and the professions. Perhaps centuries of urban residence and business specialization, coupled with a constant fear of persecution, have developed some peculiar Jewish emotional traits which contribute to mental sharpness and an unusual ambition to succeed. Possessing outstanding ability in expression and a good measure of self-confidence, the Jews have produced a large number of leading artists and entertainers; their association with stage and screen has led almost to their virtual control of professional entertainment.

Finally, though non-Jews tend to regard all Jews as of one religion, actually the Jews vary considerably in their degree of orthodoxy. The only strictly orthodox Jewish immigrant group today is said to be that composed of recent immigrants from eastern Europe. The German Jew changed many of his religious observances soon after his arrival here, and the earlier Spanish-Portuguese Jews have in a large number of instances abandoned their original religion almost entirely. Seemingly the degree of orthodoxy among Jews depends in a large measure upon the proximity of persecution. If this is true, the American Jew may be far less orthodox in the future than he is today, thus losing one of the important cultural traits which distinguish him from the Gentile. It is on this account that some have said that the best way to deal with the "Jewish question" is to prevent persecution. In the following chapter, in which we are to consider some of the new social situations created in the United States by the new immigration, we shall take up again what is referred to as the "Jewish question."

(See the references at the end of Chapter IV.)

CHAPTER IV

OUR RECENT IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS

In the new immigration we find repeated the same problems of cultural adjustment that had existed in the colonial and the old immigration, though on a somewhat larger scale. As had happened before, the new immigrants were criticized by the older residents because they were of a lower economic and social status; the religious preferences of the new immigrants, which threatened to upset the old numerical ratios, aroused the hatred of many of the older groups; finally, the manner of life of the new immigrants was so different from that which prevailed here that they were regarded as challenging American institutions and ideals.

I. The New Hostility to Immigration

The size of the new immigration waves exceeded the old ones; nevertheless, when we consider the increased size of the nation which received them, the problems of adjustment appear to be no greater than formerly, with one exception, the economic situation. As we shall see shortly, the economic motive, which was always the chief one in attracting immigration here, was likewise the motive which finally determined us to stop free immigration. There were various traditional objections to newcomers, but it was the objection raised by American industry that finally succeeded in stopping immigration. Most of the forces which had protested against former immigration protested against the new immigration also, but, though they did determine the method which was used in bringing about restriction, it was only through their alliance with the economic protest that they can be regarded as factors in bringing about the final restriction of immigration.

One of the allied forces which waged war against the new immigration may be regarded as the lineal descendant of the native-Americanism movement which had objected to the Catholic Irish and German immigration of an earlier date. Reappearing in the early 1890's as the American Protective Association, popularly referred to as the A.P.A., it reached its greatest growth as the modern Ku Klux Klan—in 1920–1924, strange to say, right after the World War, during which Catholics had

been enrolled in the American army and navy far in excess of their proportional distribution in the nation. While all immigrants were proscribed, the A.P.A. and the K.K.K. movements were directed chiefly against Roman Catholic immigrants. The K.K.K., appealing chiefly to what some observers have called the "small-town mind," and condemned by all leading thinkers, was immediately taken over by clever commercial organizers, who reaped a handsome profit at ten dollars per initiate. It was courted for a time also by a number of Protestant churches, especially in the South and in the rural areas of the North, and even by the Republican Party in the elections of 1924. Although dissension among Klan leaders, flogging outrages, political corruption, and other excesses which aroused the nation against the Klan soon led to its undoing, the Klan is important to us here as a manifestation of the hatred of Catholics which has been part of the American tradition ever since colonial times. The hooded order is in disrepute at present, but the possibility of its sudden reappearance in the future is worthy of some thought, in view of the success of the similar Nazi tactics in European countries. Davie sees a resemblance between the Klan and the Nazi movement, regarding both as forms of Protestant nationalism, and suggests that the smoldering hatred for Catholics and immigrants may flare up here again at any time.

> The Ku Klux Klan is an extreme form of Protestant Nationalism very similar to National Socialism in Germany today. The organization is less important than the atmosphere it expresses. Its significance, like that of similar organizations, lies in the fact that they are evidence of a latent fear of Catholicism and of hostility to immigrants which may flare up at any time.[1]

Although religious and other prejudices capable of being organized into anti-Catholic and antiforeigner movements seem to have been an integral part of American culture at all times, it is doubtful if Klan influences alone would have succeeded in securing the passage of the restrictive immigration laws of 1924, had it not been for two new factors injected into the immigration situation just about that time. One of these was the organized protest of labor, and the other was a sudden fear of radicalism on the part of employers. As we shall see, both of these may be boiled down to the "economic motive."

The Economic Protest

The protest of labor against the importation of "cheap foreign competition" was not conspicuous during colonial days, when the immi-

[1] Maurice R. Davie, *World Immigration* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936), page 188.

grant, utilized largely as a buffer against the Indians on the frontier, was an economic asset to the older worker. Foreign labor gradually became a constant source of irritation in the nineteenth century, especially as the frontier began to disappear and we ceased to be a predominately agricultural nation. As our industrial centers grew up, employers constantly sought cheap labor abroad, partly to fill actual employment needs and partly to produce a labor surplus so as to prevent the organization of labor unions and to break up strikes. The rapid growth of labor unions during the early decades of the twentieth century, despite the efforts of employers, provided the first new element in the opposition to unrestricted immigration. The second new factor which helped to bring about the final change in our immigration policy was a sudden fear of radicalism which spread over the nation after the success of the Russian Revolution. This event helped to change the employer's viewpoint on the desirability of importing more foreign labor and so at last to unify capital and labor on the immigration issue. Both acted to save their own pocketbooks: labor for obvious reasons, capital because it feared the spread of radicalism among the laboring classes. The Klan movement was in part the emotional expression of both these attitudes, and it expressed as well two other strong emotions: the hatred of Negroes, Catholics, Jews, and non-Nordics, and the violent nationalism which was inflamed during the war. Without doubt immigration restriction would have come without the Klan movement, but the point is that, had not the Klan served to aggravate uncritical "Americanism," we should probably have had a more sensible immigration law, without the ridiculous assumption of "Nordic superiority" and without offending the Japanese.

Immigrants, coming as a rule from the lower economic strata of European society, had always been regarded by some Americans as detrimental to our institutions. The sudden injection into our cities of so many aliens from the countries of southern and eastern Europe made the problem more conspicuous than formerly and raised grave doubts in the minds of some here as to the ability of our "melting pot" to make Americans of them rapidly enough. Many traits of these new immigrants served to arouse either suspicion or ill will—such things as their differences in dress and diet, the inferior status of women among them, their tendency to send earnings abroad instead of spending them here, the spectacular Black Hand organization among the Italians, the polyglot immigration from Austria-Hungary, and the bumptiousness of many of the Jews. The increase of the foreign-language press, along with the false charge that it was radical and scheming to overthrow

American institutions, also worried many older Americans. In 1934 foreign-language publications in more than twenty-one different languages were printed here, 150 in German, 108 in Italian, 70 in Spanish, 66 in Czechoslovak tongues, 65 in Scandinavian, and 34 in Yiddish or Hebrew, to mention only the larger groups. The appearance of Eastern Orthodox and other newly imported churches and synagogues in our chief cities was an additional cause of concern. Finally, it was claimed that the foreign vote was being used to win city elections and so was rendering the unorganized "American vote" impotent. Yet, as we have already seen, almost all these complaints are matched by those made against the older immigration. With the exception of the new economic protest, the hostility to recent immigration was largely that of colonial days in a new dress. And of the essence of that perennial hostility to foreigners Dr. Mary Elizabeth Walsh has said: "These ethnocentric attitudes imply one standard of behavior to those who are members of one's own group and another standard to those outside of it. Needless to say this double standard is opposed to Christian brotherhood." [2]

II. Americanization

We think of assimilation, ordinarily, as the process by which a foreign group is made a part of our own. The conscious direction of this cultural process in the United States has been called Americanization. Many Americans have felt that recent immigrants, coming here in such large numbers from countries with vastly different cultures, needed some organized guidance or at least special stimulus toward assimilation, lest this country should become, like Switzerland, a democracy of federated nationalities. Another fact which prompted Americanization projects was the tendency of recent immigrants to settle in the same areas of cities, or in foreign colonies, as these areas have been called. Curiously enough, the similar social tendency of older Americans to segregate themselves by moving into exclusive areas whenever immigrant families began to invade their former residential areas was generally ignored by the chief critics of these foreign colonies.

1. Exploitation of Immigrants

In order to understand why there have been so many Little Italys, Little Polands, and other strong nationality groupings in many of our cities, we should recall some of the experiences of the immigrant

[2] "The Double Standard," *The Catholic Mind*, Volume 36, February 22, 1938, page 74. (Reprinted from *Pax*, January, 1938.)

after his arrival here. Apart from the fact that the immigrant, even if he did not speak a foreign language, would naturally prefer to be with his own people, he was driven very often to the protection which these colonies offered because of exploitation almost from the moment of his arrival on American territory. The published life stories of immigrants, as well as official investigations which have been made of conditions surrounding immigrant depots, reveal how human wolves have preyed upon the helpless, ignorant immigrant at every turn.

Even on the government territory of Ellis Island the immigrant was at times confronted with exploiters almost as soon as he had disembarked. At one period, for instance, lunch boxes were thrust into his hands by brusque, military-attired "salesmen," and an exorbitant price demanded. The helpless immigrant, assuming that he was dealing with a government official, usually complied. Arriving later in New York City, he immediately became the target for boardinghouse runners, porters, taxicab drivers, expressmen, moneychangers, and railroad agents, who took advantage of the confused foreigner and often robbed him of the cash which he still possessed. Stories are told of immigrants paying for a ticket to Chicago and then being placed on the Third Avenue "L" by volunteer railroad agents. The particular evils of exploitation of young immigrant girls can easily be imagined. Because of the number who were being forced into white slavery before they could reach relatives in distant cities, private societies sprang up in New York and at other ports for the protection of recent arrivals. In the history of these societies, most of which are still functioning, we see not only the beginnings of an honest concern for the welfare of the immigrant but something of the sequence of national migrations as well.

The first American organization for the care of immigrants was the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Massachusetts, founded in March, 1737. Of an anti-Catholic character at first, its complexion soon changed, and it is today largely in the hands of Catholics. In 1790 the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland was organized; in 1812 a similar Hibernian Society was organized at Savannah; and these were followed by the Emigrant Assistance Society in New York in 1825, and the Irish Emigrant Society in 1841 in the same city. In 1881 the Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary was founded in New York for the protection of Irish immigrant girls.

Prominent persons of other nationalities took up the work in the interest of their compatriots, and in 1868 the St. Raphael Society was founded in Germany for the protection of emigrants both at the port of departure and that of arrival, effective cooperation in the United States being given by the Central Verein. Later a branch of the St. Raphael Society was founded in New York, and in this connection the Leo House was established in 1889.

In 1898 the Austrian Society of New York was founded; in 1893 St. Joseph's Society was organized for the purpose of aiding persons of Polish nationality; two years later the Jeanne d'Arc Home for the protection of French immigrant women was opened. The chief source of aid for Italians is the St. Raphael Society for Italian Immigrants, founded in 1891, while in 1901 a secular society was established for the same purpose. The Association for the Protection of Belgian and Dutch Immigrants was formed in 1907. Finally the National Catholic Welfare Conference has recently established a special department of immigration.[3]

The exploitation of the immigrant at ports of entry might have been excused to some extent because of the confusion caused by the arrival of hundreds of thousands of immigrants yearly, but one might have expected that at least the cities and towns which were to be the future homes of the immigrant would attempt to guard him against similar evils until he could protect himself. This, however, was seldom true. Upon arrival at his ultimate destination the immigrant often became the special object of exploitation by those in whose community he had chosen to live. Jobs were "sold" to him by scheming agents at a time when employers were advertising for help; notary publics, who usually had broad powers under government supervision in Europe, advertised an ability to perform all sorts of private and official functions for him at a fee, in spite of the fact that their chief function here is to take affidavits; and finally, courts lacking capable interpreters but filled with shyster lawyers soon made the immigrant distrustful of all American justice. When the care of the orphan children of Catholic immigrants fell upon the local community, every effort was made to destroy their religion, as we shall see in connection with the study of poverty. Was it any wonder, then, that the immigrant tended to stick close to his own national or religious group for protection?

2. FIRST STEPS IN ASSIMILATION

Churches in which services were conducted in his native tongue gave the new arrival his greatest sense of community security. Usually a saloon conducted by a member of his own nationality became his first American club. Other important factors in bridging the gap between foreign and American ways were national social halls, which sprang up in most foreign centers large enough to support them. Whether connected with parish churches or owned by lodges or shareholders, these halls were always important community centers. They became the centers for wedding festivities, musical and gymnastic programs, and

[3] Rev. Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925), page 265. Used by permission.

small libraries where papers both in English and in the mother tongue could be obtained, free from what has been described as the "inhibiting presence of superior-feeling and authoritative Americans." Here too, the immigrant could engage in games and other activities that brought back memories of the homeland. It was in these halls that many of the native arts were preserved until such time as social-settlement workers, at places like Hull House in Chicago, were able to gain the confidence of the immigrant and to encourage him to retain the finer things of his native land.

One of the greatest problems that confronted the pioneer social-settlement worker was that of bridging the social chasm which had developed between old-country parents and their Americanized children, a situation which was rapidly breaking up family life and leading to juvenile delinquency. This problem, as it existed among Chicago's immigrants, is described in Linn's life of Jane Addams, the founder of Hull House:

> One of her principal tasks as an interpreter was to get the parents and the children of the ward to understand each other. Thousands of the parents, by far the majority, were immigrants. As children, they had been Bohemian, Italian, Russian, Greek. But their children, born in this country, or with English as their first language, regarded themselves as Americans. Their view was obviously one to be encouraged, and yet it inevitably brought about clashes in the family life. The parents were often resentful of the different ideas of their children, the children often contemptuous of their parents, stuck in the rut of old European habits, customs, opinions. At worst, the fathers whipped their daughters for being different, and the sons sneered at their mothers' dress and ignorance, or at their fathers' maudlin babble of old days. Even at best, the pleasures of the parent and child were seldom in common, and they seldom went anywhere together.[4]

Practical psychologist that she was, Miss Addams decided to ameliorate this serious problem of childhood by deliberately "building up" the prestige of these foreign-born parents.

> It determined her to make a place in which the older people could practise their known, traditional crafts, which should parallel the studios and the music school for the younger ones who had inherited aptitude for the arts. What the children did in drawing and music and play-acting drew the admiration of their parents; and so in what their parents did, in spinning, weaving, sewing, carving, metal-working, the dramatic representation of the abilities of the parents would rouse the admiration of the children. Such a place was found and fitted up—one room at first, very simply equipped. That one room has grown into many, the equipment has become elaborate

[4] James Weber Linn, *Jane Addams* (D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935), page 179. Used by permission.

and historically interesting. Indeed, the room for old-craft practice grew into a real exhibition place of industry—the Labor Museum, it came finally to be called.[5]

Unfortunately, settlement and neighborhood houses were all too few, and only a minority of the immigrants had the first impacts of city life softened through such energetic and sympathetic friendship from older Americans. The immigrant usually came here with an exalted idea of the superiority of American culture and with a desire to acquire it quickly, but his unpleasant early experiences often changed his former ideals of America as well as his earlier ambition to give up old-country ways. It is well for us to keep this situation in mind when we discuss Americanization projects. Too often Americans have tended to criticize the alien for his failure to jump into an American cultural strait jacket all at once and have failed to appreciate the unfortunate effect of the immigrant's early contacts with American culture.

3. A RECIPROCAL PROCESS

Americanization has meant different things to different American groups. To some it meant the complete obliteration of every foreign characteristic; to others it meant especially the adoption of Puritan ideals and conduct; fortunately, there were others who viewed it as a reciprocal process through which the immigrant contributes something to our culture while taking over most of our ways of doing things. Naturally, the program of Americanization adopted in any community —and nearly every large city had its own plan during the period of intense nationalism right after the World War—depended upon the particular viewpoint held concerning the purpose of Americanization. If the directors of some of these overnight projects had only consulted the experience of those church and social-settlement workers who had been engaged in effective though unofficial Americanization work for decades, they would have learned that the only practical approach to this objective is that which shows an honest appreciation of the social values found in the several alien cultures. Unfortunately, in some instances the Americanization movement became tainted with Klan influence. When Americanization projects were founded upon bigotry and the belief that nothing good existed outside America, they further antagonized rather than won over the immigrant. One prerequisite for anyone who wishes to plan or to engage in Americanization activities—and it must be admitted that such efforts will probably be necessary for some time to come in spite of the curtailment of immigration—is

[5] *Ibid.*, page 181. Used by permission.

an understanding of the European backgrounds of the different immigrant groups.

Older Americans should be better informed about the contributions which recent immigrants have made to American culture. Much of the heralded success of our great industrial development is due to recent immigrants who have given the best part of their lives to doing the hardest and dirtiest kind of work at starvation wages. While it is too much to expect that the typical immigrant, a simple unskilled laborer or farmer, can bring us the best of his national culture, yet cultural benefits derived from recent immigration are already evident. Professor Donald R. Taft suggests three ways in which the recent immigrant has benefited the pre-existing culture. First, he has made contributions in the form of arts and crafts and industrial skills which American commercialism has been tardy, if not too late, in recognizing and encouraging. The fine lace-embroidered cloth, the wood carvings, the painted glass, and the hand-wrought jewelry of the recently arrived peasants have been neglected too often because our artistic tastes have been blunted by machine-made goods. Second, certain nonmaterial changes for the better have been brought about in America through recent immigrant influence. As Taft says, "The strengthening of Catholicism begun by the earlier Irish" has brought about a mingling of faiths and a large degree of religious toleration which contrasts with the intolerance of the Puritan. To this we might add that the large proportion of Roman Catholics among recent immigrants has undoubtedly retarded the progress of Communism here among those on the lowest rung of the economic ladder, where it might otherwise be rampant. Relative to the "conservative force" of the Catholic Church in this respect, however, Catholics must be on guard, as Cardinal Mundelein has warned us, lest this influence be taken advantage of by those who are profiting by present social injustice:

> Selfish employers of labor have flattered the Church by calling it the great conservative force, and then called upon it to act as a police force while they paid but a pittance of wage to those who worked for them. . . .
>
> Of course there is danger of the spread of Communism in our midst. The Holy Father points that out to us. But don't let others use that as a cloak to cover corrupt practices, when they cry out against Communism and they themselves practice social injustice, when they fight against a minimum wage law and we find girls and women trying to live on ten or fifteen cents an hour.[6]

[6] "Catholic Action for Social Justice," *The Catholic Mind,* Volume 36, February 8, 1938, page 48.

Professor Taft believes that as a result of the new immigration it will be more difficult to impose religious intolerance upon the United States of the future. The coming of so many different nationalities should tend also to make us more international, he believes, and so more inclined towards some practical world peace policy. In this connection it is pointed out that the immigrant's abandonment of what in former times were regarded as inherent racial or national traits, in many cases after only a single generation of residence in America, has been a cultural experiment which should prove to the world that the old belief in the incompatibility of national cultures is silly. Finally, Taft suggests that the very breaking of the crust of custom, brought about by the clash of cultures here, may prove to be the means of stimulating our civilization onwards to greater achievements.[7]

All of us are conerned today about the future of American democracy, now that totalitarian states are spreading so rapidly over Europe and Asia. Fears have been expressed here that the number of immigrants not yet fully indoctrinated with our political ideas, as well as those from countries in which either communism or some form of fascism is the present form of government, might be led rather easily into some undemocratic form of American government. To supplement this fear it is pointed out that of the 123,000,000 population of the continental United States in 1930, nearly 53,000,000 were either foreign-born, the children of foreign-born, or Negroes, Mexicans, or of other races. Is it possible that many of these may be regimented rather easily under totalitarian leadership? In speculating about the possible tendencies of the above groups in this respect we should not neglect to consider the probable attitude of older Americans towards regimentation. As a nation which is predominately urban, have we not been succumbing to regimentation in nearly every detail of our lives? Surely the members of the recent Klan and prohibition movements, almost entirely "old American," had no objection to regimentation. Intolerance is the backbone of regimentation. Recently James Truslow Adams suggested that the existence of so-called "rugged individualism" among old Americans has been somewhat misrepresented. Far from avoiding the use of government and attempting to "go it alone," Americans have always tried to make use of government at every turn for the furtherance of their individual economic ambitions, he says. Through the aid of governmental action there were "land and timber steals," high tariffs to protect special

[7] Donald R. Taft, *Human Migration* (The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936), pages 284–291.

interests, grants of franchises, as well as internal improvements undertaken by the government. The "use" of government, he says, is a part of our national tradition, to which the immigrant has now been "Americanized." It might even happen, he suggests, that the recent immigrant, whose ancestors experienced earlier and usually milder, but still unwelcome, forms of regimentation in the countries from which they came, may yet prove to be the force which will oppose rather than encourage regimentation here.[8]

III. The Jewish Question

The recent revival of anti-Semitism in Europe is one of the most amazing aspects of postwar social disorganization. Led by Hitlerized Germany, where the actual Jewish population of 500,000 was increased to over 3,000,000 by the device adopted in persecutory legislation which classified the descendants of former Jews even to the third generation as Jews, anti-Semitism has broken out more recently in Austria, Poland, and Rumania also. Will this trend spread to the United States? Many believe that such a danger exists. Our recent failure to enact laws involving drastic economic reforms as rapidly as hoped for has left the nation in a state of discontent and unrest which may yet prove advantageous to a clever demagogue, whether for fascism or for communism. Furthermore, the failure of democratic methods to rule successfully here in baseball, in motion pictures, and even in Wall Street has made so-called "czars" seem necessary. Will this tendency, paralleling the collapse of democratic government in Europe, lead to a similar demand in our own government? Under a dictatorship minority groups seldom fare well. From past history it is easy to see how not only Jews but Negroes and Catholics as well could be used as scapegoats to secure a following for an American Hitler or Stalin. Not only Jews, but also intelligent Gentiles, therefore, should be concerned lest an anti-Jewish movement gain headway here. More Jews reside in the continental United States today than in any other country in the world. Of course, if there is any honest basis for what is referred to as the Jewish question, all Americans should know about it. What are the complaints which are commonly made against the Jews in the United States, in addition to the problems seen in Chapter III, and what is to be said of them?

[8] "Is America a Field for Regimentation?" *The New York Times Magazine*, January 16, 1938.

I. CHARGES MADE AGAINST JEWS

When people feel that they can talk freely on the "Jewish question," the variety and number of objections which are raised against the Jews are amazing. Many of these arguments against the Jews are so patently ridiculous that they need no consideration here. There are some, however, which are worthy of analysis, because of the frequency with which they are repeated, if for no other reason. The most important "arguments" against the Jews in America seem to be the following: (1) Jewish international bankers are to blame for many of our economic ills; (2) Jews avoid agriculture and confine their efforts to the white-collar positions and professions of the city; (3) Jews lack good manners and a sense of modesty; (4) the Talmud sanctions immorality; (5) a recent objection—Jews are leaning towards communism. These objections will be considered in order.

International Bankers

Before American Jews can be blamed for causing our international economic ills, it must be proved that they *are* our international bankers; this does not seem to be the case. It is true that there are several important Jewish bankers, such as Paul Warburg, Bernard Baruch, and the house of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., but the evidence seems to indicate that our recent foreign loans were negotiated chiefly by non-Jewish banking houses. For that matter, the Jewish representation in the largest New York banks is said to be considerably less than their ratio to the general population.

The total amount of foreign loans outstanding on March 1, 1935, were $7,621,100,000. Of this amount 7.15% of the total was floated by Jewish bankers; 15.95% by miscellaneous banking houses, and all the balance of 76.9% were floated by known non-Jewish bankers. Nineteen of the largest New York banks have a total directorate of 420, of whom thirty are Jews. The Jewish population of New York is thirty per cent. They are represented on the directorate by 7%.[9]

Furthermore, the greatest fortunes of modern industry, those of the Fords, du Ponts, Carnegies, and Rockefellers, are not in the possession of Jews. That the Jews are overrepresented in the business world cannot be denied. The reason for this, touched upon previously, will be developed further in a subsequent paragraph. At this point it is

[9] Sigmund Livingston, *A Problem of American Jewry* (pamphlet) (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Chicago, 1935), page 20.

suggested that the basis for the "international banker" charge against the Jew is to be found in the intense nationalism of many non-Jews. The Jew has always been a foe of extreme nationalism. Like that of the Roman Catholic, his religion transcends the boundaries of any nation and so is inimical to the "blood and soil" creeds set up from time to time in particular nations. On this account it is always easy for the superpatriot to raise the false cry that Jews and Catholics are not patriotic. The Catholic should remember that he and the Jew have a common enemy in extreme nationalism and that it is no mere accident that such Jew-baiters as Streicher, Himmler, and Rosenberg are also the persecutors of Christians and the advocates of a new "made in Germany" paganism. The "international banker" charge made here particularly after the World War has all the earmarks of nationalistic fanaticism.

White-Collar Urban Workers

That the Jew is to a large extent engaged in commerce or the learned professions, rather than agriculture, menial service, and technical arts, must be admitted. It is quite another thing, however, to attribute this to any special favoritism towards the Jews and so to arouse bad feeling against them. As a matter of fact, this whole situation today can be attributed to the former persecution of the Jews in Europe. For centuries the Jews were compelled to live in the ghetto; very often they were denied the right to own or occupy agricultural land or to join the guilds of medieval city workers. Forced by necessity, as has already been mentioned, the Jew became a moneylender and a small trader, the Church's laws against interest-taking automatically making moneylending a Jewish monopoly. Even when farming was permitted to him in Europe, most Jews did not dare to engage in it, or in any other business requiring a bulky stock in trade, because of the constant fear of anti-Jewish riots. He could not hide barns, agricultural tools, and produce in a chest or carry them off in the night when a pogrom was in progress. Persecution drove the European Jew into what we now regard as his traditional city occupations and professions.

Non-Jews sometimes complain likewise about the large number of Jews who have become successful in business and in the professions. Such critics do not stop to realize that, in order to receive recognition in any line, the Jew had to be not merely as good as his Gentile competitor, but better. Consequently, the Jew strove harder to secure training and an education, and later to reach a position of eminence in his trade or profession, out of sheer necessity. Since he has never felt en-

tirely free from the danger of persecution, even in America, it is only natural that his manner of meeting life, learned in days of much more active discrimination against him, should persist here. Likewise, it is only natural that Jewish fathers should favor their sons, relatives, and Jewish friends when worth-while positions open up in their businesses. All national groups tend to do the same thing.

In spite of the valid historic reasons for Jewish congestion in certain urban trades, however, many modern Jewish leaders believe that today more Jews should be encouraged to seek a livelihood in agriculture and the more menial tasks, in order to allay the rather widespread criticism made of them on this score. Lewis Browne believes that the gross unevenness in the occupational distribution of the Jews more than anything else makes them appear as a distinct people. In order to avoid urban specialization among Jews, in 1891 a wealthy German Jewish banker, Baron Moritz de Hirsch, set aside a fund of $45,000,000, one of the largest single gifts in world history, to direct Jewish emigrants from the European cities to the open country of Argentina. Likewise, some of the leading American Jewish organizations, such as the A.Z.A., are conducting experimental farms and even offering financial inducements to get more Jews into agriculture, especially since adequate educational opportunities, always so dear to the Jews, are now available in most of our rural areas. Unfortunately, the depressed state of our agriculture and the mechanization of farms, which has reduced the need of added hands in recent years, have necessarily retarded any large Jewish movement in this direction.

Bumptiousness

That there are individual Jews who lack good manners and modesty is admitted by all. The same may be said of any religious, racial, or national group. Therefore we are concerned here only with the charge that the Jews are worse than other foreign groups in this respect. It must be recalled at the outset that American Jews came here not only from England and Germany, but more often in recent years from such widely different cultures as those of Austria, Hungary, Russia, Poland, Sicily, and the Balkans. Naturally, the manners and to some extent the morals of some of these different countries differ from our own. When a large number of representatives of these alien cultures become centered in a single area of an American city, it is difficult for the average non-Jew to distinguish between what is objectionably foreign and what objectionably Jewish. Since the major part of our Jewish population is of comparative recent European immigration, it is to be expected that

many of them will reflect manners somewhat different from those of most older Americans. For example, it has been said that the much criticized tendency of some Jews to be gaudy in their dress and in the display of jewelry, in order to attract attention, can be traced in many instances to similar national tendencies in some of the countries of southern or central Europe. Similarly, so-called Jewish standards of modesty often reflect those of countries unaffected by Puritanism. Psychological factors, in addition, also explain certain offensive "Jewish mannerisms." It seems only natural to expect that some impetuous Jews, experiencing for the first time the new freedom of America, should at the beginning throw off almost all social repressions as well as those to which they had so long been unfairly subjected in Europe.

It would seem as if the alleged bumptiousness of some Jews at beaches and summer resorts can be explained largely on the grounds just pointed out. Just as the newly rich in any population group are apt to indulge in conspicuous consumption, so too the recently liberated Jew may at times be inclined to go beyond the realms of ordinary social liberties and to challenge the customs and manners established by non-Jews. When these two factors, new riches and new freedom, are combined, as has happened in the case of some Jews who have been singularly successful here in a short period of time, it seems hard to expect Jews to conform to the strict etiquette of the American élite at once. The Jews themselves are said to recognize this situation, the "better-type" Jews often referring to their uncouth brethren as "kikes." Non-Jews likewise admit this distinction among Jews very often by prefacing their criticism of Jews with the remark, "Some of my best friends are Jews." Time and patience will probably ameliorate this problem, even though there will always be an unfortunate tendency for non-Jews to attribute to the Jews in general the bad manners of the few, simply because, as a rule, ill-mannered Gentiles are less easily identified as members of a particular nationality or religion.

Talmud Immorality

Hardly daring to criticize ancient Judaism founded upon the Old Testament, some calumniators of the Jews have attempted to prove that the later Talmud inculcates hostility to non-Jews and even sanctions violations of the moral law where the latter are concerned. In describing the collection of Jewish law, ceremonial, and general information known as the Talmud, Father Joseph N. Moody says:

> The Talmud is an enormous, unclassified work, occupying twelve closely printed volumes of about a thousand pages each in the German translation

of Lazarus Goldschmidt. It was the fruit of more than twenty-five hundred separate authors and was accumulated gradually over a period of nearly a thousand years, until it was finally completed in its classical Babylonian form about 500 A. D. Hence it contains the most diverse, and often contradictory, opinions on a great variety of subjects and includes "the most varied shades of piety and ethical thinking, casual dialogues of a general nature, private utterances of teachers totally devoid of any binding implication." It is an encyclopedia of an age and of the life of a people in which law is mixed with moral exhortation, legend, science, history, and superstition—a collection not intended as a definite code, but as material for study and edification.

As might be expected, such an unwieldy collection provides a handy arsenal for the critic of Judaism, especially since the lack of vowel signs in the original opens up the possibility of varied interpretations. Since it was the product of the Dispersion, and since its avowed purpose was to preserve the ancient religion by emphasizing its exclusive features, it is natural that certain sections of it would provide material for those who would picture the Jews as enemies of the human race.[10]

Although a few isolated passages in the Talmud might seem to back up some of the charges of those who attack the ethics taught by this collection of books, Christian scholars have shown that, when the Talmud is read with the sufferings of the Jewish people at the time of its composition in mind, these objections disappear. As Father Moody concludes, "Certainly any fair analysis of this collection of Jewish lore will reveal that it demands kindness and justice to all men as the first obligation of religion."

Communists

Curiously enough, Jews have been blamed for both communism and capitalism, depending evidently upon the "ism" which the non-Jew disliked most. In recent years the facts that Soviet Russia has favored the Jews and that Marx and Lassalle were Jews has led anti-Semites to suspect Jews of socialistic or communistic leanings, forgetting meanwhile that they have also charged them with being international bankers. Some believe that the Jews, "the prime agents in capitalism," are now bearing the brunt of a world-wide attack on capitalism. The fact that all Jews are opposed to German fascism has probably led to the suspicion that they must therefore favor its antithesis, communism. Even if there were no Hitler with an anti-Jewish policy, it is reasonable to suppose that Jews would oppose fascism in principle because of the emphasis which this form of government places upon intense na-

[10] *Why Are Jews Persecuted?* (pamphlet) (The Queen's Work, St. Louis, 1938), pages 37–38. Used by permission.

tionalism. The Jew has learned from bitter experiences that nationalistic statesmen can always secure a following sooner or later by making a scapegoat of his people.

Surely no one can accuse all American Jews of favoring communism. Too many have benefited handsomely from our present economic order. Nevertheless, there are some unprejudiced non-Jewish observers who fear that many of our Jews look favorably upon communism. The temptation for Jews to do so is obvious. As members of traditionally downtrodden and oppressed groups they are naturally sympathetic with the underdog and attracted by an appeal which wears the cloak of social justice. The pacifism of international radical movements likewise attracts the Jew, who has suffered so often from nationalistic movements. Then, too, since radicalism usually makes its greatest appeal to the urbanite, it is only natural that the urban-dwelling Jew should be conspicuous in communism in the United States. The fact that it was only at the start of the last century that the age-long restrictions against him began to break down makes the modern Jew grateful to the radicals of the "Age of Enlightenment" and of the French Revolution who were largely responsible for his freedom. That communism is against both Catholicism and Protestantism matters little, for after all the Jew has suffered persecution equally from both. That it is opposed to all religion matters little to those Jews who have abandoned Judaism, and it is said that their number is legion. With the realization that American immigration has been cut off for good and that only a small portion of the Jewish world population can ever be absorbed in Palestine, the vast areas and undeveloped resources of Russia suggest a new home for the Jew who may be persecuted elsewhere. Stalin, though a non-Jew, has skillfully played upon this dream. The rosy side of this picture is presented in the following observation from a Jewish paper published in Boston:

> The Soviet Government itself is prepared to extend money subsidies to facilitate Jewish colonization. . . . With the British Government maintaining its vicious immigration restrictions as regards Palestine and with the United States adamant as regards the entry of German refugees, Russia is today the only country that holds out hope for salvage of Jewish lives. . . . Jews should begin to revise their attitude toward Russia. If the Fascists of the world insist on lumping Jews indiscriminately with Communists, at least Jews should derive some benefit from that association.[11]

[11] *The Jewish Advocate*, March 13, 1934. (Quoted in *America*, Volume 53, July 27, 1935, p. 371.)

While some wealthy American Jews have fostered the idea of building up a Jewish state in Russia, Jews are by no means agreed as to the wisdom of this course. Some Jewish critics see in the Stalin policy merely a far-sighted Russian plan to build up a buffer state against the Japanese, for Biro Bidjan, the new Russian "Jewish republic," is on the eastern border of the Soviet republics, near Manchuria. Others fear that the religious freedom promised by the Soviet government is only a paper prop which eventually may turn out to be "religious freedom" only so long as the Jews do not worship God. At any rate, it would seem as though the present friendly attitude of many American Jews toward Soviet Russia were bound to affect their attitude toward steps being taken to introduce communism in other countries, especially when, as usually happens, fascism arises to stop the inroads of communism. In this connection it appears that, unless the whole world is to become communistic, American Jews will be flirting with danger if they permit the impression to grow that they favor the Soviet experiment. With communistic propaganda now flooding the United States largely under the false cloak of "democracy," it may not be long before all Americans are called upon to take a definite stand against this Soviet influence. If we toy with this masquerading communism long enough, it may become necessary to organize some sort of militant movement to eradicate it, and, should this come to pass, it is easy to see how the Jews could once more be made scapegoats.

It is believed that many American Jewish leaders are cognizant of the present danger and are attempting to curb the impression that Jews favor communism. In this connection it might be pointed out that Catholics have been somewhat disappointed at the silence of practically all Jews in the face of the recent persecution of Catholics by communistic groups in Spain and Mexico. Had American Jews joined with Catholics in protesting against these persecutions as the latter have in protesting against the treatment of Jews in Germany, in all probability the persecution of Catholics would not have been ignored by the American press. This is not meant to imply that Jews "own" the American press, a frequently repeated charge which is untrue; none the less, Jewish merchants by their extensive advertising exert a powerful influence over all news agencies, so much so that statements derogatory to Jews seldom appear in our newspapers or radio programs. It is hoped that Catholics and Jews, both unpopular minority groups in many countries, will learn to work in closer harmony for their mutual protection in the future.

2. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE JEW

Inasmuch as nearly every problem of modern social life has its moral implications, the Catholic who lives up to the teaching of his religion will find that this is bound to influence his attitude towards the Jews. Lest this association should unfortunately suggest to some readers an unfriendly rather than a co-operative attitude towards the Jews, because of the rather widely held belief that the Catholic Church persecuted the Jews in the Middle Ages, it will be well to consider the mĕdieval situation as well as the attitude of the Church today.

The Middle Ages and the Spanish Inquisition

The treatment of the Jews in the Middle Ages cannot be understood unless the idea of the medieval state is understood—a state in which all social policies were based upon man's concept of God's wishes. Just as the medieval Jews believed that in the providence of God they were the Chosen People and the salt of the earth, so the Christians felt that God had punished and wished to continue the punishment of the Jews. Thus each Jew and Christian took refuge behind his own theological rampart. In the Christian politico-religious society of that time public opinion dictated that the Jews should be punished for their guilt in rejecting Christ. Furthermore, those Jews who refused to become Christians were regarded as an alien people, a condition which in itself seemed to justify special government regulations. According to a recognized Catholic authority on the Middle Ages, Jacques Maritain, the fact of the dispersal of the Jewish people was generally accepted by Christians as conclusive evidence of God's punishment and a justification for the Church's approval of special regulations for their conduct within Christian communities:

> The Middle Ages did not pretend to *punish* the Jews, but in the face of the punishment to which God had subjected them, namely their dispersion among the Christian nations, it was considered justifiable to keep them under special and severe laws within the Christian communities. It was never a question of punishing the Jews but rather of drawing certain conclusions affecting the public law from a given fact, which was on the whole considered a punishment of God.[12]

At this point the reader may observe, "But what about the Spanish Inquisition and its treatment of the Jew—did the Church approve of this?" It should be noted, first of all, that most impartial historians now

[12] Quoted by the Rev. Gregory Feige (translator) in *The Church and the Jews* (pamphlet) (The Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, D.C., published by the Paulist Press, New York, 1937), page 19.

admit that Spanish Catholics had a just cause of complaint against many of their Jewish neighbors. Spain, at the time of Ferdinand and Isabella, was engaged in a life-and-death struggle against the Moors, who threatened to overrun not only Spain but all of Europe as well. While engaged with this enemy from without, Spain found that she had enemies within her gates: Jews and Moors who would have welcomed the supremacy of the African invader. That these two peoples had been persecuted previously by Spain is beside the point. Some of these Jews and Moors, who had become nominal Catholics, were found to be traitors to both Church and State. It was only natural, therefore, that the Spanish Jews should become the victim of intense hatred when it was learned that some of them were secretly opening the gates of Spanish cities to the invading Saracens and African Jews. At this juncture the Spanish ambassador in Rome tricked the Pope into granting broad emergency powers which, it turned out, could be used to the State's advantage under the guise of a Church purge of heretics within her ranks. In other words, the King of Spain arranged the Inquisition in such a manner that it would appear purely religious in form, while serving the State in both spirit and purpose.

The Church soon found, to its dismay, that the Spanish Inquisition was being used less to protect the Church against those who were betraying it within the fold than to foster the growing power of the State. Even though we make allowances for the wrought-up emotions of a people at war, their hatred for Jewish traitors should not have been permitted to develop to the point where all Jews were made scapegoats in order that nationalism might flourish, a political ruse similar to that which is being worked out in Hitlerized Germany today. More than one Pope protested against the brutality of the Inquisition, but the Church soon found that it had no power to stop the terrible retributions of the Spanish criminal courts. Long before the Inquisition ended, many churchmen realized, as all do now, that this instrument, originally aimed at heresy, was, through manipulation by the Spanish civil power, doing far more harm than good to the Church.

If it is asserted that, altogether apart from the Inquisition, the Church was a party to medieval legislation against the Jews, it should be pointed out also that Popes and Bishops were frequently the protectors of the Jews against the fanaticism of the populace and the persecution of the monarchs. While churchmen of former centuries may have felt that co-operation with the will of God demanded that alien Jews be kept subservient to Christians, they usually insisted that these guests within their walls were not to be molested or oppressed beyond meas-

ures considered reasonably necessary to enforce this status. That mob uprisings took place contrary to their wishes, especially as a result of the hatred of heretics engendered by the crusades, proves nothing. Similarly, the rise of false rumors such as that which accused the Jews of poisoning wells and causing the Black Death can hardly be blamed upon the Church.

The Modern Catholic Attitude

To return to the present-day Jewish problem and the attitude of Catholics concerning it: it may be said that experience in the application of divinely revealed principles has taught the Church many lessons. While the Church is divine, it is administered by human beings, most of whom cannot help being affected by the spirit of the times in which they live. The Church must always resist heresy, yet it is by no means committed to a policy of persecuting heretics. Just as recent decades have witnessed a new Church emphasis upon social justice, so, too, the bitter experience of the Inquisition has taught Christians the need of blending charity with the treatment of heretics. As a matter of fact, churchmen now regret that the policy of the Early Fathers in dealing with heretics was ever allowed to be forgotten. "We wish them corrected," said St. Augustine, "not put to death." St. John Chrysostom wrote even more strongly: "To consign a heretic to death is to commit an offense beyond atonement." In a recent article, Arnold Lunn describes the gradual weakening of the Church's earlier policy during the Middle Ages in the face of State pressure against the Catharists, who threatened to undermine both Church and State. He says that her past experience has been such that it is ridiculous to suppose that the Church would ever resort to persecuting heretics should she regain her former influence in social life.

> Let me sum up. The Catholic Church, though committed to a policy of resisting heresy, is not committed to a policy of persecuting heretics. If, as is most improbable, the Church should ever regain its old power, there is no more reason to suppose that she would permit, encourage or condone the execution of heretics than that the British Government would ever reinstitute the death penalty for petty theft, or burning alive as a punishment for odious crimes. . . . In this matter of heresy, as in so many other things, the Church is committed to divinely revealed principles, but is left by a process of research to discover the application of those principles to particular cases. In her dealings with heretics she has to reconcile Our Lord's warnings upon the evil of heresy and His insistence on the need for charity to the erring.[18]

[18] Arnold Lunn, "The Church and Persecution," *Ave Maria*, Volume 46, July 3, 1937, page 4. Used by permission.

All Catholic leaders agree that discriminatory legislation against Jews in the secularized states of today can in no way be justified by referring to the attitude of the Church during the Middle Ages, nor can it be justified on any other grounds. As Jacques Maritain has pointed out, under modern conditions Christian teachings demand that the State grant full civic and political equality to all its members. Even those who might sanction the medieval treatment of the Jews prior to the influence of the Spanish Inquisition, and not all modern Catholic leaders will admit this, must admit that such a policy would not be considered Christian today. Experience has finally taught mankind that there are certain moral values flowing from a purely human tolerance, a concept which was not widely appreciated in former ages by either Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant states. On this subject Maritain says:

> . . . today the medieval solution is not merely factually but also *juridically* unacceptable to us. For, there is a constantly progressing differentiation between matters spiritual and temporal, and there is an increasing recognition of the moral values of a purely human tolerance which was acquired in modern times. Under present-day conditions a Christian State (whose Christianity is not just a show or sham) would have to grant full civic and political equality to all its members.[14]

3. THEOLOGICAL ERRORS AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

From what we have just seen it should be clear now that the Church does not favor the persecution of the Jews, a mistaken idea accepted by many Jews largely because of the long-time tendency of Protestant and Jewish historians to misrepresent the Middle Ages. Fortunately, a more objective attitude has developed among historians in recent years, leading to a better appreciation of the difficulties which confronted the Church, rather than the old habit of blaming it for everything which moderns object to in medieval social life. In fact, it may be established that the Catholic Church of today, better than any other single agency, by its guardianship of Revelation protects the Jews against a new hostility which has grown up under the influence of theological errors among other Christians. Before indicating in a more positive way the attitude and conduct which should characterize modern Catholics in their dealings with Jews, it will be well to consider briefly the three chief recent theological errors which have influenced innumerable Protestants against Jews and which sometimes color the judgments of Catholics who are not thoroughly instructed in their religion. These mistaken ideas concerning Christian theology are: that the Jews had a

[14] Quoted by the Rev. Gregory Feige, *op. cit.*, pages 19–20.

tribal God, not the God of Christianity; that Jesus was an anti-Semite; that the Jews have forfeited their right to salvation. All these errors can be disposed of rather easily.[15]

The false idea that Jehovah-Yahwe, "the Lord," of our Bible translations is not identical with the one, true, the Triune God, has been fostered by certain recent Protestant Biblical students. Some of these modern Biblical critics, who have done so much to undermine the very essentials of Christianity, have attempted to make Yahwe a mere Jewish tribal God, in order to demonstrate a later "evolution" or "progress" towards a "pure-God" idea. The effects of this teaching are to deny that the ancient Jews were God's chosen people, to make the Old Testament a mere book of beautiful literature as far as Christians are concerned, and to break a bond of religious unity which should exist between Jews and Christians. The Catholic Church has always taught that the Law of Israel, except in so far as it made merely temporal applications of eternal principles (that is, the dead letters of the law which became meaningless after the Gospel of Christ), is the command of God to all people. The Church teaches likewise that Yahwe of the Old Testament is the true God and the Father of Jesus Christ, in other words, that "the God of the Old and the New Testaments is one and the same." Although the Catholic regrets that the present synagogue still clings blindly to the dead letter of the old law, he rejoices that the Revelation, once vouchsafed to Israel alone, came to him as a gift to free him from paganism shortly after it came to the masses of Jews who first followed the Apostles into Christianity. It is a rather fitting coincidence that Germany, the seat of most of the rationalistic Biblical criticism of the nineteenth century, which produced the new idea of the Jewish tribal God, should today adopt a Teutonic tribal God itself, and that this attempted separation of the God of the Jews from that of Christians should lead eventually to a new basis for the persecution of the Jews. The possibilities in the way of future persecutions of Jews that are contained in this doctrine, which breaks the old bond between Jew and Gentile, should be considered carefully by all Jews residing in nations affected by this Protestant liberalism.

Another theological error which has crept into some recent controversies over the Jews is the idea that Jesus was an Anti-Semite and not a true Jew. This ridiculous idea seems to have come from a distorted reading of St. John's Gospel, in which Jesus refers to a group of Jews who try to take his life as sons of the devil. Nothing can alter the

[15] For a more detailed treatment see the Rev. Gregory Feige, *op. cit.*, which is the source of most of our material at this point.

fact that Jesus was a Jew, a Jew who fought to save His people. Jesus prayed for the Jews, as did His Apostles. Those who would attempt to deny Christ's Jewish blood are merely striving to drive a new wedge between Christians and Jews and to pave the way for a more subtle, perhaps, but nevertheless ruthless persecution of Jews, as recent events in Germany have indicated.

The final anti-Semitic theological error to be pointed out here is that which says that the Jews, by once rejecting their Redeemer, have thereby forfeited forever the right to salvation. Scriptural texts offer ample refutation of this idea. Although a mob of Jews called a curse down upon themselves and their children by demanding His crucifixion, they were forgiven by the words of the dying Christ, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Likewise St. Paul answers "God forbid" to the suggestion that God had rejected His people forever. The Catholic Church in her official prayers has always asked for the conversion of the Jews. Though the unsympathetic conduct of some Christians has acted as a deterring influence, no doubt, there are many Christians as well as Jews who have wondered why more Jews have not come to acknowledge Jesus Christ in recent decades when Judaism seems to have run upon the rocks of internal discord.

4. THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN AND THE JEW

The charges which have been made against Jews, like those made against Catholics, are too many to enumerate. We have considered somewhat in detail the false anthropology and false theology used against the Jews. In conclusion, therefore, we shall merely point out, without attempting to go into detail, that most of the stock arguments used against the Jew are without foundation. For example, there is no real proof of the existence of ritual murders among Jews; furthermore, the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," according to which the Jews are supposed to be striving for world domination, have been shown to be forged documents; and, finally, the contents of the post-Talmudic lawbook, *Shulhan Aruch,* whose prescriptions would prove an unwholesome influence in public life, are neither known to nor practiced by the great majority of western and central European Jews.[16]

From what has been said already, it should be evident that true Christians may not participate in anti-Semitic movements. More than this, they have an obligation to use their influence to expose the errors of those who would enact special legislation against the modern Jew. If abuses exist among Jews, and most Jewish leaders will admit that

[16] Rev. Gregory Feige, *op. cit.*, page 29.

there are abuses, just as among Christians, relief should be sought first by co-operation with Jewish leaders. As Christians we have an obligation to strive to dispel the prevalent poisonous atmosphere of falsehood and hatred. In most of the complaints against Jews, reform legislation aimed at Christian offenders as well as the Jews involved should be employed. For instance, "loan-shark" legislation will correct the present abuses frequently attributed to Jews, but often profited in by Christians as well. If the stage and screen are spreading obscenity, reforms can be brought about without blaming the Jews alone for the evil. More than this, Christ's injunction to teach all nations binds us as Catholics to bring the Gospel to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and to welcome them back to the true fold.

The lay Catholic can help pave the way for Jewish conversions by exercising common courtesy towards his Jewish associates. According to David Goldstein, a prominent Catholic convert from Judaism, Protestant churches in the United States claim over 20,000 converted Jews, and as many as 80,000 are said to have joined the Christian Science Church. In addition, spiritualist groups, Theosophists, Rosicrucians, and other cults claim a considerable number of Jews. The number in the Catholic Church, according to Goldstein, is "not more than one per cent of the number in the sects and cults." Though the added "social protection" which these other religious congregations in America offer to the Jew, together with the bitter memory, as fostered by anti-Catholic historians, of the "Church's treatment" of the medieval Jew, is no doubt an important factor in this connection, surely something is lacking either in the zeal or in the approach of American Catholics when so few Jews have been converted. After describing the disintegration which is taking place among Jewish religious bodies today, both Orthodox and Reform, Goldstein says that the time is now ripe to win them to Catholicity. He suggests the following approach to the prospective Jewish convert, which incidentally brings out the close relationship between Judaism and Catholicism.

> First, they must be sympathetically induced to study the Old Testament in the light of Catholic teachings. Secondly, they must be shown that the acceptance of the prophecies and their fulfillment as understood by the Catholic Church is not a denial of the faith of their fathers. . . . Thirdly, there must be brought to the mind of Jews the historically established fact that the abolition of their Priesthood of Aaron, which functioned by Divine Sanction, the destruction of their Temple and the consequent failure to reinstitute their old sacrifice, which the Orthodox Jews of today pray for, are all a part of the Divine plan outlined in the Old Testament.[17]

[17] David Goldstein, *The Call of Israel* (pamphlet) (62 Essex Street, Boston), pages 11–12.

However zealous men like David Goldstein and a few others may be for the conversion of American Jews, their efforts will be of little avail if the average Catholic attempts to boost his ego by deliberate discourtesy towards Jews. It is hard to see how the Catholic can conscientiously join in the official prayers of his Church for the conversion of the Jews if in his civic relations he falls in with a mob spirit which belittles the Jews. One of the best ways for him to avoid this pitfall is to make it a practice to seek the facts when he hears charges against Jews. In most instances he will probably find that these statements are founded upon ignorance and unwarranted generalizations.

IV. Immigration and the Future

Because we have reached the end of an epoch, it would seem as though immigration restriction were here to stay for some time. In colonial days the immigrant was needed here for protection; in the period of rapid industrial development after the Civil War the immigrant was sought to fill the need of the crude human energy supplied by hands, arms, and backs. The transfer of so much of this crude energy from the factory to the trenches of Europe during the World War, when immigration was stopped, necessitated intensive mechanization in order that women could replace men at machines. Meanwhile, excessive owners' and investors' profits were turned back continuously into industry, so that newer and speedier machines followed, producing more and more of everything but jobs. Today we find both machines and men suddenly unemployed, largely as the result of a system that was allowed to grow up with maximum emphasis upon employers' and investors' profits and with minimum concern for the worker as a human being and for social welfare generally. Evidently we shall need no more immigrants until our present unemployed have found a place in industry again.

The continuation of our present policy of restriction does not mean, however, that the existing immigration laws, which involve unfair national and racial discriminations, should remain in force. The present national-origins immigration law was based upon the assumption that Nordic immigrants are innately superior to Alpine or Mediterranean, a theory of racial superiority which can be proved only by the nationalized "scientists" of Hitler. The idea of selecting European immigrants is certainly to be commended, but it should be upon an individual rather than a group basis. The same policy should apply to the Orient, if for no other reason than the interests of international good will. Likewise, it would seem that immigration from other nations of North and

South America should be included in the restrictive measures. With efforts on the part of our immigration authorities to distribute immigrants more widely upon arrival here, the violent protests which come from the Pacific Coast states whenever Oriental immigration is mentioned should be unnecessary.

The immigration problem is much more complex, however, than are the details involved in drawing up a suitable restrictive and selective immigration law. It is in reality a part of the broader American population problem, and the latter in its turn projects us back into international problems. Theoretically, it might be relatively simple for the United States to reduce its population greatly in a generation or so to the point where we would have the same distribution of wealth as today but very few unemployed, through a deliberate use of the twin devices of immigration restriction and birth control. Possibly the latter might even be achieved through ethical means. In a world of good neighbors where all the other nations followed a similar policy, such a plan might have its advantages. But we must face the fact that such a spirit of world co-operation does not yet exist; furthermore, recent events in Europe and the Orient indicate that a greatly reduced man power in the United States might arouse, in other growing, more ambitious nations, an unwholesome interest in some of our present domain. History indicates that the sanction of the *status quo* lasts about as long as does the power to defend it.

Certainly no really civilized person relishes the continuation of the old policy whereby nations grab and retain territory according to their physical power to do so. A higher ethical standard would make this old policy obsolete. Once it was hoped that the League of Nations might help to bring this about, but this illusion is pretty well shattered now. Yet this failure should not discourage us, for after all the ideals underlying the League were far from being unselfish and were aimed chiefly at retaining the status set up by a hypocritical treaty which blamed and penalized Germany for the World War. Now that German disgust and indignation have demolished this treaty, it may yet be possible to set up some sort of international plan whereby nations with a surplus of population can arrange conveniently to purchase, lease, or borrow needed portions of the relatively unused or undeveloped lands of a less populous nation.

Some plan of peaceful, temporary possession (and, incidentally, if we go back far enough, most nations have had little more than temporary possession of their territory) would have avoided many wars and war debts of the past. Such a plan, however, would depend upon the twin

fulcrums of Christian charity and complete international co-operation. It would not fit in with the plans of the modern jingo nationalist. That it is not beyond the realm of possibility, however, is indicated by the growing recognition of the need of international trade agreements urged by Pope Pius. If nations can be converted to the wisdom of taking down some of their tariff barriers in the interests of world peace and international economic welfare, as some are doing today, is it ridiculous to expect them to be willing to alter their immigration barriers likewise? Recently Germany and Italy announced an experiment in mass labor collaboration which indicates a new international attitude towards population movements. According to this plan Germany and Italy will make a temporary exchange of 30,000 farm and industrial workers in 1938. Italians skilled in land reclamation and production of wheat, potatoes, and sugar beets will be brought to southern and western Germany, and at the same time German artisans will go to Italy to place their technical training at the service of Italian industry.

It has been said that America reached the end of an epoch a few years ago when it practically shut off immigration. Apparently we have no more opportunities to offer the migrant here. Seemingly our farm land is overpopulated as far as commercial farming is concerned, and machines have left us with too many factory workers. In our survey of immigrant backgrounds we found that similar crises in Europe, from colonial times till after the World War, usually led to the temporary exportation of "surplus" population. No doubt many would say that America, with millions unemployed and its frontier evidently exhausted, could profit by some such mass emigration today. It seems, however, that inducements such as formerly attracted millions to the United States and the other countries of North and South America, as well as Australia, do not exist in the modern world. Most of the countries of Europe have an unemployment problem similar to our own, a problem which is no longer being solved by large-scale emigration. Instead, there seems to be a world-wide tendency for the victims of the present disorder to remain at home and demand a fairer distribution of the national wealth and other social reforms. Either by revolution or through tax-supported doles the wealthier classes of each nation are being required to contribute more to the support of those who, under former conditions, might have emigrated in search of new economic opportunity. Yet this leveling process cannot go on forever. What is the answer? Are we too many? Surely God does not intend that the most civilized portion of the human race should die out, as it will if all resort to birth control or if we engage in more world wars

to maintain the *status quo*. The answer would seem to lie in a somewhat lower standard of living for large portions of the white race and some new international plan which will permit freer migration and the maintenance of large populations on "frontiers" which are now incapable of supporting them chiefly because of the dog-in-the-manger tactics of a few nations. In brief, there must be a better distribution of wealth, not only within the nations of the West, but among the family of nations. The future of American immigration, therefore, must be considered in conjunction with the international aspects of the population problem. This latter topic is dealt with at some length in another chapter.

References for Further Reading

Abbott, Edith, *Historical Aspects of the Immigration Problem,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1926

Abbott, Edith, *Immigration,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1924

Anderson, Elin L., *We Americans,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1937

Barron, Salo W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (3 volumes), Columbia University Press, New York, 1937

Barzun, Jacques, *Race,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1937

Belloc, Hilaire, *The Jews,* revised edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1937

Boas, Franz, *Anthropology and Modern Life,* revised edition, W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1932

Boas, Franz, *The Mind of Primitive Man,* revised edition, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938

Bogardus, E. S., *Immigration and Race Attitudes,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1928

Brown, Francis J., and J. S. Roucek (editors), *Our Racial and National Minorities,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1937

Brown, Lawrence G., *Immigration,* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1930

Browne, Lewis, *Stranger than Fiction,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932

Davie, Maurice R., *World Immigration,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936

Dinin, Samuel, *Judaism in a Changing Civilization,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1933

Duncan, H. G., *Immigration and Assimilation,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1931

Eaton, Allen H., *Immigrant Gifts to American Life,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1932

Fairchild, Henry P., *Immigration,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925

Fairchild, Henry P., *Immigration Backgrounds,* John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1927

Feldman, Abraham J., *The American Jew,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1938
Fortune, editors of, *Jews in America,* Random House, New York, 1936
Garis, Roy L., *Immigration Restriction,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927
Garth, Thomas R., *Race Psychology,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1931
Huxley, Julian S., and A. C. Haddon, *We Europeans,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1936
Jerome, Harry, *Migration and Business Cycles,* National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1926
Kohler, Max J., *Immigration and Aliens in the United States,* Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1936
Levinger, Lee J., *Anti-Semitism,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936
McGuire, C. E., *Catholic Builders of the Nation* (5 volumes), Continental Press, Inc., Boston, 1923
Miller, H. A., *Races, Nations and Classes,* J. P. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1924
Panunzio, Constantine, *Immigration Crossroads,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927
Parkes, James, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue,* The Soncino Press, London, 1934
Pinsk, Johannes, *Christianity and Race,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1936
Reuter, E. B., *Race Mixture,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1931
Seabrook, William B., *These Foreigners,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1938
Schrieke, Bertram J., *Alien Americans,* The Viking Press, New York, 1936
Shaughnessy, Gerald, S. M., *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925
Shuster, George N., *Like a Mighty Army,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935
Taft, Donald R., *Human Migration,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936
Thomas, W. I., and Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (2 volumes), Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1927
Thompson, Warren S., *On Internal Migration in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Valentin, Hugo, *Antisemitism,* The Viking Press, New York, 1936
Wilcox, Walter F., *International Migrations* (2 volumes), National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1929–1931
Wirth, Louis, *The Ghetto,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1928
Woofter, Thomas J., *Races and Ethnic Groups in American Life,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933
Young, Donald, *American Minority Peoples,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1932
Young, Donald, *On Minority Peoples in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Zorbaugh, Harvey W., *The Gold Coast and the Slum,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1929

CHAPTER V

THE AMERICAN NEGRO PROBLEM

ONE of the largest groups of migrants that came to America was made up of African Negroes. They came at an early date and so might well be called a part of the "old immigration," were it not for the fact that they did not come here of their own volition. Except for a few thousand Negroes who have emigrated freely in recent years from the West Indies, chiefly from Jamaica and the Bahamas, the ancestors of our present Negro population arrived here as slaves. From 1619, when the first cargo of slaves landed at Jamestown, until 1809, when Congress prohibited their importation, slaves were brought here in varying numbers depending upon the fluctuations of their economic value in the American market. So unreliable are statistics concerning the size of the Negro population at almost any stage of our national development that it is not surprising to find that there is no accurate record of the number who came here before the first census in 1790. In that year the census figures indicated that there were 757,208 Negroes here, or nearly one to every five white persons. By 1930 this ratio had decreased to about one to ten, making the Negro "America's tenth man." Before considering the various factors involved in the failure of the Negro to increase as rapidly as the white in America, we shall find it helpful to trace briefly his career during the seven or eight generations from slavery to date.

I. THE NEGRO'S RISE FROM SLAVERY

Dr. Alain Locke has sketched the course of the American Negro's epical adventure "through a long inferno of slavery and a yet unfinished social purgatory" in four acts.[1] In the beginning the Negro, somewhat like the white indentured servant, arrived here as a piece of human property to serve under a master in whichever colony needed his labor most. In the second act, Negroes were sucked down into the lower South, into a slavery which, as the policy of white indenture was gradually abolished, became more degrading. Transplanted to America,

[1] *The Negro in America* (American Library Association, Chicago, 1933), pages 11–17.

the former African tribesman's whole way of living was forced into a new mold. Weighted down by heavy toil, he was able to adapt himself and to survive only through patience, loyalty to his master, and a smiling humility. His one consolation was found in Christianity, which he willingly adopted as his hope and relief from the darkness of his existence. Then came the Civil War and its aftermath of Reconstruction, during which the emancipated Negro went through the slow, difficult readjustments necessary for self-maintenance. After his first bewildering experiences as a freedman in the postwar period, during which he was in turn the object of mob violence, of the wardship of the federal government, and of feverish attempts at higher education, he started his slow march up from slavery. It was not long before tenant farming reduced him to a state which made him wonder if, after all, servitude had been abolished. Next the newly won franchise was snatched from him in the South in spite of constitutional amendments, and finally, in spite of the Bill of Rights, he saw a policy of segregation and economic discrimination in both town and country spread over the entire nation.

In the period just before the World War, which marked the most recent phase of the American Negro's epical adventure, the Negro began to abandon the sagging agricultural economy of the South, with its unscientific tenant farming, for the southern cities, which were becoming industrialized, and for the North. He was in great demand in the North especially as a substitute for the cheap labor of the European immigrant, since the World War had temporarily checked immigration to the United States. In the North the Negro workers awoke the antagonism of the older workers, an antagonism which invasions of cheap labor always inspire regardless of the color of the new workers. At the same time—perhaps sharpened by the labor situation—racial tension increased in the South. All over the country race riots broke out. This, and the crash of idealism following the "war to save democracy," a crash socially reflected in the increase in race riots and the revival of the Ku Klux Klan, brought bitter disillusionment to the Negro just returned from the social equality of the army.

The consequent reaction of most Negro leaders to all this has taken the form of an intensified race consciousness and an attempt to revive group morale through a more aggressive program of self-help and self-determination. The Negro's efforts are being directed now chiefly towards independent economic enterprise and the recovery of lost civil and political rights. With the white "mass mind" of both North and South still so racial and reactionary, the Negro sees his only other ray of hope in the recent emergence of an enlightened white minority which

stands out because of its willingness to foster his progress and to join cooperatively in community programs to eliminate friction.

A RACE PROBLEM

While many sociologists regard the Negro problem as basically similar to the immigration problem, since the underlying protests against the Negro are believed to be chiefly economic, the original problem has now become so interwoven with additional misunderstandings and prejudices that its solution is much more difficult than the solution of the problems created by the immigrant. Not merely is the Negro regarded as a member of another race, but, according to the offhand viewpoint of probably the majority of whites, he is innately inferior both mentally and morally because of his particular racial heredity. The first point to be considered, therefore, in an attempt to solve the Negro problem, is the matter of his alleged racial disabilities.

First of all, even though the whole concept of race is blurred, so much so that some authorities advocate the use of the term "population group" instead, it must be admitted that the Negro's obvious physical characteristics are of such a nature that certainly he is of a different race, if the term "race" has any meaning at all. So much for the matter of "race." As to the "problem" involved, some writers feel that it is, rather than Negro, more of a "white" problem, one brought about by the mistaken viewpoints of American whites. In this connection it is well to remember that group antagonisms based upon race are of comparatively recent origin. Clashes of different peoples have taken place from time immemorial, but they have usually been based upon such distinctions as that between Greek and barbarian, native and alien, Christian and Jew, or Turk and heathen. Color, or the idea of race, was not injected into such antagonisms until rather recently.

Race antagonisms seem to have commenced with the rise of the British slave trade. This evolution can be seen even in the change in attitude towards the Negro in America, according to Weatherford and Johnson.[2] While the white colonists felt superior to the Negroes from the start, this feeling was based upon the fact that the latter were unbaptized heathen. Very little importance was attached to racial considerations until the new material conditions surrounding Negro-white relations became fixed. With the establishment of this economic status the white commenced to rationalize about the Negro's ability and, like the Nazi of today, to try to make his rationalizations seem scientific.

[2] W. D. Weatherford and C. S. Johnson, *Race Relations* (D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1934), pages 50–51.

This is the basis for most white prejudice today. Weatherford and Johnson say:

> The rationalizations of the status of Negroes as slaves in support of the profitable institution of slavery served to place a stamp upon the Negroes as a race which remains today, only slightly changed in its main features. The scientific literature and other formal arguments required in proof of the presumed inferior qualities of the black race went to lengths scarcely contemplated at the inception of these relations. The stereotypes hang on, and have become a part of the culture of the common people as well as of that class originally concerned. And although anthropology itself has now repudiated practically every dogma of essential inequality which it once supported, the old emotional definitions remain.[3]

One of the chief reasons why our race problem persists is the widespread belief among whites that the Negro is inferior by his very nature. What basis is there for this belief? The best-known modern tests for measuring the mental and moral ability of groups and individuals show no inferiority of the Negro. Though some of the earlier tests, such as those given to soldiers during the World War, seemed to indicate Negro mental inferiority, later analysis of these tests showed that many important variables had been overlooked in arriving at that conclusion. These earlier tests have been rejected by most modern investigators, such as Professor T. R. Garth. Garth and many other authorities reject the earlier conclusion that the Negro is innately inferior because the tests used involved so many environmental and cultural factors to which the Negro had never had access. The earlier tests missed this point almost completely; they were not objective. Similarly, it is impossible to show, apart from the realm of prejudice, that the Negro is innately inferior to the white in emotional and other personality qualities which go to make up character and to determine conduct. The individual today who "knows" that the Negro is by nature inferior to the white possesses information which men of science have been unable to obtain after the most careful study!

Race Attitudes in Children

The reason why so many people have the impression that the Negro is innately inferior to the white is probably their failure to distinguish between race and what ethnologists call culture. One does not need to go back to the African tribal life of the Negro, or even to his condition of former servitude in the Deep South, in order to appreciate the fact that the Negro has been exposed to a set of life experiences which have

[3] *Op. cit.*, page 51.

differed vastly from those of white Americans. Close inspection will show that the culture or civilization to which the great majority if not all of the Negroes are directly exposed, even in the most liberal northern cities of today, is vastly different from that of their white neighbors, even though the two races may live only a few blocks apart and receive nearly the same wages. From early childhood American culture constantly forces upon the Negro the idea that he is "inferior" to the white. The Negro child soon learns this from white children, not because the latter feel any instinctive superiority to their Negro playmates, but because the white child gradually acquires the "superiority myth" from his elders. In a survey of national and racial attitudes in children, which extended to sixty elementary and high schools in thirty states, Father Maurice S. Sheehy found that the great majority of teachers did not detect any evidence of consciousness of racial differences in their pupils until the age of ten.[4] Children tended by Negro nurses sometimes think as much of their nurses as they do of their mothers. When young children commence to use unfriendly epithets towards others, very often they do it as pure imitation without any feeling of race consciousness. Lasker relates a case of a four-year-old colored boy who called any child who made him angry a "nigger." "He thinks of the word as something to make one angry because he sees other children get angry at being called 'nigger.'" [5]

The white prejudices which the Negro child usually encounters after the age of ten immediately commence to shape his character and conduct in ways which can be appreciated easily by anyone familiar with the conclusions of modern psychology relative to the great importance of childhood experiences. One can visualize the force of early impacts of racial prejudice upon the future character of the growing Negro child in the following observations made by teachers in New York schools.

We found that a Negro girl was very timid when she was in a room with white girls for an oral examination.

Often members of racial groups fail to have any save a defensive attitude and fail to appreciate the genuine contribution of their race to civilization.

I have noticed older children very sensitive. They are crushed by the fact that they are not liked and sometimes they accept conditions because they are unable to change matters. However, there is no general type of reaction. One will resent teasing, another will strike back, another will compensate

[4] Rev. Maurice S. Sheehy, *National Attitudes in Children* (pamphlet) (The Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 1932), page 4.

[5] Bruno Lasker, *Race Attitudes in Children* (Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1929), page 4.

by performing antics to secure popularity. The disposition of the child is evidently a factor in this reaction.[6]

Though the reaction of the Negro child to his first experiences with race prejudice may vary, his conduct generally tends to become standardized in this respect as he grows older. He soon learns that he can avoid painful conflict with whites only by accepting a position of inferiority. In fine, he is apt to adopt obsequiousness as the key to social peace. Constant servility in outward conduct frequently leads to an inward feeling of inferiority and futility. It is not strange, therefore, to find that the average Negro youth loses whatever early ambition he may have had, once he realizes the relatively fixed position of his race in American society. While he may live in the same city block with whites, ride on the same cars and busses, eat the same foods, and even attend the same schools, the silent forces of race prejudice which mold conduct and attitudes soon place him in a social environment which is entirely apart from that of his white neighbor. Until intelligence tests can measure the mind of the Negro as a thing altogether distinct from degrading cultural forces, such tests will be of little scientific value. Meanwhile many sociologists will probably continue to believe that, if the relative social and economic positions of the white and the Negro had been reversed from the start in the United States, the white might occupy about the same position as the Negro does today.

II. The Negro Today

Despite the obstacles placed in his way in America, the intellectual achievements of the Negro since emancipation have been nothing short of amazing. Naturally, it is very difficult to measure such achievement; it can only be suggested by a few indices, such as those for education. When it is recalled that the Freedmen's Bureau, which was largely responsible for Negro education right after the Civil War, had only about 150,000 pupils in its southern schools in 1870, the 1930 total of Negro students in public schools in eighteen southern states—over 2,000,000 in elementary schools, over 100,000 in high schools, and approximately 25,000 in colleges—shows the great educational awakening that has been in progress. In 1933 there were 16,000 Negro college graduates, among whom were ninety doctors of philosophy. The number of Negroes in the professional classes has increased from 32,879 in 1890 to 137,263. There are at least eighty-nine Negroes listed in *Who's Who in America*. Among the outstanding living Negroes are Carter G.

[6] Rev. Maurice S. Sheehy, *op. cit.*, page 5.

Woodson, W. E. B. DuBois, Charles S. Johnson, Robert R. Moton, and Alain Locke, writers on Negro history and social problems; Langston Hughes, Countee Cullen, Sterling Brown, and Claude McKay, poets; Paul Robeson, Roland Hayes, and Marian Anderson, singers; Will Marion Cook, Hall Johnson, and Rosamond Johnson, composers; and George Carver, chemist.

Although the Negro has made remarkable progress in the face of almost universal prejudice against him, as any issue of *The Negro Year Book* will indicate, the depth of the chasm which still separates him from white America can be seen easily if we make a brief survey of the Negro's present handicaps in modern American society. To this end we shall consider his relative social position here under the five following headings: political, economic, educational, social, and religious. After such a glance at the Negro's inferior position in our society we shall be in a better position to consider the policies and programs which should be adopted for his welfare in the future.

I. POLITICAL STATUS

One of the reasons for the bitterness of Reconstruction days was the sudden thrusting of the ballot upon the Negroes in the South, a situation which naturally created a fear of Negro dominance on the part of resident whites. Wholly unprepared to meet the new responsibilities of voting, the Negro, whose vote in many areas was more powerful than that of the combined whites, was immediately made the tool of corrupt politicians. As might have been expected under such circumstances, various devices aimed at nullifying the fifteenth amendment developed gradually in southern states. First there was intimidation; later, quasi-legal devices were adopted, such as literacy tests, poll taxes, and the so-called "grandfather" clauses which, for illiterates, restricted the ballot to those whose ancestors voted before 1867.

The enforcement of various legal provisions by white election officials, together with continued intimidation in many localities, has practically taken the franchise away from the majority of southern Negroes today. The practical results of disfranchising measures may be seen by consulting some election statistics. In 1896, in Louisiana, 130,344 Negroes registered; four years later, in 1900, as a result of discriminatory measures, there were only 5,320. Because of such discrimination, which has persisted and even been revived long beyond the emergencies of the Reconstruction era, the southern Negro is not able to correct many of the abuses to which he is subjected, as doubtless he would be if he were able to vote freely. Some idea of the Negro's political rights in the South

may be gathered from the following remarks of Senator Ellison D. Smith, who, with other members of the South Carolina delegation, left the floor of the Democratic national convention in Philadelphia in 1936 when a colored minister rose to open a session with prayer:

> The situation in the south before and since the Civil War makes it impossible for the south to recognize and accept the Negro as an equal political factor. Political equality means social equality and social equality means intermarriage, and that means the mongrelizing of the American race. There is not a man in America that has more regard for the Negro in his place than I have. But realizing as I do these unspeakable dangers inherent in this thing, I cannot and will not be a party to the recognition of the 14th and 15th amendments. Nor will I support any political organization that looks upon the Negro and caters to him as a political and social equal.[7]

In the northern states, where the Negro is able to vote without restraint, his needs are given much more attention by political office-holders and legislators, especially when the Negro vote is based on modern issues rather than upon sentimental attachment to the party that led the fight against slavery.

2. ECONOMIC STATUS

In the South the Negro has long been the prisoner of King Cotton. It was the invention of the cotton gin (in 1793), and the extension to the Deep South of the plantation system for the growth of cotton, which made slavery so profitable to whites of the South. Before this significant historical development, slavery, in the South less gradually than in the North, was being abandoned as economically unsound in the way that Washington, Jefferson, and other great Americans had hoped for. But the intensive cultivation of cotton meant intensive cultivation of the Negro as well, and the end of the Civil War found great numbers of them victims of the cotton culture. Released from slavery, the majority of Negroes remained in the South, chiefly as cotton farmers under a tenant share-cropper system which is not far removed from slavery itself. As a share-cropper the Negro furnishes the labor while the white owner furnishes tools and seeds as well as land, usually marginal land. Food and other supplies, advanced to the Negro farmer on credit, usually by the landowner or the cotton merchant, keep the tenant farmer and share-cropper in continuous debt. Excessive prices and fraudulent bookkeeping are sometimes a part of the credit plan. As a result of this system of farming, which has reached out now to include more whites than Negroes, it may be said that the South today has

[7] Reported in the Chicago *Tribune*, June 25, 1936.

a peasantry which is very similar to that existing under the former European serfdom. This particular evil was mitigated somewhat for the Negroes, during and after the World War, when many went to the cities, a movement which reduced the number of Negroes engaged in agriculture considerably. Whereas over 54 per cent of Negroes were engaged in agriculture in 1910, only 36 per cent were so listed in the census of 1930. However, that census also showed about 1,000,000 white and 700,000 Negro tenants and share-croppers still in the cotton belt. What will become of these workers when the mechanical cotton-picker is introduced more widely? It would seem as if additional migration to the cities of the North and South were the only answer, unless King Cotton is to be dethroned.

The Negroes who have migrated to the city have tended to settle chiefly in a few occupations. Since 1910, the percentage of Negroes engaged in the manufacturing and mechanical industries has increased from about 13 to 19, while those engaged in domestic and personal service have increased from about 22 to 29 per cent. These two occupational groups, along with farming, include the great majority of Negro workers. A number have opened up food stores, eating places, and small business establishments catering to their own race, but the ratio of these to the entire occupational group is necessarily very small. In industry, as in trade and commerce, the Negro is usually limited to menial tasks because of the difficulties which arise when he is placed over white workers or in a position which brings him into anything but menial contacts with white customers. His attempts to learn a trade and enjoy the protection of trade unions have been blocked, in most instances, by either the overt or the covert opposition of local unions, even when a national union is not averse to his membership. Even if he has been permitted to join a union, he is frequently the first to be laid off and the last to be rehired. At a recent public hearing on conditions in Harlem, before the New York State Commission on the Urban Colored Population, the following facts concerning the present economic plight of the New York Negro were brought out:

> Only six per cent approximately of the B.M.T. (Subway) employees are Negroes, and these few hold low-salaried jobs. . . . The New York Telephone Company does not employ a single Negro telephone operator. . . . The Savings Banks in the State of New York employ "some" Negroes, but "in general, one does not find Negroes in the banks." . . . Less than three per cent of the members of Local No. 3 of the Electrical Workers Union are Negroes. . . . The Astor Hotel never has employed any Negroes, except during labor difficulties. Neither have Childs, Longchamps, Bickfords, or the Waldorf Cafeterias, and yet whenever a union or corporation official

testified at the hearing he claimed that no discrimination had been practiced.[8]

The effect of economic discrimination upon the ambition of young Negroes can easily be imagined. White parents, who encourage their children to study and to make other sacrifices necessary to learn a trade and to get ahead in the world, should be able to appreciate the rather helpless position of the Negro parent: both parent and child know that the young Negro's efforts to get ahead will be blocked effectively at nearly every turn by white prejudice. Is it any wonder, then, that Negro children often lose interest in their school work, leading the uncritical teacher to believe that they are mentally inferior to whites of the same age? Or is it strange that these same Negro children sometimes become truants and so drift into delinquency, which leads to a similar false conclusion that Negroes are innately inferior to white adolescents in their ability to live moral and law-abiding lives?

While it is true that a number of Negroes have entered the professions in recent years, the proportion is much smaller than that which exists in the white population. The reasons for this are evident. First of all, it requires considerable money to be able to devote the number of years necessary today for education in medicine, law, teaching, social work, or the ministry. Again, once his education is completed, the efforts of the professionally trained Negro are limited usually to his own group. Unfortunately, the long habit of looking up to the white as a superior man discourages many Negroes from patronizing their own doctors, dentists, and lawyers. The Negro lawyer is frequently handicapped in addition by the existence of unfriendly white judges and juries.

3. EDUCATIONAL STATUS

The present status of the education of Negroes can be appreciated only through comparison with conditions which existed before and just after the Civil War. During slavery, when the Negro occupied a position not far removed from that of a beast of burden, white masters regarded Negro education as wholly unnecessary. More than this, it was considered even dangerous. At least four southern states prohibited Negro education by law, lest education should make the Negro dissatisfied with his lot. Only when a smattering of education enhanced the Negro's economic value to his master, as in domestic service, was

[8] Louisa Byles, "The Negro in the City," *The Interracial Review*, Volume II, January, 1938, page 6. Used by permission.

he taught to read. The illiteracy rate among Negroes in 1870 was over 80 per cent—this in spite of the fact that some free Negroes had been educated in the North before that time, and in spite of the educational program for southern Negroes, by that year fairly well under way. The poverty-stricken South, which had been deprived of its most valuable "farm machinery" by the Emancipation Proclamation, was in no position to finance Negro education immediately after the war. During the Reconstruction period Negro education was directed and financed largely by overzealous northerners, who unfortunately bewildered the Negro and antagonized his white neighbors as well by introducing at once college preparatory education similar to that given to whites. In 1895 an educated Negro leader, Booker T. Washington, started a movement which changed the emphasis in southern Negro education from preparation for the professions to training for agricultural and industrial life. Since that time there has been a greater interest in Negro education on the part of southern whites, who after all have to pay most of the taxes for Negro education today.

It has been said that the modern trend in Negro education began about 1900. At that time only 31.3 per cent of the Negro children between five and twenty years of age were enrolled in school; by 1930 this figure had been raised to 60. Whereas illiteracy among Negroes ten years of age or over was formerly 44.5 per cent, by 1930 it had been reduced to 16.3. However, the much lower white illiteracy rate, 2.7 per cent, shows that much still needs to be done before Negro education equals that of whites, even in such a simple matter as literacy. There are still many glaring weaknesses in the public-school system for Negroes, especially in the South where most of the Negro illiteracy is found. One of these weaknesses is the comparative lack of funds available to Negro education. In spite of improvements in recent years, figures summarized for eleven southern states in 1930 showed that the current expenditures per white pupil averaged $44.31, while that for the Negro was only $12.57. Similar discrepancies might be pointed out in other phases of the educational system where Negroes are involved. Among these are a shorter school year, improper buildings and equipment, and salaries so low as to make it difficult to secure adequately trained teachers.[9]

The Negro still has a long way to go before it can be said truthfully that he enjoys equality with whites in higher education. Some of the so-called colleges for Negroes in the South (he is barred from colleges attended by whites) teach such subjects as agriculture, dairying, black-

[9] W. D. Weatherford and C. S. Johnson, *op. cit.*, pages 358–361.

smithing, bricklaying, masonry, and carpentry, rather than those of the usual college level—which is not to say that he does not have a few outstanding colleges of his own, such as Howard, Fisk, and Atlanta, in addition to the recently established Catholic Xavier University in New Orleans. At the best universities of the North there are many Negro students.

4. SOCIAL STATUS

The social position occupied by the Negro in the United States can be appreciated best when it is contrasted with that of members of his own race in Brazil. Brazil, as a Portuguese colony, early received thousands of Negro slaves. In 1826 they outnumbered the whites. During the period of slavery the Portuguese, like many North American slave-owners, interbred to some extent with the Negroes. On the other hand, after the Brazilian emancipation, the Portuguese freely intermarried with the Negroes. Today, as a result northern Brazil is made up chiefly of whites, mulattoes, and Negroes, who live together without race prejudice, friction, or "color lines." [10] In the United States there was some Negro-white intermarriage in colonial days, but later, as slavery settled in the Deep South, laws were passed there prohibiting such marriages. All of the southern and a few of the northern states continue to prohibit such race crossings. In stable communities where family backgrounds are well known, race prejudice, if not law, still prohibits the marriage of whites with persons having "a single drop" of Negro blood in their veins.

Although there are several Negroid physical characteristics besides color, color has been chosen here as the mark of social division; hence the "color question." If a mulatto is sufficiently light in color and his family background is not generally known, he may cross the color line and pass as a white in his business and social life in the more mobile communities. Thousands are said to do this every year and in many instances to marry whites. But for the black man, even though it may happen that he actually has less Negroid ancestry than some mulattoes who are able to "pass," a special form of social ostracism known as "segregation" is a specter which haunts his social life in the United States from the cradle to the grave.

On the surface it may seem as though Negro segregation is not very much different from the existence of "foreign colonies" of immigrants

[10] Race prejudice has developed in Brazil during the last five years, partly because of "white persons from the United States making their investments and their homes in Brazil." *Negro Year Book 1937–1938*, page 330.

in our cities. In practice, however, the two institutions are vastly different. While the immigrant with his foreign culture usually seeks the protection and association of his own kind, segregation is both compulsory and permanent for the Negro, in spite of the fact that his only culture now is that of America. The Negro is set apart from white people in his social life by both American custom and law, and the sanctions of custom are often more unpleasant and far-reaching than the penalties of the law. The unfortunate effects of compulsory segregation upon the social life of the Negro are most obvious in what may be called (a) residential segregation and (b) segregation in public and semipublic services.

Residential Segregation

Negro sections of cities are usually characterized by the most unhealthful and degrading housing conditions. Though it is hardly to be expected that those at the bottom of the economic ladder will enjoy the best houses, one would naturally expect that housing ordinances and appropriations would protect the Negro resident at least as well as they do the equally low-salaried white. This is seldom true. Furthermore, when an improved economic status prompts the Negro, as it does the white, to seek a better house and neighborhood, he finds that he is not free to move out of areas that are generally regarded as Negro zones. If he is bold enough to pioneer a bit by moving into a "white neighborhood," he usually encounters fierce white opposition, based partly on sentimental and partly on economic motives. No matter how well educated or refined the invading Negro family may be, white neighbors feel that his presence is a reflection upon both their social and their economic status, while property-holders and storekeepers foresee as a result of his coming a wholesale migration of white tenants or customers from the area, followed by a sudden drop in real-estate values. Such Negro invasions are repelled, therefore, by various indignities aimed at humiliating the Negro, who is regarded as "not knowing his place," and sometimes even by violence.

Residential segregation is a factor in the Negro's high death rate as well as in the disorganization which is found so frequently in his family life. Established "colored zones" tend to remain fixed, and as a consequence Negro areas become more and more congested, or, if they expand at all, they spread into the least desirable sections of the city, near the factory or business areas or frequently in the vice area. From this condition high rents, excessive numbers of lodgers in private homes,

and general overcrowding result. The evil effect of this situation upon family and child life should be obvious.

Segregation in the Services

If segregation were merely residential, Negroes would probably endure it with a minimum of complaint. With sympathetic co-operation from whites and public officials, as in some cities, it might be worked out fairly well to the satisfaction of all. But additional segregation in public and semipublic services acts as a constant reminder to the Negro that he is regarded as inferior. Schools, libraries, parks, hospitals, transportation accommodations, and other public services for Negroes are sometimes equal to those furnished to neighboring whites; more often these facilities are far inferior, and occasionally nonexistent. Furthermore, as the Negro leaves his own residential district, in the course of his daily travels he must keep informed constantly as to the places that are reserved for whites, or else submit to rebuff and insult. If, for instance, he steps into a drugstore, restaurant, or tavern outside the Negro area, he runs the risk of being ignored altogether by the clerks or of being victimized by exorbitant prices if, to comply with the law, they make a sale to him. Furthermore, it sometimes happens that the glass or dish which he has used is smashed deliberately upon the table or floor by the waiter in order to impress the Negro patron and all who are present with the fact that Negro trade is not wanted.

The various devices to which white society resorts in order to "keep the Negro in his place" are too numerous to mention here. Pullman, hotel, and theater accommodations are frequently "sold out" just as he applies; if a hotel clerk fears that legal action may follow a refusal to provide accommodations, the Negro may be taken to his room on the freight elevator. Segregation usually means that the Negro is placed beyond the pale of that code of good manners which white people ordinarily observe in their social contacts. An educated Negro attending a mixed meeting, for instance, is never certain when he takes a vacant chair that the white person seated next to him will not get up and move away instantly, as a deliberate affront to him. Approaching a street corner where a group of white men are loitering, the Negro is not surprised if offensive remarks are addressed to him, nor is the proximity of a white police officer any protection to him. Where it is still a custom for white men to rise and give their seats to women in public conveyances, the Negro woman usually finds that this courtesy is denied her. Nor are these discourtesies limited to uneducated white

circles. The writer once witnessed a group of college students standing on a street corner and jeering at a passing Negro funeral procession. Segregation, as enforced against the Negro in America, enables certain types of psychologically inadequate white persons to bolster up their submerged ego at the Negro's expense, thus giving themselves a temporary subconscious feeling of superiority. It is partly on this account and partly on account of direct competition with the Negro for jobs that the "poor whites," rather than the better class of whites of the South, are the chief Negro-baiters.

Health and Social Status

It is the growing opinion of many doctors that the inferior social and economic status of the Negro, rather than any innate racial weaknesses, has been the chief cause of his poor health record in America. The Negro population is ravaged by tuberculosis, pneumonia, whooping cough, influenza, typhoid fever, and venereal diseases, most of which are induced by such conditions as bad housing, poor sanitation, ignorance of hygiene, insufficient nourishment, and lack of proper medical attention. In 1933, the general Negro mortality was 14.1 per thousand; white mortality was 10.3. In the same year the Negro infant mortality rate was 85 per thousand live births (53 for whites); the Negro maternal mortality rate (1933–1935) was 96.1 per 10,000 live births (54.6 among whites.). Life expectancy among Negroes is fourteen years less than among whites. In 1931 the Negro death rate from tuberculosis per 100,000 in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia was 286, 283, and 247 respectively, while that for whites in these cities was 58, 49, and 61. In a study of the major causes of death among Negroes and whites in 14 southern states, 1931–1933, it was found that while diseases of the heart and of the kidney were the two most important causes of death for both groups, respiratory tuberculosis ranked third among the colored but only eighth among the whites. The same study showed that in deaths from syphilis the ratio of the colored to the white was 8.6 to 1.[11]

These comparisons reflect clearly the effect of a lowered social and economic status. For example, in the matter of medical attendance at birth: in 1935 only 43 per cent of Negro live births were attended by physicians (94 per cent for whites). Only 17 per cent of these Negro births took place in hospitals (40 per cent for whites).[12] Not only this,

[11] Mary Gover, *Mortality among Southern Negroes since 1920*, United States Public Health Bulletin, No. 235 (1937), pages 18–21.

[12] *Infant and Maternal Mortality among Negroes*, United States Children's Bureau Publication, No. 243 (1937), pages 6–7.

but also poverty, poor food, bad housing, overcrowding, overwork, worry, and other things which diminish physical resistance are the lot of the Negro mother and child. Ignorance of hygiene and reliance upon quack cures, superstitions, and incantations make Negro births even more hazardous. These factors play an important part likewise in the incidence of tuberculosis, which is so closely related to social and economic factors that it is sometimes spoken of as the workingman's disease; many of these same factors are related also to the high ratio of syphilis. "Since syphilis is more apt to be recorded as a cause of death among colored than white, the relative difference in the rates may be exaggerated. However, the ratio is undoubtedly high." [13] Another factor which may make the percentage of syphilis and gonorrhea among Negroes appear greater than it should be is the fact that the most common source of these statistics has been free clinics. Since the Negroes can seldom afford the services of a private physician for the costly treatment of venereal disease, the figures from this source have probably been overweighted as far as race is concerned.

It is possible, of course, that the relatively higher morbidity and mortality rates among Negroes are due in some measure to inferior physique or to a racial lack of resistance to our climate. For many years this was taken for granted, and little was done to improve health conditions among Negroes. There may yet be some truth in the naïve assumption, but such studies as that made of tuberculosis by Dr. Floyd P. Allen seem to point out a very definite correlation between economic status and disease, rather than a correlation between race and disease. Dr. Allen found that the tuberculosis rate varied rather widely in three different census tracts of Cincinnati. In one tract there were no deaths from tuberculosis, in the second the rate was 290 per 100,000, and in the third it was 673 per 100,000. As to economic status, the first area contained the Negroes with the highest range of occupations and incomes, the second tract contained the Negroes of low economic status, and the third tract, with the high mortality, was made up almost entirely of the very poor white population.[14]

In addition to the health handicaps already mentioned, there is the Negro hospital situation. According to W. D. Weatherford and C. S. Johnson, in 1926 there was one hospital bed for each 139 of the white population in hospitals for whites, and one for each 1,941 Negroes in hospitals for Negroes. Though it is possible in addition for Negroes

[13] Mary Gover, *op. cit.*, pages 21–22.

[14] "Physical Impairment among One Thousand Negro Workers," *American Journal of Public Health*, Volume 22, June, 1932, pages 581–582.

to be admitted to wards of public hospitals in northern cities, ". . . in the South, while certain limited provisions are made in special wards of public hospitals in the large cities, it is a fact which has often been given dramatic and fatal acuteness, that the great majority of hospitals, public and private, will not admit Negro patients under any circumstances." [15]

When one stops to consider the important relationship between personal health and achievement, one can see that health handicaps alone must be a tremendous obstacle to Negro advancement. The conclusions of Dr. Allen's study of Cincinnati Negroes suggest that social injustices inflicted upon the Negro are recorded in his mortality and morbidity rates.

> Among 1,000 male Negro industrial workers only one was found to be essentially free of physical defects, and for the remainder, major defects predominated. In view of this situation, we wonder how these men can endure moderate to great amounts of physical effort exacted of them. As a matter of fact, many do not long endure; they suffer physical breakdown relatively early in life. Even now the toll is so great among these people from tuberculosis, syphilis, and the degenerative diseases that comparatively few reach old age. . . . This situation is not without hope of improvement. We find in the recent mortality records of small groups of Negroes in a higher economic class, and in favorable environment, an indication of definite improvement. Mortality and morbidity rates among Negroes can, we believe, be lowered to the point where they will compare favorably with those for whites. This may eventually come to pass, but there will be many social, economic, and health problems to be dealt with in realizing the accomplishment.[16]

Some additional light may be thrown upon the Negro's health record by considering his past rate of growth in the United States. The percentage of Negroes in the total population has declined almost continuously since the first census was taken in 1790. At that time they constituted almost a fifth (19.3 per cent) of the population. By 1930 the total number of Negroes had increased to about fifteen times the number in 1790, while the whites, aided by white immigration and mulattoes who had crossed the color line, increased to about thirty-four times. However, even if white immigration, like Negro immigration, had ceased after 1800, the Negroes in all probability would not have held their own with whites during these years, because of a lower rate of natural increase.

Though the birth rate of Negroes has usually been higher than that

[15] *Op. cit.*, page 380.
[16] *Op. cit.*, page 586.

of whites (in 1933 the colored birth rate was 20.2 and the white rate 16.1 per thousand of population), until 1932 the excessively high Negro mortality rate more than offset the birth rate. Until recently, therefore, the white population was growing much more rapidly than the Negro. In 1932 an important change took place in this situation, when, probably for the first time in our history, the proportionate excess of births over deaths among Negroes exceeded that among whites.

EXCESS OF BIRTHS OVER DEATHS, PER 1,000 OF THE POPULATION, IN THE REGISTRATION AREA OF THE UNITED STATES.[17]

	1920	*1930*	*1932*	*1933*
White	10.7	7.8	6.5	5.8
Colored	8.6	5.2	6.8	6.1

These figures, based upon the crude birth rates, were probably affected to a considerable extent by the addition of white immigrants in the prime of life to our population prior to 1920, and it is likely that they now reflect in addition the recent operation of public-health measures, long available to whites but previously denied to Negroes, in reducing the Negro death rate. From 1920 to 1933 the Negro death rate was reduced 23 per cent (from 18.3 to 14.1), while the white rate was reduced only 18.9 per cent (from 12.7 to 10.3). Present tendencies seem to indicate that with restricted immigration and continued health measures among Negroes the future decline in the Negro race is not to take place nearly as rapidly as that now predicted for the white.

Lynching

The most brutal aspect of our social segregation policy is lynching. While the number of Negroes who lose their lives each year through this mode of so-called "popular justice" particularly reserved for Negroes is not so large today, the constant fear of lynching is a force which helps to make the various other unjust phases of segregation effective. Although it may be objected that whites are lynched also, the 3–1 ratio of Negroes to whites in lynchings since 1882, combined with the fact that Negroes constitute only about 10 per cent of our population, makes lynching pretty definitely an anti-Negro weapon. From 1930 to 1935 inclusive, eighty-three Negroes were lynched and only nine whites. The number of lynchings has been reduced considerably since 1882, but the rate of nearly twenty Negro-lynchings a year, with the exception of a smaller number in 1932, remained fairly constant from 1930 to 1935. In 1936 the number dropped suddenly to eight, a

[17] *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (1936), page 87.

figure which was repeated in 1937. Of those lynched in 1937, all were Negroes and all were already in the hands of the law. Most lynchings take place in the rural South, Mississippi, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, and Florida being the chief offenders.

There is a widespread impression among whites that Negroes are usually lynched because of the crime of rape. Investigations have shown, however, that this reason is alleged in only a minority of lynchings. Negroes have been lynched in recent years for charges of resisting arrest, poisoning mules, and stealing cotton, and even for "talking disrespectfully." Furthermore, in some instances when lynching has been resorted to in order to "protect the virtue of white womanhood," the circumstances of the cases have led to a strong suspicion that the Negroes' attentions were welcomed by adult females who made no complaint until their illicit intimacy was discovered by others.

There is scarcely an intelligent argument which can be advanced in favor of lynching today. It has been shown to increase crime and so to defeat its own purpose. It brutalizes the youth of both races and writes all Negroes down as scarcely above the beast. When women attend lynching parties or take their children to them, or incite men to such crimes, the whole morale of a community is lowered. Better than any further arguments on this point perhaps is the eyewitness description of Mississippi's 1937 lynching of Negroes Townes and McDaniels, as reported in *Time:*

The court had assigned counsel to defend them, set a date for trial by jury. Everything was according to law. But when they stepped out of a side door of the courthouse, they found themselves face to face with what so often handles cases like theirs in the South. An angry mob surged forward, took them from the custody of their guardians without a struggle, threw them into a school bus.

Followed by 40 automobiles, the bus sped down the highway toward Duck Hill. Two miles from the scene of last December's murder, 500 country folk, including women and children, waited expectantly in a patch of pinewood. When the motorcade from Winona arrived, the mob closed in to watch as the terrified Negroes were dragged from the bus. People in the back rows could hear heavy chains clink as the two blackamoors were made fast to trees.

Bootjack McDaniels, a lanky Negro with powerful shoulders, was asked to confess first. He gibbered that he was innocent. A mobster stepped forward with a plumber's blow torch, lighted it. Another ripped McDaniel's shirt off. Again he refused to confess. Then the blue-white flame of the torch stabbed into his black chest. He screamed with agony. The torch was withdrawn. He reiterated his innocence. Again the torch was turned on him and the smell of burned flesh floated through the woods. Again he screamed, and

when it was withdrawn this time he was ready to confess. . . . When his confession was delivered in sufficient detail, the lynchers fell back and a volley of bullets crashed into Bootjack McDaniels, 1937's lynching victim No. 2.

Despite what he had just witnessed, Negro Townes was not yet ready to repeat the confession which county officers had said he signed with his X after he was arrested last fortnight. But the blow torch soon burned the story out of him. . . . Then they piled brush high about sobbing Negro Townes, drenched it with gasoline, touched him off—1937's lynching victim No. 3.

Back in Winona, the judge who had heard the Negroes' pleas of not guilty promised a Grand Jury investigation, but the sheriff and his men said they had not recognized any of the mobsters who seized their prisoners. Said Deputy Sheriff Hugh Curtis: "It was all done very quickly, quietly and orderly." [18]

For twenty-five years concerted action has attempted to stop the practice of lynching. In an effort to bring some of the southern states into line with national public opinion, which has grown antagonistic to lynching, antilynching bills have been proposed in several successive sessions of Congress. In January, 1938, only a long minority filibuster of southern senators finally prevented the passage of the Wagner-Van Nuys bill. This bill would have empowered the Attorney General of the United States to order an investigation upon receipt of information that local peace officers had been negligent in preventing a lynching or in failing to prosecute members of a lynching mob, and, if willful negligence was proved, would have provided for criminal action against the state official and civil action against the responsible local unit of government.

According to Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which sponsored the bill, "lynching is both a cause and an effect of the Negro disenfranchisement in many parts of the South. Sheriffs and public officials are elected by white voters and therefore have no allegiance to Negro citizens. On the other hand, lynching and the threat of terrorism prevents Negroes from working and agitating for the franchise which is rightfully theirs." [19] Therefore it may be said that those who oppose such a federal antilynching bill wish to uphold continued violations of the Constitution; they wish to permit human life to be taken with impunity. Even though the passage of such a law may not stop all lynching, it will at least help to restore our national honor and to remove the impression abroad that Americans follow the law of the jungle in dealing with the

[18] *Time*, April 26, 1937. Used by permission.
[19] *The Interracial Review*, Volume 9, September, 1936, page 134.

Negro citizen. It is hoped that the Wagner-Van Nuys bill will serve as a pattern for a subsequent one.

5. RELIGIOUS STATUS

The following excerpt from a letter written by an educated Catholic Negro to *America,* after its publication of an article on the Negro problem, should bring the present religious status of the Negro home to some of his fellow white Catholics with something of a jolt.

I happened to be in Southern Maryland one Sunday and I dropped into a Catholic church to hear Mass. The church was divided into two sections, the front section for the white people, the latter section for the colored. Negro money was taken up separately from that of the whites. The most trying and disquieting part of the whole affair was in receiving Holy Communion. Negroes went up to the altar of God to receive Holy Communion only after our good Catholic white friends had received Communion. I wonder if God sanctioned that. Please don't think I am a Communist, because I am not. I only want to give my reaction to your article. I am a Negro and a Catholic. Thank God! I graduated from Catholic grammar and high school and Virginia State College. I wanted to attend a Catholic college but I was refused admission to a Catholic college because of my color.[20]

Yes, sad to say, segregation has reached even into Christian churches. Where Negroes are very numerous, they are usually expected to attend their own churches even though "white" churches are much closer; where they are few, often they must attend "Jim Crow" churches, that is, churches for whites which restrict Negroes to seats in a gallery or in the back pews. Sometimes Negroes are excluded altogether, even though similar denominational services are not offered elsewhere in the community. Religious education, like church services, is frequently required to bow down to race prejudice also. Catholic Negroes desirous of sending their children to local Catholic schools sometimes find that a Catholic education is denied to them unless they can afford to send their children to some distant city. On this point Father John La Farge, S.J., who has championed the cause of the Negro for many years, has commented as follows:

Negroes listen, in Northern churches, to sermons that impress upon the congregation the duty of sending Catholic children to Catholic schools, from the parochial school to the university. Yet if they attempt to comply with this rigid requirement of the Canon Law of the Church, as well as of the natural law of God, they are informed, in many instances, that they are not wanted, and that their presence would amount to revolution. But in a neighboring town or parish they will find that exactly similar conditions prevail,

[20] *America,* July 13, 1935, page 333. Used by permission.

and yet Negro children frequent the school without any semblance of disturbance.[21]

The Negro is accused very often of being less moral than the white in his family and social life. In the treatment of crime we have pointed out how the Negro is grossly misrepresented when the facts are considered. Similarly, if we make due allowance for cultural influences, the conduct of the Negro in his sex relationships is not entirely to his discredit. Critics of the Negro should remember that white owners paid very little attention to any form of Negro marriage during slavery, and in the confusion which followed emancipation not very much more was done to stabilize Negro family life. While the free Negro attempted to follow the approved American pattern of sex relationships as time went on, he was confronted frequently with that foolish white conviction which holds that the Negro is by nature incapable of living up to a moral code as high as that of the whites. Long confined to the most degraded sections of our cities and very much limited in his religious opportunities, the Negro has naturally had a hard climb up the moral ladder. Yet it is doubtful whether the white race, subjected to similar influences, would have acted any differently, as Father La Farge has pointed out so well:

> Given any form of racial origin, if a child is born into demoralizing housing conditions with their accompaniment of promiscuity and bad example; if it is deprived of normal healthy recreation; if the dominant group generally assumes that a Negro boy or girl need not bother to take care of his or her personal integrity; if the minority group itself absorbs such ideas and is in no wise trained to resist them; if it is subjected to the highly disintegrating influence of an emotional type of religious excitement alternating with long periods of enforced idleness; if there is a total absence of ambition or opportunity for cultural advancement while youth is freely fed upon the dregs of cheap amusements; if in addition to all this there is the group-memory of days when promiscuous intercourse was held economically profitable by the employer; and if the dominant group has consistently made use of the weaker group as a means to satisfy its passions—if all these and many more that could be enumerated are present, is it quite objective and reasonable to conclude that only those persons who in some way trace their ancestry to the shores of Africa will necessarily suffer impaired morals? [22]

The fact that the illegitimacy rate among Negroes is generally higher than that found among whites in the United States has been pointed out frequently as an indication that Negroes by nature lack self-control in sex matters. Yet, when the factors involved in these unfortunate births are analyzed, as they were by Doctor Ruth Reed in one of her

[21] *Interracial Justice* (America Press, New York, 1937), page 111. Used by permission.
[22] *Ibid.*, pages 30–31.

New York City studies, the case against the Negro collapses. Miss Reed discovered many factors which helped to explain the Negro illegitimacy rate on grounds other than the racial. For example, it was found that Negro girls are employed at an earlier age than white girls, and "in greater numbers in the group of occupations in which the illegitimacy rate is higher in all countries, i. e., in domestic and personal service." [23] Miss Reed found in addition that in four fifths of the cases the unfortunate girls had migrated from outside New York State for employment, frequently without parents or relatives. As a result of this study Miss Reed concluded that "there is no conclusive evidence that Negro women are meeting their problems of family life in any way which may be regarded as characteristically racial." [24] In his morals which are so closely related to his religious activities, as in his political, economic, educational, and social states, the Negro is a victim of conditions which make him appear at a disadvantage when compared with his white neighbor.

At this point the question naturally arises as to what the future has in store for the Negro. Is he to continue "in his place," as a footstool for the white man, or will Christian and scientific principles commence to prevail?

III. The Negro and the Future

Up to this point the chief concern here has been to present a picture of the Negro problem as it exists today. From this brief survey of conditions as they are, the question naturally arises as to what should be done about them. In attempting to suggest an intelligent approach to the solution of the Negro problem we shall stress three points here: (1) the scientific basis for future action, (2) the moral issues involved, (3) some of the agencies working for reform, and the content of their programs.[25]

1. THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR REFORM

In our attempt to summarize here the modicum of scientific information which should be known to anyone interested in a solution to the Negro problem, the word "scientific" will be used in a broad sense to include not only biological and ethnological data, but also knowledge

[23] *Negro Illegitimacy in New York City* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1926), page 40.

[24] *Ibid.*, page 132.

[25] The development of these three points follows rather closely the analysis made in Father La Farge's *Interracial Justice.*

contributed by such fields as experimental psychology, social psychology, and constitutional law.

In view of the psychological and other evidence already considered, let us assume at the outset that the Negro is equal to the white in his native mental ability and emotional qualities, and that existing white prejudices against the Negro are capable of modification through proper education, since they are acquired attitudes which are not a part of man's nature. While the biologist knows of no inherent objection to the crossing of these two races and the consequent elimination of the racial problem in this manner, as has taken place until recently at least, in northern Brazil and a few other places, social psychologists believe that in the United States white prejudice is still much too great to permit consideration of this solution, at least for some time to come. In answer to the other proposal, that Negroes be rounded up and sent either to an African colony or to some "forty-ninth state" to be established within the continental United States, constitutional lawyers say that such a plan could not be carried out, even if it were possible otherwise, because the Negro is an American citizen and unwilling to accept such an exile. As a matter of fact, the tendency of Negroes in recent years has been in the opposite direction. Although there were a hundred or more "Negro colonies" fifty years ago, today these all-Negro communities exist only in a few places, such as Mound Bayou, Mississippi, and Boley, Oklahoma. In spite of the many evils of our present forms of segregation, Professor Charles S. Johnson of Fisk University believes that, even if colonization were possible for a large number of Negroes, the isolation which it involves would have even greater disadvantages in that it would cut off the Negro from the main current of American cultural development.

> Of the two evils it seems better for Negroes in America to direct their energies toward normal participation in the life of American communities, even if this involves more frequent personal disappointment and much disorganization during the gradual process of acculturation.[26]

So much for the drastic solutions proposed. There is only one solution left: to improve the Negro situation as it exists in our midst. The foundation of such improvement is only the foundation of any Christain social plan. Christians are bound to comprehend, and then to improve, the lot of the Negro by the moral principles upon which their lives are built.

[26] "A Footnote in Isolation," *The Survey Graphic*, Volume 27, January, 1938, page 36.

2. THE RELIGIOUS AND MORAL BASIS FOR REFORM

At one time many people attempted to justify white oppression of the Negro on the ground that the Negro either had no immortal soul or, if he had, was "accursed" by God and so doomed perpetually to a position inferior to that of the white. Both these products of white defensive rationalization, which at various times have acted as props to exploitation of the Negro, are theologically untenable for Catholics. The Negro's soul is just as dear to God as that of the white, and the only stain upon his theological ancestral escutcheon is that of original sin, which he, like the white, inherits from Adam. Catholic theology has always recognized the Negro as a man having equal rights under the laws of nature and grace. As early as 1482, even before America was discovered, the Popes had forbidden the purchase of slaves and the reduction of free Negroes to slavery, under pain of excommunication. Although there have been Negro saints in the past, the recent movement for the canonization of Blessed Martin de Porres, born in South America of a Spanish father and a Negro mother, has evidently brought home to many Americans for the first time the fact that there is no color line in heaven.

The extent to which Negroes have had to suffer because of the acceptance of the Cham canard by many white Christians in recent centuries brings out one of the most amazing illustrations of "wishful thinking" and distorted anthropology in history. Generations of white Americans have sought to justify their economic exploitation of the Negro on the erroneous ground that Negroes, "the accursed descendants of Cham (Ham), are destined by God to occupy an inferior position to that of the white." As the historian, Georges Goyau, pointed out very well not long ago in an article in *Le Figaro,* the belief that the Negro race is accursed is a result of a strange mistake in Biblical interpretation:

> In Genesis it is a question of a malediction having fallen on Chanaan, son of Cham; and in fact this malediction was realized in the victory of the Israelites over the Chanaanites. This is the single fact that sacred history gives us. But aside from this history, a whole legend was elaborated according to which Cham himself had been cursed. This legend, which one finds in a rabbinical book of the sixth century, was practically overlooked for a thousand years, but in 1677 a Protestant physician of Amsterdam, Prof. Hannemann, made a fortune for himself out of dedicating a volume to it, and the infamous story then commenced its tour of the world.[27]

Until quite recently it was the fashion to rationalize race prejudice even in educated circles, and to attempt to justify white prejudice

[27] Quoted in the *Arizona Catholic Herald,* February 21, 1936.

against the Negro on the ground that it was innate and unpreventable. Since science has rejected this opinion, there is a moral obligation for white people to try to overcome their race prejudice if it has already been acquired from their environment. It may be admitted that this emotional control is not easy to acquire; nevertheless, anyone who claims to live a moral life is bound to exercise self-discipline by curbing such unwholesome tendencies and by cultivating counteremotions which are in accord with reasonable conduct. Perhaps the simplest way for a white person to abandon his race prejudice, once his intellect has come to appreciate the inaccuracy of his former impressions of the Negro, is to start by curbing his white ego-building tendency to refer to a Negro as a "nigger," a "coon," or a "darky" or by any other belittling terms which are offensive to intelligent Negroes. Next he should realize that a good Christian is not permitted to offend a Negro by manners which reflect the myth of white superiority, nor may he circulate unverified and disparaging rumors about Negroes. Neither can he incite or play upon the prejudices of another in this matter, according to Catholic moralists. For example, a newspaper reporter or editor may not make it a practice to refer to Negroes in the headlines over crime stories, unless he also does so for whites and various nationalities. To print such a headline as "Irishman holds up train" or "Jew robs gas station" would surely incite prejudice against the Irish and the Jews and would bring an immediate and merited protest from these groups. For similar reasons a headline reading "Negro attacks woman" is morally objectionable and a remnant of a practice which is being abandoned by the best newspapers. Christian subscribers should jog the conscience of editors who fail on this point.

The Christian law of charity is not concerned merely with negative acts, however; it obliges us to perform positive acts of kindness towards the Negro as well. Since the Negro is a fellow member of the Mystical Body of Christ, Christians must go beyond the demands of strict justice in their dealings with him. This obligation would seem to require that, where the present system of Negro segregation exists, it should be regarded as only a temporary expedient, to be removed as quickly as possible. While segregation may not always be an unjust arrangement in theory, in modern America it makes for injustice in practice. As segregation is carried out in urban America with its mobile population, it constantly imputes essential inferiority to the Negro group. Even in the less mobile small towns of the South, segregation does not, as its defenders have claimed, permit the operation of "parallel civilizations," but rather brings about a complete subjection of one group on an un-

yielding basis of assumed innate Negro inferiority. In a minute study of a typical small town of the South, referred to as "Southerntown," Dr. John Dollard has shown that the three gains which accrue to the dominant white group as a result of the American caste system there—economic gains, sexual "gains," and prestige—extend into practically every phase of human existence and thus utterly destroy the illusion that even in the South the two races can have any separate destiny.[28]

Segregation of the American Negro cheapens a human personality and opens the way for violence and exploitation. Father John La Farge, S.J., has said: "While theoretically indifferent as a policy, segregation tends to objective injustice, and away from social peace." Father Francis J. Gilligan, professor at the St. Paul, Minnesota, Theological Seminary, objects likewise to segregation or the attempt to establish a Negro ghetto in the United States, and indicates that we have a moral obligation to open the doors of our economic and cultural life to deserving persons regardless of color.

> It is just as impossible to isolate one section of a city as it is impossible to separate a living hand from a living body. The commercial and industrial life of the city flows back and forth through every section of the city as blood flows through the veins and arteries of the human body. We Catholics would strongly denounce as a violation of natural rights any practice which would deny employment to Catholics in all stores except those patronized by Catholics, or any practice which would limit Catholic attendance at schools and institutions to a Catholic neighborhood. Our own sense of justice in that regard suggests the natural moral quality of the policy advocated for the Negro. As Catholics then it appears that we are committed to a policy of opening wider and wider to the deserving Negro the door to the nation's economic and commercial life.[29]

In spite of the many objections to segregation, it would probably be disastrous, as Father La Farge and others have pointed out, to attempt to abolish it immediately or completely in those areas where it is now entrenched by law or custom. However, the toleration of this policy as a temporary measure in these areas should not be regarded as an approval of Negro segregation in principle. Neither does it excuse us from working towards its gradual elimination everywhere. Christian ethics is not founded upon expediency, nor, as we have already seen elsewhere, does custom make right. Segregation therefore may be accepted only as a temporary and emergency measure, and should not be extended to areas where it has not yet been adopted. In accepting it

[28] *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1937).

[29] "The Catholic Social Worker and the American Race Problem," *Proceedings* of the Twenty-first National Conference of Catholic Charities (1935), page 303. Used by permission.

at all we are bound to work toward its ultimate abolition, by removing the causes of racial friction and by striving to work out a new policy based upon justice, charity, and a mutual understanding between the two races. How shall this new policy be worked out? A brief survey of the most important existing agencies of reform should indicate the lines along which the new policy will probably develop, as well as some of the contents of this future program.

3. PROGRAMS AND AGENCIES FOR REFORM

Foremost among those who would remove the injustices of the present segregation policy are the members of various interracial movements. Among these organizations, which strive to effect better race relations through peaceful methods of friendly conduct, co-operative activities, and educational projects, are interracial commissions and committees made up of the more intelligent members of both races. Some of these groups are sectional, like the Southern Commission on Interracial Co-operation, and others are state-wide; some, such as the Chicago Interracial Commission, are confined to a single city, and others are located in colleges. Finally, there are interracial movements associated with various religious denominations, such as the Department of Race Relations of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the Catholic interracial group.

Negroes themselves have organized several national associations to foster interracial adjustments, among these being the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which strives to protect the legal rights of the Negro, and the National Urban League, which carries on research, labor education, and organization among Negroes. In addition there are movements, fostered by some of the Negro colleges in the South, which promote adult education and general social betterment among Negroes. Finally, it is worth observing that in recent years Communists have made it a point to come to the aid of Negroes, especially in the more spectacular cases involving the violation of constitutional rights, with the idea of convincing Negroes that their ultimate salvation lies in communism. Father John T. Gillard, S.S.J., who has written widely on the Negro problem, is of the opinion that communist ideology is steadily being built up among the Negro masses and that some of the prominent younger Negro intellectuals are already Communists. He also points out that, as a result of misleading communist propaganda here, Negroes assume as a commonplace that the Holy Father approved of Italy's campaign against the Negroes of Ethiopia, a belief which has done immeasurable damage to

the Church's work among American Negroes.[30] The rapid spread of communism among American Negroes is pointed out likewise by Carter G. Woodson, Negro historian, who says:

> The impatient, "highly educated" Negroes say that since under the present system of capitalism the Negro has no chance to toil upwards in the economic sphere, the only hope for bettering his condition in this respect is through socialism, the overthrow of the present economic regime, and the inauguration of popular control of resources and agencies which are now being operated for personal gain. This thought is gaining ground among Negroes in this country, and it is rapidly sweeping them into the ranks of what are commonly known as "Communists."[31]

Catholic Activities

The objectives of the Catholic interracial program, as it is being developed gradually by the active groups of Catholics associated with *The Interracial Review, The Catholic Worker,* the National Conference of Catholic Women, the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, and other organizations, are twofold; first, the combating of race prejudice, and, second, the establishment of social justice for the whole social group regardless of race, in order that the two races may live together in the community without friction or inequality. The methods of the Catholic approach may be described briefly as consisting of prayer, example, and direct activity. In prayer it emphasizes the socializing influence of communal participation in the liturgy of the Church. Whenever possible it encourages collaboration with the direct apostolate for the American Negro, especially in the South. White contacts are urged, not merely with those who are objects of compassion, but also with the more advanced Negroes who are working for the betterment of their race. Starting with the formation of parish and college study groups aimed at self-education concerning the problems of the Negro and the type of Christian conduct which should govern white relations with him, the Catholic interracial program urges that every opportunity be taken to spread this information to other Catholics, as well as to protest publicly against injustices inflicted upon the Negro.

It is suggested also that Catholic groups interested in the welfare of the Negro should become concerned about general housing, work relief, education, recreation, child welfare, and other public projects, in order to see that Negroes receive their full quota of public benefits.

[30] *Christ, Color, and Communism* (The Josephite Press, Baltimore, 1937).

[31] *The Mis-Education of the Negro* (The Associated Publishers, Washington, D.C., 1933), page 43.

All such efforts presume of course that "white aloofness" to the Negro has already been broken down. In the writers' experience friendly contacts with the Negro, as well as study, are necessary if white prejudice is to be removed. The following statement which a college student voluntarily added at the end of a sociology term paper on the Negro shows how "doing" changed his attitude after study and discussion had failed to do so.

In conclusion, I have to confess that before taking this sociology course, I was prejudiced against the Negro and that I remained so even after having discussed the problem in class. However, I decided later to get some first hand information, and so I joined the campus Saint Vincent de Paul Society through which I came into contact with many Negroes in town. As a result of this experience I have come to realize that Negroes are not only badly treated, but terribly misjudged. Catholic men and women, college men in particular, should become better informed about this very important problem, so that when the time comes, they will be ready to fight for a fair opportunity for the Negro.

The Intermarriage Bugaboo

Some white people frown upon efforts to establish friendly relations between the two races because of a belief that this will tend to bring about intermarriage, a thing which they abhor. There are no biological objections to Negro-white marriages, nor, if we judge from the fact that sex relations have always taken place between these two races in the United States, is there any important innate psychological aversion. Neither does the Church prohibit such marriages, for they are not only common but also socially beneficial in some other countries. Nevertheless, from a sociological viewpoint such marriages cannot be recommended at present. The chief sociological objection to such unions in the United States is that under existing conditions they produce a tension in family relations which makes marriage too difficult. It may be granted that the two persons immediately concerned may eliminate their color prejudices and live in complete harmony, but the various "in-laws" usually complicate the family circle in such a way that old prejudices are constantly being revived. Furthermore, the definitely hostile attitudes of unrelated members of the community would seem to add another serious hazard to the success of such unions for some time to come. For the consolation of those who are alarmed about the possibility of such marriages here, it may be pointed out that those who are most active with the present Negro-white interracial movement do not find that any tendency towards intermarriage results from it. Some whites may suspect that most Negroes desire such marriages, but close

observers say that this is not true. According to Father La Farge, Negro education and improved social status do not result in any marked increase of interest in whites of the opposite sex.

The writer has found no evidence to the effect that the establishment of friendly, just, and charitable relations between the Negro and white groups encourages any notable tendency to intermarriage. Such indications as there are seem to point in the contrary direction: that in proportion as the pressure of fear and insecurity is removed from the minority group and its status raised by education and improved welfare, spiritual and temporal, the better opportunity is afforded to its youth to find suitable life partners within its own members.[32]

Father La Farge very properly takes pains to assuage the fears of those whites whose "alarm" at the very thought of possible racial intermarriage even at some remote future date might arouse opposition to any immediate program for the relief of the Negro. Yet it should be observed here that, since neither scientists nor churchmen see any cause for alarm in racial intermarriage, it is conceivable that a more intelligent public opinion may some day make such marriages unobjectionable even from a sociological viewpoint. In *Brown America,* Edwin R. Embree, executive head of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, which is devoted to the interests of the Negro, maintains that because of earlier race crossings there will be no black race in America in a few more generations anyway, even if there is no more infusion of white blood. The United States census counts 20 per cent of our Negroes as mulattoes; Embree suggests, however, that "well over half" of our present Negroes have some white or Indian blood and reminds us that "race crossings" were not at all uncommon even among the "better people" in early America.

No special odium was attached to the begetting of mulatto children in slave days. It was regarded almost as a matter of course. Thomas Jefferson was reported, when President, to have regretted that certain of his own children were estopped from voting because of the conditions imposed by their maternity. When a yellow girl, reputed to be the daughter of President Tyler and living in his entourage in the White House, eloped with a white man and in punishment was sold "down the river," the matter was so ordinary as to cause only a piquant wave of gossip in Washington society. What was customary in this regard of those in high places was true to a greater degree of the generality of slave owners.[33]

As to the aesthetics of racial intermarriage—and by itself concern about the color of the resultant offspring would seem to be little more than that—studies made by the Carnegie Institution of Washington

[32] *Op. cit.,* page 143. Used by permission.
[33] *Brown America* (The Viking Press, New York, 1931), pages 6–7.

and others seem to show that almost all Negro characteristics disappear after the third generation from the original black-and-white mating, thus permitting most of the third generation offspring to pass for white. The product of the first cross between a pure white and a pure black (though, of course, members of neither race, strictly speaking, can be called biologically pure today) is a mulatto. The child of a mulatto and a white person is a quadroon. When a quadroon mates with a white, the offspring is an octoroon. Most octoroons can and do pass as whites. When an octoroon mates with a white, the offspring, designated as a "mustifee" in the West Indies, is always white, there being no possibility of a black "throwback" in the offspring. Even in such a strict "color line" state as Florida, the legal ban against marriages between a white and a Negro vanishes in the case of the mustifee, which is to say that in Florida a white may legally marry a person one of whose great-grandfathers was a Negro. In this connection, one cannot help speculating about the ultimate effect of close association in America between the offspring of southern Europeans and, let us say, quadroons. The European ancestors of some of our present Mediterranean stocks had no great antipathy towards the Negro, as their intermarriage in Brazil indicated. Nor from the aesthetic viewpoint is there much difference in color between the quadroon and some of the darker Mediterranean types. Is it rash to suggest, then, that with the marriage of a white to a mustifee already legal in a southern state like Florida, it will not be too much to expect that the marriage of a white to a quadroon may easily become socially acceptable in certain of our Mediterranean groups of the North, where for the most part there is no legal obstacle anyway? If such a process should take place on a wide scale our "Negro problem" might quickly vanish because of a scarcity of Negroes, at least in the northern cities.

The College Crusade

While Catholic Negroes form a majority group among the Negro Christians of the world, they make up only a small percentage of the Negro Christians in the United States; there are only 250,000 here in contrast to 5,000,000 Protestant Negroes. There are many plausible explanations for the Catholic Church's neglect of the apostolate to the American Negro in the past. Among these excuses might be mentioned the former scarcity of Catholic churches in the Deep South, the smoldering anti-Catholic prejudices here which would have burst into flames at the first indication of Catholic leadership in the cause of the Negro, and the gigantic problem which the Church faced in having to build

churches and schools for the rapidly increasing Catholic population as immigration increased in the North from the Civil War to the World War. Although these and other conditions handicapped Catholic missionary zeal for American Negroes in the past, such reasons cannot be alleged much longer. The zeal which Catholic college students are now manifesting in regard to the Negro's welfare, as indicated each month in the columns of *The Interracial Review,* suggests that a new and more courageous leadership in regard to the whole Negro problem is beginning to assert itself.

One of the very tangible products of the recent Catholic youth movement, which promises to go a long way in breaking down color lines that churchmen hitherto have not dared to ignore, is the "Standard Program" drawn up at a conference of Catholic college students at Fordham University in April, 1937, for adoption in Catholic colleges. This program, since approved and supplemented at Providence College, St. John's University, and other conferences of Catholic college students, calls first of all for the organization of an interracial club on every campus. Further emphasis upon the formation of a truly Christian viewpoint on interracial justice is to be obtained through debate and by means of articles published in collegiate periodicals. In October, 1937, the National Catholic Alumni Federation at its biennial convention voted to support the Catholic interracial program, pledging federation members to assist the Negro by "using their influence in public or in private to obtain proper living conditions for the Negroes in our towns and cities through adequate housing, recreational, and health facilities; through hospitals and charitable institutions; through equitable treatment by public welfare and relief agencies; through equal opportunities for employment as well as for utilization and development of professional and technical abilities; and through full protection of their persons before the law and especially effective protection from mob violence." [34] With Catholic college students and alumni thus joining their efforts on behalf of the Negro today, it is to be hoped that Catholics with fewer educational opportunities will soon realize likewise that the social justice urged by Leo XIII and Pius XI was for Negroes as well as whites, and that "racial prejudice" and "Catholicism" are terms which do not go together. Only when these facts are recognized in practice may it be said that Christian Democracy has been realized.

[34] John V. Hinkel, "The Federation Accepts the Challenge," *The Interracial Review,* Volume 10, December, 1937, page 188.

References for Further Reading

Allen, James S., *The Negro Question in the United States,* International Publishers, New York, 1936

Baker, Paul E., *Negro-White Adjustment,* The Association Press, New York, 1934

Boas, Franz, *Anthropology and Modern Life,* revised edition, W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1932

Brawley, Benjamin, *The Negro Genius,* Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, 1937

Brown, Francis J., and J. S. Roucek (editors), *Our Racial and National Minorities,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1937

Dowd, Jerome, *The Negro in American Life,* The Century Co., New York, 1926

Doyle, Bertram W., *The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937

DuBois, W. E. B., *Black Reconstruction,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1935

Embree, E. R., *Brown America,* The Viking Press, New York, 1931

Feldman, Herman, *Racial Factors in American Industry,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1931

Garth, Thomas R., *Race Psychology,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1931

Gillard, John T., S.S.J., *The Catholic Church and the American Negro,* St. Joseph's Society Press, Baltimore, 1930

Gillard, John T., S.S.J., *Christ, Color, and Communism,* Josephite Press, Baltimore, 1937

Herskovits, Melville J., *The American Negro,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1928

Johnson, Charles S., *The Negro in American Civilization,* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1930

Kennedy, Louise V., *The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1930

Klinberg, Otto, *Race Differences,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935

La Farge, John, S.J., *Interracial Justice,* The America Press, New York, 1937

Locke, Alain, *The New Negro,* Albert and Charles Boni, Inc., New York, 1925

McKinney, T. T., *All White America,* Meador Publishing Company, Boston, 1937

Moton, R. R., *What the Negro Thinks,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, New York, 1929

Raper, Arthur F., *Preface to Peasantry,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1936

Reuter, E. B., *The American Race Problem,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1927

Reuter, E. B., *Race Mixture,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1931

Spero, S. D., and A. L. Harris, *The Black Worker,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1931

Stonequist, Everett V., *The Marginal Man,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937

Weatherford, W. D., and Charles S. Johnson, *Race Relations,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1934

Woodson, Carter G., *The Mis-Education of the Negro,* The Associated Publishers, Washington, D.C., 1933

Woodson, Carter G., *The Negro in Our History,* The Associated Publishers, Washington, D.C., 1931

Woofter, Thomas J., *Races and Ethnic Groups in American Life,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933

Work, Monroe N. (editor), *Negro Year Book 1937–1938,* Negro Year Book Publishing Company, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, 1938

Young, Donald, *American Minority Peoples,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1932

Young, Donald, *On Minority Peoples in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937

CHAPTER VI

THE AMERICAN POPULATION PROBLEM

It was "news" when, in March, 1937, Dr. Louis I. Dublin, internationally recognized authority on vital statistics, made the charge that Mrs. Margaret Sanger, the American apostle of artificial birth control, had, by a misguided and shortsighted fervor, done inestimable damage to this country. After asserting that our declining birth rate is rapidly bringing us to a point where our population will become stationary and then recede, he indicated that artificial birth control is the chief factor in this population change. Attack led to counterattack; Mrs. Sanger replied by maintaining that Dr. Dublin had neglected to point out that the death rate had also dropped, and that Dr. Dublin's was "the voice of a hundred years ago—not the voice of the future."

Six months later Mrs. Sanger herself claimed the headlines when, with war clouds hanging over Asia and Europe, she charged that Japan, Italy, and Germany were menaces to civilization and to world peace because of population pressure brought about by their refusal to sanction the practice of artificial birth control.

From these incidents it should be apparent to the reader, if the idea had not occurred already, that birth control is not only a timely problem, but also one which has both national and international ramifications. Yet birth control is but one phase of the larger sociological study known as the population problem. Like many others, the modern population problem cannot be understood adequately without some appreciation of its historical background.

I. Historical Background

1. Pre-Malthusian Experience

Population policies seem to have concerned mankind ever since the dawn of history. In ancient Greece, Plato maintained that population should be held in check, specifying 5,040 free citizens as the proper population for his ideal city; his pupil Aristotle went even further by advocating a state population policy which included abortion, infanti-

cide, abandonment, and deferred marriages as legal means of keeping "the most suitable limit" for the population.

Within a century after the death of Aristotle, the historian Polybius lamented the influence of these philosophers upon the nation, pointing out that Greece had become decimated, not by war or disease, but through lack of procreation brought about by luxurious living in which both marriage and paternity were being shunned. Too deeply had the people drunk of the wells of their overpopulation-fearing philosophers, the result being that the adoption of the means of population control recommended by them had brought about population shrinkage. Some time later, with the Roman chariots outside the city gates, it was too late for the Greeks to talk of passing laws to encourage people to have children. Roman experience was similar to Grecian. After a few centuries of wealth, power, and similar luxurious living, Romans began to ignore the sanctions of religion which had made their family life so successful, and parenthood was neglected to such an extent that hasty and futile laws were passed to encourage population increase just about the time that the uncivilized Germanic tribes began to descend upon Rome.

One of the first tasks of the early Christian Church was that of combating the pagan marital customs of Greece and Rome. Marriage was praised not merely as a good thing but as a holy thing, a sacrament, and, though it had legitimate and commendable secondary ends, parenthood, the Church insisted, was its primary object. Every effort was made to stamp out the practices which had led to depopulation, not because population increase was in itself a virtue, but because decreased populations in these areas had been brought about by sinful methods. Until the sixteenth century very little seems to have been written directly upon the subject of population. That there were periods of temporary population pressure at various times and places, whenever the technique of food production lagged behind population growth, we may reasonably suspect. However, the lack of literature on this topic would seem to suggest that such periods did not cause very much alarm. The methods of population control used in times of population pressure in medieval Christian Europe are described in Father John M. Cooper's *Birth Control,* which, though written in 1923, still remains one of our best brief treatments of the population problem, in the opinion of these writers.

The great masses of the people of medieval Europe postponed marriage and a large number from among the economically handicapped classes remained celibate. Of the latter number, many found refuge, as well as conse-

cration to God and service to the race, in the clerical and monastic life, for the step from economic to religious celibacy was a comparatively short one. Overpopulation was averted, and averted without either the corroding practices of artificial birth control or the frenzied death-struggle of starving men. War, famine, and pestilence there were, no doubt, enough of them and to spare, but overpopulation was, so far as we can judge, a minor factor in their genesis and growth, while contraceptive practices among the married were apparently not common.[1]

While British writers began to show some apprehension about the possibility of overpopulation as time went on, the great majority of pre-Malthusian European writers, influenced no doubt by the economic mercantilists and the growing nationalistic spirit in Europe, favored a growing population.

2. MALTHUS

The modern movement to control the growth of population started with the publication of Robert Malthus's *Essay on Population*. The famous thesis of Malthus, first proposed in 1798, stated that population tends to increase in geometrical ratio (1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64), while the food supply increases in arithmetical ratio (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7), only. According to these ratios he figured that, theoretically, one should expect to find a population doubled in about twenty-five years and increased to sixty-four times its original size in 150 years; meanwhile the food supply would have increased but seven times at the end of 150 years. In practice, this statistical tendency did not work out entirely, he said, because of the operation of two kinds of checks to population growth, the positive and the preventive. The positive, or more important of these checks on normal population growth, consisted of periods of disease, war, and other dysgenic human or social ills. The preventive checks alone, celibacy, delayed marriage, and periodic abstinence from sexual intercourse in marriage, would never be sufficiently effective, he believed, to offset disproportionate population growth and so render the positive checks entirely inoperative. Consequently, in contrast to the viewpoint of the Utopian social reformers of his day, he visualized nothing ahead for mankind but repeated cycles of poverty, hunger, disease, war, and other ills by which he saw nature attempting to cut down the encroachment of population growth upon the food supply.

The original viewpoint of Malthus was pessimistic, to say the least, and, though he altered his viewpoint later to some extent, as, for example, when he came to attach greater significance to the efficacy of the pre-

[1] Rev. John M. Cooper, *Birth Control* (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1923), pages 42–43. Used by permission.

ventive checks, it was because of his original viewpoint, widely adopted by the economists of his day, that economics came to be called the "dismal science."

In recent years Malthus has been misrepresented frequently as having sanctioned the movement to promote the use of contraceptives. However, an American authority on population, Warren S. Thompson, says that Malthus's writings give no indication that he ever considered contraception as an approved preventive check for overpopulation. As a student of the population problem Malthus must have been fully aware of the fact that contraceptive devices had long been used among both civilized and uncivilized peoples; furthermore, the discussion of his theory had already led to the advocacy of contraception among some of his contemporaries. Yet Malthus, an Episcopalian clergyman, adhered to the viewpoint which Christian Churches up to that time had always taught, namely, that both the Bible and sound philosophical reasoning condemned the sin of Onan.

A defense of the moral position of Malthus on the subject of contraception should not leave the false impression that his religious and philosophical ideas were always sound. He has been accused of being a "born aristocrat" who never completely overcame his prejudice against the "rabble." His first book was written as a reply to William Godwin, a liberal who advocated the theory that there was plenty of wealth for all if only it were distributed properly. Further antagonism to Godwin's viewpoint, which saw most of the ills of the day as founded in a poorly regulated economic order, was manifested in Malthus's second volume, especially in his opposition to poor relief, which he regarded as a stimulator of population increase. Judged by the standards of social justice accepted by most Christians of today, Malthus falls considerably short in that he failed to recognize the fundamental fact that the working classes have a natural right to subsistence at least, if Christian justice is to mean anything. This fact was pointed out recently by Father Francis P. Cavanaugh, C.S.C.:

> At one time he [Malthus] seemed to feel that somehow or other the suffering masses were almost entirely to blame for their own position. Because of that, then, he seemed to feel that the intelligent upper classes should not waste too much sympathy on them. He seemed to fail to grasp the idea of natural rights—that man, because he is a man, has the right of access to those things necessary to his life as a man. By such a position he naturally outrages Christian teaching and beliefs. For example, he tells us: "A man who is born into a world already possessed, if he cannot get subsistence from his parents on whom he has a just demand, and if the society do not want his labor, has no claim or right to the smallest portion of food." We believe

all men have equal rights of access to the goods of earth as regards subsistence, and anyone hindering that access acts unreasonably.[2]

It will be well for the reader to keep in mind two points brought out in the above quotation: first, Malthus's failure to recognize the ethical dictates of the natural law which guarantee a man the right to life, and, second, his "upper class" psychology. As will be pointed out later, these two original Malthusian weaknesses can still be seen in the policy of his modern disciples, a policy which an English author described recently as "a cunning campaign to sacrifice the race to a crazy and selfish social system."

3. THE NEO-MALTHUSIANS

The next stage in the evolution of the population problem commenced with the neo-Malthusians, a group which, while claiming to be disciples of Malthus, advocated preventive checks against overpopulation which were definitely at variance with the teachings of his Christian morality. Francis Place shocked Christian England when he openly advocated control by contraception in 1822; he was supported by George Drysdale, Robert Dale Owen, John Stuart Mill, and others, some of whom, in addition to advocating contraception as a preventive check, utilized the new movement as a vehicle for urging sex freedom generally, even going to the extent of advocating legal abortion, more widespread divorce, free love, and a general abandonment of the existing Christian code governing sex. It remained for an Englishwoman, however, Mrs. Annie Besant, to provide the first genuine momentum to that phase of the neo-Malthusian movement which was aimed at making contraception popular. This she achieved chiefly by setting herself up as a martyr to the cause of womanhood after her much publicized arrest and trial for the sale of forbidden literature on contraception.

The combined efforts of the early neo-Malthusian leaders and the overpopulation warnings of Ricardo and other *laissez-faire* economists began at last to have an effect. Public sentiment suddenly became so panicky under the combined attack of the pessimistic economists and the neo-Malthusians that contraception was discussed openly even among the more conservative groups as a means of escaping what appeared to be certain disaster. However, even among the new "liberal" Christians there still remained considerable distrust of the neo-Malthusian movement, especially on account of its apparent sanction of so many things which were contrary to the basic tenets of a Christian

[2] Rev. Francis P. Cavanaugh, C.S.C., "Misreading a Theory," *The Ave Maria*, Volume 42, July 13, 1935, page 35. Used by permission.

civilization. In other words, the neo-Malthusian attack, like most militant movements, was showing a tendency to get out of hand, so that a new and more conservative leadership became a necessity. It was about this time that Dr. Marie Stopes in England and Mrs. Margaret Sanger in the United States entered the picture.

4. THE BIRTH CONTROLLERS

At the start of the present century, under the clever and more conservative leadership of Mrs. Sanger and Dr. Stopes, the modern birth-control movement commenced. Birth-control leagues were organized in various sections of the country, and with the exception of contraception it was agreed that the anti-Christian ideas of the older neo-Malthusians should be either soft-pedaled or dropped entirely. While the alleged danger of overpopulation was still retained as the scientific cornerstone of the movement, arguments which often made a greater sentimental or popular appeal were added. Among these new approaches to public opinion were the appeals which emphasized the sacrifices or alleged dangers involved in frequent motherhood, the sufferings of the poor as a result of their large families, and especially the existing dysgenic situation in which, as it was said, the "better classes" with their small families were being swamped by the disproportionately larger families among the "poorer classes." It was argued that, if the race was to be saved eugenically, the poorer, or, as it was assumed, the "inferior," stocks, must be taught to practice contraception.

Whatever judgment is to be passed upon the merits of the modern birth-control movement, Mrs. Sanger must be credited with making it a reality. By the clever adaptation of her appeal for the spread of contraception to the particular immediate situation—in one instance to the inconveniences of motherhood, as when addressing certain women's clubs; or to unemployment, in times of economic distress; or to war, in times of international tension—she succeeded in winning many sympathetic audiences and thus in breaking down much of the embarrassment which formerly attended the discussion of this topic. Not only did she show herself to be a good psychologist, by copying the tactics of Mrs. Besant and setting herself up as a martyr in the eyes of so-called liberal public opinion, but she proved herself a very good saleswoman in addition, by giving a new and more appealing name to the product she was promoting.

Instead of talking about "contraception" Mrs. Sanger began to speak of "birth control," a term which in its literal meaning had no particular immoral connotation. Through the use of this misleading term many

people who at first would have been shocked at the mere mention of contraception were attracted to meetings, influenced there by her specious arguments, and finally made advocates of contraception. Soon prominent professors of economics and sociology in our leading universities began to write and speak boldly in her defense, while the newspapers and magazines, ever anxious to parade the sensational as well as that which has to do with sex, gave her much free advertising. The clinics set up in the larger cities for the dissemination of contraceptive information were sometimes given such misleading titles as "Mothers' Health Center" in order to mislead the public and so avoid embarrassing opposition. As a means of obtaining popular favor such clinics usually provided free medical services for mothers and prospective mothers, in addition to carrying out the main objective of the group which founded them. In a remarkably short period of time public opinion, especially among the upper classes, began to favor Mrs. Sanger's viewpoint openly, and cash commenced to pour into the coffers of the Birth Control League; only one obstacle remained—the complete removal of ecclesiastical opposition to contraception. This process, the retreat of the Churches, though the saddest, is one of the most interesting phases in the history of the whole birth-control movement.

5. THE BREAKDOWN OF MOST RELIGIOUS OPPOSITION

The present sanction of birth control on the part of most Christian and Jewish denominations, with the exception of the Roman Catholic and one or two other groups, is a matter of common knowledge. When we stop to consider the fact that at the time of Malthus all these groups were united with the Catholic Church in opposing contraception as immoral, this about-face in a matter involving fundamental morality should be a religious phenomenon of major importance to the sociologists. In order to comprehend just what took place in so many of the non-Catholic denominations that have come to sanction contraception, it is necessary to digress a bit and recall the history of the concept of morality as mores as well as the nature of Protestantism itself. Incidentally, an understanding of these two things should give the reader the clue to many possible future tendencies in American social, economic, and political life, as well as a better understanding of the birth-control movement itself.

The so-called mores concept of morality, or that viewpoint which holds that right and wrong are based solely upon custom, is the result of fearless sociological thinking along the lines first established, but for a long time never fully recognized, by the founders of Protestantism

itself. True, the idea of custom-made morality has spread much more rapidly in recent years, since Protestantism lost almost all power of united leadership by its division into hundreds of different sects and by the Fundamentalist and Modernist controversy which subdivided each of these sects into two hostile and irreconcilable camps. Nevertheless, the seed of the new philosophy which was to make the prevailing custom, rather than the dictates of God or right reason, the norm of morality was sown, as we shall see, by the very founder of Protestantism.

Protestantism, as every student of religion knows, was founded upon the principle of private judgment. Dogmatically it revolted against the teaching authority of the Church, and took its stand on the right of each man to be his own teacher and lawgiver. Inconsistently enough, the early Protestant Churches saw the necessity of defining the beliefs and prescribing what was to be proper moral conduct among their adherents, and this practice has been generally accepted by laymen, though with diminishing enthusiasm, down to the present. This Protestant inconsistency was aided by the force of the old pre-Reformation Christian tradition in both belief and conduct, which acted as a steadying influence to prevent Protestantism from following at once the antiauthoritarian course required by its logic. It was a case of what sociologists call "cultural lag"; that is, for a long time actual religious practice did not catch up with the new theory involved in Protestantism. While Rationalism, or the general substitution of man's own opinions for the revealed word of God, together with Materialism, Marxism, and other anti-God philosophies, helped to pave the way, it remained for the sociologists, following out the original premises of Protestantism, to popularize the idea that morality might be nothing more than man-made custom, so that anything which is wrong at one period or in one place may become right with a change of man's customs. Of course, good philosophers know that true morality in its fundamental principles does not depend upon any particular religious creed, but rather upon the requirements of the Divine Order; however, it seems too much to expect the average man to comprehend the not-too-simple philosophical concept of this Natural Law, especially when he lives in an environment which rejects not only the idea of the supernatural but Church authority as well.

Sociology, always excepting here that which Catholics regard as sociology, is almost unanimous now in teaching that morality is custom-made. The entrance of this concept into the thinking of formal sociology seems to go back to the pioneer efforts of Herbert Spencer. Spencer

saw society as a constantly evolving organism; in the process of change there could be no permanent ethical standards. American sociology took over the Spencerian idea, as far as it applied to standards of right and wrong, with the result that a sort of pragmatic ethics has come to be accepted in sociology, namely, that the type of human conduct which works best at a particular time or place is right and so becomes a custom which all should observe. With the rapid spread of sociology in our universities in recent years, particularly its mores concept, it was only a matter of time until many college graduates, divinity students included, began to talk and write freely about "custom-made morality," "the new morality," "our changing ethics," and "the evolution of morals." In fact, it was suggested that one who refused to accept new moral codes resisted the advances of science. With the old philosophical groundwork which regarded some things as objectively and permanently right or wrong thus torn out of education, it became very easy for agitators for any new type of moral conduct to obtain a hearing, particularly if they were members of some sophisticated or organized propaganda group.

Sex and Custom

It is possible, no doubt, for us to exaggerate the extent to which the so-called "new morality" has been adopted by non-Catholics. A dozen years ago Father Charles P. Bruehl quite correctly protested that the new morality was limited solely to the field of sex relations. It is also interesting to recall that he objected at that time to those who regarded the new morality as a product of an alleged postwar "revolt of modern youth," by pointing out that adults rather than youth were responsible for the attack upon the traditional code of morality. He said:

> The glamor of the new morality quickly vanishes if it is subjected to a close scrutiny. At first blush, it seems to be a gigantic revolt, impressive at least by reason of its imposing dimensions and its overwhelming magnitude. The impression is that we are dealing with Titans, who with crude strength are trying to tear down the whole edifice of morality. Such an undertaking would not be devoid of a certain epic quality. But it is not so. There is no horizon to the new morality. It is only concerned with sex problems. It only aims at sexual freedom. It does not seek expansion of the human personality on a truly big scale. It is quite satisfied with the emancipation of the sex instincts. Sexual starvation is its resounding battle cry. Sex hunger is its strongest argument. In everything else man may be enslaved but his sexual impulses must have unlimited scope. To this the whole new morality movement dwindles down. . . .
>
> The young only follow in the footsteps of their elders. They do not sit down laboriously to reason out ethical problems. The moment of pleasure in

which they are engaged completely absorbs their attention. In the case of the new morality they merely repeat phrases which they have read or heard somewhere. The new morality is sponsored by adults and mostly by men and women of mature age, whose outlook upon life has been distorted by some experience. True, a large portion of modern youth accepts the new morality, but they have not invented it. They accept it because it does not interfere with their momentary desires. He who reads into it the crystallization of the vital aspirations of a new generation is gloriously deceiving himself.[3]

However, Father Bruehl's viewpoint concerning the importance of the mores influence is not in conflict with that presented here, for, if the revolt against morals was (at least in 1925) concerned only with sex, its application to the population problem is obvious. Furthermore, it is our contention that non-Catholic sociologists, and not youth, have been responsible for the development of the new concept of morality. Nor, in our opinion, has youth alone been responsible for the extension of the mores idea since 1925.

With what amounted to a change in the general philosophy of Protestants brought about by the widespread acceptance of the new idea of morality, the stage was set for the approval of contraception. As a result of this change, by 1925 it could be said that nearly every sociology textbook written by a non-Catholic could be counted upon to do two things: first, to predict a future state of world overpopulation, and second, to recommend contraception as the only scientific way to avoid this terrible crisis. Very frequently, in addition, the "antiquated" and "unscientific" position of the Catholic Church, which still disapproved of contraception, was pointed out and held up to ridicule. Thus non-Catholic sociology with its emphasis upon "scientific" morality became Mrs. Sanger's greatest ally in leading a generation of university graduates to accept her viewpoint on contraception. The recent collapse of most Protestant and Jewish ecclesiastical resistance to contraception in the face of the propaganda barrage of the birth-control advocates is just about what one might expect under the circumstances. One after another, most of these denominations broke down before the ever-growing popular demand for birth control, meanwhile trying to save face by pointing out the grave overpopulation danger as a sufficient and "scientific" motive for their action. Protestant Fundamentalists, caught napping only a short time before by the new discoveries in geology and anthropology, did not dare to leave themselves open to another possible charge of being "in conflict with science."

[3] Rev. Charles P. Bruehl, "The New Morality," *Central Blatt and Social Justice*, Volume 18, July, 1925, page 119. Used by permission.

Moral Values Slump

The ecclesiastical debacle in the face of the birth-control campaign has been so complete that some of the leaders of the birth-control fight have already gone on to seek new conquests, such as that involved in attempting to "break down" ecclesiastical objections to euthanasia. A newly organized national society, with a prominent New York Jewish rabbi as one of its directors and Dr. Charles Francis Potter, leader of the First Humanist Society, as its president, is now attempting to legalize the killing of the incurably ill as well as to break down the moral objections which those creeds that have accepted the Ten Commandments have always raised to killing the innocent. "We have for years been active in the birth control movement," said the president of the new society recently, "and since that fight is largely won we feel free to transfer some of our efforts to the euthanasia enterprise." His remarks at that time present a perfect example of the type of theological "reasoning" that has generally characterized the campaign to make birth control moral. To quote:

> The Christian church, especially the Roman Catholics, I have been told, will bitterly oppose euthanasia; the legal profession may say there are insuperable obstacles to the passing of laws, and medical men may bring up their Hippocratic oath (dated 400 B. C.).
>
> But common men and women, faced with the practical problems of whether or not they will let their loved ones suffer torment for months before death, will cut through all this ancient red tape and somehow make it possible to do the decent and right thing.
>
> There is sure to be someone who says it is against the Ten Commandments of Moses, who said "Thou shall not kill." Perhaps the time has come to forget Moses and listen to the words of Jesus, "Blessed are the merciful." [4]

From this statement one might well infer that, with the sixth commandment pretty well riddled, the advocates of the mores concept of morality are now out to abolish the other nine, thus broadening the scope of the attack on morality observed by Father Bruehl in 1925. With "Thou shalt not kill" junked as "outmoded," one cannot help wondering what will prevent an impatient and unscrupulous heir from "somehow making it possible" to hasten the death of his prospective life-loving benefactor. The fight to make birth control decent is doing strange things to religion and society.

In December, 1935, a group of thirteen prominent non-Catholic clergymen published a joint statement attacking a sermon in which

[4] Quoted in the New York *Times*, January 17, 1938. Used by permission.

Cardinal Hayes had condemned birth control as immoral. It is rather remarkable, as Cardinal Hayes pointed out in his reply to them, that the criticism of these leaders of religious thought should have made no reference to the moral values involved, making the sole test of the desirability of birth control a utilitarian one, namely, the alleged danger of overpopulation. This incident is but one of many possible examples of the great change in fundamental ethical beliefs on the part of non-Catholic leaders brought about by the might of neo-Malthusian propaganda. One cannot help wondering what the reaction among Protestants will be when it becomes generally realized that the birth-control propaganda concerning the danger of overpopulation was grossly exaggerated and far from scientific, and that America is headed for serious population decline largely on account of it, as we shall see in the following section. Recently the neo-Malthusians have attempted to offset possible reaction. The birth-control leaders' new tack, by which they have been trying to create the impression in recent months that they are in favor of "better spaced" rather than fewer children, will fool no one who is acquainted with their Malthusian heritage and their previous propaganda.

II. Alleged Danger of Overpopulation in America

Regardless of what the true state of affairs was in 1937, the average American, according to Dr. Dublin and other observers, had been convinced by then that his country was in danger of overpopulation. This state of mind might have been expected, in view of the constant reappearance of the Malthusian theory in its different forms, both in treatises on economics and sociology and in the widespread propaganda of the Birth Control League of America. Even though it is hard to believe that any informed person of today is impressed by the alarming estimates of those who have been warning us of the dangers of overpopulation, the widespread acceptance of these figures by at least the the rank and file make them a matter of concern to us here. The "alarmist" predictions can be summed up very briefly.

In 1923, Professor Edward M. East of Harvard wrote a book, *Mankind at the Crossroads,* in which he estimated that both America and the world were traveling at a rapid pace towards a dangerous condition of overpopulation. Shortly afterwards Professor Edward A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin repeated the warning in his *Standing Room Only?* For several years these books became the bases for all sociological treatises on population. Needless to say, both books were heartily wel-

comed by the Birth Control League of America, which saw to it that they were given wide publicity. Professor East compiled an impressive group of figures which indicated that, though it took the entire period of human life on earth to produce a population of about 850,000,000 persons in 1800, it took only a century for this population to double. Dr. East said that, if population increase was to continue at this new rate, doubling each century, and comparative estimates were given to suggest that it would, the pressure of population upon the food supply would soon become acute. For the United States, where the population had increased from a mere 4,000,000 at the time of the first census in 1790 to almost 106,000,000 in 1920, Professor East predicted that by 1980 the population would outgrow the food supply and land area, unless some unforeseen event took place to check its growth. Our agricultural resources, said Professor East, could not support a population of over 166,000,000.

Naturally, such alarming predictions as these aroused a great deal of interest, and the population problem immediately became a subject of more careful study. Two groups of students were especially concerned: first, those who felt that they knew something about the productive capacities of land as well as other sources of food supply; and second, a growing group of research men called the demographers, who were making statistical studies of population. It might be added here that statistics had only recently become a subject of specialized study, but as a result even at this time many of the older statistical calculations made by those who lacked this special training were being criticized and rejected.

I. AGRICULTURAL EXPERTS OBJECT

The estimates of the overpopulation alarmists were challenged first by agricultural experts. Whereas Professor East had estimated that food would not be available for a world population which would exceed 5,200,000,000, and an American population of over 166,000,000, other prognosticators, especially experts in the United States Department of Agriculture, indicated that there were resources enough for a world population of 10,000,000,000 and an American population of 350,000,000. Furthermore, it was pointed out, with the development of irrigation projects and improved agricultural methods, no one could predict accurately the possible unforeseen sources of food supply. In recent years most of us have been amazed at the rapid progress made in the development of synthetic foods and in the discovery of new food values long overlooked in plants all about us. The soya bean, which, according

to a New York *Times* editorial based upon a scientific report, "would alone upset the Malthusian calculations," might be cited as a case in point. This lentil, which, discovered some 25,000 years ago but virtually unknown in the United States as recently as twenty years ago, is said to take fourth place among our agricultural products today, being exceeded only by wheat, corn, and oats. Few people realize what an important factor this "new" soya bean may become in supplying food and other needs of a growing population.

In the first place, it may substitute for the cow on occasion or supplement its supply of milk. Then it is rich in certain vitamins. Soya oil is a good synthetic neighbor to other oils for paint purposes. As a soap its "lathering capacity" (varying as it does with the degree of hydrogenation of the oil) is not affected by the hardness of water. A list of its present uses includes, besides those just mentioned, auto parts, rubber substitutes, floor covering, stock feed, breakfast cereals, flour, infant diet materials, beverages and candy. In its nearly one hundred varieties it creates markets not heretofore open to agricultural products and is a grateful guest of the soil, for it is "chemically beneficial" and "ideal for crop rotation purposes." As for the future, it is predicted that an agricultural product in demand by industry, yielding a large cash crop to farmers and possessing nutritive food values to both man and beast, "cannot long be ignored." The wonder is that it has taken so many centuries to discover its merits.[5]

If modern agriculturists are assuaging the fears of some of those who formerly worried about overpopulation, the chemists are going even further. In fact, some chemists tell us that the farm will not even be necessary in the future, since most food will be produced synthetically in laboratories. Furthermore, they tell us that this food will be balanced, containing just the necessary elements for nutrition, thus relieving the organs of assimilation and digestion of extra work. Though these predictions will probably seem a bit fantastic to most of us, the recent advances of chemistry in the field of synthetic silk, rubber, and other products should suggest that many new foods will be produced synthetically on soilless farms in the future, thus releasing portions of our present agricultural lands to other uses. Finally, the crops of recent years, so large that only "plowing under" could be resorted to in order to dispose of them in some instances, should make any further concern over food shortage seem ridiculous.

2. DEMOGRAPHERS PREDICT POPULATION SHRINKAGE

The predictions of modern agricultural experts and chemists alone greatly weaken the Malthusian case, but the facts brought out recently

[5] The New York *Times*, October 1, 1936.

by the new school of statisticians are even more impressive. These men, who for the most part had no previous association with the Malthusian or neo-Malthusian controversy, seem to have been attracted to study demography or larithmics, as the scientific study of population size is sometimes called, chiefly because they were engaged professionally in compiling vital statistics for insurance companies and other large business concerns. The publications of their "new statistics" on population first began to appear about 1926. To the amazement of social-science students, who by this time had just become accustomed to the practice-birth-control-or-be-overpopulated warnings of Professors Ross, East, Fairchild, and others, these new experts all agreed in denying the danger of overpopulation and in predicting not merely a stationary population in the near future but in most cases even a succeeding decline in population as well. Furthermore, their most recent estimates predict a maximum population at a much earlier date than their former estimates. Where Dublin saw this maximum scheduled for 1970 in his 1931 prediction, he advanced the date to 1950 in 1937, at the same time lowering the estimated size of the maximum population. Some of the most recent estimates are as follows:

AUTHORITY AND DATE OF ESTIMATE	SIZE AND DATE OF MAXIMUM AMERICAN POPULATION
Dublin (1931) [6]	148 million in 1970
Whelpton (1931) [6]	144.6 million in 1970
Thompson and Whelpton (1933) [6]	145 to 190 million in 1980
Lorimer and Osborn (1934) [7]	136 million in 1955
Dublin (1937) [8]	140 to 145 million in 1950

3. SOURCES OF EARLIER STATISTICAL ERRORS

When one considers these forecasts of the demographers and then recalls that, at the time when these figures were announced, many sociologists and economists were still predicting overpopulation for America as well as northwestern Europe and most of the rest of the world, it is a cause of some wonder. Why were practically all the neo-

[6] Lowell J. Reed, "Population Growth and Forecasts," *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, pages 159–166.

[7] F. Lorimer and F. Osborn, *Dynamics of Population* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934).

[8] Quoted in the New York *Times*, March 28, 1937. In July, 1938, the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Committee reported to President Roosevelt that the nation's population of 127,500,000 of 1935 will reach a maximum of 158,000,000 in 1980, to be followed by a decline unless the birth rate increases or immigration policies are changed. The committee also gave a minimum estimate which placed the peak at 138,000,000 in 1955, with a decrease of 10,000,000 in the ensuing twenty-five years. (New York *Times*, July 6, 1938.)

Malthusian social scientists so misled in their own calculations? Several factors known to the modern student of social statistics explain these errors, which we may presume were made in good faith; among them were (a) a failure to analyze the causes of the falling death rate, (b) a failure to distinguish between "life expectancy" and the span of life, and (c) a failure to distinguish between the "true rate of natural increase" and the crude rate.

The Death Rate

The decline in the death rate in the civilized world in recent decades has been rather spectacular. During the fifty-year period ending in 1932 the rates of such countries as the Netherlands, Germany, Russia, and Italy fell approximately 50 per cent, while those of Spain, England, and Wales fell only slightly less. It is true that the birth rate has fallen almost as rapidly in some of these countries, but the fact that there still remains an excess of births over deaths has forestalled most popular concern over the declining birth rate. In 1930 the approximate excess of births over deaths per 1,000 of population in some of the European countries was as follows: Netherlands 14, Italy and Spain 12, Germany 6, Belgium and the United Kingdom 5, and France 2. Carelessness in recording vital statistics makes it impossible to give comparable figures for the United States for this fifty-year period; however, the excess of births over deaths in 1930 was 6.9.

The falling death rate, though a source of legitimate pride to us, has been a cause of much misunderstanding in estimations of the size of future populations. First, let us consider some of the chief causes of the reduction in the general death rate. Briefly, during the period from 1920 to 1934 inclusive, the American death rate from pneumonia was reduced about 42 per cent, and that from tuberculosis was almost halved. Moreover, the deaths of children under two years of age from enteritis and diarrhea have been reduced by about two thirds. In addition, there has been a reduction of the infant mortality rate from all causes from 100 per 1,000 live births in 1915 to about 60 in 1934, a decrease of 40 per cent. The trend in the general death rate in the United States has been steadily downward, with the exception of the period of the influenza epidemic after 1918, and in 1936 it was the lowest in history.

While at first sight the above figures would seem to suggest that adequate compensation is being provided for the declining birth rate, they are very deceptive, as many of those who attempted a few years ago to predict population growth have since found out. First of all, there is a consideration which should have been obvious enough:

while the birth rate may, theoretically, be reduced almost to zero, the death rate cannot be cut down beyond a certain point, since people must die eventually. Second, an analysis of the causes of death shows that death has been thwarted chiefly in diseases of childhood—typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, smallpox, and infant diseases. On the other hand, deaths from the so-called degenerative diseases which affect people in middle life or old age have been reduced very little; in fact, there has even been a marked increase in the crude death rate in many of these diseases, such as diabetes, cancer, and heart disease. Our present death rate of about 9 per thousand may be reduced somewhat, but, according to the prediction of experts, it must soon begin to rise again as we approach a stationary population. As any population approaches such a condition, its age-level necessarily rises and so its death rate increases. It has been figured out that in a stationary population a death rate of 10 could be maintained only if people lived, on the average, about 100 years, which, as we shall see, is far too much to hope for.

Life Expectancy

On account of the great reductions brought about in the death rate for certain diseases in recent decades, many people, upon hearing that the "expectancy of life" has been increased, feel that most Americans may soon hope to reach the century mark. It is true that life expectancy has been increased; this simply means that a young person may expect at birth to live longer than he might have lived had he been born a generation or so ago. In 1850, for example, life expectancy at birth was about forty years; today it is slightly over sixty. We have already seen that almost all of this increase is due to the control of diseases which formerly took so many lives in infancy and childhood, while the death rate from many of the degenerative diseases which begin to take their greatest toll after middle age has actually increased. In the first thirty years of the present century the death rate from cardiac diseases increased from about 140 to 205, while that from cancer increased from about 66 to 96. As a result of this increase in the mortality of the later-in-life diseases, one's life expectancy at 60 today is not quite as much as it was in 1850. When we realize that these two diseases are among the most important causes of death it should be evident that the "span of life" has not been increased, and that one's chances of living to be a hundred are no better than they were a century ago; in fact, they are not so good as they were then. In 1850 American men who reached the age of 60 had a statistical life expectancy of 15.6 years; by 1929 this had decreased to 14.01 years. The expectancy of life for women is slightly

longer than for men. Science has not yet learned how to make centenarians; seemingly they just happen.

Rate of Increase

The older population estimates were often rendered unreliable by another error, a common error in statistical method, namely, the failure to recognize the "true rate of natural increase" as distinct from the crude rate. It is possible, for example, that the vital statistics of a country may show an annual increase in population, because of an excess of births over deaths, while in terms of the future the country is actually failing to reproduce itself. This situation occurs when the age distribution of the population shifts so that the proportion of those bearing no children has become larger than before. This is exactly what has been taking place in the United States (as well as in England, Wales, France, Germany, and Sweden) in recent years, as was first pointed out by members of the new statistical school, such as Kuczynski and others, commencing about 1926.

Demographers use what is known as the population pyramid to show graphically the age distribution of a group. Where the age distribution is normal, the graph of the various layers of a population approximates the form of a pyramid, the smaller elderly groups being near the top and the larger group, children under 5, at the base. In 1930 the base of the United States population pyramid was smaller than the next layer for the first time in history. If this tendency continues, as students of population now predict, the base of the pyramid will continue to shrink while the middle and upper parts bulge, until, with a declining population, the graph will resemble somewhat a spinning top. Although the crude-rate or observed-rate tables still seem to indicate an annual increase in productivity, our true rate of population "growth" has remained on the red side of the ledger since 1930, going down rapidly each year, except for a temporary reduction in this annual rate of decline in 1934.[9] Of course, the true situation will not reveal itself in the crude vital statistics until later, perhaps nearly twenty years hence, if we take the recent estimate of Dr. Dublin concerning the expected arrival of a stationary population. This elusive fact is conducive to a false sense of complacency on the part of those who do not understand the somewhat technical nature of the population statistics. As an example of this confusion reference might be made again to the letter of the thirteen prominent non-Catholic clergymen who attacked

[9] Alfred J. Lotka, "Modern Trends in the Birth Rate," *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, pages 1–13.

Cardinal Hayes's position on birth control in 1935, a letter in which the old fear of overpopulation was suggested by the statement: "A study of the vital statistics of the leading countries in the world proves that while the birth rate has dropped markedly during the last fifty years, the death rate has declined with equal rapidity."

In all the population predictions above it is presumed that the present small immigration quotas, fixed by law in 1924, will remain unchanged. Should we decide later to change our present policy and invite more immigrants, it is quite likely that the countries of northwestern Europe will not supply them, for the population tendencies there are very similar to those of the United States. At present it looks as if it would be a long time before the existing antipathy to increased immigration of any sort can be broken down.

From the facts which we have considered in this section it should be evident to all that overpopulation is no longer a problem for Americans to worry about. Even the former prophets of gloom are now beginning to admit their error, although, unfortunately, fewer people will hear of their retractions than heard of the sensational predictions which they made a little over a decade ago. Professor E. A. Ross, commenting in 1936 upon his earlier book which was so widely heralded by the birth controllers, says: "I was too alarmist as to American and West-European population trends. It has been shown that the age make-up of these populations is such that, *with no more resort to birth control than now exists,* their death rate is bound to rise while their birth rate is bound to fall; so that in two or three decades their problem may be *population shrinkage* rather than *population growth.*"[10] It is quite generally believed by experts that, once our population growth becomes stationary, it will be impossible to keep it at that point. The momentum of decline will result in ultimate shrinkage.

What will happen in a nation whose population is shrinking? Are we commencing to feel the economic and social effects of a population which is growing less rapidly already? These are the questions which the better informed are commencing to ask.

III. Social Effects of a Declining Population

In the decade since Kuczynski's original predictions were made concerning population drifts, students of the population problem have been speculating about the probable social effects of population shrinkage. These observations can be grouped pretty well under four different

[10] *Seventy Years of It* (D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1936), page 299.

headings. Some have seen in the new figures the decline of Western civilization or, at any rate, of the "best nations"; others would confine the evil consequences to economics; all lament the social or economic waste involved in the differential birth rate which seems to be an integral part of America's tendency to population shrinkage; finally, a number of additional effects, some social and some psychological, have been suggested. Taking note of the fact that not all experts admit that a declining population is a social evil, we shall consider these alleged effects of population shrinkage in order.

1. "CIVILIZATION ENDANGERED"

In introducing the British budget for 1935 the Chancellor of the Exchequer remarked, "I must say that I look upon the continual diminution of the birth rate in this country with considerable apprehension." This government official may have been more concerned about the future size of the British army and navy than about the general social welfare of Great Britain, but some people believe that, as the contagious scourges of treaty-breaking and rule by brute force spread over large portions of the globe, the two interests are, unfortunately, by no means incompatible. While there is a modern tendency outside military circles to belittle the "cannon fodder" argument for population growth, the grim realities of recent European politics have led others to believe that under existing conditions "preparedness" is the price which must be paid for the maintenance of the best in Western culture and that preparedness demands men to man battleships. Some of the alleged cultural and political aspects of population decline are described, from the British viewpoint again, in the following observations by Dr. E. R. Roper Power:

> There are many who are moved by considerations of national and imperial patriotism. To such, the prospect of a decline in population, with its corollary of a decline in cultural and political prestige, will not be welcome. But much more than prestige is at stake. The existence of a culture is threatened. The white population of the British Empire is no longer reproducing itself and no longer can it rely on a steady stream of immigration from the mother country. Moreover, there are other races which are still increasing rapidly. "A flood is rising which cannot long be kept back by the immigration barriers of a dwindling people." The position of countries such as Australia and New Zealand is very vulnerable. Even if the international and political consequences be looked upon objectively, it must be admitted that the declining fertility of this country and the rest of Western Europe will give rise, not merely to changes in the relative importance of different nations and cultures, but that the tension in international affairs can but be heightened. The

bitterness of competition, both commercial and political, increases when the prizes to be competed for, markets or territories, decline in size.[11]

It must be admitted that Dr. Power's argument, however veiled, is chiefly an appeal for the preservation of the *status quo* and "white supremacy." That cultural advancement would be impeded under the domination of the blacks or the yellow race or some other Western nation might well be challenged by a non-British or non-Caucasoid critic. But something more than the collapse of the British Empire is threatened by population shrinkage, according to a recent editorial in the New York *Times,* which had as its theme the idea that despotism must not be allowed to exceed us in babies any more than we permit it to surpass us in armaments. Our approaching population decline, when viewed in the light of recent events in Europe and the Orient, suggests to the *Times* the need of "more democratic babies."

> Reluctantly people have recognized in this country and in Britain that Hitler and Mussolini and General Araki must not be allowed to have all the guns. So we may get around some day to recognize that despotism must not be allowed to have all the babies. Hitler and Mussolini are offering premiums to the mothers of future soldiers. Democracy may decide to encourage more babies to be grown into free men. To combat excessive birth restriction we may yet see bonuses or wage allowances for the heads of moderately large families.[12]

Though this last argument, at any rate, will probably appeal to many Americans today, it must be confessed that it is based upon a rank pessimism which assumes that force is the best line of defense in our present civilization. Must we admit that modern nationalism, bad as it is, has really brought us to this impasse?

2. AMERICAN ECONOMIC WELFARE AFFECTED

As might be expected, there is considerable difference of opinion concerning the validity of the arguments given in the previous section. While it cannot be said that there is unanimity in predicting the probable economic effects of population decline, at least the great majority of experts see in prospect changes which will not benefit our economic life. Some assert that the recent depression and recession were caused to some extent by a stunted market resulting from the retardation of population growth. In fact, it is customary now to speak of our present retarded growth and our future decline collectively under the title of

[11] "Population Prospects II," *The Tablet* (London), Volume 171, January 29, 1938, page 135. Used by permission.

[12] "Topics of the Times," January 20, 1938. Used by permission.

population shrinkage. Among the first changes which, economists say will accompany this falling population will be an increase in the number of abandoned farms, idle factories, and vacant houses as the proportion of adults, who must produce, to children, who only consume, becomes greater. This in turn will bring lower interest returns, which will discourage private capital from entering these fields. They tell us also that the psychological effect of all of this will very likely be depressing, thus further restricting all business activities. Though the subject is a new one, some writers have already taken it up in some detail.

W. S. Thompson points out that American business has always operated upon the assumption of a growing population, which assumption up to now has been a valid one. Before the World War every decade brought an increase of from 20 to 35 per cent in the number of customers. With this constant source of increased trade beginning to be shut off, Thompson feels that our present economic structure is facing a new type of crisis. With tariff barriers being set up at the same time to prevent the expansion of our foreign trade, and American business leaders showing a selfish tendency to maintain profits by monopolistic methods rather than by increasing the individual purchasing power of the worker, Thompson regards our industrial future as rather dark. Similarly, in regard to farming he sees a picture which is none too reassuring. Even though the loss of our foreign grain market, at the same time that farmers were ceasing to feed grain to horses which were being replaced by tractors and automobiles, was an important cause of the recent agricultural depression, he points out that the simultaneous shrinkage of the American consuming market through a slower population growth is already a larger factor in our agricultural distress than is generally realized.[13]

3. THE DIFFERENTIAL BIRTH RATE AND SOCIAL WASTE

Professor S. J. Holmes and Monsignor John A. Ryan have both pointed out certain unfortunate social effects (which are taking place already) of the recent decline in the birth rate. Professor Holmes says that it is bringing about a disproportionate decline in the numbers of what he calls our "best" people. After showing that the decline is taking place much more rapidly in the upper and middle classes than among the less fortunate, he says that "with the possible exception of some agricultural colleges in the South and the West, the parents of our college students probably represent a group which is failing to re-

[13] *Population Problems* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935), pages 260–264.

produce itself at the present time."[14] This group he regards as representative of the intelligent, thrifty element of the population from which we receive most of our leadership. It is notorious that college graduates as a group likewise have small families.

In commenting upon the differential birth rate, Monsignor John A. Ryan reminds us that there are authorities who emphasize the importance of heredity much less than Professor Holmes, and that the deliberate "race suicide" policy of the higher economic and social classes will only make more room at the top for those who are physically and *morally* stronger. However, he agrees to some extent with Professor Holmes's viewpoint inasmuch as he laments the social waste involved "in the disappearance of an exceptionally intelligent and competent group and the cost of raising and training another group to take their places." Monsignor Ryan also indicates another early social effect of a declining population, namely, a weakening of the moral fiber of a nation. He points out that, even when a population is within two or three decades of shrinkage, but when most families are having less than four children and people are beginning to prefer animal self to rational self and egoistic things to altruistic things, they are already in a condition of moral decadence, a condition which ultimately must affect social life generally. In such a society, he says, "There already exists a devastating amount of softness, luxury and materialism and a fatal decrease of mental and moral discipline, of endurance and of the power of achievement."[15]

4. MISCELLANEOUS EFFECTS

In addition to the detrimental effects of population shrinkage upon business and agriculture, Professor Thompson indicates many other changes, not necessarily injurious perhaps, among which are the following: (1) The school system will have to be reorganized on account of an increase in the proportion of old and middle-aged people and a decrease of children. Whereas people over forty-five made up only about 23 per cent of our population in 1930, present trends indicate that they will comprise 40 per cent in 1980, while those under twenty, who constituted nearly 40 per cent in 1930, will drop to 25 per cent. The elementary schools have already commenced to be affected by the fact that there were fewer children under five in 1930 than in 1920. In 1935 more children were graduated from the elementary schools than ever

[14] *The Eugenic Predicament* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1933), page 87.
[15] *Seven Troubled Years* (Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, 1937), page 119.

will be again. Estimates based upon a study of present trends show that there will be over eleven million fewer people in the five-to-nineteen age group by 1980. (2) Social-work emphasis will have to shift from child welfare to the problems of an older population. Existing endowments for children's homes may go begging, while the demand for old-age pensions will increase. Meanwhile, the taxes to support the ever-increasing old-age group will fall upon a diminishing group of younger people. (3) We shall become more conservative in our economic and political life. Not only will there be a greater percentage of older people in control of business and governmental affairs, but psychologically older people will be less willing to change the *status quo*. Consequently, opportunities for youth will be fewer, and some of the more ambitious or restless may have to migrate to other lands if internal disorders are to be avoided, since the American frontier has passed. Furthermore, it is suggested that with an increasing proportion of persons too old to work efficiently it will be difficult to increase the per capita production of workers and to raise the standard of living.[16]

Dr. Dublin is of the opinion that with the popular awakening to the statistical facts, which must come soon, the effect upon the psychology of the nation may be bad. There will be a depressing feeling, not altogether dissociated from fact, perhaps, that America has had its day. If the decline continues, eventually we may come to regard ourselves as a beaten people, burdened with the weight of unused facilities constructed for a large population and of a crushing overhead to be paid for by fewer people. Commenting upon the effects of population decline upon future social work, at the 1937 National Conference of Catholic Charities, Bishop Aloisius J. Muench, of Fargo, warned that with the increased proportion of the aged there might arise a demand for "mercy killings" of the aged on the part of the future successors of those who now advocate sterilization and birth control.

5. CONCLUSION

Though the great majority of expert opinions indicate that the social effects of a future stationary and declining population are fraught with evil for America, it must be admitted that there are a few qualified observers who do not agree that all the predicted evil social effects will follow. Some even say that the good effects may more than compensate for the evil ones. Although these optimists have not yet answered all the arguments of their opponents, they point out, in general, that a

[16] Warren S. Thompson, *Population Problems* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935), pages 264–266.

decreasing population, by concentrating farming and mining on the richer lands and industry in the more efficient factories, may thereby produce a higher standard of living for all. Furthermore, they tell us that there has been too much of a tendency in the past to assume that the huge benefits which accrue to the captains of industry and finance are distributed proportionately to the rank and file. Because of this delusion, they say, we should hesitate hereafter to accept the claims of the big businessmen who, like modern statesmen, regard population growth as beneficial to national welfare, for "profitable business enterprise" and "community welfare" are not necessarily synonymous terms. In view of this difference of opinion concerning the economic effects of population shrinkage, and especially in view of the fact that such misleading emotional factors as nationalism and racial prejudice are interwoven with many of the arguments which favor population growth, it is impossible to say definitely that economists have proved that population shrinkage is an unmitigated evil. The recent report of the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Committee indicated no alarm about the future downward trend. It even suggested that such a trend might afford a chance to work out better human relations.

Instead of dwelling longer upon the disputed prophecies concerning the effects of a declining population, we may find it more helpful to leave this controversy for the present and turn to consider the light which may be thrown upon this problem by a consideration of the so-called "optimum" population concept. In this matter of numbers, has anyone shown that there is some "best" size of population for America? If those who have been working upon the new optimum theory are able to set up a certain number for us as that of the best population, then it should be relatively easy for us to evaluate present and expected population drifts simply by comparing them with the optimum.

IV. The Optimum Population

1. Definitions of "Overpopulation"

One of the most recent trends to be introduced into discussions of the population problem is that of the optimum population. In attempting to analyze the meaning of optimum ("best") as it applies to the population situation, we are forced to drop back and consider more carefully the meaning of what we have hitherto accepted as a rather obvious term, namely, overpopulation. After we have seen the different senses in which the word "overpopulation" has been used, we shall be

in a better position to understand the problems involved in defining the optimum population.

It is an unfortunate fact that in much of the controversy which has taken place about the danger of overpopulation the word "overpopulation" has been used by various writers in different senses. Consequently, when a modern observer looks back over the long population controversy, it is often difficult for him to tell which of at least three possible senses a particular writer had in mind. (a) Most of the writers of the last century seem to have used "overpopulation" in an absolute sense to mean a population so swollen that the available food resources would not be sufficient to enable it to live. It is in this sense, that is, in reference to subsistence, that the word is still understood in the popular mind today. (b) More recently it has become the fashion to interpret overpopulation in terms of a so-called economic law of "diminishing returns." According to this interpretation, sometimes called the relative in contrast to the absolute sense, it is maintained that, after a certain point has been reached in population growth, increasing amounts of food can be obtained only with so great an expenditure of effort as to involve a comparative economic loss. If a particular farm were to be used as an illustration of this viewpoint, it could be pointed out that increasing the number of workers on the given acreage would result in additional output per worker up to a certain point. After this point of diminishing returns had been reached, the return per worker would gradually decrease. According to this definition there would be overpopulation when the point of diminishing return had been passed. (c) The third and most recent viewpoint is that of the optimum, which holds that there is a certain "best" population for a country and that, once this has been exceeded, there is overpopulation. According to some authors the optimum is based solely on economic factors and so is not much different from the theory of diminishing returns. In regard to each theory the neo-Malthusians would, of course, advocate population restriction by contraceptive means once a condition of overpopulation is regarded as imminent.

Superficial Ideas of Overpopulation

There are several different situations which at first sight may be mistaken for overpopulation. Six such instances may be cited.

A superficial observer might say that density of population is the clue to the existence of overpopulation. If we consider recent figures on the density per square mile by nation, the population density of Japan proper (440), China proper (about 370), Italy (341), and British India

(248) might seem excessive and alarming when compared with the density of Argentina (10), Spain (11), Brazil (12), Russia (18), and the United States (41). Yet one seldom hears France (191), Denmark (201), Germany (345), or the United Kingdom (496) spoken of as overpopulated, even though their density far exceeds that of all the second group of nations and the density of some of them exceeds that of some of the former. The inhabitants of these rather densely populated nations of northwestern Europe also have high standards of living, and there is no indication of famine, disease, or epidemics known to be caused by widespread undernourishment. The same can be said of Holland (562) and Belgium (674) with their much greater population density. Density of population, therefore, is not the index to overpopulation.

Second, it cannot be said that a nation is overpopulated today when it does not grow enough food to feed its inhabitants, even though it may be true that a barren rock in midocean might be overpopulated with only one person. Great Britain is a nation which produces less than half of its own food supply; yet its people are well fed because manufactured articles are exchanged with other nations for food through world trade. Whether a nation is overpopulated or not seems to depend more upon its stage of social, economic, and political development than upon density and food-productivity.

Third, if we considered the number of persons per square mile of *arable land* in 1930, we might say offhand that Japan, which with 2,853 persons per square mile leads the world in this respect, was certainly overcrowded, especially when the United States with its mere 221 persons per square mile is considered. Yet a second look at the arable land figures indicates that Great Britain, Netherlands, and Switzerland, countries not usually regarded as overpopulated, all rank close to Japan, each having over two thousand persons per square mile.

In a fourth situation one may even point to some nation in which large numbers are constantly underfed and frequently ravished by devastating famines. Yet even in this case it cannot be said that nature has produced too many people for the area if a change in the existing socioeconomic or political organization would bring relief. This, we maintain, would be a case of social disorganization rather than overpopulation in any sense of the word. We shall consider this case more in detail later in connection with population problems in the Far East. To consider a more precise situation, Gillette and Reinhardt say that overpopulation takes place in a highly industrialized society "when the masses of people are unable to earn incomes sufficient to maintain

them in health, efficient working conditions, and to maintain the standards of living required for civilized existence." [17] Some might say that America was overpopulated even before 1929 according to this definition, for certainly a large portion of the "masses" were unable to earn enough to maintain "the standards of living required for civilized existence," if we mean by "civilized existence" an American living wage. However, most economists would probably say that our low wage at that time was due to the fact that the "masses" were deprived of their share of the nation's income by the operation of an unjust *laissez-faire* economic system rather than by any "overpopulation." If we are to accept the Gillette and Reinhardt definition, the question arises as to what is meant by a universal "decent standard of living." Is it to be based upon the American estimate, or should people be reasonably contented in another land with much less? Gillette and Reinhardt, after admitting that there are no Western nations "in which the income of the masses is not sufficient to cover expenditures of food alone in a lavish manner," go on to point out that many families skimp expenditures for food in order to satisfy other wants "such as autos and movies." From this they conclude: "There is already considerable overpopulation in several European nations." [18] But does this conclusion necessarily follow? Some might say that there would be no overpopulation in these nations, according to this viewpoint, if there were fewer movies and autos, neither of which are absolute necessities. Moreover, must one assume that it is impossible to improve the existing social organization of these countries so as to permit a wider use of autos? Finally, if one attempts to present a hypothetical situation in which a progressively rising standard of living is matched against a population that continues to increase up to the full measure of its biological capacity, as some of the neo-Malthusians do, it is quite possible or even probable that a condition of overpopulation would result, since there must be some limit to the productive capacity of the earth. But such a proposition would seem to assume not only an unnatural birth rate, but also, after a certain point, an unreasonably high standard of living as well.

From these considerations it should be evident that "overpopulation" is a most deceptive term and almost incapable of definition except by subjective standards. What would appear as overpopulation to an aristocrat might be regarded as social disorganization by one less favor-

[17] John M. Gillette and James M. Reinhardt, *Current Social Problems* (American Book Company, New York, 1937), page 81.
[18] *Ibid.*, page 83.

ably situated. Where one critic would make excessive human fecundity the villain in the plot, another would blame excessive greed and a lack of respect for principles of social justice. Until very recently it was customary for neo-Malthusians to say that most wars were caused by overpopulation. Analysis of the term and further study of the causes of war have led many of them to qualify the old charge by saying that the *belief* that overpopulation exists causes war, as it probably does at times. Some of the more vehement advocates of contraception regarded the depression unemployment problem as evidence of overpopulation. They said there was overpopulation when some starved in the midst of plenty. Most population authorities ridicule this. Since one's definition of overpopulation involves so many subjective factors, such as different standards of living and different ethical viewpoints, any definition is likely to be pretty subjective.

Because of the confusion which surrounds any definition of overpopulation, it should be more timely, as well as more profitable, to try to understand the meaning of the optimum concept and the possibility of achieving an ideal number of people. For that matter the more alert neo-Malthusians, who realize that there is no longer any conceivable danger of absolute overpopulation and that because of inventions and new techniques the law of diminishing returns is scarcely a law at all, are now seeking refuge in the concept of optimum population when they see fit to talk at all of the danger of overpopulation.

2. "OPTIMUM" IS OBSCURE

It would seem as if the question as to what is the "best" or optimum population, that is, neither underpopulation nor overpopulation, must have been discussed to some extent ever since men first began to consider the population problem. In a primitive tribe dependent upon hunting and fishing for subsistence and little concerned about anything except food gathering, the visualized optimum was probably that population which provided sufficient food gatherers to feed the tribe and at the same time did not deplete the game supply so as to make food-getting too difficult. When such a tribe became concerned in addition with the problem of defending its game preserve against a hostile neighbor, the optimum was probably changed to include a sufficient number of fighting men. More than likely something approaching the maximum population became the optimum in this situation. On the other hand, we have already seen that Plato and Aristotle advocated the legal restriction of the size of the population to a desired optimum for their ideal states, although actual population control by means of abor-

tion, unnatural love, and infanticide got out of control and resulted in unforeseen population shrinkage in some of the ancient Grecian city-states. Whenever the later nations of the West visualized any particular population as ideal during the long centuries which followed, it was probably the maximum. With disease and warfare often cutting down population growth at a terrific rate, there must have been little long-time concern, outside particular localities, about overpopulation. With the birth of modern nationalism in the period which followed the Middle Ages, the military statesmen favored a maximum population and found few to dispute the wisdom of their policy. During the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the mercantilists in addition were influential in making a growing population popular by urging it as a necessary condition of economic welfare.

A Value Concept

From what has already been said it should be apparent that any discussion of the optimum-population concept must of necessity bring up the question of values. Does one mean the "best" population for business, for war, or for wholesome social life generally, or what? The Chamber of Commerce concept of "best" in the average American city would probably emphasize a rapidly growing population with each person becoming a potential new customer. On the other hand, the unorganized automobile worker probably would not favor his company's policy of attracting unneeded help to the city through misleading advertising, as has happened, since he knows that without independent unions the amount of his wages tends to vary inversely with the length of the line at the employment office. When one speaks of the "best" population, perhaps he should answer the question "best for whom?" at the same time.

One group of modern population students regards the optimum size purely as an engineering problem. According to this frankly materialistic concept the optimum is the size which furnishes that labor supply which when fully utilized "is necessary to operate the total resources of land, materials, and instrumental capital at the point of least (labor) cost per unit of product or income." [19] This concept of Professor A. B. Wolfe would make the measure of optimum population primarily quantitative and "not one of ethics." There is, on the other hand, a sizeable group which opposes this economic or materialistic evaluation of optimum population as being too narrow and partial, and which maintains that values other than simple efficiency in the production of eco-

[19] *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, page 246.

nomic goods must be considered in gauging human welfare. This latter viewpoint, which is sometimes called the welfare concept, holds that man must be viewed as a human being fit for civilization and that, when he is so regarded, economics is not the whole of life. Thus Professor Donald R. Taft feels that a reasonable definition of the optimum "would be in terms of maximum development of all sides of the personality—of fullness of life." [20] This welfare optimum would vary necessarily according to time and locality; at one time or place it might favor cultural advancement through a smaller family than the economic engineers would advocate; at another time or place some urgent social need might be fostered better by a larger family than would be advisable as far as maximum economic benefits were concerned.

Whichever of these positions one takes in defining the optimum population, there still remains considerable obscurity. If he accepts the materialistic viewpoint, he is confronted with the fact that there can be no one definite optimum over a long period of time because of constant changes in the quality and quantity of resources and variations in the technique of their utilization. W. S. Thompson has enumerated about twenty different conditions which influence the attainment of the economic optimum population at any time for a particular area. On the other hand, according to the broader welfare standard, intellectual, moral, and personal values must be considered, over which there is apt to be so much difference of opinion that statistical formulation is impossible.

As we proceed to consider the optimum concept, it gradually becomes more evident that in our complex social life it is almost impossible to establish any exact norm as the optimum population, and that, even if the norm were discovered, it would be almost impossible to achieve it. Recently E. F. Penrose suggested that a "welfare optimum" might be arrived at for a nation by the "consensus of experts." According to this "planned population" viewpoint, a nation which *thinks* that it is overpopulated could, by changing its habits gradually, attain the optimum determined by experts. Yet, as Professor Taft points out, even if a people should believe that the country is overpopulated, it might be difficult to get them to change their existing consumption habits to conform to the demands of the experts. We might add that for the same reasons it would be even more difficult to get them to change their reproduction habits, once the practice of contraception had become widespread, simply because the experts thought the country underpopulated. Similarly, Professor Wolfe concludes, concerning his norm, that, even if we could

[20] *Human Migration* (The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936), page 107.

arrive at an optimum that was definite, it would be hard to imagine a social control authoritative enough to enforce it.

It would seem to be increasingly evident that the optimum population is a value concept, and that there are in consequence almost as many opinions concerning what the optimum is as there are criteria accepted as bases for evaluation. Though the problem of determining the optimum population is laden with many difficulties, Professor Wolfe, for one, would not permit these to discourage us from attempting to seek its solution, pointing out that it is only in the last twenty years that this concept has had a prominent place in the literature of economics because of the "stranglehold" which Malthusian logic had upon the thinking of most economists. Since so much of this Malthusian logic in recent years has been dominated by the non-Catholic idea of contraception, it certainly cannot be out of place here to suggest briefly some viewpoints or "values" which Catholics believe essential to the optimum population concept, if we are to continue to use this vague term at all.

3. CATHOLIC VALUES AND THE OPTIMUM CONCEPT

What is the chief value to be considered in working out a population policy? The Malthusian groups say, "Take care of *quantity* first"; the eugenists say, "Take care of *biological quality* first." Differing in its viewpoint from both these schools, the Catholic philosophy of population has always placed *moral quality* first. The last school is more concerned with good people than with goodly numbers of so-called "good stock." Perhaps the basic tenet of its population policy can be summed up in the oft-quoted slogan of Father Pesch, S.J.: "Where the quality of a people is safeguarded, there need be no fear for its quantity." This slogan points very definitely towards a "welfare" optimum rather than a materialistic one. It emphasizes established values of individual and social ethics; furthermore, it assumes that inner controls, if functioning properly, can usually achieve these values without strong authoritative social controls. Of course, it recognizes that, men being what they are, a certain amount of legislation in keeping with ethical principles will usually be necessary to achieve its ideal. However, its basic appeal is to the conscience of the individual rather than to outside force.

Christianity has never taught that "increase and multiply" means that parents have an obligation to have all the children they are biologically able to have or more than they can reasonably support, as it has erroneously been accused of doing. Yet the rather mild admonition that, other things being equal, a greater number of people will give greater glory to God might possibly be interpreted as a slight leaning

towards the maximum-population ideal, even though the motives here would differ from those prompting militarists or mercantilists. It is possible, of course, that patriotic motives in times of military stress may have led individual churchmen to make statements which reflected the viewpoint of militarists more than that of the Church. Finally, it should be recalled that the original injunction to "increase and multiply" was given in a world whose population was almost nil, and this Scriptural passage cannot be said to apply in the same manner in a world where this emergency has long since passed. Relative to this Scriptural passage Bishop John F. Noll writes as follows:

> Many entertain a prejudice against these words of the Almighty addressed to Adam, and again to Noe, and still again to Abraham. In fact they are very much misunderstood. People read in them an actual command to everybody to marry and become the parents of as many children as is possible.
>
> Such is not the meaning of Almighty God's words recorded in Genesis many times. When God directed these words to Adam and Eve they were childless, and He would have them know that He was going to bless them with "other selves," the greatest possession they could have. It was after the Deluge that He addressed these same words to Noe, when it was necessary that the world be re-peopled, and the words were pregnant with blessing. The words were addressed to Abraham when he lamented the fact that he had no child, and the Lord told him that he would be "blessed" with seed as numerous as the grains of sand on the sea shore.
>
> Paternity and maternity were, in the Old Law, considered as a special blessing from Heaven, while sterility was regarded as the greatest temporal punishment that Heaven could send.[21]

If the Church has usually tended to encourage rather than to discourage births, it is probably because she recognizes the fact that most people do not have to be encouraged to avoid self-sacrifice; nor has the Church ever been inclined to encourage people to sin, since it has always known that the chief means of achieving childless marriages are contraception and abortion. At any rate, it seems quite likely that Christianity leaned towards the maximum-population ideal during the early centuries while it was engaged in combating the demoralizing influence of the depopulating practices of Greece and Rome on family life. When in more recent times Catholic economists joined with the socialists in making the first attacks upon the population-reducing Malthusian ideal, which, as we have seen, would have discouraged most social reforms and humane legislation in the interests of the *status quo,* many people again began to associate the Catholic Church more directly with the maximum-population ideal. Finally, the Catholic Church's bitter opposition

[21] *A Catechism on Birth Control* (pamphlet) (Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana, 1938), pages 28–29. Used by permission.

to the contraceptive methods urged by the neo-Malthusians seemed to put her very definitely into the maximum-ideal group, in the minds of many of those who rejected the Church's teaching on birth control. Unfortunately, the Church's motives in this matter do not seem to be understood by some of these critics, as would appear to be indicated by the suggestion of an author of a recent college text on the population problem, that one of the motives which inclined her towards the maximum-population ideal was the desire to increase the "power of the priests."

The Catholic viewpoint, in brief, holds that, if people observe correct values, there can be no serious problem of either overpopulation or underpopulation. Christian virtues will act as regulators of both population extremes, preventing mankind from dying out upon the earth as well as slowing down the rate of growth by ethical means whenever necessary. For a summary of the Catholic viewpoint it is hard to improve upon the following statement of Monsignor John A. Ryan even though it was written in 1909, when many people were somewhat alarmed about the danger of overpopulation.

> Where production is effectively organized, and wealth justly distributed; where the morals of the people render them industrious, frugal, averse to debilitating comforts, and willing to refrain from all immoral practices in the conjugal relation; where a considerable proportion of the people embrace the condition of religious celibacy and others live chastely and yet defer marriage for a longer or shorter period, and many emigrate whenever the population of any region becomes congested—undue pressure of population upon subsistence will never occur except locally and temporarily.[22]

Sufficient has been said here about the general policy of the Church concerning population growth. Some of the specific values which Catholics would emphasize in any population program for the future will be commented upon in the next chapter.

In this chapter we have seen that with the appearance of the modern demographer the Malthusian fear of overpopulation became ridiculous, at least as far as modern America is concerned. Since the United States of the near future is faced with the prospect of a shrinking population, we tried to find out whether or not this would be a good or an evil thing. Though we saw some very strong economic and social arguments which suggested that shrinkage will be a social evil, we found that not everyone agrees with this conclusion. Nor did an examination of the new optimum-population concept throw any more light upon this problem. Since our efforts up to this point have failed to uncover any

[22] "Population," *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

generally accepted social evaluation for the phenomena of population shrinkage, some new approach to the problem would seem to be necessary. This we propose to take up in the following chapter.

(See the references at the end of Chapter XII.)

CHAPTER VII

ARE WE DYING OUT NATURALLY?

Is shrinkage, the present trend in American population, anything we need to worry about? In the last chapter we saw that it is difficult if not impossible to determine in advance just what size of population is best for the United States. Nor, apparently, can we prove beyond all dispute that a stationary or declining population will be an economic or social evil. Some new approach to the question would seem to be in order. The approach which we propose to make in these chapters will be that of analyzing the *causes* of the present trend. If no great amount of evil can be found in these causes, then it would seem to be impossible to attach any valuation to the present trend; on the other hand, if these causes necessarily involve certain things which are contrary to the "good life," then to this extent at least the present trend will have to be regarded as an evil. It is conceivable, of course, that population might decline because of some mysterious physiological disorder—such as inherent sterility—or some equally irremediable factor.

It is frequently said that delayed marriage, necessitated by a longer period devoted to education, explains America's recent decline in population growth. Unfortunately, our problem cannot be explained away as easily as this. While delayed marriage brought about by the added years devoted to higher education has been a factor in reducing the birth rate in the upper middle-class groups, it is not yet an important factor in the case of the majority of the population. In fact, in the large working-class group there has been a slight decrease in the age of marriage, thus offsetting to a considerable extent the advancing age in other groups. For the nation in general bride and groom are not older, on the average, than they were forty years ago. Nor, contrary to prevailing opinion, has there been any decrease in the frequency of marriage or in the proportion of married women in our population, with the exception of three of the depression years, 1933, 1934, and 1935. The marriage rate has remained practically stationary since 1880, except for some of the depression years. However, the possible effect of a permanent falling off in the number of marriages may be gathered

from the fact that it is estimated that the loss of births due to this cause alone between January 1, 1930, and December 31, 1935, may have exceeded a million.

The first reaction of some people to the figures cited in the last chapter may be the observation that perhaps the white race is dying out through inherent natural causes so that nothing can be done about it. Therefore, before proceeding to consider the various possible "voluntary" causes of population shrinkage, or those brought about in some way by human planning, it will be well to attempt to measure the possible influence of involuntary biological sterility as a cause of our reduced birth rate. Having disposed of this, which we shall see to be a minor cause of our declining birth rate, we shall proceed to consider what we may call the major or voluntary causes of population shrinkage.

Involuntary sterility is without doubt the cause of some childlessness in marriage, but just how much it is difficult to say because it is impossible to get adequate statistics upon this subject. Some gynecologists have estimated that as many as 10 or 12 per cent of our marriages are involuntarily sterile. Other students of the problem have said that these figures are much too high because the doctors who compiled them made a specialty of curing sterility and so, by judging from the large number of these cases that came to them for treatment, received a false impression of the proportion of such cases among married people in general. Evidence to bear this out is suggested by statistics from other sources, which indicate that only about half of this amount of sterility is involuntary.[1]

I. Population Maturity Laws

From time to time various evolutionary and cyclical theories have been proposed in an attempt to explain variations in the fecundity and sterility of different racial and cultural groups. Spencer developed the idea suggested by Darwin (who in turn got the idea of the "survival of the fittest" from reading Malthus), that the process of natural selection increases individuality and decreases fecundity in the higher species. Since the more advanced forms of animal life can protect their offspring better than the lower forms, nature realizes that few need to be born in order that a higher species may perpetuate itself. By analogy it is suggested that nature makes the more advanced human races less fecund. While this, like many other theories, has a certain amount of

[1] Warren S. Thompson, *Population Problems* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935), pages 159–162.

surface plausibility, its inadequacy as a human population law is seen immediately when it is recalled that some of the most primitive tribes of humans have a low birth rate. This low rate exists, it is believed, because of a lack of soft cooked foods, which makes it necessary for mothers to nurse their babies for a period of years, a process which tends to delay the return of menstruation and so the ability to conceive again.

Nitti and Dumont have theories concerning population maturity which are somewhat like Spencer's, though founded upon more plausible reasons. The general idea of these authors, whose proposals are sometimes called "social capillarity" (tendency to rise) theories, is that a rise in the stage of either individual or group culture decreases fecundity, not because of some innate biological law, as Spencer had it, but by reason of an increase in the number of man's desires. According to these theories, the desire for sex life and offspring is submerged as it is forced to compete with a host of new and equally attractive wants. However, as the critics of this theory have pointed out, this alleged tendency cannot be a law, for it does not hold true for China, at least, nor for the city of Stockholm, where recent sample studies indicate that the educated and prosperous have more children than the uneducated and poor.[2] Furthermore, critics say that the decline in fecundity among some of the Western groups, which seems to follow the alleged capillarity law, has been brought about by a greater knowledge and use of birth control among the upper-class groups rather than by any decrease in the relative importance of sex desires among them. In other words, the desire for offspring has been crowded out by new interests, while sex desire and satisfaction have remained unchanged. At any rate, it has been found that in practically every country where the generally raised economic status accompanying the Industrial Revolution has been in effect for any length of time the national fertility has declined. Likewise, in most instances, fertility has declined most rapidly in those particular families that have reaped the greatest material advantages from the new economic order. Rae, whose theory is very similar to those of Nitti and Dumont, is so convinced that a competing-desires law operates to reduce fertility that he even advocates that it be applied as a practical means to avoid overpopulation. He says that, if we raise the cultural stage of a fecund group, multiplication of desires will follow, and that this will tend to diminish the urge of the former desire for off-

[2] Frank W. Notestein, "Class Differences in Fertility." *The Annals*. Volume 188. November, 1936, pages 26–36.

spring and so reduce the national birth rate of nations and groups that are now regarded as growing too rapidly.

In addition to these theories, many other ideas have been proposed to account for variations in fecundity. Almost a hundred years ago Thomas Doubleday suggested that the reduced alkalinity of the blood brought about by indolence and overfeeding among the wealthy classes might be an important factor in reducing fecundity; similarly, acidosis has been blamed by others. Dr. Raymond Pearl has tried recently to explain human population growths by comparisons with the animal and insect kingdoms. He points out that after a certain point the more a farmer feeds his cattle the less fertile they become. From this analogy he attempts to explain why the poor have more children than the rich. Food variations explain differences in growth among nations as well as cycles of growth within nations, he believes. He thinks that fertility curves worked out in the study of fruit flies correspond closely with certain population changes among many nations. Several other more or less intricate theories, such as those of Cox and Gini, which resemble Pearl's, have been proposed at different times to explain the rapid increase of population in England and Wales during the last three decades of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth century. A simple and very plausible one is that which attributes this increase chiefly to a decreasing mortality rate brought about by a greater knowledge of disease control. In accounting for the retarded fecundity among individuals today, Enid Charles has suggested that the adoption of strong soaps and increased bathing is responsible for considerable involuntary sterility among women of the upper classes. Other writers have contended that high-tension city life in itself tends to induce a psychological sterility, if not a physiological sterility, in some people. And so on.

Judging from the numerous and frequently conflicting opinions concerning the cause of population fluctuations, it would seem evident that there is no "law" of population growth which is beyond human control. So many factors, cultural as well as biological, are involved in human population growth that the possibility of ever discovering a law which will apply to all nations and groups seems rather remote. However, this does not mean that all the theories above are necessarily erroneous; to what extent they may operate at particular times and places is a problem for future research to decide. Recent discoveries by chemists have suggested that class variations in the consumption of vitamin E may effect class variations in the rates of fecundity.

II. Involuntary Sterility in Individuals

In addition to any effects that may follow from the operation of population maturity laws, if they be laws, it is a well-known fact that many people are sterile through no deliberate choice of their own. In some instances this is due to a physical deformity; in others it seems to be the result of some previous experience. Two causes of the latter type of involuntary sterility are important enough to be considered here: (a) contraceptives, (b) venereal diseases.

1. CONTRACEPTIVES

In his *Judgment on Birth Control,* Dr. R. de Guchteneere, a Belgian gynecologist, devotes an entire chapter to the medical aspects of birth control. He first enumerates the various methods of contraception in use, and then points out not only how each one is injurious, but how it may lead directly or indirectly to sterility. Nor is his indictment of artificial birth-control methods open to the valid criticism made by some of the recent birth-control leaders against somewhat similar evidence, namely, that these dangers are attributable only to some of the older and largely abandoned methods of contraception. According to Dr. de Guchteneere, whose viewpoint in this matter corresponds with that found in similar books by Dr. Sutherland, Father Moore, and others, every known method of artificial birth control is objectionable from the viewpoint of either bodily or mental health, if not both. Authority after authority is cited by de Guchteneere to show that, regardless of the particular method used to prevent conception, in time nature usually exacts a penalty, and that this not infrequently is permanent sterility. For instance, from their well-known treatise on gynecological medicine and surgery, Professors Faure and Siderey are quoted as follows: "Genital excess, abnormal excitation, prolonged use of contraceptive methods undoubtedly damage the reproduction functions. Incurable sterility is then often a source of despair to young women who wanted to escape the burdens of maternity for some few years." [3]

If we may judge from such testimony, the present widespread use of contraceptives must be producing an increasing amount of involuntary sterility in America. In fact, the degree of "safeness" which married people sometimes attribute to a particular contraceptive device is, according to some physicians, an exaggeration based upon the false belief

[3] R. de Guchteneere, *Judgement on Birth Control* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1931), pages 141–142.

that they are still fertile. Furthermore, it is difficult to see how a contraceptive can be effective without being injurious in some degree.

2. VENEREAL DISEASES

These diseases, particularly gonorrhea, are regarded by many physicians as the chief causes of involuntary sterility. While syphilis, particularly the congenital type, is responsible for some sterility, it is gonorrhea that is known as the "sterilizer of the race." In many instances it brings about sterility at once; in others it does not have this effect on the female until after the first pregnancy. Some authorities have gone so far as to say that it is the cause of fully one half of the involuntarily sterile or one-child sterile marriages.

It is very difficult to get accurate data on the amount of venereal disease. This is due in part to the failure of some physicians and clinics to report these diseases, also to the fact that victims are often unaware of their ailment, while others through ignorance or shame attempt rather worthless self-treatment or go to "advertising specialists." Judging solely from the number of infected persons known to be under the care of doctors, it has been estimated that approximately 1,500,000 persons each year seek treatment for venereal diseases in the United States. While the proportion of these diseases varies widely in different groups according to social, economic, and racial factors, it is said that 5 per cent is a moderate estimate of the amount of syphilis in our whole population.[4] A report of blood Wassermann tests taken in large groups of college students, made at the meeting of the American Student Health Association in Chicago in 1937, showed positive reactions in not more than from 0.2 to 0.3 per cent, the majority of these showing congenital syphilis. The rate is higher among males than among females and higher among Negroes than among whites. Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and one of the acknowledged leaders in the present campaign against syphilis, has said that at some time during his or her lifetime one adult in ten is infected by this disease. Our figures are not so definite in regard to gonorrhea, but all admit that it is far more prevalent than syphilis.

We have already said that venereal diseases cause a considerable number of the involuntarily sterile or one-child marriages. Where state laws have attempted to prevent the marriage of infected persons, as in

[4] William F. Snow, "Venereal Diseases and Sex Abnormalities in Relation to Population Growth," *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, pages 70–77. For a brief recent analysis of the venereal-disease problem see Howard A. Phelps, *Contemporary Social Problems* (1938), pages 177–187.

twenty-three states, no doubt some unfortunate marriages are either prevented or delayed pending medical treatment. However, in the past the chief value of these laws seems to have been educational in most instances, since such methods prescribed for determining the existence of venereal disease as the affidavit of the parties to be married, or a superficial health examination without a blood examination for syphilis, are very inadequate. In recent years Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and a few other states have improved these laws by requiring a scientific test for syphilis prior to marriage. These latter laws are frequently spoken of as "hygienic" marriage laws. The New York law, which became effective July 1, 1938, might be cited as an illustration. According to this law, those applying for a marriage license must present a statement from a physician as well as an official report from an approved laboratory indicating that neither examination nor serological blood test shows syphilis in a communicable stage. In certain exceptional cases, as where a woman is pregnant, judges and physicians are permitted to waive the requirement. Another New York law provides that physicians attending pregnant women must have them tested for syphilis. These recent "hygienic" marriage laws must be distinguished from "eugenic" marriage laws on the score of morality. The latter, which have as their object the sterilization of the supposedly unfit in the interest of posterity, are condemned by the Catholic Church. The purpose of the "hygienic" law is to protect health here and now through legitimate temporary measures. It would seem that the state has a right to require that a blood test be taken and that those who are suffering from a venereal disease put off marriage until cured. In this case the natural right of the parties to marry is not destroyed, but the exercise of this right is merely deferred, as, for example, in the case of those who are prohibited from marrying because they are too young. It would be different if the state attempted to forbid marriage permanently.

As can easily be imagined, the acquisition of a venereal disease by a husband or wife is the cause of much family disorganization, even when separation or divorce does not result. Perhaps the most pathetic marital tragedies are those in which one of these diseases, thought to be cured before marriage, recurs after marriage in one who at that time is living a blameless life. While the existence of venereal disease is seldom, if ever, alleged in a divorce case, since in most instances this would be tantamount to admitting publicly that the innocent party is also infected, it is said to be a frequent cause of divorces granted for cruelty, desertion, and other conventional legal causes.

Most people are amazed when they learn for the first time the extent to which venereal diseases damage the human race. Dr. William Osler said, "Know syphilis in all its manifestations and relations, and all other things clinical shall be added unto you." Syphilis is said to be the underlying cause of from 10 to 20 per cent of all incapacitating heart diseases, 15 per cent of all blindness, and over 10 per cent of all admissions to institutions for mental disorders. In addition, syphilis attacks the kidneys, liver, stomach, and other vital organs of the body under the guise of so many other different diseases that it has been called the "great imitator." On this account it has been said that syphilis is the leading cause of death. It is also the cause of many premature and still births. Estimates as to the number of children who are born with syphilis (congenital syphilis) vary from 2 to 5 per cent of the whole child population. Gonorrhea causes few deaths, but brings about much temporary physical incapacity as well as considerable permanent blindness. In the army and navy, where very accurate statistics of this disease are kept, more days are lost because of gonorrhea than because of any other sickness. From these figures we may infer that the health and earning power of the general population are likewise affected considerably by gonorrhea.

While the picture which has just been considered is rather dark, it is by no means hopeless. Once society decides that it wishes to reduce the percentage of venereal diseases, modern medical and sanitary science is able to show the way. One of the first steps to be taken, however, is to break down the taboos which have prevented people, sometimes even physicians, from explaining venereal diseases. While at one time there may have been some merit in the viewpoint which held that, since these diseases were chiefly the results of immorality, society should not be concerned about the victims, such an attitude is out of place today, when we realize not only the terrible effects of these diseases but also what was not known until somewhat recently, namely, how to cure them successfully. Finally, we realize now that the victims are often innocent men, women, and children. Judging from recent signs, especially the present frank discussion of these diseases in the press, America at last is awake to an evil which many European countries have already realized and consequently brought under considerable control.

Modern medicine is especially optimistic about the future of syphilis control. It is said that 75 per cent of the early cases can now be rendered noninfectious in a few days and quickly cured by proper treatment. Nearly all cases can be cured if the treatments are kept up. Much syphilis can be avoided, it is believed, if the public is taught more about

this disease. In explaining what a judge should know about syphilis, Dr. Joseph Roby, of the Bureau of Health, Rochester, New York, described the three stages of syphilis as follows:

> Like a good many other diseases it is contracted, in the vast majority of cases, only by direct contact, not often, if ever, by an inanimate object such as drinking cups. The reason for this is that the organism causing the disease does not live long outside of the human body. From about fourteen to eighteen days after the contact there develops, on the infected person, at the point of contact, a sore, or ulcer, which may vary considerably as to its severity and duration. This sore, or ulcer, as a rule, does not heal readily and is very infectious to any one else. The lymphatic glands in the neighborhood of this sore enlarge and are to be felt as little kernels or lumps under the skin. As a rule, there are no constitutional symptoms, but sometimes the patient may notice that he does not feel quite well. This is called the primary stage. Then, in about six weeks, the so-called secondary stage is ushered in by general malaise, fever, sometimes quite high, a sore throat, a rash resembling measles, general enlargement of the small lymph glands in the neck, groin, under the arm, and at the elbow, headache, and aching of the bones and joints. The severity of this stage also varies greatly in different individuals, from something so mild that they do not notice it at all to quite severe sickness. Then, as a rule, even without treatment, the disease quiets down and absolutely nothing may be noticed for a period varying from months to many years. But, then, in untreated cases, at sometime or another, the so-called tertiary symptoms may appear. The disease may then affect any part of the body from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet, and, unlike almost any other disease, any organ or part of the body may be involved, the two most dreaded situations being the brain, in the shape of the so-called general paralysis, and the spinal cord, as locomotor ataxia. Surely a serious enough picture, but the hopeful part of it is that if these cases can be controlled, by law if necessary, the vast majority of them can be cured in the early stage and at least be rendered safe so far as the community is concerned.[5]

Many mental cases caused by syphilis are now being returned to normal community life, while even congenital syphilis can be prevented today by proper prenatal care to the expectant mother. Two chief objectives are being emphasized in the present public campaign against syphilis: first, find and treat the existing cases; second, prevent new infections.

Prostitution

One of the chief causes of the spread of venereal disease is the prostitute. While it is true that some cases of venereal disease are contracted by kissing, and a very few by the use of infected drinking cups, towels, bed clothing and toilets, by far the great majority are the result of

[5] "Legal Aspects of Social Hygiene," *Proceedings*, 24th Annual Conference of the New York State Association of Magistrates (Albany, 1937), pages 46–47.

sexual intercourse. In a great many instances the initial infection can be traced to a prostitute. All studies indicate a high percentage of venereal disease among prostitutes. Gillin cites two New York studies, one of which indicated that over 42 per cent of these women were syphilitic, while another reported only 10 per cent free from venereal disease.[6] Since venereal disease seems to accompany promiscuity, women who are loose in their morals, even though they are not prostitutes, are often a source of infection. While some say that the increased use of certain types of contraceptives has reduced the danger of infection somewhat, others feel that the false sense of security which these devices often give has been the cause of much additional infection.

Society has been struggling with the problem of prostitution for centuries with comparatively little success. Several methods of control have been tried. Europe for the most part has until recently accepted the plan of "regulation," in which prostitution is regarded as a necessary evil. Under this system houses of prostitution were legalized and taxed, and prostitutes were compelled to live in a segregated district. Several arguments have been advanced in favor of the European system. In addition to providing revenue for the state, the tax restrictions tended to make the trade less profitable and so, it was said, to discourage it. It was said that, when the inmates of these brothels were subjected to frequent medical examinations, the danger of spreading venereal disease was lessened. This last argument was shattered in recent years when it was realized that such examinations of prostitutes were practically always superficial, far too infrequent, and usually avoided by those who suspected that they were infected.

While the American policy has usually favored the repression of prostitution by fines and imprisonment, law enforcement has lagged to such an extent that more or less segregated districts have grown up in most large cities. City officials will usually argue that the centralization of this evil in a particular area prevents street soliciting and the scattering of prostitutes into residential areas, but the basic reason for the existence of these segregated areas is usually the fact that their permanent location makes it easier for corrupt politicians to collect graft. It is believed that only one city in the United States (Reno, Nevada) still has a legally recognized "district." Yet there is scarcely an American city without an area of this sort which is known to most citizens as well as to the police, and which operates contrary to law but presumably under the "protection" of grafting officials, even though occasional raids are staged, often as a means of punishing those who neglect to pay

[6] John Lewis Gillin, *Social Pathology* (The Century Co., New York, 1933), page 316.

tribute. With the recent indictment of three county officials, following an investigation of white slavery at Atlantic City, a federal grand jury handed up a presentment from which the following significant statements are culled:

"Owners and operators of the said houses of prostitution," the presentment said, "paid $100 weekly during the Summer months and $50 weekly during the other months of the year to an official of Atlantic County for protection against arrest and prosecution."

"Testimony indicated," the presentment continued, "that a house of prostitution could not operate unless such payments were made to the said official."

"Prostitution, even though open to condemnation, becomes insignificant when compared to widespread lawlessness which may and does follow in its wake. Such conditions, if tolerated and countenanced, ultimately lead not only to the impairment of public health and morals, but to the corruption of law enforcement officials and the demoralization of the community."

"It appeared to be common knowledge in the said city of Atlantic City that conditions above described existed for several years," the presentment asserted. "But the officials of the Department of Police, including the chief of police, who appeared before this body, denied knowledge or suspicion of their existence.

"The denials of said officials were neither impressive nor worthy of belief in view of the known facts and circumstances." [7]

The charges above, if true, can be duplicated in most of our large cities. It is, unfortunately, the "American way" of dealing with prostitution.

The modern recommended attack upon prostitution and venereal disease includes the detention of diseased prostitutes in prison hospitals for treatment, instead of periodic fines and imprisonment alone. In some places the male patron also is required to undergo examination after arrest and to undertake treatment if found to be diseased. Injunction and abatement laws have been invoked recently against buildings used for immoral purposes in some states. Under these laws a citizen may institute legal proceedings to have such a building "padlocked" against any use for a period of a year, if it is established to the satisfaction of the court that the charge is true and that the owner should have known of it. While such legal action against those who derive financial profit directly or indirectly from prostitution will tend to stem the evil, it is generally felt that more effort than heretofore should be expended in preventing this evil, by educating people to the dangers of prostitution and by trying to remove some of the causes of prostitution. No

[7] New York *Times*, January 15, 1938. Used by permission. For a more comprehensive description of prostitution see Mabel A. Elliot and Francis E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization* (1934), Chapter VIII.

doubt, it will help considerably if the many dangers of venereal disease and its close association with immorality are brought home more forcibly to the public. Likewise, such measures as minimum-wage laws for women and the abolition of tenement houses in which normal home privacy is almost impossible will tend to prevent many girls from drifting into this occupation. However, one fundamental fact must not be overlooked, namely, that religious and moral education are society's greatest protection against the evils of prostitution and other sex offenses. Unfortunately, much of the effort which is now expended in suppressing vice is vitiated by the failure to take this basic fact into consideration.

Conclusion

In concluding these observations upon involuntary sterility as a source of population shrinkage we may say that, though venereal diseases, the use of contraceptives, and possibly certain rather vague population maturity "laws," in addition to physical defects, all play a part in producing unwanted sterility, the cumulative evidence suggests that, if the race is dying out, it is not primarily because of these particular conditions. Population students say that a far greater percentage of childless marriages are more or less deliberately so, and that in such marriages we have a condition known as "voluntary sterility." Since voluntary sterility is usually temporary, seemingly it should be much easier to correct should society ever decide that population shrinkage is an evil.

Inasmuch as deliberate infecundity may be brought about by means that are moral, it will be necessary to examine the various motives which have led people to adopt means of restricting the number of their offspring and to weigh these motives against certain needs of society before we can say definitely that this tendency towards infecundity is an evil. These motives, which we will call the chief causes of voluntary sterility, may be considered under five different headings: (1) the growth of cities; (2) an inflated standard of living; (3) greater freedom for women; (4) low wages; and (5) antifamily attitudes. Even though some of them necessarily overlap, it is difficult to tell which is the most important cause.

(See the references at the end of Chapter XII.)

CHAPTER VIII

THE EFFECT OF THE CITY AND ITS STANDARD OF LIVING ON POPULATION GROWTH

FROM what we have seen of the various involuntary causes of infecundity it would seem apparent that we are not dying out naturally. In other words, the present curtailment of population growth in the United States is not for the most part indeliberate or due to forces of which man is ignorant or over which he has little control. It is, then, the other group of causes of population shrinkage, the voluntary causes, which we must examine most carefully if we would know why our growth is declining and if we wish to determine whether this population drift is a good or a bad thing. Without attempting to suggest their degrees of importance, we shall consider in order the growth of cities, an inflated standard of living, greater freedom for women, low wages, and certain antifamily attitudes, which, as we shall see, seem to be not only the voluntary but the five major causes of population shrinkage. In conjunction with each of these we shall make an evaluation and point out possible remedies where an evil seems to exist. In this chapter we shall examine (1) the growth of cities and certain consequences that follow, and (2) the tendency to attempt to live up to an inflated standard of living, which, as we shall see, is a characteristic of many city-dwellers.

I. THE GROWTH OF CITIES

The growing tendency of our population to center in cities, the constant tendency of cities to grow larger, and the propensity of "city ideas" to spread to the surrounding rural areas have acted as powerful forces in retarding American population growth. In analyzing the city from the viewpoint of population growth, we immediately face the fundamental fact that the average city is not adjusted to the child. As presently organized it is pre-eminently a work and play place for adults. Our cities have grown up for the most part with very little planning, and least of all has consideration been given beforehand to the needs of those adult workers who might attempt to bring up

families. Consequently, the child has been forced very often to compete with the city for his very existence. Whatever legislation now exists to protect him against the hostile forces of the city has for the most part been enacted only after a long hard fight against the entrenched interests of those who have profited most financially from city life.

The spirit of the city has always acted as a powerful force in keeping its birth rate lower than that of the surrounding country. Speaking before the National Catholic Rural Life Conference in 1935, Dr. O. E. Baker of the Department of Agriculture estimated that in 1930 the ratio of children under 5 per 1,000 females of from 15 to 45 decreased as we proceeded from farms to great cities, as follows: on farms, 545; in villages of less than 2,500, 471; in cities of from 2,500 to 100,000, 341; in cities of more than 100,000, 293; in seven of our great cities, 225. Dr. Baker estimates that there is a 20-per-cent deficit in cities in the number of children requisite to maintain the population level. With an increasing percentage of our population living in cities each year, except some of the depression years, and with the large city populations failing to reproduce themselves, the effect of the city in terms of ultimate population shrinkage for the nation should be obvious.

In attempting to analyze the various city factors which militate against childhood, we are confronted immediately with the problem already pointed out, namely, the tendency of the causes of population shrinkage to overlap. However, avoiding duplication of treatment as far as possible, we see that the city is an antichild institution for several reasons. First of all, in the city it is difficult to find the very space in which to put a child. Each additional child creates a new demand upon the limited space in the home, and usually city housing accommodations must be purchased at so much a cubic foot. Because of overcrowding, the city child is more in his parents' way than he would be in a roomy farmhouse, and this tends to force the child outside the home for most of his recreation. Outside the home the child again faces a housing arrangement which has grown up for the most part for business profits without providing space for his needs, and consequently his attempts to play on city streets result in frequent conflicts with the interests of neighbors, pedestrians, and vehicles. Thus the influence of such primary groups as the family, the play group, and the neighborhood group, always considered necessary for character development, is vitiated. The plight of the child in turn touches his parents and makes them less willing to subject additional children to such a hostile atmosphere. Sometimes delinquency, fostered by such an unnatural environment, further adds to parental worries.

The financial costs involved in raising a child are much greater in the city than in the country. He must be dressed better, and his proximity to stores and commercial recreations which constantly suggest new needs necessitates more frequent purchases. Finally, in the modernized home he is likely to be a total liability to his parents financially, at least until he has passed the age of 16, whereas the farm child can always be of some material assistance to his parents around the farm or the home, without interfering with his health or schooling. If the city child is to be educated for urban life, as is usually the case, his period of special training, whether in craft or college, takes a longer period of time and so adds to the financial cost of being a parent. In contrast to this, the rural child learns most of the agricultural pursuits inexpensively, chiefly through constant observation and experience on the farm.

Wholesome Family Life Essential to Social Welfare

In view of the various antichild influences which are undermining so many urban families today, one might reasonably ask whether sociologists still believe that wholesome family life is essential to the welfare of the larger social group. Sociologists answer unanimously in the affirmative. It is easy to show that the welfare of the individual family should be the concern of all. If people are going to live in peace and harmony in society, there must be a certain modicum of social virtues to start with. Unless people have some desire to co-operate, some respect for the personal and property rights of others, some feelings of altruism, and a fundamental desire for justice, to say the least, the larger group life is impossible. While it is true that man is by nature a being destined to live in group life, many of the tendencies which he manifests in early childhood are contrary to the qualities which we regard as necessary for social life. In most cases the young child seems to be predominantly selfish and has little regard for the rights of others. He must be educated out of this and prepared for group life. This preparation is given most effectively in the family circle, where the child is subjected to constant, day-by-day, patient instruction under the guidance of those who love him. He learns not only the principles of right social conduct, as they might be taught, we shall say, to a group in a classroom, but the application of these principles through supervised daily living. Most of all, his emotions are shaped in the family, and we may as well admit that in our daily affairs most of us are judged by our emotions as much as, if not more than, by our intellects. The writer knows of no one

who has described the social contribution of the large family quite as well as Father John M. Cooper, who says that in such a family

> . . . almost every fundamental type of personality and character will more likely be found that may be found in the larger society of the world. In such a family we have a sort of world in miniature, a micro-society wherein the child learns to live with and adjust himself to his fellow human beings of diverse types and temperaments, and learns it naturally, simply, and efficaciously, and from cradle up. In this small democratic world of brothers and sisters, he learns self-reliance; he learns generosity and the habit of sharing; he learns the give-and-take of life; he learns self-discipline and self-mastery; he learns fair play, for he is taught it in brushing shoulders with his peers who, although bound to him by the bond of blood affection, have abundant resources, albeit sometimes rough-and-ready ones, for obliging the recalcitrant to knuckle down to the demands of an elemental and stern justice. Self-reliance, self-control, charity, justice, teamwork—all these primary human qualities are, in a family of fair numbers, bred into the child's life by a vital method that makes our own reasoned-out and tested technic of child training seem almost like a sorry makeshift, and that goes far to compensate for the common educational groping and stumbling and erring of even the more intelligent and conscientious parents in that most complex and difficult of all human tasks, the moral training of children.[1]

It should be evident, then, that wholesome community life is impossible unless we preserve family life. Forces which are so unfriendly to child life as to discourage many people from having children certainly must injure the family life of those who do have children. Society, therefore, should be concerned about this situation; an effort must be made to curb the antichild forces of the city in the long-time interest of all. It is futile to spend millions of dollars annually on schools for the purpose of educating children to become good citizens if the most important of our educational units, the home, is unable to function because of the defects in urban life. If we are to have children at all, and even the most rabid neo-Malthusian believes that this will always be necessary and desirable, it would seem as if the existing antichild influences in urban life must be corrected. In our dealing with these forces, two plans of attack would seem to be available: we may seek to escape from the city through various agrarian ventures, or else the city itself must be changed so as to remove its most objectionable features. Without admitting that these plans are mutually exclusive, since both reforms can and should take place together, we shall consider, first, agrarian antidotes to the antichild influences of city life, and, second, the city of the future.

[1] *Birth Control* (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1923), pages 28–29. Used by permission.

I. AGRARIAN ANTIDOTES—EVILS OF CITY LIFE

When one recalls the value of wholesome family life to the nation and then reflects upon the injurious effects of modern urban life upon the family and the child, the first suggestion is likely to be, "Why not a back-to-the-farm movement?" Before considering the plausibility of some such movement we shall summarize briefly some of the advantages which rural life offers for family development.

Whereas children are likely to be economic liabilities from birth till marriage in the city, usually on the farm they are able to work in some way which is not injurious to their welfare from ten years of age onward. In agriculture the family rather than the individual is the economic unit, so that a wife and family become almost essential in operating a farm. In the city a wife is unable to make much of a contribution to the family income unless she works outside the home, in which case children become even greater economic burdens. Even the aged, whose pathetic helplessness in machine-age urban life constitutes an additional economic problem, have a useful and respectable place in rural life.

Dr. O. E. Baker, of the Department of Agriculture, has pointed out that in rural life we have a culture which America cannot afford to lose. In this culture every member of the family not only has a valuable and respected role, but does work which tends to strengthen character, rather than, as often happens in city life, to weaken it. The rural social code approves the self-sacrifice of parents for the sake of children and emphasizes the duty of the individual so to regulate his family life as to promote general social welfare. From the mere fact that the farmer tends to think in terms of nature and life processes, whereas the urbanite tends to think in terms of machines and commerce, the former develops an organic natural view of life which fosters wholesome marriage and parenthood, whereas the latter inclines towards an artificial and mechanistic philosophy in which nearly everything, including the child, is considered in terms of a profitable contract. Dr. Baker is of the opinion that any civilization based primarily upon an industrial and commercial system in which the individual rather than the family is the economic unit is doomed to perish. Against this evil he has suggested two general lines of procedure: first, an attempt to preserve some of the economic and social attributes of the rural family through part-time farming; second, the development of a new rural civilization which, while it will not be the rustic culture of a century ago, will nevertheless preserve many of the former home industries and a truer sense of values, in

which many present urban necessities will be regarded as needless luxuries. Only through these changes does he believe that the best of our civilization can be preserved.

In recent years at least two agencies have been engaged in projects whose objectives closely parallel those suggested by Dr. Baker. The Resettlement Administration of the federal government, though primarily a rural relief agency set up during the depression, has attempted to demonstrate the possibilities of future part-time farming in an improved social order, in addition to aiding financially embarrassed full-time farmers to remain on their lands. Likewise, the small but active Catholic Rural Life group has tried to create a greater appreciation for the social values of rural life and to aid in various ways those who are engaged in correcting the evils of the present agricultural regime. We shall consider both of these, examining first some of the projects undertaken by the Resettlement Administration, referring to the work of this federal agency under this, its best-known title, rather than under its recently adopted name, the Farm Security Administration.

The Resettlement Administration

The Resettlement Administration, which took over the former federal Subsistence Homestead Agency, is regarded by many as one of our most farsighted new governmental agencies. Its work, being somewhat experimental, has necessarily followed along several different lines. Where farmers are making an unsuccessful attempt to eke out an existence upon land ill suited for farming, the government is attempting to buy this land and devote it to reforestation, grazing, wild life, and other uses for which it is better adapted, rather than to continue to carry its present residents on federal relief. New plans must be made for these families, as well as for other relief families, such as rural tenants. Two plans have been developed for dealing with needy rural families: first, the organization of new rural settlements; second, the infiltration of these families into existing rural communities.

The resettlement program is often misunderstood to mean that more people will be engaged in commercial agriculture. Since farm machinery has made it possible for fewer people to produce more agricultural goods today than the market can consume, the welfare of all farmers would be jeopardized if more people were to be induced to undertake productive farming, by a back-to-the-farm movement. It seems quite likely that even fewer commercial farmers will be needed in the future. Today only forty-nine man hours are needed to grow and harvest 100 bushels of wheat, as compared with eighty-six man hours in 1900. Be-

cause of this and similar changes the farm families moved to different lands under the government program will be settled on land now owned by people of retiring age. Also, large landholdings which are now producing commercial crops will be purchased and subdivided, and those who were formerly tenants on this land will be aided so that they may become small owners. Fewer of the products of this land will be sent to the market, since a large portion of the new subdivided farms will be utilized for the production of fruits, vegetables, and dairy products for the consumption of those living on the land.

One of the greatest problems in rural life today is that of debt. Many farms have heavy mortgages contracted during boom times. Food prices were up in those days, and farms were given a high value. The value of these farms has greatly decreased since then, so that at the prevailing prices paid for farm products it is impossible for farmers to pay off these mortgages. Since the creditor as well as the debtor is very often the loser when these mortgages are foreclosed, it is to the interest of both, as well as to the interest of the community, to have these mortgages scaled down to a reasonable sum. Realizing this situation, which affects so many members of a community, the Resettlement Administration organizes committees of local citizens who try to get debtors and creditors to come to an agreement whereby the principal or interest rates are reduced, or the time for payment extended. During a three months' period in 1935, debts of some 4,000 farmers were reduced over 32 per cent by these voluntary farm-debt adjustment committees working with the Resettlement Administration.

In its greenbelt projects the Resettlement Administration is showing us what may well be the small city of the future: a model city built for child and family life rather than chiefly for commercial interests. The Suburban Division of the Resettlement Administration has taken over the creation of three new suburban communities designed to provide decent homes for 3,000 workers and farmers. These so-called greenbelt communities are located near Washington, D.C., Milwaukee, and Cincinnati. Although costly, because they were constructed with relief labor, they are carefully planned low-rent towns built for children as well as adults and surrounded by a green belt of forests, parks, and small farms. They will have their own schools, churches, playgrounds, stores, and community buildings, permitting residents to enjoy the advantages of both town and country. Rents will be within the reach of that group whose income ranges from $1,200 to $2,000 a year. Such communities, it is hoped, will serve as demonstrations for future privately constructed high-grade housing for low- or moderate-income

groups and as examples of town planning in the interests of the family group rather than commercial interests alone. The greenbelt plan is described by its authors as follows:

. . . Our suburban resettlement program differs from the usual slum-clearance program in various ways. The houses are built in the suburbs, where land is cheaper, instead of in already overcrowded cities. It differs further in so far as areas with productive farm land have been selected. This will enable neighboring farmers to earn a livelihood with a ready-made market. It will also enable tenants to engage in farming as a recreation or on a part-time basis to supplement their incomes. A third difference is that the suburban resettlement community will be complete, with its own postoffice, stores, town hall, inn, schools, churches, and recreational grounds, instead of being a row of houses or apartments.

Each community will be laid out on approximately 200 cleared acres and will be surrounded by farm areas and woodland; thus preventing undesirable industrial development in the future.

The Greenbelt idea is not new. England has two successful Greenbelt communities. In our country there are a number of "Garden Cities"; but unfortunately such dwelling places are beyond the means of our low-income workers.

In these Greenbelt communities, homes, though not elaborate, will be well designed and well built. They will have all sanitary improvements and there will be sufficient open space to give the word "home" a real meaning.

These communities will be safe and healthy places to live. Wherever footpaths cross busy streets, underpasses will be built. Automobile roads will skirt the community rather than run through it. There will be ample recreation space.

Residents of Greenbelt towns will assume their fair share of local taxes and the community will have the same political status as similar towns in the state.[2]

The Catholic Rural Life Movement

Since over 80 per cent of our 22,000,000 Catholics are urbanites, Catholics as a group have been hit harder by those forces which undermine family life than most other groups. Furthermore, American Catholics have an added expense in the rearing of children since they must pay for their education in Catholic schools and colleges, in addition to supporting the public schools and colleges maintained by the state through taxation. Since our cities are not reproducing themselves and are largely dependent upon the country for their future inhabitants, now that immigration has been practically cut off, Catholic leaders are becoming especially concerned about the spiritual welfare of the rural children who will later migrate to permanent homes in the city. In the past the

[2] *Resettlement Administration* (pamphlet) (Government Printing Office, 1936), page 23.

religious education of rural children has been very inadequate as a rule, chiefly because of the lack of parochial schools and the great distance to church. Largely through movements inspired by Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara of Great Falls, Montana, much progress has been made recently in remedying this defect through such instruments as the religious vacation school, the religious correspondence school, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and the introduction of visual education and other devices aimed at making religious education in the home as well as in the schools more effective.

Important also are the organized efforts now being made to see that Catholic children receive a just share in vocational training, transportation, and other extracurricular benefits often provided by the state for rural children at the taxpayer's expense. Recognizing also the fact that most vocations for the priesthood and sisterhood come from the cities, Catholic rural life leaders are making an effort to have the study of rural problems introduced into seminaries and sisters' colleges, in order that future spiritual leaders may feel more at home when given rural assignments. Unfortunately, in the past city-bred religious leaders have often felt rather helpless and strange in a rural setting and so have tended to encourage country youth to migrate to the city instead of pointing out the values of rural life and helping them to solve the economic and other special problems which confronted them.

Credit Unions

One of the projects fostered by the National Catholic Rural Life Conference in order to simplify problems of farm finance is the credit union. A credit union is a co-operative society aimed at breaking the stranglehold which certain financing companies now have upon those who need to borrow small amounts from time to time and at encouraging its members to save. In the absence of credit unions it is not at all uncommon to find financing companies exacting enormous interest upon small loans, by the use of various special interest fees and extra charges so worded as to deceive the unsuspecting borrower and to evade the usury laws. To the inexperienced the wording which we have taken from the loan card of a typical finance organization would seem to indicate a low rate of interest: "Interest on this loan will be figured on unpaid balances of principal at the aggregate of two and one-half per cent a month on any part of the unpaid principal balance not exceeding $100 plus two per cent a month on any part of the remainder thereof not exceeding $200 plus one per cent a month on the remainder thereof, computed for the actual number of days between payments." Yet if the

interest rates per year be substituted for what seem to be the low 2.5 per cent, 2 per cent, and 1 per cent in the statement above, the rates will be 30 per cent, 24 per cent, and 12 per cent respectively. It might be added that these are very moderate rates compared with what some small loan organizations demand. Some idea of the enormous profits accruing to these organizations is suggested by the fact that for several years now the "loan-shark" lobby has been rated as second in strength only to the public-utilities lobby in one of our midwestern state legislatures. Without legislative control it is not uncommon to find "loan sharks" charging interest rates of 100 or 200 per cent. Professor Frank O'Hara has described the lower rates possible under legislative control of the small-loan business, showing also how the credit union can give a lower interest rate than other agencies, thus giving us a most effective remedy for the "loan shark" evil. To quote:

To combat this evil a variety of institutions have been set up to furnish loans at lower interest rates. Under the uniform small loans law enacted in more than a score of states personal finance companies are permitted under the law to charge interest rates as high as 42 per cent per annum on small loans. A study of small loans made in 1931 discloses the fact that other lending agencies are also cutting into the business of the "loan sharks" by charging lower interest rates (Evans Clark, *Financing the Consumer,* New York, 1931). The following are the usual rates per annum charged by these companies. Pawnbrokers, 36%; Axias (mostly organized among certain foreign groups in New York City), 28.5%; Remedial Loan Societies, 26.9%; Industrial Banks, 17.3%; Personal Loan Departments of Banks, 18.1%. . . . The usual rate charged by credit unions is 12 per cent.[3]

The credit union is a co-operative venture, aimed at helping the farmer and the wage-earner, which has been patterned after the co-operative savings and loan banks of Europe. Since the passage of the first credit-union law in Massachusetts in 1909, most of the states have passed similar laws authorizing the establishment of credit unions. However, the original impetus for these laws in the United States seems to have come from a group of Canadian Catholics who brought the idea to New England. While the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, along with the late Edward Filene of Boston, has been one of the chief advocates of this movement in this country, credit unions are just as important to industrial workers as they are to farmers. So highly does Bishop Aloysius J. Muench of Fargo, North Dakota, regard them that he recommended recently the establishment of a credit union in every parish of his diocese. The organization and operation of a credit union,

[3] *Credit Unions* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1937), pages 6–7. Used by permission.

which can be effected by almost any rural or urban parish, are described in some detail by Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara as follows:

A credit union is a bank, but a unique sort of bank. To begin with, each credit union is limited in the scope of its operations to a specific group of people, such as the employees of a factory, store, mill, the members of a society, a profession, a trade, the members of a church parish, those living within a well-defined rural district, small community, or neighborhood, etc. To become a member of a credit union, therefore, one must first be a member of the specific group within which the credit union in question operates. Membership is predicated on an agreement to buy one share at a par value of five dollars, payable in cash or in regular installments of twenty-five cents, payable generally on a weekly or sometimes a bi-monthly or even a monthly basis. The word "share" in a credit union, however, has no further significance than to afford a basis for membership. As a thrift plan the purpose of the credit union is to induce the individual member to save periodically to the limit of his saving capacity. The unit of savings is purposely very small, and the credit union is vitally concerned to assist the member who can save but little, at the same time affording a ready method for saving to the member who can save a more appreciable amount. If, for example, the member can save fifty cents a week, he subscribes to two shares, paying twenty-five cents a week, in the average credit union, on each of them. If he can save two dollars a week, he subscribes to eight shares, paying in twenty-five cents a week on each share. If, however, he can save but twenty-five cents a week the credit union is equally as eager to be of service to him. It is appreciated in a credit union that by the time the member has paid in installments for his first share or shares, he will have acquired the habit of saving and will go right on indefinitely saving additional shares.

In this fashion money is, of course, accumulated much more rapidly in fact than one would imagine to be possible.

The second phase of credit-union service is concerned with the use to which this money is devoted. Credit unions may make loans to their members at reasonable rates of interest for any provident purpose. A provident purpose has been interpreted to mean that the loan must promise, to the best judgment of the credit committee, to be of benefit to the borrower. Credit unions, therefore, make not only remedial loans, but constructive loans as well.

Each credit union is managed by a board of directors, a credit committee and a supervisory committee, chosen by and from the membership in elections in which each member has a single vote whatever his shareholding. The board of directors, in turn, chooses, by and from its own membership, a president, a vice-president, a clerk, and a treasurer who is the general manager.[4]

[4] *The Church and the Country Community* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1927), pages 91–93. Used by permission.

Other Co-operatives

The rapid growth of various kinds of co-operative societies in Europe and their recent introduction in some parts of the United States have aroused the concern of private storekeepers. Without a doubt the co-operative reduces the profits of the storekeeper, smashes monopolies, and eliminates useless middlemen. In other words, it tends to reduce the excessive profits of a few, so characteristic of American business in the past, and to distribute benefits more equitably. On the other hand, it appears that the co-operative movement will not eliminate legitimate private enterprise, where the latter is efficiently conducted, according to Frederick P. Kenkel, editor of *Central Blatt and Social Justice,* the official organ of the Catholic Central Verein, which, like the Catholic Rural Life Conference, has been active in encouraging this movement here. He says: "But the fact of the matter is, cooperation has nowhere ruined independent storekeepers because, for one thing, cooperators are not at all bent on doing away with them. Moreover, in not a few countries storekeepers and independent tradesmen, such as bakers, have organized cooperative purchasing of raw material and other goods with the intention of meeting competition." [5] It is said that, where it is in the interest of the consuming public, co-operative leaders have shown an increasing tendency to collaborate with private business.

England's long experience with co-operatives, commencing with the Rochdale experiment in 1844, shows some of the effects of these ventures upon monopoly as well as upon private business generally. For example, some years ago the Proprietary Articles Trading Association was formed to induce private retailers to fix the price of a large number of articles of everyday use at 25 per cent above the wholesale price. The co-operatives refused to sign this agreement, whereupon retaliatory pressure brought upon the manufacturers by the trading association made it impossible for the co-operatives to purchase these articles. As a result of this action the co-operatives began to manufacture these articles themselves and so forced the retail price down to a reasonable level. In another instance, where the co-operatives found that one company practically controlled about 80 per cent of Britain's soap trade, the co-operatives set up their own factories and eventually forced the trust

[5] *Central Blatt and Social Justice,* Volume 30, January, 1938, page 306. The Catholic Central Verein of America, founded in 1885, has four chief activities: the promotion of social action, social service, maternity guilds, and credit unions. For years it has opposed both capitalism and socialism (communism) by advocating "Christian Solidarism," a term adopted by Father H. Pesch, S.J., but used previously by Carl von Vogelsang of the Christian Social School of Germany and Austria.

to scale down its prices. Many similar instances could be presented to show how consumer co-operatives present one solution to the problem of price levels which are artificially inflated. As a rule, co-operatives force down retailing margins, defeat the purpose of monopoly, and tend to stabilize prices at low levels. Although America has lagged behind several European countries in developing co-operatives, by 1936 it could be said that 12 per cent of all our farm products purchased in that year were bought through co-operative societies and that a co-operative automobile-insurance company is now the seventh largest in the field. Co-operatives need not be associated with large enterprises, however. In advocating the wider use of the co-operative as an aid to the poverty-stricken American Negro, Richard Deverall described how twenty indigent Negro families in Gary, Indiana, opened a buying club with twenty-four dollars in 1932, a humble beginning which resulted in a store doing an annual business of $40,000 in 1936.[6] The co-operative can aid both the city dweller and the rural dweller; because of the depressed state of agriculture, it is almost essential to the latter.

A remarkable recent example of the possibility of co-operatives is to be found in the diocese of Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Commenting upon this project, *The Survey Graphic* said recently: "Talk to anyone who has had the privilege of looking over the St. Francis Xavier extension work, and he will tell you that this is the outstanding work of rehabilitation that is going forward on the American continent today. Men who a few years ago knew nothing of economic or social terminology, today run lobster factories, deal intelligently with dealers in Boston, operate stores, run credit unions in such a way that many of them have become the real banks of the communities."[7] The depression left this area in terrible straits. The demand for fish shrank to one third of what it had been, a fact which only added to the irritation of the native fishermen, who had to sit by and watch the large fish companies sell the local catch at ten times what they paid for it. Meanwhile, the farmers were unable to raise their products at a profit, and the underpaid miners were talking of communism. With the younger folks leaving this land of despair in hope of finding jobs in Boston, the Extension Department of St. Francis Xavier University in the town of Antigonish undertook what a member of the Carnegie Foundation has described as "the most amazing example of Adult Education ever undertaken anywhere." Acting upon the conviction that the only way to save democracy is to teach the

[6] "The Negro and the Co-operative," *The Interracial Review*, Volume 9, September, 1936, page 141.

[7] Bertram B. Fowler, "The Lord Helps Those," *The Survey Graphic*, Volume 27, June, 1938, page 343.

people to use the brains that God gave them, the school sent faculty members out to organize adult groups of fishermen, farmers, and miners in order to guide them in the study of their own problems. It was pointed out to them that, if they proceeded to learn why their efforts were not bringing an adequate return, they would gain a knowledge which would prevent them from being browbeaten by politicians and robbed by special interests. The idea took hold, and one of the first results of this new type of practical adult education was the organization of what the farmers called buying clubs. The development of this and other co-operative weapons by which these people regained their economic freedom has been described as follows:

First they tried buying fertilizer. They bought it in carload lots direct from Ontario. They got it at nearly half the price. They became enthusiastic, but their studies told them that effort would be made to break up the buying club by price cutting. They stuck to the buying clubs despite tempting offers. And to prove the wisdom of this, in the past three years organized rural groups pooled orders for 15,000 tons of fertilizer on which they saved $75,000. Each year they charter a ship that brings fleur and feed to them from Lake Superior, with a saving on each ship load of about $8,000.

The people in the cities went in for buying things together too. They started out in most cases with a small group buying staple supplies like potatoes, meat, or coal. They ended by founding a co-operative store. In this they were encouraged by the phenomenal success of 28 miners in the town of Sydney Mines. These men in the year 1907 opened a co-operative store with an initial capital of $343. By 1929, this group, whose membership increased enormously, owned and operated a large parent store at Sydney Mines, four branch stores in other towns, a milk pasteurizing plant, and a bakery. In that year they had a business turnover of $1,730,000.

. . . There are also many successful ventures in co-operative production and marketing. Many of the little fishing villages, which not so long ago were struggling for a bare living, have found they could pool their catch and sell direct to Boston. They could charter a ship and send lobsters direct to the great co-operatives in England. . . . In one year in the little village of Havre Boucher the operations of a co-operative factory and selling agency paid to the fishermen two cents more per pound than their unorganized brothers and, in addition, gave to its 70 members a surplus of $10,800.[8]

[8] W. P. Fogarty, "The Throttle of Destiny," *The Catholic Digest*, Volume 2, November, 1937 (condensed from *St. Joseph Lilies*, September, 1937), pages 73–74. Used by permission. Rev. Francis J. Boland, C.S.C., Professor of Politics at Notre Dame, who made a personal investigation of this movement on Cape Breton Island in August, 1938, found that the town of Reserve Mines, almost entirely communistic three years ago, has scarcely a communist today, chiefly as a result of the development of the credit union, co-operative buying, and the co-operative building of homes.

The Philosophy of Agrarianism

Addressing the National Catholic Rural Life Conference at Richmond in November, 1937, Ralph Adams Cram favored the Antigonish approach to that of the Resettlement Administration because of the possibilities of bureaucratic mismanagement always inherent in government projects. Cram sees our present capitalistic regime as doomed, largely because "the status of the rank and file of our so-called common people in the cities—the factory workers and the small business and tradesman—differs but slightly from that of slavery," a condition which he believes cannot long go on. He believes that the Resettlement Administration experiments, though mismanaged, are an indication that "even" the government is becoming conscious of the approaching crisis and is groping for a better type of social organization.

Dr. Cram thinks America's only hope rests in some plan which will settle a large percentage of our present "wage slaves" on the land with "time off for mill work to supplement maintenance and revenue from the land," rather than to have subsistence from the land made subsidiary to wage subsistence in the old-type mill or factory, as these values were arranged by the Resettlement Administration. Unless subsistence from land owned in fee simple is the primary objective, he says, we shall not get away from the "slavery" inherent in the wage system and its consequent social dangers. The industrial adjuncts to farming he would have organized on a profit-sharing basis and communally owned and administered. Recognizing the fact that "not everyone is fitted by nature to act as a self-sufficient unit" in the new self-contained agrarian-industrial communities, he would utilize these people, the minority who are "unemployable except under strong control and definite direction," either in mass production in the cities or on corporately managed farms. Only by emancipating the great masses of the landless wage-earners of our technocratic regime (the "proletariat" of Dr. Goetz A. Briefs[9]) and making them "free men" in the true sense, owners of property in land and craft and trade, rather than merely possessors of a vote, can we prevent the "religion" of communism, with its promise of a Kingdom of Heaven on earth, from winning over this, probably the majority group of Americans, according to Dr. Cram.

Those who hold to this last viewpoint concerning urban disorganization admit rather frankly most of the charges made by the socialists and communists against the present social order. They regard communism as a genuine threat to our nation, in which "less than

[9] *The Proletariat* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1937).

forty per cent" of the population, to use Dr. Cram's figures, are "free men." They believe that we must "fight" communists, not by beating them with rubber hoses, nor by denouncing them as "irreligious" and letting it go at that, but by bending every effort to bring about a reconstructed social order based upon the principles of Christian social justice laid down by Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI, lest the proletariat here should follow the course of many of their European counterparts. In this new Christian social order the family will be the unit of society in fact as well as in theory.

Father W. Howard Bishop, one of the leaders of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, agrees with Dr. Cram in visualizing the end of our capitalistic regime as it is now organized. Only through a complete reorganization of our present system, which favors urbanization and excessive private profits rather than true human and social needs, can we hope to combat the twin evils of communism and fascism. In the establishment of the new social order, Father Bishop urges six chief objectives:

(1) The new order should be based upon man and his human needs and values of body, mind, and soul, not on mammon and the pursuit of money for money's sake.

(2) Civilization's heart should be the home and its soul the Church, instead of the factory and the money market which take their place at present.

(3) Production of home necessities should be returned to the home so far as possible, by restoration of the home crafts on the farms and even to a limited extent in towns and cities. Small business enterprises centered about the home should be given every protection and encouragement.

(4) Civilization's stronghold should be the farms, rather than the cities, farms on a family basis, cultivated for a living, first and primarily, rather than solely for profit, with high self-sufficiency and low dependence on cash income, with the family home as the throbbing heart of each little enterprise, and the Church its inspiration.

(5) The State should facilitate the widest possible distribution of farm, home and business ownership and proprietorship.

(6) Every department of agriculture should be organized co-operatively to function harmoniously with similar organizations of industry, with the Government standing by as monitor or referee to prevent abuses and conflicts, but leaving the actual work of managing the various occupations for their own best interests to the autonomous action of the various organized groups themselves.[10]

As we look into the minds of our farm leaders, Catholic and non-Catholic, it becomes more and more evident that a rather drastic reorganization of American life, in which the present city and its methods

[10] "Town and Country," *The Catholic Digest*, Volume 1, June, 1937 (condensed from *Catholic Rural Life Objectives*, St. Paul), pages 72–73. Used by permission.

are to play a less important role, is contemplated. Catholics who are acquainted with the "social encyclicals" of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI are by no means shocked at these "radical" proposals to reorganize our urban industrial life, for the encyclicals recommend as much. It is sometimes forgotten, however, that these encyclicals touch likewise upon the closely integrated problems of the farm, by urging such things as a wider diffusion of landownership and the establishment of farms owned and operated by families. In fact, one cannot go very far in examining the many problems of our industrial cities without confronting the closely related rural problem. In the past we have tended to isolate rather than to integrate these two areas and to favor by protective tariffs and other measures the city property-holder rather than the farmer. We have actually been proud of our "bigger and better" cities, built up at the expense of country life. Now that we have stopped to analyze this topheavy structure more carefully, it becomes apparent not only that the modern city is inimical to family welfare and so also to national welfare, but that the solution to this urban problem must be sought to a considerable extent outside the city limits. It is for this reason that the former fields of rural and urban sociology are merging in the study of *regional* sociology, in which the present artificial barriers between city and country are being broken down. In the next section we shall consider some of the possibilities of changing the geographical organization of the city of the future through regional planning so as to make it more livable for those, probably the majority of our population, who must remain there.

In concluding our survey of the possible ways of relieving urban congestion through agrarian movements, we shall give, as a summary, three points emphasized by Father Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., Director of the Rural Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C. They are the following.

> . . . (1) people can live on small acreages or in villages, even though their work is in the city; (2) they can live on farms or in villages and devote part of their time to farming and part of it to rural industries; (3) they can live on farms and devote part of their time to commercial farming and part of it to home industry. In every case, whether engaged in urban, country-town or home industry, these people would be living in the country. They would not be cooped up in those modern whirlpools of destruction, our gigantic industrial cities. They would be enjoying at least in considerable measure the advantages of a rural mode of living.[11]

[11] "The Shadow of American Decline," *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, Volume 36, October, 1935, page 41. For additional data on the Catholic philosophy of agrarianism see *The Commonweal* for July 1, 1938, and the current issues of *The Catholic Rural Life Bulletin*, published at St. Paul.

2. THE CITY OF THE FUTURE

Some say that the present disorganization of the city, especially as it affects wholesome family life, is only a transitory condition which should not cause any great concern. They point out that the urban problem arose so quickly (more swiftly here than in any other place in the world) that we have few precedents as yet to guide us. Whereas there were only six cities of 8,000 or more in the United States at the time of the first census of 1790, in 1930 there were almost a thousand of over 10,000; whereas only a little over one fourth of the population lived in cities of 2,500 or over in 1880, in fifty years this ratio increased to considerably over one half. These changes, for the most part, confronted a population trained either here or abroad for rural life and with traditions which were often ill adapted to the new form of social organization. With some truth they point to satisfactory adjustments to what were once grave problems in city life. At one time epidemics and diseases seemed to be so uncontrollable that the permanent abandonment of American cities was seriously considered. Such problems as an adequate food and water supply, sewage disposal, and lawlessness likewise seemed to be insurmountable at one time, but in a large measure they have been solved. Such progress is pointed to by some writers as proof of our ability to cope with the influences so detrimental to family life without greatly upsetting the present urban order.

There are others who see the present urban disorganization, especially as it affects the family, as a mere surface symptom of a much greater ailment which is eating at the very heart of the nation, namely, the formation of an ever-increasing wage-earning proletariat, brought about by the vanishing ownership of land. Dr. Briefs has said that the effect of this diminution of ownership among the rank and file is to intensify the rivalries among wage-earners as well as that between wage-earners and their employers. Furthermore, these "enslaved" wage-earners, he says, are engaged in agriculture as well as industry. Tenantry increased from 35 per cent of the total number of farms in 1900 to 45 per cent in 1935. Lewis Mumford goes further than Dr. Briefs. He denounces the modern "power state" as "devoted mainly to the protection of the powers, properties, and privileges of the ruling classes" which he regards as responsible for most of our urban evils, and he advocates the establishment of a new "service state" in which the land will go back to the community "from which it was originally derived." [12]

Whether one regards the existing urban social disorganization which

[12] *The Culture of Cities* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1938).

is so detrimental to wholesome family life as only a temporary growing pain in the life history of the capitalistic city, or rather as a surface symptom of a much greater ailment, the fact remains that the city of the future will very likely differ considerably from that of today. Moreover, no matter how far agrarian reforms may go in getting more urban workers to live on noncommercial farms and in garden cities, there will always remain a considerable part of the population that will continue to live in the city. What will the city of the future be like?

The Effect of the New Warfare

All of us have wondered at the Sunday supplement's imaginative drawings of the "city of the future," with its various street levels, moving sidewalks, and hundred-story buildings arranged to accommodate much larger populations than are now crowded into the modern metropolis. While there are many engineering arguments against the feasibility of such a fantastic development, the recent bombing of cities in Spain and China, which has given us a glimpse of the probable methods of future warfare, suggest that military strategy at least may bring about the curtailment rather than the expansion of future urban growth. In the World War bombing was of minor importance because neither airplanes nor bombs were sufficiently effective for this manner of warfare. Instead, attempts were made to harass London and Paris by means of dirigible raids and long-range guns. No doubt the opposing Allies would have shelled Berlin had they likewise been able to advance within range of the German capital. Recent military operations indicate that death from the skies will be one of the chief features of warfare in the future. To this end powerful bombing airplanes have been perfected, and a new type of delayed-fuse giant bomb has been developed. Their occasional use in the "poor man's war" in Spain was sufficient to enable us to imagine the consequences of city raids in a war between two first-class nations. The death-dealing qualities of the delayed-fuse bomb are terrible enough. What will be the consequences of gas raids or of the showering of disease germs upon a modern metropolis by the new military airplanes? It is hard to believe that international agreement, which failed to stop the use of gas, can stop this new type of warfare. Its military advantages are too evident, and those who carry on wars are seldom seriously worried about its humaneness as far as the enemy is concerned.

Bombing of cities in future wars will probably be undertaken for two reasons, to destroy important military objectives and to demoralize the rearguard, both of which are ancient military tactics. Only the

weapon to be used is new. In justifying the bombing of cities, General Franco asserted that there were about 180 military objectives in Barcelona alone. It is said that such bombings also act as effective propaganda in breaking the spirit not only of soldiers at the front but also of people at home engaged in manufacturing and other pursuits to support the army, thus compelling one and all to ask whether it is worth while to carry on longer against such horror. When one stops to think of the mere secondary effects which would follow the breaking of the water mains, the shattering of the electric, gas, transportation, and sewer systems in an air raid upon a city like New York or Los Angeles, it is enough to raise a serious question as to the wisdom of developing further military targets of this sort for future enemy bombing airplanes. In an address on armaments before the Italian Senate, in March, 1938, Premier Mussolini not only predicted that future wars will be conducted in a greater measure from the skies, but warned the Italian people to prepare for this now by living in smaller towns.

> War from above must be conducted in a manner to disorganize the enemy positions, to dominate the sky, to fracture the morale of the people. . . . War from the sky is destined to assume even greater importance in the war of tomorrow. . . .
>
> The best active defense against air attack consists in sending away from the great centers of population all those—and they are many—who are not absolutely required to live there. From this moment I say that all those who can organize their existence in smaller towns in the countryside would do well not to await the twelfth hour.[18]

The Effect of New Inventions

There are many arguments, in addition to the military, which suggest that the very large city has had its day. Our modern cities have been molded pretty largely by steam. Steam power, in its application both to machinery and to transportation, has tended of necessity to concentrate great numbers of people into small areas during working hours. Since steam used for power cannot be carried any considerable distance, the use of steam in conjunction with water power made the larger factory far more profitable than the smaller one. This tended to draw workers closer and closer around the places of employment, especially since rapid transportation and communication were of much slower growth than the factories. But steam is now being replaced by electricity and the gas engine as the chief source of direct motive power. Electricity, whose significance for industry and communication has come to be recognized in the last two decades, can be distributed at a comparatively

[18] Associated Press release in the New York *Times*, March 31, 1938.

small cost over hundreds of miles of territory, thus eliminating the chief reason for former urban congestion. Several large producers have already recognized the fact that it is more economical to break up their large manufacturing centers into smaller units strategically placed nearer the sources of raw materials. In addition, there are advantages to the employer in the way of low rentals and lower wage scales.

Unfortunately, as factories move away from the cities, offices and commercial houses seem to move in to replace them. The result is an exchange of factory workers for poorly paid, unskilled, white-collar workers. Yet the office, as well as the productive end of modern business, can be decentralized with profit as a result of modern inventions, as some business leaders are now commencing to realize. Though large downtown offices were formerly necessary, because of the need of quick communication between sales, accounting, and other departments, the development of quick, cheap means of communication by telegraph, telephone, and teletype has made it possible now for a central office to keep in constant contact with widely scattered branch offices. Another argument for decentralization of office workers is emphasized by Warren S. Thompson, who points to the greater inefficiency of office work under the conditions which now prevail in the large cities. While it is unfortunately true that the large city employer is able to secure the unorganized clerical worker at about the same wage as the smaller-town operator, Professor Thompson says that the worker cannot contribute the same amount of service in the large city because of various urban factors which reduce his efficiency. Among these factors are noise and confusion, made necessary by office crowding, and lack of adequate ventilation. Furthermore, the poorer living conditions which the low-salaried clerical worker of the large city must face at home make him a less efficient worker than the small-town resident whose living expenses are not so high. Unfortunately, employers have not yet seen the wisdom of office decentralization as clearly as they have seen the wisdom of productive decentralization.[14]

The arguments just put forth in favor of the decentralization of our large cities are entirely economic. While they will be opposed by real-estate owners, newspapers, hotel men, and others who profit by greater increases in city population, it is hard to see why these economic arguments should not prove effective in the near future at least in stemming the old drift towards so-called "bigger and better cities." In addition there are the many social arguments for smaller cities and towns already

[14] *Population Problems* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935), Chapter 20, "The Future of the Large City."

considered, along with the military argument, which may eventually prompt governments to stimulate decentralization on a wider scale than is involved in some of the present projects of the Resettlement Administration. Sociological studies sometimes refer to the modern city, with its typical sequence of adjoining areas growing out like concentric circles from a nucleus or downtown business area, as "mononucleated" in form. As a successor to such cities, which were modeled in an era of steam power, Thompson suggests a compromise form of organization, the "polynucleated" city, in which many small cities will be established within the areas of the present large city. As the big city reorganizes on the basis of electricity and gas-engine power, it can spread out over a greater area with less costs for business rentals, thus eliminating many of the social abuses of existing urban congestion as well. If people are enabled to live and work in less congested and smaller neighborhood areas, there will result not only a more realistic community and political life, but a close-knit family life in addition. In a thought-provoking book, *The Culture of Cities* (1938), Lewis Mumford asserts that the day of the modern metropolis is over and that the salvation of our civilization depends upon the establishment of cities planned for the people who live in them rather than for exploitation.

Conclusion

With social, economic, and military arguments favoring both the agrarian movement and the establishment of small-town industries and polynucleated cities, it would seem that the existing type of antifamily large American city has reached, if it has not already passed, its peak. However, the city of yesterday will be with us for a long time to come unless those who appreciate its evils combine their efforts against entrenched interests in order to abolish them. It seems rather doubtful that these reforms can be made in time to ward off the stationary population which is around the corner or even in time to prevent the decline in population which seems certain to follow that stage.

II. An Inflated Standard of Living

Closely related to urbanism as a force in reducing population growth is the ever-increasing modern tendency to regard luxuries as necessities. In a predominantly rural community farmers and their families are perforce content with the basic necessities of life and aspire to only a few luxuries; this was especially true a generation ago, when rural dwellers were comparatively isolated. In less measure it was then true

of cities, in startling contrast with the wide differences in standards of living plain to be seen in any modern city. No urban resident today can fail to be conscious of the fact that he has, or does not have, conspicuously more or less than some of those who, though they rub his shoulders, are not his neighbors. His consciousness of this is heightened by the unfortunate "conspicuous consumption" of the rich and near-rich, who so often seek their pleasures before an audience. The importance thus attached to wealth is partly blamed for juvenile crime by Commissioner Thayer of the New York State Department of Correction. "The possession of wealth for the ease and luxury which it brings and the freedom from the disagreeable restraints of ordinary life it allows has been held up to youth," he said, "as the main object in life, the gauge by which success or failure will be determined. The evidence of wealth on every side, the careless and profligate spending of money for momentary pleasure, has stimulated desires which are too clamorous for recognition to brook the delay of patient and honest accumulation." [15] There was less incentive for living beyond one's means in the country and in the small towns of yesterday, because people knew each other and just about how much income each received. On the other hand, with the anonymity and mobility of modern urban life, a person is judged very often by the evidences of prosperity he displays, even though he may be living far beyond his means and defrauding his creditors. Social status and apparent economic status have tended to become synonymous in modern city life, so that some strive for needless wealth chiefly in response to a human craving for a feeling of importance.

I. "RESTLESS AMERICANS"

While the arrogant display of luxuries made possible by vast differences in income has led to discontent and revolution in some countries, in America up to now it seems to have acted chiefly as an added spur to the ambitions of those who lacked these things. Until very recently America was a young country with untapped natural resources. Wealthy families that had "risen from the ranks" were pointed out in nearly every community. "Ambition" was a word which in the American psychology became almost synonymous with success, so that the lack of evidence of wealth often came to be regarded as an indication of personal inadequacy. Consequently, people often strove to better themselves, not merely because of the pleasure to be derived through the en-

[15] *Proceedings*, 25th Annual Conference of New York State Association of Magistrates (Albany, 1936), page 22.

joyment of luxuries, but in order to bolster up their ego as well. Newly married city dwellers were urged on by an ambition either to retain against all odds the advantages of a social status already acquired or, in more instances, to raise their economic and social position far beyond that of their parents. There are few countries in which social advancement, at least for those living above the very lowest economic level, is so easy to attain and so much sought after as in America. Our society is divided into several different social levels, each determined pretty much by economic status. The urge to rise to a higher level seems to be strongest among those who stand at the edge of a social level, provided it is not too close to the bottom. In this race for social preferment those with the largest families are greatly handicapped. As a result, parenthood has lost much of its prestige on the higher social levels, except in the case of those who in this respect are influenced by religious motives.

American homes of today are probably the most attractive in the world's history. Radios, rugs, overstuffed furniture, oil and electric heaters, electric cleaners, electric cookers, electric refrigerators, and a dozen other things, in addition to fancy plumbing, make even modest American homes appear as castles to many of the ordinary people of Europe. Through improved transportation and refrigeration the majority of our population now enjoys a year-round diet of fresh green vegetables which even the wealthiest could not afford a generation ago. Most of these new expenditures have been foisted upon us in the last quarter of a century. At first they were novelties to be tried, but, once tasted, they were so pleasant that it was difficult to drop them. So many new wants were proclaimed as necessities that there were more ways of being "poor" in the United States than ever before. Common sense as well as science taught us that some new things were necessities, but each new luxury was usually followed by a barrage of clever advertising and high-powered salesmanship in a "buy more" campaign to confuse us. The schools, either bewildered themselves or else fearful of local political pressure from commercial groups, hesitated to give future purchasers and homemakers truthful and practical advice about buying. The newspapers and magazines, of course, were allied with business, and the speed of city life prevented us from thinking for ourselves. All this has contributed to a state of general confusion in which few people seem to be able to determine which things are luxuries and which are necessities, and what their proper standard of living should be. So much confusion exists that in marriages above the low-salaried group we find that disputes about financial matters constitute one of the most frequent sources of domestic discord. Common sense dictates one stand-

ard of living, while style, fostered by commercial interests, demands another.

One of the chief reasons for the frequent discontent over financial matters in marriage is the fact that our wage system is adjusted to the individual rather than to family responsibility. According to our present wage theory, the individual worker who is not raising a family today is supposed to be saving up in order to do so in the future. It is this childless group with its surplus cash that is most earnestly sought after by the manufacturer of luxuries and frills. All kinds of attractive but unnecessary articles are advertised for his or her pleasure, and the appeal of such displayed luxuries naturally touches the married also. As a result of the sales pressure exerted to reach the "luxury market," parents often attempt to enjoy these fads also, a strain which adds to the cost of child-rearing and finally makes parenthood distasteful. The remedy for this situation, described so well recently by Dr. E. R. Roper Power in the London *Tablet,* would seem to be a family wage system in which those who are actually carrying the burdens of parenthood will receive a larger wage than the others.

> Commerce caters for the bachelor, or, at least, is specially polite to him as the most profitable of customers. The consequence of this is not merely that the family is ill cared for, but that the whole speed of the process of multiplying wants and extending the range of possible satisfactions is greatly accelerated. Were there less discrepancy between the income of bachelors and parents, this process of extending the range of economic goods would be slowed down, more attention given to more basic needs and the process of adjustment made more gradual. Not only does this artificial stimulus give rise to problems of spiritual and cultural adjustment on the part of the individual, but it further embarrasses the family and puts more temptations in the way of parents. The lightly burdened are able to taste the new interests and pleasures, the would-be parents are faced with the dilemma of abstinence or minimizing their burdens. The sacrifices entailed by parenthood are thus further emphasized by contrast.[16]

Where parents are straining every effort in social climbing or in achievement of unreasonable material ambitions, children are usually in the way. Where the standard of living regarded as a prerequisite for commencing married life is raised too high, the birth of children is postponed. When this inflated standard of living, which restless ambition never allows to slow down to meet the income, is raised continually after marriage, it brings about a condition in which the date of the arrival of postponed babies is forced constantly to compete with

[16] "Population Prospects III," *The Tablet* (London), Volume 171, February 5, 1938, page 167. Used by permission.

new luxuries. Even in the matter of obstetrical care many people tend to live beyond their means. Instead of reasonably good medical services for an ordinary uncomplicated birth they must have the city's most expensive obstetrician along with special nurses. Instead of a hospital bed in a small two- or four-bed maternity section they must engage an expensive private room, all this very often in order to "keep up with the Joneses." Because the social pacemaker, "Mrs. Jones," plans on sending her children through college, her less prosperous imitator decides at once that she can have only as many children as can be sent through college. And so the whirl of social competition goes on and on with children becoming fewer and fewer, especially in those families where there is no objective moral code to dictate appropriate conduct in such a situation. What America seems to need is a redefinition of "success" in which it will be clear that the deeper test of life is not economic achievement but what you can do without and still be a real person.

In one large group of urban dwellers we find an apparent contradiction to what has just been said concerning rural and urban birth-rate tendencies, for the unskilled laborers of the city still show a birth rate which compares rather favorably with that of the farm. Yet a closer analysis would seem to indicate that some of the same forces which keep social ambition within reasonable bounds in the country serve likewise to stabilize the ambitions and consequently the birth rate among the unskilled laborers of the city, many of whom are immigrants or sons of immigrants. Low pay, lack of education, and oftentimes a language or foreign accent which constitutes an additional social barrier have united to keep city laborers from coming into close social contact with white-collar groups and their higher standards of living. Perhaps debilitating housing and neighborhood conditions, plus the very futility of even attempting to raise their living standard while deprived of the bargaining power of organized labor, have induced them to accept their present status with little question.

In contrast to the unskilled laborer, the unorganized and poorly paid urban clerical workers, who for the most part have very small families, are outstanding examples of the effects of what we have just described as "unregulated ambition." Unlike the unskilled laboring group, clerical workers are constantly thrown in close contact with employers and their higher standards of living. On account of their more refined dress and manners, clerical workers are more apt to take advantage of the anonymity of city life than day laborers and so to try to live in a manner which is beyond their means. Social climbing is possible for them but

futile for the day laborer, and in their attempt to follow the new pace potential children are sacrificed. Should a like desire to live beyond their means become common in the unskilled working group, as it apparently has in Stockholm, where the laborers now have smaller families than the wealthy, we may expect a much greater falling off in America's future population growth. With the radio and other forms of persuasive advertising invading the homes of our unskilled laborers, indications are that this group may soon learn to adopt the same restless desire for a constantly advancing standard of living which now characterizes many of the clerical and middle-class groups.

It is conceivable that our new immigration policy, which has practically shut off immigration, may have the unforeseen effect of slowing down striving for social position here. With the hundreds of thousands of immigrants arriving here annually to act as manual laborers in former times, an idea developed that unskilled labor was somewhat disgraceful for anyone except an immigrant or a Negro. Since manual labor must go on, it appears that the laboring class of the future must of necessity remain rather stable. If we take a more wholesome and Christian attitude towards manual labor and regard it as an honorable vocation, it should be possible to build up a working class which will be not only contented, self-respecting, and even proud of its social position, but educated as well. Who knows but that a part of our present social unrest is due to the frustration of the old American desire to "rise" above manual labor? To continue to regard manual labor as a sign of failure, of a lack of either ambition or ability, will only contribute to the formation of a discontented class which will be the ready prey of revolutionary movements. A more sensible attitude towards labor, combined with the granting of reasonable social privileges to a person whether he is blue-stockinged or blue-denimed, will halt much of our strained social striving with its accompanying broken hearts and depleted families.

If the willing acceptance of the idea of a rather permanent laboring class on the part of some people is essential to future family welfare in America, so likewise is the abandonment by others of the idea that our so-called "upper classes" have any claim to permanency or special privilege. Too often it has been assumed in our employer-employee disputes that the existing returns of capital are forever fixed by some inexorable law of economics, so that a greater return to labor must be sought from increased prices to the consumer or from some other source. "America's sixty families" must not complain if the government, which by its negligence in an age dominated by rugged individu-

alism allowed them to amass an inequitable share of wealth, decides to curb their financial dynasty through social legislation in this age when human rights are being given greater consideration. With fewer at the top engaged chiefly in conspicuous consumption, there will be less incentive for the middle classes to strive to amass luxuries at the expense of wholesome family life. With a better distribution of wealth, more people may be taught to live according to standards of being rather than standards of pecuniary prestige.

2. "AGENCIES OF FINANCIAL EMBARRASSMENT"

A considerable part of the blame for the ever-increasing levies on the household treasury may be laid at the door of what Dr. Walter A. Maier has called the "agencies of financial embarrassment," namely, unscrupulous salesmanship, installment buying, and loan sharks.[17] Whereas the small townsman of a generation ago merely had to be on guard against the "Saturday night faker" and other occasional unscrupulous itinerant salesmen, the city dweller of today must stand off this type daily at the front door, read around him in the advertisements of his newspaper and magazine, and try to dial around his blasts on the parlor radio.

Making use of practical psychology, the suave modern advertiser is difficult to cope with. Newspapers and now the radio, dependent upon his advertisements for their chief source of income, are reluctant to expose his fakery, nor does education in school or college dare speak out very boldly against his deceits. Meanwhile, purchasing has become a much more complex process than it was a few generations ago, when cloth was purchased by the yard for clothing and food and drug supplies were limited to a few staples. While impartial consumers' purchasing guides along with books like *100,000,000 Guinea Pigs* have opened the eyes of many people to some of the frauds of modern salesmanship in recent years, such people constitute only a small and probably the least injured proportion of the purchasing public. Until public opinion can be so aroused that legal measures to regulate advertising and salesmanship in the interests of the average untrained purchaser can be passed over the heads of corrupt legislators, who attempt to divert attention from the main issue by talking of the "freedom of the press," little practical relief can be looked for in this field.

Installment buying is a second "agency of financial embarrassment" which has added needlessly to family expenses and in many instances contributed another handicap to happy married life. Enticed by the

[17] Walter A. Maier, *For Better Not for Worse* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1936), pages 475–479.

appeals of "easy credit" and "a small down payment and a little a month," thousands of newlyweds have entered upon married life with the husband's salary mortgaged for many years to come without the slightest idea as to how their debts shall be paid. Starting out without adequate previous savings, all at once they seek to purchase many of the luxuries and advantages which their parents accumulated over a lifetime. This spending spree is encouraged by salesmen, who realize what the newlyweds realize but seldom—that the goods purchased will be paid for at a price from 6 to 16 per cent more than that established for those who pay cash. Furthermore, installment-plan purchasers are seldom aware that the law is all on the side of the vendor in these purchases. For instance, should they fail to make the last few payments on their home furnishings, usually the entire furnishings can be taken away from them. Sometimes an installment house will trap an unsuspecting family just before the final payment has been made upon household furnishings by the device of inducing them to make an additional purchase with the flattering suggestion that "a new contract will not be necessary." Since the new items are added to the old contract, the entire furnishings can be seized if payments are not kept up on the recent purchase.

The other "agency of financial embarrassment," the usurious small-loan business, has been mentioned already and the credit union suggested as an antidote. Urging forbearance, fortitude, and resistance to the capricious dictates of commercialized fashion, especially during the decade which follows twenty-five, sometimes called the "age of accumulation," Professor Maier concludes with this homely advice to newlyweds:

> The keep-up-with-the-neighbors complex must vanish if we are to return to healthy home normalcy. The young matron whose eyes linger on the wraps of mink and the fulsome wardrobe of others in her social set must learn to resign herself to the lower level of fur-trimmed, tailored cloth. The family across the street may banish the icy chills of February mornings by the magic of the thermostat; but if the family pocketbook cannot be stretched to provide the comforts of self-regulating systems of heating, we must accept the anthracite with the attendant furnace chores, not in a spirit of resignation or protest, but with an unperturbed optimism that gratefully recognizes how much more serious the situation might be.[18]

Father Edward Roberts Moore likewise gives a list of unnecessary things which newlyweds should avoid, in spite of the appeal of streetcar placards, newspapers, billboards, and radios, which attempt to make

[18] *Op. cit.*, page 480.

the possession of these much-advertised products a mark of social sanction. False standards are set up in this way, writes Father Moore, "standards of possession, not of being; standards that are artificial and misleading—standards, all too often, that are incompatible with any but a small family." [19] A perusal of the pictures in advertisements of automobiles and other widely advertised products would suggest that the two-child family is regarded now as the American ideal. Yet demographers agree that such a family will not maintain even a stationary population. W. S. Thompson estimates that even with the existing low death rates, if every couple having children had about 2.6 children, we should only preserve a stationary population in America.[20] If the population is to continue to grow, however, more than three children will be necessary. Many believe that, once reproduction habits have reduced population to the stationary level, it will be very difficult to prevent it from dropping far below this level soon afterwards.

In the *Twilight of Parenthood* Dr. Enid Charles shows how our present scheme of social life actually promotes small families. Similarly, Dr. Louis I. Dublin writes: "The very organization of society today carries with it the potentiality of its own undoing. Our social and economic set-up encourages depopulation by putting a premium on sterility, partial or complete. The glorification of self-advancement as a main objective of life throws into eclipse other loyalties such as those to the family and the nation." [21]

3. SUGGESTED REMEDIES

Many remedies have been suggested to meet the evils of excessive spending. The development in our cities of the old-fashioned neighborly spirit, in which intimate knowledge of each other's affairs discourages "bluffing," if it could be brought about, might help. Keeping strictly to a sensible family budget would no doubt be a great aid in many cases. A social-justice program which will cut down the disproportionate profits now accruing to the more prosperous would probably help to discourage much "conspicuous consumption." If our public schools dared to teach young people and through them their parents how to pierce the smokescreen of salesmanship so as to make intelligent purchases, they could be helpful too. But fundamentally this whole situation seems to be a moral and religious problem. It calls for a new and aroused

[19] *The Case Against Birth Control* (The Century Co., New York, 1931), page 160.
[20] *Op. cit.*, page 444.
[21] *The Population Problem and World Depression* (pamphlet) (Foreign Policy Association, New York, 1936), page 30.

social morality based upon personal virtues. Possibly the recent period of bewildered spending is only a temporary one in American life and as a result of depression experiences is to be succeeded by a return to common sense. No doubt the editor of *Ave Maria* had confidence in the fundamental ideals of young people, at least, when, in commenting upon the recent observation of Dean Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard College ("Young women today want to be married, have babies, and a home, and to make a good job of doing it"), he added:

> All normal young men and women have lofty ideals until our grown-up population begins putting ideas into their heads. Even then they do not lose those ideals, but submerge them for a time to be resurrected occasionally, and sighed over during those saner periods when the better side of nature has had a chance to come to the surface. All normal young men and women, we repeat, have decent instincts; but when a thousand selfish sales organizations begin to fill their heads with foolish ideas on what they call being beautiful and having a "good time," and particularly when these efforts are supplemented by the allurements of theatre and press, our bewildered young people have a difficult time keeping a balance.[22]

Many believe that the young men and women of today will live within their means in marriage if they are taught to do so by precept and example. It is said that the fault lies chiefly with their grown-up philosophers. A neopaganism which sanctions a tense pursuit of personal pleasure and ease and a contempt for sacrifice, under such shibboleths as "the right to happiness" and the desire "to live one's own life," has paved the way for all those agencies which encourage an exaggerated standard of living and its consequent marital unhappiness and sterility. Some sort of "organized encouragement" is needed to strengthen parents and future parents in the fight against false philosophies. We do not need a demographer to tell us that a society in which ungoverned selfishness is the keynote cannot survive. Nor should it be necessary to emphasize the obvious remedy for this modern weakness, namely, a return to Christianity. How different modern society would be if, for example, a larger number of Catholics followed the admonition given in the following commentary on the rules of the Third Order of St. Francis, a religious order recommended recently by Pope Pius XI for men and women, both married and single, living in the world:

> In all things let the members of the Third Order avoid extremes of cost and style, observing the golden mean suited to each one's station in life. The purpose of this point of the Rule is to counteract the spirit of the world: avarice, greed, vanity; to foster the spirit of contentment with one's station in life; not to live beyond one's means, not to try to keep up with the Joneses.

[22] Volume 46, October 2, 1937, page 440.

It inculcates the principle of moderation and simplicity, which in turn beget satisfaction and happiness.[23]

Perhaps what is needed most right now is some such organization in which those who are now fighting alone against the tendency toward an inflated standard of living in their personal and family lives can gather together and find mutual aid and support. It is difficult for the individual to fight against this modern philosophy alone. It is against the modern success ideal "based on the love of money for its own sake beyond reasonable need" that Father Paul Hanly Furfey protests so vigorously while advocating the return to a truly Christian society, in his recent *Three Theories of Society*.[24]

References for Further Reading

Andrews, B. R., *Economics of the Household: Its Administration and Finance,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1935

Borsodi, Ralph, *Flight from the City,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1933

Brunner, Edmund de S., *Rural Trends in Depression Years,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1937

Brunner, Edmund de S., and J. H. Kolb, *Rural Social Trends,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933

Carpenter, Niles, *The Sociology of City Life,* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1931

Clark, Evans, *Financing the Consumer,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1930

Cole, William E., and Hugh P. Crowe, *Recent Trends in Rural Planning,* Prentice-Hall, New York, 1938

Daniels, John, *Cooperation, an American Way,* Covici-Friede, New York, 1938

Davie, Maurice, *Problems of City Life,* John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1932

Donham, S. Agnes, *Spending the Family Income,* Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1933

Fowler, Bertram B., *Consumer Cooperation in America,* The Vanguard Press, New York, 1938

Fowler, Bertram B., *The Lord Helps Those—,* The Vanguard Press, New York, 1938

Friend, M. R., *Earning and Spending the Family Income,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935

Gallert, David J., *Small Loan Legislation,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1932

Gillette, J. M., *Rural Sociology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1935

Gist, Noel P., and L. A. Halbert, *Urban Society,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1933

Hoffer, C. R., *Introduction to Rural Sociology,* Richard R. Smith, New York, 1934

[23] Fr. Juvenal Emanuel, O.F.M., *A Layman's Order* (pamphlet) (Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, 1937), page 4.

[24] The Macmillan Company, New York, 1937.

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L., *The Farmer's Standard of Living,* The Century Co., New York, 1929
Kolb, J. H., and Edmund de S. Brunner, *A Study of Rural Society,* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1935
Kyrk, Hazel, *Economic Problems of the Family,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1933
McKenzie, R. D., *The Metropolitan Community,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933
Mumford, Lewis, *The Culture of Cities,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1938
Muntz, Earl E., *Urban Sociology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938
Sanderson, Dwight, *On Rural Life in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Sanderson, Dwight, *The Rural Community,* Ginn and Company, Boston, 1932
Schlesinger, Arthur M., *The Rise of the City, 1878–1898,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1933
Sims, N. L., *Elements of Rural Sociology,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1934
Sorokin, P. A., and C. C. Zimmerman, *Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology,* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1929
Thompson, Warren S., *On Internal Migration in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Thompson, Warren S., *Population Problems,* revised edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935
Woolston, Howard B., *Metropolis,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1938
Zimmerman, Carl C., *Consumption and Standards of Living,* D. Van Nostrand Company, New York, 1936

CHAPTER IX

EFFECT OF LOW WAGES AND WOMEN'S WAGES ON POPULATION GROWTH

THE adequacy of the wages paid to the male breadwinner is generally believed to have some relationship to the size of his family; likewise, the employment of his wife is supposed to affect population growth. This employment of wives and of women generally may be regarded as a symbol of a broad tendency to give greater freedom to women. In this chapter we shall consider population growth as affected by (1) low wages and (2) greater freedom for women.

I. LOW WAGES AND THE BIRTH RATE

It is a well-known fact that in the low wage groups there is a high inverse ratio between wages and the infant mortality rate. In a series of studies made in different cities by the Children's Bureau a few years ago, it was found that the infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births varied from 167 when the father's annual income was under $450 to only 59 when this income was $1,250 or over. Other studies have shown that, if mothers are employed during pregnancy, the infant mortality rate is higher than in the case of unemployed mothers. The same correlation has been established when mothers are employed during the infant's first year of life. Independent of their other effects, therefore, low wages cause population shrinkage in so far as they contribute rather directly to raising the infant mortality rate.

Except for the undisputed facts just seen, the relationship between low wages and our declining birth rate is not always what one would expect to find. Whereas many people who practice birth control allege that they are impelled to do so for economic reasons, statistics taken in the aggregate do not seem to indicate that low wages are an important cause of birth control. The birth-rate figures seem to indicate that the practice of birth control actually decreases as we approach the low-income group, a fact which neo-Malthusians constantly lament. Studies made in five representative cities indicate that in 1929 married women with incomes of less than $1,200 had more children than those who

enjoyed a family income of $2,000 or more. It is common knowledge that the wealthy have fewer children than those in middle-class circumstances. What, then, is to be said of the "economic" argument for birth control? One answer would seem to be that in a great many cases where this motive is alleged an attempt to live on a higher standard of living than the given wage reasonably permits, rather than a low wage, is the basic cause of financial distress. In other words, in such cases it is not a case of the "economic" but of the "inflated standard of living" cause of birth control, already considered here.

It would be ridiculous, however, to attempt to deny the economic argument altogether, merely by citing the cold statistical correlation between wages and the number of children. It must be admitted that there are a great many people outside the low-wage group who are underpaid. Nor, in a country as blessed with natural resources as our own, can they be blamed for desiring to live on a higher plane than their present wages permit. No doubt proportionately low wages are a factor in the postponement of children in many lower middle-class marriages.

Under our present American "go it alone" policy young married couples are usually forced to start their married life without benefit of dowry or any adequate recognition of their new status either in our system of wage payment or through tax exemptions. Meanwhile, they must pay for wedding clothes, a honeymoon trip, and the furnishing of a new home, the total expense of which usually far exceeds the amount of their previous savings, and must also meet the current added costs of living. Is it any wonder, then, that so many young wives of white-collar workers find it necessary to postpone childbearing and to seek outside employment for a period in order to supplement their husbands' pay envelopes?

As we have already seen in studying the effects of an inflated standard of living, a number of factors must be considered in attempting to understand why a high birth rate still accompanies a low wage in the present unskilled laboring group in the United States. First of all, it was pointed out, a very large proportion of our unskilled laborers are in the recent immigrant group. As members of the latest group of immigrants, they, like their various predecessors, have had to accept in turn the lowest steps of the economic ladder. The majority of these people came from European farms where the birth rate was high; speaking a language other than English, they tended to live close together in socially isolated areas of our cities, a condition which helped to perpetuate their European habits and traditions. Cut off geograpically

and socially from association with older groups, they had relatively little contact with a higher standard of living and little desire to rise on the social ladder. With additional immigration cut off soon after their arrival, they were, unlike their predecessors, unable to profit by being able to move up to a better job with the arrival of newer immigrants.

As a result of all of these conditions, it happened that, just about the time when extensive studies were being made of class differences in fertility a few years ago, we found a large group of manual workers whose standard of living had not risen as rapidly as that of the better-educated higher-income classes. Of these manual laborers as a group it could be said that their European customs, interests, habits, and attitudes had undergone comparatively little change. These factors, it is believed, rather than any inherent biological correlation between low wages and fertility, as some of the population maturity "laws" would have it, explain the birth rate in our present laboring class.

I. RELIGION, WAGES, MORTALITY, AND THE BIRTH RATE

Religion and the Birth Rate

One hesitates to speculate as to just how far religion enters into the interlocking class characteristics of our present laboring group so as to affect the birth rate. Certainly the proportion that comes from Catholic countries is larger than it was in most immigrant groups at earlier periods of American history, and studies conducted since 1930 in eight large American cities indicate that, class for class, Catholics are more fertile than Protestants.[1] An English study based upon the annual ratio between births and marriages from 1922 to 1935 showed that in each of these years the Catholic ratio exceeded the national ratio, the ratios in 1935 being 2.39 and 1.71.[2] On the other hand, birth-control advocates boast periodically of the large number of Catholics who patronize their clinics, as an indication that contraceptives are used as widely by Catholics as by non-Catholics. At least three factors should make us hesitate in accepting the statistics offered on this point: first, the publicity and propaganda value in making such unchecked claims; second, the fact that many Catholics have probably been misled as to the purpose of the clinic, where such titles as "maternity clinic" and "mothers' health center" or similar inoffensive descriptions are used, or have assumed that information which is not contrary to Catholic teaching might be available there; third, the fact that social agencies have some-

[1] *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, pages 32–33.
[2] *The Tablet* (London), Volume 171, January 22, 1938, page 104.

times required their clients to report to such clinics. Though it is unfortunately true that some Catholics have succumbed to the temptation to use contraceptive methods, there is a strong likelihood that many listed as Catholics in the birth-control clinic reports are nominal Catholics at best. With the great majority of Catholics residing in the large cities where these clinics are centered, it is only natural that some of both types of Catholics should be found on the clinic registers. A recent article in *The Ladies' Home Journal* which purported to give a cross section of the opinions of American women, based upon a sample survey, stated that 51 per cent of the Catholic women interviewed favored birth control. However, the writer failed to indicate what kind of "birth control," natural or artificial, was favored and how many Catholic women were interviewed, both very essential points if the survey was to be of any value. One can easily appreciate the news value of stories which seem to indicate that the Church's teaching on artificial birth control means nothing to Catholics; however, such stories do not seem to be based upon the truth.

Fertility of Families on Relief

At this point a word should be said about a rather widespread misunderstanding concerning one alleged effect of the recent depression upon fertility. In 1934 two studies showed that families on relief were having more children than families of roughly comparable groups not on relief. Coming at a time when loud complaints were being made about the rate of taxation, and when the government's relief program was under the fire of its political opponents, these studies were given widespread publicity by various interests. The slightly increased birth rate of 1934 was due, some critics said, to the government's "foolish" relief policy. Despite the care which the authors of these studies had taken to avoid having people draw such a false conclusion, others passed on the impression to the general reading public that families accepted for relief immediately began to have more children.

As might have been expected, birth-control advocates seized upon this opportunity to urge that contraceptive education be made a part of the government's relief program. Some went further and suggested that it might be necessary to sterilize these "ungrateful" recipients of public aid. As a matter of fact, as Stouffer, Sydenstriker, and Perrott pointed out in their studies, what had actually happened was that the fertility of these relief families had simply *remained* high after government aid was granted to them. Causal sequence ran from high fertility and unemployment to the need for relief, rather than from public relief to

increased fertility. As to the increased birth rate of 1934, this was probably the result of the slight rise in the marriage rate in 1933.[3]

The Birth Rate and Infant Mortality

Several other misleading ideas have been fostered in recent birth-control propaganda. One of these is that statistics prove that a high infant mortality rate necessarily accompanies a high birth rate. By using this statement as an argument for teaching those among the poor who have large families to practice contraception, neo-Malthusians are able to pose as humanitarians. As a matter of fact, one could argue just as logically that a high birth rate causes a low infant mortality rate, as far as statistics alone are concerned. It could be shown, for instance, that Norway has a higher birth rate and a lower infant mortality rate than its neighbor Sweden. The real causes of a high infant mortality rate are usually those things which are commonly associated with poverty—lack of proper prenatal and obstetrical care, improper nourishment, unsanitary housing conditions, and ignorance of hygiene—rather than frequent births apart from these factors. A true humanitarian would strive to remedy these things, by working to bring about a living wage and better housing and hygienic conditions for these families, rather than to scold these unfortunate people for having children. The following case, giving the experience of a young wife in moderate circumstances going to the clinic of a voluntary hospital to apply for maternity care, illustrates a sad but common situation among those of limited means, one which could be remedied quickly if neo-Malthusian humanitarians joined in the fight for social justice instead of working against it.

This young woman has $30 in her pocket. The clerk says, "Our price is $70. Pay the $30 now, $15 a month for the next two months, and $10 for the last month, and you will have paid your $70 before you are admitted." "I can't save that much money," the woman says timidly. "No reduction in price," says the clerk. The woman hesitates. "You can see the doctor and talk to him if you are not satisfied." The patient goes into the clinic and waits an hour and a half. When she finally sees the doctor she says, "I haven't enough money to pay for my confinement." The doctor looks distressed. "Please don't talk money matters with me. This must be taken care of at the front desk." The woman hurries from the clinic. She will have to go to a free institution. She has always paid her way.

Come with me now to a public hospital. Here comes that same woman. Yes, she is eligible. "Just sit over there." One o'clock. Two o'clock. Three o'clock. She is called and put up on the table. The doctor is friendly but weary. "You come back next week and we will give you a *good* examination. Bring a

[3] *The Annals*, Volume 188, November, 1936, pages 34–35.

specimen with you. We had 120 patients here today, so we can't take them all." He pats her on the arm. She goes home. Will she go back there next week? As yet, nothing has been done for her. She has just been hurried through the business end of it. This not having money is a big problem!

Perhaps there is a doctor in the neighborhood who will not charge too much? She talks it all over with her husband. Yes, a private doctor would be best. So a day or two later we find her in the office of a doctor around the corner who does a little obstetrics now and then. He will come for $30. "No examination is necessary; do all that when you're in labor. Call me when you're in labor. You can have a visiting nurse after the baby comes."

That night this young woman and her husband once more read the bulletin sent out by the medical society, which says, "Every woman needs a complete examination early in pregnancy, regular and frequent examinations thereafter with urinalysis and blood-pressure readings, and a Wassermann test early in pregnancy to make sure the baby has the benefit of every safeguard." [4]

It is rather easy to see why a higher infant mortality rate should occur among mothers situated like the one in the case above—to say nothing of the plight of those who have to rely upon midwives because they cannot afford a doctor—than among those who are financially better off. But isn't the remedy obvious to a true humanitarian who is not unwilling to attack the many problems involved?

There are two opposite and equally antisocial viewpoints which tend to confuse the real issue in cases like that of the prospective mother just described. First, there are the socially ignorant who belittle this mother's search for modern prenatal, obstetrical, and postnatal care on the plea that it cost little or nothing to have a baby a generation or so ago. Those who respect this argument evidently are unaware of the advance in modern obstetrical knowledge, which has created services which parents "did not need to purchase a generation ago" simply because the need of this care was not known until very recently. Likewise, the advocates of this argument forget the very high infant mortality rate of those days. The second antisocial viewpoint is that of the neo-Malthusian who, appreciating the need of this new care and urging it upon prospective mothers, tells them at the same time to have fewer children so as to be able to pay for their care. In other words, the neo-Malthusian, recognizing the greater cost of being a parent today, makes no effort to increase the income of parents. He prefers apparently to have the present maldistribution of wealth continue, but pretends to be a humanitarian by urging those parents who are not yet "in on the cut" to consider children as luxuries they cannot afford.

[4] Helen Corbin, "Maternity Care: The Human Side," *The Child* (Children's Bureau), Volume 2, November, 1937, page 102.

The Birth Rate and Maternal Mortality

Very similar is the "humanitarian" argument for the use of contraceptives, based upon the assertion that there is a higher maternal mortality among mothers of large families because of lack of adequate "spacing" between births. In this instance again the statistics offered as evidence must be analyzed very carefully, for some studies might be cited to "prove" that prolific childbearing is a cause of maternal longevity. Getting down to the facts, we find several factors which must be considered in evaluating this statistical information. First of all, it must be admitted that there is a certain amount of danger attached to each childbirth, which is one reason why the world has always revered motherhood. On the other hand, many mothers of very large families have been long-lived chiefly because they had very strong constitutions to start with. Eliminating the variables which are most deceptive in statistics of this sort, we find that the chief causes of maternal mortality among mothers who have children in rapid succession are approximately the same as those which bring about most infant mortality, that is, lack of prenatal and obstetrical care and lack of knowledge of sanitation and hygiene, especially when these things are lacking to a mother who is in a run-down condition because of improper nourishment. Most experienced physicians say that there is no reason why several close births should endanger a healthy mother. Therefore, we should be on guard against the propaganda stunt of the newest phase of the birth-control campaign, which, recognizing the fact that the overpopulation argument is no longer valid, has commenced to emphasize what it calls "planned parenthood" instead. In advocating fewer children for the "lower classes" under the camouflage of "planned parenthood," the Malthusian aristocrats are merely changing the emphasis in their advertising copy. In this appeal for "planned parenthood" the innocent public is frequently presented with a "horrible example" case history of a sick mother and her weak children, all this, it is said, because of lack of contraceptive knowledge. If we study the background of those who are putting out such propaganda, we often find that this is just another "humanitarian" gesture of economic royalists who wish the underpaid to keep down the size of their families so as to remain contented with their present wages. Catholics say, *increase the family wage;* in addition, teach mothers that a reasonable interval between births will usually be taken care of by nature if the mother resorts exclusively to breast feeding most of the first year; and finally, point out that in the great majority of cases proper spacing can be achieved by the applica-

tion of the so-called "rhythm theory." In his recent *Catechism on Birth Control* Bishop John F. Noll made the last point clear in his answer to the question, "Has the Catholic Church an official position in relation to the spacing of children?" He said: "Yes; it permits parents to settle that matter in their own minds provided, through mutual agreement, they will abstain from the use of their marital rights during the fertile period." [5]

Birth Control and Unemployment

A final neo-Malthusian misrepresentation, the most superficial though sometimes the most misleading of all their arguments, is that which asserts that unemployment is due to the failure to practice birth control. Chesterton brought out the brutality of this argument when he compared it to a fictitious situation in which society had more boys than hats. The neo-Malthusians argue, he said, that we should cut off the heads of some the boys, rather than do the obvious thing by making more hats. In the background of this neo-Malthusian argument we see again the same characteristic upper-class motive to protect the *status quo* which has been so generous to it. Consequently, reorganization of our economic system, which would provide social justice as well as more jobs for the unemployed but smaller profits at the top, does not appeal to average neo-Malthusians. Dr. Kuczynski recently accused them of gross stupidity in attempting to make use of the present unemployment situation as an argument for birth control, pointing out that he knows of no better way to increase unemployment for the next fifteen years than by large-scale birth restriction. As explained elsewhere, unemployment is a complex economic problem and not, strictly speaking, a population problem at all.

It is against the best interests of the larger social group to subject either the children or the parents in the present large-family working-class group to unnecessary hardships through low wages. We have already considered the effect of such wages in increasing the infant mortality rate. From our study of the effects of poverty we know that, while low wages sometimes bring out sterling qualities of character, more often in modern society they result in unwholesome health and environmental conditions which dishearten and defeat those who would rise above their influence. At any rate, laboring-class families should not be forced to try to develop character against the terrible odds brought about by low wages, which are due for the most part to social injustice.

[5] *A Catechism on Birth Control* (pamphlet) (Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana, 1938), page 56.

Nor should the slightly higher-salaried white-collar workers be restricted to small families partly through similar injustice.

2. BIRTH CONTROL VS. SOCIAL JUSTICE

In the interest of the large-family working-class group, as well as of the almost equally underpaid lower middle classes, social justice is a crying need. Though this topic has been developed elsewhere, it might be pointed out here again that in our opinion the neo-Malthusian group has been one of the greatest obstacles to the achievement of this objective. First of all, the advocates of birth control have made no effort to bring about an increase in the wages of the underpaid, or to improve housing, recreational, and other living conditions. Their sole objective has been to get the underpaid to reduce the size of their families by the use of contraceptives. In doing this they have diverted attention from what is the true need, social justice, by creating the false impression that the underpaid are chiefly to blame for their present unhappy economic condition. By emphasizing the alleged need of family shrinkage, the neo-Malthusians have thrown a "smokescreen" around existing social injustice, as if to prevent the underpaid from seeing the true cause of their plight, lest perhaps they should take the necessary means to correct it.

Catholic Social Teachings Eclipsed

In the writers' opinion, the neo-Malthusians have also retarded the progress of social justice by diverting the attention of Catholic leaders from the social teachings of Pope Leo XIII. In order to understand this charge we must recall briefly the history of the recent so-called social encyclicals. In 1891 Pope Leo XIII wrote an epoch-making message to the entire Catholic world, condemning the evils of the *laissez-faire* economic social order created by the Industrial Revolution, and demanding drastic reforms, with justice rather than charity to the workers as the main objective. In doing this he gave sanction as well as added publicity to the condemnation of industrial evils already made by Bishop von Ketteler in Germany and by other Catholics elsewhere long before the socialists and communists began their agitation. If the attention of Catholic leaders had not been diverted rather suddenly from the demand for a living wage and other economic reforms urged by Pope Leo XIII, social injustices could hardly have continued as long as they have with so little change in this and in other industrialized countries.

The authors believe that the birth-control propaganda, which began to get under way in most industrialized countries just about the same

time as Leo's message was announced, had the effect of retarding greatly any widespread appreciation of the importance of the social teachings of the Church. Nor is it any wonder that the attention of Catholic leaders was diverted temporarily from these Christian economic objectives when we recall that the advocates of contraception were striking at the very foundations of Christian morality and through their propaganda were bringing about the collapse of one Christian sect after another in the matter of contraception. Against this powerful propaganda the Catholic Church, as the "guardian of the faith," had to re-emphasize the basic Christian teaching that contraception was sinful. Naturally, other Christian teachings had to suffer somewhat, by way of emphasis, while this "drive" was on.

Nevertheless, it is consoling to recall that all through the period when the chief efforts of the Church were necessarily concentrated against the birth-control heresy, there were always those, such as Monsignor John A. Ryan and Father Joseph Husslein, S.J., in this country, who continued to work for social justice, as their books and magazine articles of these years will show. In a campaign such as that carried on by the birth-control group, in which the appeal for unrestrained sex passions was organized against the self-restraint taught by Christianity, it was difficult for Catholic leaders to tell just when it was wise to relax somewhat in the attack on birth control, on the assumption that Catholics were no longer in danger of accepting this heresy, and to place greater emphasis upon efforts to achieve social justice. As time went on, here and there those who were in closest touch with economic conditions gradually began to urge that the time had now come to place more emphasis upon the social teachings of the Church. For example, in an imaginary "Letter to Leo XIII" written at the start of the present decade, Mary Gordon, after recalling his teachings on social justice, went on to say to Leo:

> Tell me, Your Holiness, *why* do we not hear more sermons about these things? Why, Holy Father, do not our splendid priests (God bless them all and send us many more of them) begin a *Crusade* for a living wage for the working man?
>
> If they preached yours effectively would they not be removing the occasion of sin for many who are (mayhap) now disregarding your Successor's Encyclical on Christian Marriage on account of strained circumstances; disregarding it and straying away from Holy Communion when every Catholic knows that Holy Communion is to the soul what bread and meat is to the body?
>
> Why, Holy Father, do we see our bookracks filled with pamphlets on "Birth Control," "Race Suicide," and copies of "On Christian Marriage"? There is

not a single copy of your wonderful "On Labor," neither is there a pamphlet on same.[6]

Similarly, a short time before, a prominent English Jesuit suggested that the time had come at last for a change in emphasis, and that every priest should preach at least two sermons on social justice to each one on birth control.

Catholic Social Teachings Re-emphasized

The official turning point in the matter of re-emphasizing Catholic social teaching came finally in 1931. In that year Pope Pius XI wrote a strong encyclical to the Catholic world in which he pointed out that the approaching fortieth anniversary of Leo's encyclical should become an occasion for a concerted world-wide drive to achieve the long neglected objectives urged by Leo. As a result of this new message, which went even further than Leo's in indicting present social injustices and demanding economic reforms, the entire Catholic world has become aflame suddenly with a sincere interest in the achievement of social justice.

Since this incident in 1931 many Catholics have commented upon what they erroneously call the "new" social teachings of the Church. To some they seem "socialistic" and out of place in a Catholic pulpit. But to those Catholics whose love of justice and fellow man had not been blunted by too much wealth and power, as well as to those who already knew of the older encyclical of Leo XIII, the voice of Christ was recognized through the encyclical of His vicar. To Catholics already interested in social reform the principles laid down by these two Popes provided the needed light to guide their steps between the dark pit of communism and the false security of socialism. The alleged "newness" of these teachings to so many Catholics today is due, we suggest again, to the unfortunate and diverting influence of the powerful neo-Malthusian propaganda.

It is nothing new to point out that neo-Malthusians are not interested in the true welfare of the underpaid. Malthus, the founder of this whole school of thought, was, as we have already seen, interested chiefly in the "upper classes." Commenting upon Malthus's attitude towards the poor, G. C. Heseltine has said: "He held that they were wrong to seek to improve their condition by demanding better treatment from their employers, and forming trade unions to secure that end. Their poverty

[6] *America*, Volume 46, February 13, 1932, pages 456–457.

was their own greatest crime because the remedy lay with themselves. It was their own fault for being there at all." [7] So, too, we believe that most of the modern neo-Malthusians, like many modern eugenists, are essentially aristocratic and concerned about the underpaid chiefly through selfish motives. They don't like to see the "lower classes," as they usually call the underpaid, increase in numbers while they decrease. Finally, as upper-class beneficiaries of the present unjust economic order, they do not wish to see the establishment of social justice reduce their "cut." Rather than pay a living wage and so end social distress in a humane manner, they prefer to urge birth control, in order to reduce their tax assessment for the poor and to prevent the underpaid from feeling the effects of social injustice too acutely, lest perhaps they rise in violent and effective protest.

Plans to Lighten Financial Burdens of Parenthood

Eugenist Paul Popenoe recently proposed three means of redistributing economic burdens in the interests of married people who wish to have children. He suggests, first of all, the adoption of a family-wage system rather than a continued attempt to realize the policy of "equal pay for equal work." This he would extend especially to men in the white-collar salaried groups, who, he says, are often unable to afford more than two children today. Next he suggests that we devote our attention to plans for sharing the national wealth with young married people rather than with the aged. For example, he says that the present policy of law firms which start a young lawyer at $10 a week with the assurance that he may receive $10,000 a year after thirty years should be amended so as to pay a wage which will permit a young man to marry and have children now, even if this means that he will receive only $5,000 a year after thirty years. The present low salaries of young people are, he adds, not only a social injustice but "an important factor in maintaining the present system by which 'the large families live in small houses, the small families in large houses.'" Finally, anticipating a wider adoption of birth control among the economically depressed farmers who now supply the population needs of the city, he advocates that the present policy of favoring city industries through tariffs be reversed in favor of the farmer.[8]

In analyzing the causes of the present "parents' strike" (contraception being regarded very properly as but the efficient cause of population decline), Dr. E. R. Roper Power, an English Catholic writer on

[7] "Origin of the Birth Control Idea," *America*, Volume 44, February 7, 1931, page 424.
[8] *The Forum*, Volume 98, December, 1937, pages 315–318.

population, places a large measure of the blame upon a wage system in which the bachelor or the childless couple receives the same wage as the father of six children. Admitting that children have always involved countless sacrifices, economic and otherwise, he says that the present economic sacrifices involved in child-rearing are so great that, lacking an adequate family wage, married couples are hesitating to undertake it. As a remedy, he says, we must plan an "economic society for parents" in place of the present one, which caters to the childless individual. To this end we should introduce family allowance systems which aim at encouraging fertility. Such measures should not be regarded as "bribes" to parents, he insists, but rather as measures in the interest of social justice. "The living wage," he says, "can have meaning only if it is related to the varying incidence of family responsibility. The incidence of such responsibility varies not only from individual to individual but also in time during the course of an individual's life." [9] In addition to lightening the economic burden through a wage commensurate with family obligations, the same author would have municipal authorities provide housing accommodations at rentals adjusted to family needs rather than to the mathematically figured economic cost of the speculative builder. To these suggested aids to parents we might add that even more should be done to offset the present effect of the added economic costs in child-rearing brought about by child-labor legislation and compulsory school-attendance laws. Such economic balances might include free medical clinics for mothers and children, free lunches in schools, and greater income-tax deductions on account of children.

Another recent proposal to lighten the financial burdens of parenthood, especially in the matter of obstetrical care, is the Catholic Maternity Guild.[10] The Maternity Guild, originated by Father Joseph J. Schagemann, C.SS.R., was launched at the annual meeting of the Women's Union of the Catholic Central Verein of America in 1932 and is still fostered by this organization. Since then it has been organized in several cities, among which are San Antonio, New York, Rochester, Indianapolis, Fort Wayne, Milwaukee, and St. Louis. The existing guilds vary somewhat in their plan of organization and operation, but the essential idea is to create a parish fund for the purpose of defraying promptly the expenses incidental to childbirth among guild members. While some guilds have accumulated a fund which enables them to provide care for indigent mothers in the parish as well, the

[9] "Population Problems IV," *The Tablet* (London), Volume 171, February 12, 1938, page 197.

[10] Rev. Joseph J. Schagemann, C.SS.R., *The Catholic Maternity Guild* (pamphlet) (Central Bureau of the Central Verein, St. Louis, 1937).

guild aims primarily to be of service to people of moderate means. In addition to payments made to the guild by expectant mothers, sometimes funds are accumulated through parish socials as well as by donations. If a mother is unable to pay her full share to the fund, a parish credit union is usually able to advance loans at low interest.

Because of their unity and ability to make prompt payments from guild funds, the Maternity Guilds are able to make arrangements with selected physicians and Catholic hospitals whereby members will receive adequate care at a lower cost than they could if they acted as individuals. In one city the guild is able to provide ten days' ordinary care in a hospital ward for $25 and a physician's services for $20. In another city complete services, including prenatal and postnatal care, are provided in a two-bed ward for one week at a total cost of $40. When it is recalled that the average charge for a noncharity confinement case in a large city is estimated at around $200, the importance of the Maternity Guild movement to the urban wage-earner is apparent. Until a family living wage is paid on a larger scale, it may prove to be the ideal stopgap. Its very organization also suggests permanent educational possibilities, such as that of building up a morale among mothers in order to resist the forces in modern life which attempt to belittle motherhood or to set up extravagant "styles" in obstetrical care which go far beyond actual needs.

Conclusion

A broad program of social justice, the attainment of which at this late date means the passage of considerable social legislation, is our most important need today in dealing with the low-wage evil as it affects the family. In other words, the Catholic fight against birth control must be carried to the economic imperialists. After pointing out that what we need is "wealth control, not birth control," Father Ignatius W. Cox, S.J., goes on to say: "Birth controllers look at the slums, the filth, the dirt, sometimes the crime. They pass over this. They are not engaged in doing away with these. They would do away with the only beautiful things in the slums—children. . . . What about doing away with the slums? What about an equitable distribution of wealth?" [11]

Social reform very often comes slowly. Social legislation seems to be blocked at nearly every turn by legislators or even jurists whose economic philosophy is *laissez faire*. As each new progressive law is proposed, big business sets up an organized outcry that such a law will

[11] *Birth Control, Birth Controllers, and Perversion of Logic* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1936), page 10.

"ruin the nation's business" and shut its factories, and that the forces behind the bill are communist or fascist or, at any rate, trying to undermine the Constitution. Little business usually echoes the cry. Finally, under the false cloak of patriotism, leagues to encourage the "American way" in business or to "uphold the Constitution" are formed, and the gullible, aroused by misleading headlines and by form letters and radio appeals, are asked to write or wire their congressmen to stop this legislation which big business dislikes. Every time business conditions pick up a bit, Congress is urged to "let things alone" and to "give us a breathing spell," in other words, to fall back to the old *laissez-faire* policy. The editor of *America* wrote recently in contrasting the three chief tendencies in dealing with our grievances: "The Christian way is that of cure; the Communist way is that of irritating the wounds; the Capitalist way is that of permitting them to fester." [12] Sometimes good Catholics—occasionally a leader—are misled by clever capitalistic propaganda such as that just mentioned, thus unwittingly becoming allies of the forces against parenthood.

It is difficult for leadership in either the White House or Congress to keep forging ahead against the constant and well-organized opposition of the manufacturers and commercial groups. Worst of all, perhaps, is the reactionary press, which in many instances seems to be endowed by big business to mislead the public and to create a distrust of the leaders who are fighting for the common man. At one time a newspaper reader could rely fairly well on the news columns if he distrusted his newspaper's editorials. Today, except for a few outstanding newspapers, the news is editorialized to fit the policy dictated by the business office of the paper. Commenting upon the efforts of the big daily newspapers to prevent Congress from continuing its proposed plans for a better distribution of wealth, early in December, 1937, Father Raymond A. McGowan of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wrote in an article syndicated in the Catholic press:

> The open leaders in this particular period of reaction are the big daily newspapers. For a good while not many have been on the side of the people. Now still fewer are.
>
> The two issues that seem to bother them most are the taxes on business and the labor movement. They are themselves business enterprises trying to get and keep as much profit as possible. They are also big employers. It used to be said that these newspapers were tools of their advertisers. That was never as common as it was charged. But now they are definitely lined up in accord with the demands of their own profits and their position as employer.
>
> They do not speak, however, of their own special profits or even now of

[12] Volume 59, May 7, 1938, page 109.

their own special status as employer, even if some time back they were commonly arguing that it was against the freedom of the press for newsmen to organize into unions. Now they are speaking in more general terms of all business and all employers.[13]

Michael Williams commented upon this same prostitution of American journalism in April, 1938. After pointing out the strange way in which our press "ganged up" on leaders who were trying to secure the passage of needed social legislation, he added that "the degree to which the great mass of the daily papers are the propaganda instruments of big business interests is now seen to be very great." [14]

Until our legislators are made to realize that, in spite of the opposition forces, adequate social legislation must be passed, and that an economic system founded upon injustice cannot long endure, Catholics will have failed to perform their duties as outlined for them by the "Social Action" Popes, Leo and Pius. To remain passive in the present crisis or, what is perhaps worse, to criticize those Catholics who are demanding "action," on the true but untimely plea that "reform starts in the heart of the individual," is to admit that neither one's heart nor one's head has been touched as yet by the social injustices heaped upon Christ's poor.

II. Greater Freedom for Women

The start of what is spoken of as the "women's movement" is usually traced back to the publication of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* in 1792. However, it was the Industrial Revolution rather than the agitation of feminists which brought about the greatest change in the position of women. The Industrial Revolution, which took manufacturing out of the household, very often took women with it. It is said that from two thirds to three fourths of the first factory workers were women. The effects of an independent income were not long in asserting themselves. New rights for women were demanded and soon forthcoming in the fields of education, politics, and law. But the quest for independence was not the motive which brought women into industry; it was financial necessity, the same need which keeps most women there today.

Most women go to work with the idea of leaving in a short time in order to marry. Consequently, they usually seek positions which require little or no apprenticeship because they are not particularly in-

[13] Taken from *The Catholic Transcript* (Hartford), December 2, 1937.
[14] "Views and Reviews," *The Commonweal*, Volume 27, April 22, 1938, page 722.

terested in future promotion. Industry and trade have an ever-increasing proportion of such positions to offer, and women have been welcomed to these blind-alley jobs. Employers concerned with financial returns rather than with human values soon recognized the fact that women employees usually hesitated to join unions or to go out on strikes, so they hired women in place of men and paid them lower wages. To protect unorganized women against this injustice, minimum-wage laws were enacted, but until recently blocked by courts which placed property rights above human rights. Meanwhile, the number of women workers increased. While our female population sixteen years of age and over showed a fourfold increase between 1870 and 1930, there was a sixfold increase in the number of gainfully employed women in the same age group. Although the increase in the percentage of employed women has been considerable, the increase in the number of married women gainfully employed has become quite alarming. Today three out of ten married women are gainfully employed. Since 1900 the number of gainfully employed married women has quadrupled, while the total number of married women increased only by 23 per cent. Without counting widows or the divorced, it may be said that over a fourth of all women working today are married; if those doing supplemental work are counted, the percentage of married women employed is even higher.

This migration of women into industry has played havoc with the birth rate. Factories and stores, while encouraging married women to work, made no provision for the possibility that they might need some weeks of temporary release in order to bring children into the world. As a result, potential babies began to compete with actual and necessary jobs. Women might wish to remain at home and raise families, but, when fathers and husbands were often deprived of a living wage, children soon became a luxury which they could not afford. It is said that the employment of women outside the home, particularly in factories and stores, has also contributed indirectly to depopulation because of the pelvic disorders induced by employment which requires protracted standing. James H. S. Bossard says that the strain of supporting the body is transmitted to the hips under such conditions, because neither the bone nor the muscular structure of the female leg is as well adapted to the standing positions as that of the male leg. This results in a narrowing of the hips and a congestion of the organs enclosed by the hip bones, a condition which makes childbearing more difficult. "This condition is likely to be especially prevalent because so many girls start to work when young. Investigation shows that at least two out of five

married women who were factory girls are treated for pelvic disorders before they are thirty." [15]

I. WHY WOMEN WORK

Although some women insist on doing gainful work outside the home even though they are adequately supported by husbands or fathers, most women work because they have to. Nor is their need pin money. They work because they must eat, clothe, and shelter themselves. Though some are partially but inadequately supported by others, many are their own sole support. Some also support others. If less than a living wage is paid to the male breadwinner, a condition which unfortunately is far from uncommon in the United States, women must leave the home, as a rule, if they wish to supplement the family pay envelope. With the making of clothes, the baking of bread, the preparation of various other foods, and the laundering process taken over by industry, there is little work with an economic value which a woman can do in her own home. Large-scale production took over these women's home industries, selling the finished product back to the home at a price, but not, in most instances, adding that price to the husband's pay envelope. Woman's chief economic role in the modern city home is often that of purchasing agent, and, if the family treasury is smaller than a reasonable budget would demand, it is difficult for her to perform this economic function in a helpful manner.

In commenting upon the problems created by women in industry, Father R. A. McGowan says that it is generally considered old-fashioned nowadays to protest against so many working women, because most of them need work and the employers want them to work. Yet now, he says, it begins to look as if the old-fashioned view might come to be the new-fashioned view. While he upholds the ethical right of a woman to work if she wishes, and prefers to see those who do not marry enter positions which will be better than the petty, monotonous, stopgap jobs which so many hold at present, he believes that a proper organization of industry will make it unnecessary for so many women to work. Better wages to fathers and husbands will permit women to prepare for and fulfill more satisfactorily their normal roles of mothers and homemakers. "For our economic system can be organized," Father McGowan says, "so as to need fewer workers and so as to pay all of those who work a decent living wage." He says:

[15] *Social Change and Social Problems* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1938), page 410. Used by permission.

Much of the problem of working women resolves itself into a question of how to solve the general industrial problem and especially of how to obtain for all men in the United States at least a family living wage. Nearly half of the men wage workers are not getting such a wage now. If they did, few of their wives . . . would attempt work outside of their home duties but would stay at home and take care of their homes and their children,—something that is not by any means a part-time job. They would not send their children to the day-nursery,—that lesser cruelty which, in refuge from greater ones, gross inhumanity forces charitable persons to establish. They would not leave them for the older children to care for. They would not leave them to their own care.[16]

2. MARRIAGE OR CAREER

Although the majority of women workers have no choice in this matter, it must be admitted that there are many married women who cannot offer a valid economic reason for remaining in business and neglecting normal home activities. Often this is due to an improper appreciation of the values of homemaking. Unfortunately, some women, successful in business, have come to regard motherhood and homemaking as insignificant and plebeian. Others have said that the "monotony" of homemaking would bore them. Both these attitudes indicate a failure to appreciate that it is not belittling the mental or moral qualities of women to say that successful motherhood is woman's greatest career. Such women as regard homemaking as monotonous frequently thus indicate a defect in their educational background. Homemaking, especially where it includes child-rearing, is a task which should be sufficiently interesting and challenging to any woman. If she fails to find it so, it is usually because she knows too little about it. By way of analogy it might be pointed out that an anthropological museum is just a collection of dry fossils to many people; yet to a student who has had an opportunity to dip into anthropology it is most interesting, and to the expert it is positively fascinating. So with homemaking. If young women are properly educated for this task, they will find that it can be most interesting. It should not be difficult for honest education to lead women to this attitude. What woman who has dipped into child psychology can say that the guiding of children's mental and emotional development is not a full-time job? Psychologists are constantly emphasizing the importance of training in the first few years of a child's life. The task of cooking has been raised to a science by the dietitian. Here again the intelligent homemaker should find absorbing interests.

[16] *Women in Industry* (pamphlet) (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., no date), pages 29 and 30–31. (See also the pamphlet with the same title published by The Paulist Press, New York, 1938.)

Nor should it be overlooked that the success of most married men is due in large measure to the encouragement, inspiration, and homemaking efficiency of their wives.

In a recent article in *Harper's Magazine,* Charlotte Muret, a married woman, raises the question whether the woman who avoids domesticity in order to carve out a career for herself is to be envied. False emphasis has been placed upon the "monotony" of homemaking, she says, while the monotony of perpetually teaching or typewriting has been overlooked. Finally, she points out that housekeeping gives a woman many more opportunities for "self-expression" than is generally realized. Even though many of the former household duties have been taken over by outside agencies, there still remain "the thousand troublesome details of life" which she can take off the shoulders of the family breadwinner, to their common happiness. More fundamental than any other argument against out-of-the-home careers for married women, according to Mrs. Muret, is the psychological fact that such successful careers outside the home tend to deprive husbands of the "sense of possession" which she believes is essential to love and marriage.[17] Writing in somewhat the same vein in another magazine, Mrs. Corra Harris, popular novelist, emphasized the fact that only the exceptional woman can combine a public career with a happy married life. Consequently, for the female genius who is unwilling to be hampered by home duties she urges spinsterhood.

Another factor which may have given a false value to careers outside marriage is the recent tendency to extol "great" women, many of whom are not prominent for their domesticity. Professor Maier singles out two such lists, one selected by Emil Ludwig, and the other by the National Council of Women for the Century of Progress Exhibition in Chicago. Of the latter list of America's twelve greatest women, only three led normal married lives, he says, and in Ludwig's list of the world's ten greatest women he finds some "who would be barred from the United States on the ground of moral turpitude and others who are irreconcilably antagonistic to the ideals of clean, happy womanhood." [18]

When we realize that women did not get the right to vote in this country until 1920, it is conceivable that some of the laudation heaped upon the success of women who have evaded domesticity may be due to a still lurking desire on the part of women generally to show that they are "equal" to men. After centuries of living in a "man's world," where

[17] "Marriage as a Career," Volume 173, August, 1936.

[18] Walter A. Maier, *For Better Not for Worse* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1936), page 451.

it seemed that nearly everything of importance outside the home was achieved by men, it is only natural, perhaps, that many women wish to use their new freedom to prove that they are just as capable as the male of the species. If this is true, it would seem as if time should iron out this exaggerated psychological urge towards careers, for, with the first thrill of the new freedom ended, good judgment should tell women that they have always been as capable as men as far as native mental ability is concerned. On the other hand, a return to sanity will remind women that they are emotionally equipped to do a thing just as great as, and much more important than, those things achieved in the lives of most great men, namely, being good homemakers. While there will always be a few married women better situated by nature or circumstance to follow a career other than that of homemaking, the average wife will probably be happier, as Charlotte Muret has said, "to live for someone else," to share her life rather than make an independent career for herself.

CONCLUSION

Monsignor Francis J. Haas, like Father McGowan, is of the opinion that the problem of married women in industry will tend to disappear with the universal payment of a living wage to the fathers of families. This should be our objective in dealing with the problem, he says, and other devices, such as plans for part-time employment of married women which will allow them to spend a portion of the day at household duties, are to be regarded only as "emergency measures." [19] Until most married women are excluded from gainful occupations outside their homes, as Monsignor Haas thinks they should be "on the broad grounds of sound social policy," they should receive equal pay for equal amounts and qualities of work when engaged at the same tasks as men. Otherwise their competition tends to increase the number of unemployed men.

In considering the greater freedom of women today as a cause of population shrinkage, we found that this "freedom," for most married women who work outside the home, is more of a fiction than a fact. Though some married women work in order to avoid monotony at home, to continue a career, or to purchase luxuries not within the range of the wages paid to their husbands, the great majority are compelled to do so by dire necessity. The obvious solution for this majority group goes back, of course, to the cause previously considered, namely, low wages. It is merely a phase of the failure to provide social justice in the

[19] *Man and Society* (The Century Co., 1930), pages 174–175.

United States. It should not be necessary to emphasize the fact that any tendency of women to engage in outside activities which interfere with proper child care or domestic happiness is a social evil in itself.[20]

(For references on the low-wage problem and social justice see the end of Chapter I; for other references see the end of Chapter X.)

[20] For a brief guide to sound thinking on labor legislation, see Elizabeth Morrissy, *What Laws Must We Have?* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1937).

CHAPTER X

EFFECT OF ANTIFAMILY ATTITUDES ON POPULATION GROWTH

In addition to the many causes of population shrinkage already considered, we have a group of miscellaneous causes of shrinkage which, for want of a better name, may be classified here under the general heading of antifamily attitudes. Conspicuous among these influences which discourage normal family life and so tend to reduce the birth rate are two, the frivolous attitude towards marriage, and the propaganda for birth control.

I. The Frivolous Attitude towards Marriage

While marriage usually is and certainly should be a happy status, the widespread tendency to regard it and its obligations lightly is doing untold damage. Many a marriage is destined to failure right from the start chiefly because one or both of the parties entered into it without sufficient serious thought. Time and again we read of marriages performed hurriedly at some Gretna Green after only a few days or hours of acquaintance. No doubt some of the quick-moving plots of the motion pictures have helped to popularize such streamlined courtships, but in any event the widespread facetious attitude towards marriage, associated with, if not fostered by, the possibility of an easy divorce in case the marriage is not a pleasant experience, is an important factor. "Love at first sight" is a cause of many of these ill-fated marriages. After describing such love as "a myth, a silly misnomer invented by fiction writers who knew their public," Father Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., goes on to say:

> There can be no true love without benevolence, which consists primarily in giving, not receiving. "Marry in haste and repent at leisure" may be wrapped in the whiskers of antiquity, but there is no substitute for sane courtship, and sane courtship requires time. If we were more accurate or scientific, we should call this "potential love at first sight," for love is not mere passion or physical attraction, however intense it may be, but it includes other elements as well—spiritual or mental elements without which no love will ever last and without which no marriage will prove happy or successful.[1]

[1] Quoted in *Ave Maria*, Volume 46, November 6, 1937, page 601. Used by permission.

The stage, the films, and now the radio are continually suggesting, at least by inference, that the obligations of marriage are not to be taken too seriously. Except for Kathleen Norris, few outstanding American novelists seem to possess the courage or the ingenuity to untangle a complicated marriage plot and bring about a happy ending short of divorce and remarriage. Recently on the legitimate stage, *Brother Rat,* otherwise a popular "clean play," hit a new low in ribaldry when a character referred to a husband's "stupidity" in having a baby "with a drugstore on every corner in the United States." The words of some of our popular songs are quite out of harmony with any viewpoint which holds marriage to be a serious or sacred obligation. Of course, it will be urged that no one with a sense of humor is offended or misled by these jests, but even a superficial observation of the attitude of many couples who have entered marriage in recent decades would seem to suggest that the contrary is true.

The seeds of levity sown before marriage are harvested after marriage. If one or both of the contracting parties have rushed into marriage with an idea that it is going to be one continuous round of personal pleasure without a great deal of self-sacrifice and habit reformation, they are destined for disillusionment if not early separation. When divorce is being contemplated, or even when it is regarded only as a remote possibility in a marriage, children are likely to be postponed until it is pretty well decided that divorce and remarriage are out of the question. By that time it may be too late to have more than one or two children, even if years of selfish living have not developed a permanent no-child policy in the home or perhaps physiological sterility. A survey conducted by *The Ladies' Home Journal* in 1937, which purported to give a cross section of the opinions of America's 37,000,000 women, found that 69 per cent of all who voted said "yes" in answer to the question, "Do you believe in divorce?" This attitude suggests that children will be fewer in the future. In 1931 children were reported in only 38 per cent of the divorces granted in the United States, and the average number of children in these cases was less than two. While the American divorce rate, approximately one sixth of the number of marriages, is the highest in the world, the fact that divorces are increasing faster than marriages suggests that more than one out of six marriages now being consummated will end in divorce.

I. THEOLOGY AND MARRIAGE

The present frivolous attitude towards marriage is probably, in a large measure, a logical sequence to the early Protestant sanction of

divorce and the subsequent denial of the sacramental nature of marriage. Chesterton once remarked, "The obvious effect of frivolous divorce will be frivolous marriage." Non-Catholics sometimes wonder why the Church places so much emphasis upon the sacramental nature of marriage; a great many have told Catholic priests that they would become Catholics if only the Church taught differently upon marriage and the sex problem. Commenting upon the reason why the Catholic Church attaches so much importance to marriage, Father Martin J. Scott, S.J., says:

> It is because Christ has set her the example. Rather, it is because she is carrying out His solemn mandate in the matter. The Catholic Church did not institute Christian marriage. Christian marriage is the institution of Jesus Christ Who elevated it to the dignity of a sacrament. In the design of the Creator marriage was intended as the proper means of perpetuating the human race. Originally, marriage was a perpetual bond between one man and one woman, but human license had eventually weakened it and lowered it from its high estate. Christ restored marriage to its original status, and moreover dignified it by making it a sacred rite of His holy religion.[2]

It is to be expected that a civilization which regards marriage merely as a civil contract or as a legal status arrived at by means of a civil contract eventually will differ widely from a society in which marriage is regarded as a sacred rite of the religion of Christ. Fortunately, in regard to marriage our American civilization has its roots in the Catholic tradition of Europe, and for this reason, until recently at least, Protestants have been slow in breaking away entirely from the sacramental tradition and adopting the purely legal viewpoint of marriage, in spite of their official belief in the matter.

2. THE "NEW MORALITY" AND MARRIAGE

Early Protestant theologians may unwittingly have dealt the first blow to the sanctity of marriage. The later philosophers, sociologists, socialists, and communists have been waging a direct war upon marriage and the Christian sex code ever since. A few years ago England's Bertrand Russell, who said that our sexual ethics are about three generations out of date, was introduced in many of our colleges as "one of the foremost philosophers of the day." His bitter pronouncements against Christian sex morality were repeated likewise by his wife, Dora, who said in one American lecture that she believed young people should have two or three companionate marriages before settling down.

[2] *Marriage Problems* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, no date), page 3. Reprinted from *Father Scott's Radio Talks* (P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York).

Nor did she think that faithfulness after marriage was important. About the same time the sociologist Harry Elmer Barnes of Smith College was maintaining that supernatural considerations should be ignored where sex was concerned, and that the law should not interfere except where personal violence or fraud was involved. Numerous other sociologists at leading American universities might be cited for their abuse of "academic freedom" in order to make similar attacks upon marriage and the Christian code of sex morality.

Socialism has always pointed with envy to the supposedly "free" state of sex relations among primitive peoples and has maintained that matrimony is merely a capitalistic institution. August Bebel said that the sexual act was "simply a question of individual taste" and did not concern morality at all; Friedrich Engels said that marriage differs from prostitution "in that one is purchase and the other hire." Communism likewise promises emancipation from "capitalistic" marriage laws. Russia in the early days of the Soviet Union attempted to demonstrate to the world the true Marxian idea of "marriage." It is quite generally known that both socialism and communism are advocated today in some of our leading universities. With atheism on the increase this trend is perfectly logical.

Dr. Homer A. Harvey finds that he can usually place proponents of antifamily attitudes in one or more of four categories: adults whose creed reflects the course they have followed; virgins of both sexes who have become victims of sex obsessions; social uplifters who "shoot first and look afterward"; and those who have become cynics because of their own unhappy marriages.[3] To this list might be added the platform idol and the magazine writer who place publicity and profit before principles. Then, of course, there are the outright atheists who realize that one of the best ways of breaking down the Christian faith is through the establishment of habits which are contrary to Christian teachings. Whatever the thinker's motives may be, his antifamily ideas, if sufficiently publicized, will eventually be adopted by portions of the masses in this age when many former Christians are accepting custom as the chief basis of morality. In view of what some so-called thinkers have advocated in recent years, it is not at all surprising to find that some groups are commencing to accept these antifamily ideas as commonplace. For instance, at a conference on youth and sex made up of parents, teachers, social workers, and others in Westchester County, New York, not long ago, it was decided that concubinage should be regarded as perfectly licit.

[3] "Sex Ethics: New or Old," *The Forum*, Volume 96, August, 1936, page 65.

The consensus of opinion was that, all things rightly considered, a young couple past eighteen with mutual affection, who for any one of many possible reasons could not marry, should not be socially ostracized if they, in peace and dignity, wished to live together in whatever way they could manage.[4]

The tendency to take the obligations of marriage lightly has become so widespread in America today that legislators, alarmed at our increasing divorce rate, are attempting to establish legal restrictions against hasty marriages. Laws requiring public notice followed by a few days' delay prior to marriage have been passed in several states, a device which is a rather frank imitation of the banns of marriage by means of which the Church has always striven to protect and give dignity to the sacrament. When intelligent public leaders become fully aware of the importance of stable family life to the welfare of society, we may expect to see many more such attempts to restore by law some of the original dignity of marriage. However, it cannot be repeated too often that laws cannot change a people's ways if their philosophy points in another direction. If America is to retain a wholesome family life, its idea-makers, rather than its law-makers, need to get busy. While some legislation may be helpful, it will be far more effective to refresh the memories of those who have forgotten that there is a deeper moral law governing marriage. In the freedom of thought and expression permitted in democracy it is possible that ideas aimed at breaking down the very pillars of democracy may become dominant. Without the controls developed in wholesome family life democracy is impossible; those who are attempting to cheapen Christian marriage are wrecking family life.

A second antifamily attitude remains to be pointed out. Some think that in addition to being the greatest single cause of the birth decline it is likewise an important factor in cheapening marriage generally and so in undermining wholesome social life.

II. The Childless-Marriage Ideal

The propaganda for birth control is a campaign for fewer children in marriage. It was once considered normal to have several children, but the propaganda for contraception has now created an attitude in many circles whereby pregnancy is to be associated either with stupidity or with male brutality. This has tended to make the childless marriage, or the marriage with only one or two children, the "intelligent" and fashionable marriage.

[4] *Ibid.*, page 69.

Methods of preventing birth by what Christians long regarded as "unnatural" means have been known at least since early Biblical times. Practically all the present-day contraceptive devices have been in use for centuries, especially those which are used most widely. Yet until recent times, it is believed, birth control was practiced only by a small minority of the population, even though the birth of children was nearly always a source of some added expense in a household and was in every case a restriction upon the selfish pleasure of parents. In the past the unnatural means of controlling birth were little used, chiefly because they were regarded as immoral. As we have already seen, in the last few decades the organized propaganda for birth control has succeeded in making these means seem moral to those who have accepted the idea that custom makes morality. However scientific or humanitarian the followers of Mrs. Sanger may claim to be, on account of their desire to distribute contraceptive information more widely, the chief objective of the Birth Control League of America, in our opinion, has been to break down Christian opposition to unnatural birth control. We have already considered the success of this campaign as far as most non-Catholic churches are concerned.

In spite of the apparent success of birth-control propagandists in getting so many non-Catholic groups to accept their new code of morality, Catholics still maintain that unnatural birth control is sinful both for Catholics and for non-Catholics. The basis for this statement is what is known in philosophy as the "natural law." Unfortunately, it is not easy for one who is untrained in the methods of philosophical reasoning to grasp the full significance of this teaching without rather careful study. This fact has led to considerable misunderstanding on the part of those who lack the patience or the ability to go to the heart of the problem.

I. THE "AGAINST NATURE" OBJECTION

This is not the place to attempt to explain the metaphysical concept of the natural law and its application to birth control (the Catholic student examines this in his courses in philosophy, if not in religion). It is amazing how frequently neo-Malthusians attempt to belittle the natural-law argument against birth control and by these very efforts indicate that they not only miss the point of the whole argument but fail likewise to understand what is meant by "natural law." While almost any of the birth-control literature touching upon morality might be cited as an example, a recent book on the family, which is widely used as a college text, will illustrate what we mean here. In a rather ex-

haustive treatment of birth control, Willystine Goodsell attempts to refute the charge that the use of contraceptives is "unnatural" and therefore sinful: "The progress of medical art and science reveals one long struggle to defeat nature's ways, and the same may be said of surgical operations. Our artificial lives in heated houses are thoroughly unnatural, as are all our efforts to harness the physical and chemical energies of nature so that they may serve human ends." [5] Any student who has taken the time to understand what is meant by "natural law" will realize that Goodsell has missed the point entirely. Anyone who accepts Goodsell's conception of the natural law and subsequently thinks birth control is sinful is a nitwit. Professor Goodsell, falsely presuming that his parallels represented right understanding of the natural law, quite properly concluded with this: "This argument seems unworthy of more detailed and serious consideration." Nor is it surprising, in view of this typical ridiculous misrepresentation of the ethical argument, that some sincere neo-Malthusians should attempt to tell Catholics that contraception is not immoral. In commenting upon this misunderstanding, found so often in birth-control literature, Monsignor John A. Ryan suggests that it is due to the fact that most of these critics are unfamiliar with metaphysical reasoning, although in some cases it may be due to the fact that critics have suffered a degeneration of conscience through the influence of bad thinking habits or current education and environment. He says:

> They find the concept of intrinsic evil unintelligible. They cannot think of any act as evil unless it produces evil effects; that is, effects which involve some positive injury to human beings. They can see that murder, theft and lying and adultery are wrong because they have bad consequences for human welfare; that is, they deprive some persons of satisfactory experiences or inflict some inconvenience. Under the same conception of moral evil, many persons see nothing reprehensive in legal killing of the insane and the incurable, or in abortion of an unviable foetus. The intrinsic deordination of contraceptive practices they cannot regard as morally evil, since it does not necessarily produce bad effects and sometimes has obviously good effects.
>
> One might ask whether those believers in God who reject the concept of intrinsic evil in relation to contraception would not recognize blasphemy as an evil that is intrinsic, since it obviously cannot have an evil effect upon God.[6]

[5] *Problems of the Family* (D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1936), page 315. The authors believe that the concept of the natural law should be developed in the philosophy course rather than in the sociology course. For an explanation of the correct concept of the natural law see Rev. Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C., *The Elements of Ethics* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936), Chapter IV.

[6] "The Moral Aspects of Periodical Continence," *The Ecclesiastical Review*, Volume 89, July, 1933, pages 31–32.

Because of the many misrepresentations of the Catholic teaching on birth control that are found in sociology literature, it may be appropriate to point out just what the true position of the Church is, if it is not already clear here.

While the Catholic Church urges all her members to study the Bible, she realizes that only a very few will have either the time or the necessary training to become expert in interpreting this great document. For this reason she has established a commission of highly trained experts, very much after the manner of our own Supreme Court, whose chief lifework is to study and interpret this great book. Nor does she believe that people are stultifying their minds when they accept the decisions of this commission. Similarly, in the matter of morals, she does not expect that the average Catholic will have the time or the training to engage in research into the ethical and Scriptural basis of each new moral problem that presents itself in contemporary life. Therefore, from time to time, she makes use of encyclicals and other official documents to teach (and it should be recalled that Christ commissioned her to teach all nations) Catholics what is right and wrong in regard to new situations, lest they be swayed by the winds of popular fancy or by propaganda. Her teaching upon the immorality of contraception is very definite, and it will be well to establish this fact here, at least for those who still accept authority in religion. First of all, it should be emphasized that the belief which regards contraception as sinful is not a new one.

More than one hundred years ago the Roman Curia repeated its strict prohibition of Neo-Malthusianism. In 1823 the Sacred Penitentiary declared the prevention of conception contrary to nature. On May 21, 1851, the Holy Office branded as scandalous, erroneous, and opposed to the natural law of marriage the proposition that for honest reasons the onanistic use of marriage was allowed. The Sacred Congregation also condemned as scandalous, erroneous, and already indirectly rejected by Innocent XI the proposition that marital onanism was probably not forbidden by the natural law. . . . The Holy Office thus regards Neo-Malthusianism as forbidden by the law of nature just as sexual self-gratification is. In fact, the practice is nothing else than mutual masturbation, which evidently can never be allowed.

What a seriously sinful violation of the natural law is entailed in marital onanism, is sufficiently revealed by the judgment passed on Onan's sin. Onan wished to have no children by Thamar, and therefore abused the sexual act: "He spilled his seed upon the ground" (Gen. xxxviii, 9). But punishment followed immediately, for as Holy Writ continues, "therefore the Lord slew him, because he did a detestable thing." [7]

[7] Rev. Dominic Pruemmer, O.P., *Birth Control* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1933), pages 5–6. Used by permission.

In his recent encyclical *On Christian Marriage* Pope Pius XI merely repeated the traditional Christian teaching when he said: "Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious." Since we believe that the obligations of the natural law fall upon non-Catholics as well as Catholics, all contraception is wrong, and, likewise, the propaganda which has attempted to popularize it, whether for Occidental or for Oriental, is, from the older ethical viewpoint at least, itself an evil.

2. HAS THE CATHOLIC CHURCH CHANGED ITS TEACHING ON BIRTH CONTROL?

With the simultaneous announcement of a new "rhythm theory" concerning the cycles of fertility in women by Dr. K. Ogino of Japan and Dr. Hermann Knaus of Austria in 1930, and the subsequent explanation that Catholics might, for good reasons, take advantage of this new discovery, many neo-Malthusians attempted to create another false impression, namely, that the Catholic Church had changed its teaching on birth control. As we have seen elsewhere, this discovery called for no new teaching on the part of the Church. For a sufficient reason the Church has always permitted either permanent or periodic abstinence from the marriage relation. In taking advantage of the more accurate definition of the monthly periods of female sterility brought out by recent research, married people are merely co-operating with, rather than frustrating, nature, and therefore are not violating the natural law. The regulation of births by this method may be called "natural" birth control, in contradistinction to "artificial" or sinful birth control.

In all probability this new discovery, which has made birth control by periodic abstinence scientifically possible in many marriages, will tend to reduce the birth rate in some Catholic groups. In fact, the announcement of this discovery in the midst of a world economic collapse, when many families were financially unable to bear the cost of additional children, has been regarded by many observers as an act of Divine Providence. However, certain points are overlooked by those enthusiastic neo-Malthusianists who believe that, except for method, effective birth control is now entirely beyond the pale of morals for all. First of all, Catholics may not restrict the marital act exclusively to the sterile period, unless there be a good and sufficient reason. There must be some serious justifying cause, whether economic or pertaining to health, if this is to be permitted. For example, if a newly married

couple adopted this method merely because they did not wish the arrival of a child to interfere with their selfish social life for a few years, their conduct would be sinful. Second, in the enthusiastic reception of this discovery many have overlooked the Church's constant teaching as to the primary purpose of marriage, namely, the begetting of children. So important is this Christian objective in marriage that moralists question the validity of a marriage into which the parties enter with the deliberate intention of using the rhythm theory to avoid *all* children.

Monsignor John A. Ryan even suggests a hypothetical case, which might possibly arise on account of the use of the rhythm theory, in which the practice would have to be abandoned in order to stop population shrinkage. "Suppose," he says, "that in consequence of general periodical abstinence, the Catholic proportion of the population of the United States, or of Belgium, or Holland, or Germany, or France, or Ireland should greatly decline, with the obvious consequences of a notable diminution in actions that promote the glory of God and a great relative increase in offenses against God in the realms of both faith and morals." Monsignor Ryan is of the opinion that "if these consequences became imminent a large proportion of Catholic couples would be under specific and particular obligation to discard the practice of periodical abstinence so far as would be necessary to maintain at least the previously existing proportion between Catholics and non-Catholics." [8] With the spread of communism in several countries of Europe and the appearance of a frankly anti-Christian state philosophy in Germany, it is rather easy to imagine a situation in which Monsignor Ryan's hypothetical case would be realized. In such an unusual situation the Catholic population policy would for once be concerned about numbers.

In addition to emphasizing the fact that Heaven is won by sacrifice and positive acts, rather than by merely avoiding sin, the Church, in connection with the new rhythm theory, reminds men and women that childlessness tends to develop selfishness in marriage. Selfishness corrodes and warps the character of husband and wife and so jeopardizes their marital happiness. Personal greed and exaggerated independence then develop and are usually followed by nagging and discontent. In a popular pamphlet on this natural birth control, Father Daniel A. Lord, S.J., draws a thought-provoking picture of the young couple who practice it needlessly during the first year of their married life.

No child comes at the end of that first year to throw into their lives a new interest. They begin, as people usually do after the first warmth of passion

[8] *Op. cit.*, page 34.

has faded and they have exhausted their common interests and enthusiasms, to be bored with each other. They are skating close to that edge over which so many young couples fall; they are courting the perils of disillusionment that come at the end of the childless second year.

Without knowing it, they have warped and dwarfed their own lives. Instead of completing the glorious natural triangle with the complementary side that is the child, they begin as two parallel human beings, whose lines never really converged and eventually swing rapidly away at a sharp angle.[9]

In view of the caution with which the Catholic Church has approved the rhythm theory, it certainly may not be said that she is "encouraging" antifamily attitudes.

3. CHARACTER-TRAINING AND FAMILY EXPERIENCE

As has been emphasized before, the Church is concerned primarily about moral qualities rather than numbers in the population. However, since she believes that character is developed chiefly through self-sacrifice, she urges reasonably good-sized families wherever they are possible, in the belief that the moral development of both parent and child is fostered by this arrangement. We have already noted the character-training values of large-family experience for the child, a fact which refutes the specious claim of those parents who greatly restrict the size of the family on the plea that this is better for the child. The widespread belief that an only child is likely to be a spoiled child is in itself a condemnation of propaganda for the greater use of birth control, for it is among the wealthy classes, where contraception has been practiced longest, that the family with only one or two children is most common.

It is important to remember also that the education of the adult for good citizenship is fostered in the process of childbearing and child-rearing. Surely even a utilitarian would admit that a society in which adults were rapidly growing more and more selfish and so less interested in altruism and the common good would be in an unhealthy condition. Though conceivably it might be possible to devise some new ways and means of teaching married adults not to be selfish pleasure-seekers, in order that social life might be more orderly, we know as yet of no way of training the adult which is nearly as effective as nature's, namely, that of homemaking and child-rearing. After long contact with hundreds of families in social settlements, Woods and Kennedy have observed that "adult life, relieved of the fullest care of children,

[9] *What of Lawful Birth Control?* (pamphlet) (The Queen's Work, St. Louis, 1935), pages 32–33.

would become so poor and mean as to imperil civilization itself." [10] Warren S. Thompson, who is one of America's outstanding authorities on population problems, expresses a similar thought more subtly when he writes: "It is very doubtful whether most of us can avoid the personal costs of reproduction and come through with an attitude toward life and its problems which is thoroughly humanistic—which will allow us to see ourselves in our proper perspective in the scheme of human living." [11] The same theme is developed by Father Cooper. After pointing out the well-known psychological fact that personality does not normally develop entirely from within, but is dependent upon contact with some outside "situation," he says that rearing a family is an excellent project in the adult's moral education.

> The rearing of a good-sized family of children entails two or three decades of unselfish care and active responsibility, of curtailment of liberty and renunciation of pleasure, of ready sacrifices and self-denials of the most altruistic kind. It means hardships courageously faced and borne, moral effort consistently and persistently put forth, responsibilities unflinchingly shouldered, sacrifices unselfishly made. Fathers and mothers are trained not by the feeble words of human exhortation, but by the living experiences of their very parenthood.[12]

4. BY-PRODUCTS OF BIRTH-CONTROL PROPAGANDA

The subject of contraception may not be dismissed here without a word about voluntary abortion, which is also an important and evidently a rapidly growing means of bringing about population shrinkage. In fact, an increase in the number of abortions would seem to follow logically from the popularization of contraception for two reasons: first, the fact that birth-control philosophy tends to create an attitude in which children not only are unwanted but are regarded as the result of an unfortunate accident; second, the fact that, short of complete sterilization, for the general public, at least, there are no absolutely certain means of contraception.

It may be granted that there are some contraceptive devices which in theory or under laboratory conditions work "almost perfectly," but their use assumes a degree of intelligence and emotional control of which only a small portion of the population will at any time be capable. Margaret Culkin Banning recently pointed out that the most widely used contraceptives, both chemical and mechanical, vary in efficiency

[10] Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *The Settlement Horizon* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1922), pages 281–282.

[11] *Population Problems* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935), page 339.

[12] Rev. John M. Cooper, *Birth Control* (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1933), page 25. Used by permission.

from 10 to about 60 per cent.[13] Naturally, therefore, if the birth-control propaganda is grossly misleading in that it causes people to place too much confidence in unreliable contraceptives, as editor H. L. Mencken pointed out in *The American Mercury* a few years ago, some of those who have been misled by this propaganda will resort to abortion in order to prevent the birth of children that they are unwilling to have. Perhaps there is an open admission of this correlation in the movement now under way to make abortion operations ethical and legal. Here and there occasional "liberal" churchmen have already attracted attention to their pulpits by openly advocating this change, thus indicating that a parallel movement to break down Christian morality, which regards abortion as a form of murder, may be in progress also.

Abortion contributes to population shrinkage in at least three ways: by causing the death of fetuses, by the concomitant death of many potential mothers due to the fact that the risk of infection is about ten times greater than in ordinary childbirth, and by producing subsequent sterility in some of the women who survive the operation. While we have no way of knowing just how many abortions take place annually in the United States and what proportion of these are criminal, some have placed the total figure as high as 1,500,000. According to a more plausible estimate by the editor of *The American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology,* each year at least 8,000 fruitful women die and over 600,000 fetuses perish as a result of abortions.[14] The same authority points out that, though it is difficult to determine the amount of acquired sterility that is caused by abortion, the crippling effect of this operation is no doubt quite serious.

One of the many unfortunate psychological by-products of birth-control propaganda, with its emphasis upon alleged reasons for *not* having children, has been the establishment in the minds of many women of the ridiculous idea that childbirth is a very dangerous process. Instead of regarding childbirth as a normal process, as natural a function of the human machinery as the digestive process, many women have recently come to regard it as a semipathological situation associated with surgery, Caesarean delivery, unbearable pain, deformities, and even death. A consequent dread of playing that part in the drama of the race which women have played since the days of Eve has no doubt tended to restrict the number of offspring even among women who would not resort to contraceptive methods or abortion. Such a situation is all the more ridiculous in the face of the new freedom for

[13] *The Reader's Digest,* Volume 31, August, 1937, page 3.
[14] *The Annals,* Volume 188, November, 1936, page 81.

women, which should, if properly used, make them better equipped physically for childbirth. On this point Father C. C. Martindale, S.J., has asked: "Why, given the development of feminine athletics, the abolition of corsets, and so forth, are girls infinitely more frightened about having children than they were? I say, and mean, frightened, not merely undesirous. I agree that this is partly a moral question. . . . But it looks as if girls were being stampeded into a panic about having babies, and this is the more iniquitous if, as I am assured, statistics of infant and maternal mortality are being swollen by the increasing of deaths due to abortions." [15]

Similarly, another English clergyman, Bishop William F. Brown, thinks that "fashion" created by birth-control propaganda is very influential in reducing the birth rate. After serving as a member of English commissions to study the national birth trends, he made the following comment concerning the cause of the birth decline: "The main causes are economic or social—raised standard of living and cost thereof, limited housing accommodation with restrictions on overcrowding, drastic reduction of juvenile employment, desire of women for more freedom to get about, to use a popular expression, last but not least, fashion or convention, whichever it may be called. This last, in my view, is a most potent factor." [16] Birth-control propagandists have been for the most part women of the upper classes, women with very small families. By their constant references to "the large families of the lower classes" (sic) these patterns of fashion have created a feeling among middle-class parents that it is plebeian or vulgar to have more than one child or two. It is chiefly because women of the "lower classes" are, as we have seen, less sensitive to the dictates of fashion that they have not adopted the upper-class family pattern. Worthless fears, whether of the exaggerated dangers of childbearing or of being out of style, are in all likelihood important factors in discouraging parenthood.

Summarizing briefly what has just been said concerning the birth-control campaign, which is chiefly responsible for the childless-marriage ideal, we find that the only new thing it had to offer was a new morality which is intrinsically bad. Birth-control propaganda received a favorable hearing largely because a socioeconomic crisis existed, but it is most unfortunate that the campaign was directed against Christian

[15] "Regeneration?", *The Commonweal*, Volume 27, March 4, 1938, page 512. A Catholic mother writing anonymously in *The Commonweal* for July 15, 1938, complains that in some groups women who have children are today regarded either as stupid or as very sensual.

[16] Letter to the editor, *The Tablet* (London), Volume 171, February 19, 1938, page 245.

morality rather than against social injustice, the immorality which had caused the crisis. As a result, we now have two immoralities, and we still have the crisis. Besides encouraging human selfishness in marriage, the birth-control campaign has indirectly brought about death and despair through increased abortion, exaggerated fear of the dangers of normal maternity, and a low estimate of motherhood. Need anything more be said to indicate that the propaganda for birth control has been an unfortunate antifamily influence? When one recalls the freedom afforded to those who are attempting to create a frivolous attitude towards marriage as well as to those who are boldly campaigning for birth control, it would seem that Professor Carr-Saunders is entirely right when he says that we are in need of nothing short of a "social revolution" which shall place the family in its original position "in the center of the social field" with all other institutions subordinated to it. At present, antifamily influences are undermining our society by placing the family's interests last.

III. Conclusions Concerning the Chief Causes of Population Shrinkage

In the last four chapters we have sought out what seemed to be the chief factors bringing about population shrinkage in America. We examined these factors rather carefully in order to determine whether or not they in themselves are social evils. This particular approach to the study of the problem of depopulation was deemed desirable in view of the fact that not all qualified commentators agree as yet that the retardation of American population growth, even if it results in a declining population, will in itself be an evil. For the present, therefore, the evaluation of the existing population trend seems to hinge upon our judgment concerning the causes which are bringing it about. If these are evil, then it may be said that the population trend, in so far as it is brought about by these particular causes, is undesirable.

We found that there are five chief causes of our population shrinkage. In each instance we saw that the identified cause involved something which rendered it an evil in itself. (1) *Urbanization,* which seems to be proving that "man cannot breed in captivity," is depriving the children who are born in the existing type of large factory-shaped city of necessary primary group training without which there can be no well-organized adult social life. (2) The *inflated standard of living* which so many Americans are straining to attain is causing widespread unhappiness, as always happens when people strive for standards of material

possession and ignore standards of being. As a result of this tendency to live beyond one's means, our social life is being infected with a debilitating materialism which endangers all the spiritual values generally regarded as necessary for wholesome group life. (3) Because of the widespread payment of *low wages*, many wives are forced either to seek work outside the home or to subject their families to a standard of living which they rightfully feel to be too low in a country as wealthy as our own. This unnatural way of living reduces the number of children. Where wives do not seek outside employment, social unrest is being engendered by the realization that in many instances children must be reared on less than a living wage, an unrest which birth-control leaders seek to divert by urging the use of contraceptives. In some instances young children die because of a lack of medical care and other necessities, brought about by very low wages. Only the blind and hard-hearted economic royalist will deny that this is an evil. (4) Though some women have forsaken home duties for selfish social activities, because of a faulty evaluation of the importance of homemaking as a career, most women who seem to have taken advantage of the new *feminine freedom* by working outside the home have been forced to do this because of the inadequate wage paid to the chief breadwinner. Educators have not yet indicated how mothers can successfully bring up children by remote control. Spoiled children usually grow into maladjusted adults. (5) Anything which increases human selfishness tends to undermine both the family and the larger social group. Therefore, altogether apart from the theological and moral implications of the situation, from a "practical" sociological viewpoint (without granting that these two viewpoints actually can be separated) such *antifamily attitudes* as those which take the obligations of marriage lightly and accept and foster the childless family ideal are social evils. We assume it to be axiomatic among sociologists that wholesome family life is essential to national welfare.

Granted that the five chief causes of our population shrinkage are in themselves social evils, it might so happen that they are irremediable. Looking into this matter, we found that such is not the case. In nearly every instance rather obvious remedies can be identified. (1) The present type of city, shaped in the days of steam motive power, can be changed to one in which family life will not be jeopardized; in fact, it may happen that the military tactics of modern warfare will bring this change about more quickly than social arguments could. At any rate, new agrarian-industrial communities based upon co-operation and a wider diffusion of privately owned property in land will greatly

relieve existing urban congestion. (2) The tendency to live beyond one's means can be corrected by proper education, education which will protect our citizens not only against the forces of style and supersalesmanship, but also against the philosophy of materialism as well. (3) The low-wage evil can be corrected by the application of the principles of social justice enunciated nearly half a century ago by Pope Leo XIII. These principles can be achieved in America, provided we are not too long diverted from this objective by the existing upper-class greed, which is reflected in the birth-control movement and in the policy of the majority of our city newspapers. (4) After social justice has brought about a wage which will permit wives to remain at home, proper education in the importance and fascination of homemaking as a career should act as a force to correct most of the other evils of the new feminine freedom. (5) The family can be restored to its proper position in life if we set about to do so. Whether this is to be brought about by the "social revolution" which Carr-Saunders advocates, or merely by the wider application of Christian teaching to marriage, is a question of method. It is suggested here that today both are necessary: a revolution in our *laissez-faire* economic order to be brought about by federal and state legislation, and a widespread change of attitudes concerning the nature and purpose of marriage.

Returning to the problem which confronted us at the beginning of these chapters, we find that the five chief causes of the present trend in American population growth are objectionable, altogether apart from the fact that population shrinkage results from them. The welfare of society demands that they be corrected. Though it seems evident that the correction of these defects will also change the present downward population trend, this result is less important than the correction of the causes themselves. Therefore, while we find ourselves still uncertain whether population shrinkage in general is an evil, at least we know that shrinkage achieved by the five chief means now in operation in America is a very decided evil.

References for Further Reading

GENERAL

Angell, Robert C., *The Family Encounters the Depression,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1936

Breckinridge, Sophinisba, *Women in the Twentieth Century,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933

Cavan, Ruth S., and K. H. Ranck, *The Family and the Depression,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1938

Charles, Enid, *The Twilight of Parenthood,* W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1934
Cunningham, Bess V., *Family Behavior,* W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, 1936
Douglas, Paul H., *Wages and the Family,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1925
Elmer, M. C., *Family Adjustment and Social Change,* Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1932
Foerster, Friedrich W., *Marriage and the Sex Problem,* revised edition, Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, 1936
Fortune, editors of, *The Accident of Birth,* Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1938
Goodsell, Willystine, *Problems of the Family,* revised edition, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1936
Gray, Alexander, *Family Endowment,* Ernest Benn, London, 1927
Groves, Ernest R., *The American Family,* J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1934
Groves, Ernest R., *Readings in the Family,* J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1934
La Follette, Cecile T., *Employed Married Women Homemakers,* Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1934
Maier, Walter A., *For Better Not for Worse,* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1936
Myers, Garry C., *The Modern Family,* Greenberg, New York, 1934
Parsons, Alice B., *Women's Dilemma,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1926
Stouffer, S. A., and others, *On the Family in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Van Keuren, Floyd, *Outfitting for Spiritual Marriage,* Morehouse Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1935
Vibart, Hugh H., *Family Allowances in Practice,* P. S. King and Sons, London, 1926
White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, *The Home and the Child,* The Century Co., New York, 1931
Wieman, Regina Westcott, *The Modern Family and the Church,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1937

THE CATHOLIC VIEWPOINT

Bruehl, Charles, *Birth Control and Eugenics,* J. F. Wagner, New York, 1928
Chesterton, G. K., *The Superstition of Divorce,* John Lane Company, New York, 1929
Gillis, James M., C.S.P., *The Catholic Church and the Home,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928
Guchteneere, Raoul de, *Judgment on Birth Control,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1931
Hartley, Olga, *Women and the Catholic Church Yesterday and Today,* Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1935
Joyce, George, S.J., *Christian Marriage,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1933

Latz, Leo J., *The Rhythm of Sterility and Fertility in Women,* revised edition, Latz Foundation, Chicago, 1934
Meyer, Fulgence, O.F.M., *Plain Talks on Marriage,* St. Francis Book Shop, Cincinnati, 1927
Moore, Edward R., *The Case against Birth Control,* The Century Co., New York, 1931
Morrison, Blakewell, S.J., *Marriage,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1934
Norris, Kathleen, *Hands Full of Living,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York, 1931
Sause, Bernard A., O.S.B., *Why Catholic Marriage Is Different,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1937
Schmiedeler, Edgar, O.S.B., *An Introductory Study of the Family,* The Century Co., New York, 1930
Schmiedeler, Edgar, O.S.B., *Readings on the Family,* The Century Co., New York, 1931
Sutherland, Halliday G., *Birth Control,* P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York, 1922

(For references on social justice see the list at the end of Chapter I.)

CHAPTER XI

WORLD POPULATION PROBLEMS

I. World Growth and Decline

Until comparatively recent times we had no reasonably accurate idea of the population of the earth or of any particular area of it. Consequently, it is difficult to tell precisely what population increases and decreases have taken place in the past. It is generally believed that the figures of ancient writers concerning the size of their armies and their nations are not only boastful but grossly exggerated. One of the first important attempts to estimate world population from bits of known information was by a Father Riccolo, S.J., in 1661; yet his estimated world population of 1,000,000,000 is regarded now as little more than a guess. On the basis of later information and modern methods of calculation, Professor Edward B. Reuter estimates that the probable population of the world in the seventeenth century was only about 450,000,000. By the start of the nineteenth century this number had increased to 836,000,000, by the start of the twentieth century to 1,551,000,000, and by 1929 to 1,820,000,000, according to the estimates of this same author.[1] Judging from these figures, the population of the world has quadrupled in three centuries.

The difficulties in the way of making accurate estimates of world population are brought home to us when we consider the dearth of information about many areas even today. Consider, for instance, the aboriginal population in Africa, Oceania, and even South America, in which whole tribes still remain undiscovered and unnumbered. Even among our civilized nations the population figures are sometimes far from accurate. For China, for instance, the figures given by some students differ by as much as 200,000,000 from the usual estimate of 300,000,000. Recognizing these limitations, Reuter divided up the 1,551,000,000 estimated world population of 1900 into continental divisions as follows: Asia, 859,000,000; Europe, 401,000,000; Africa, 141,000,000; North America, 106,000,000; South America, 38,000,000; Oceania, 6,000,000.

[1] *Population Problems* (J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1937), pages 31–32.

Among the chief national groups on the continents the rates of increase during the last century have varied rather widely. Reuter believes that the Chinese population has remained practically stationary, but that of Japan has more than doubled since the country was opened to European commerce in 1868. During approximately the same period the population of India increased by about one third. During the nineteenth century rather uneven rates of increase took place in Europe. The populations of European Russia and Spain tripled, those of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Great Britain, and Ireland approximately doubled, and that of France increased by only about one third, dropping her from second to fifth place among prewar European national groups. Grouped according to size in 1930, the six chief postwar European national groups ranked as follows: Russia, Germany, Italy, France, England and Wales, and Spain.

I. THE DANGER OF WORLD OVERPOPULATION

Even though we disregard the extravagant estimates of world-population increase made by Malthusian enthusiasts, the fact remains that the European population has been increasing rapidly, especially during the last century. This fact has led to considerable speculation as to the population-carrying power of the earth. In a study already referred to, Professor E. M. East estimated in 1927 [2] that only 40 per cent of the earth's land area is fit for producing food; this land, distributed according to population, would amount to about five acres per person, an area which he said could not be reduced more than half without the occurrence of overpopulation. Looking back over the previous rates of population increase, East predicted that the subsistence level would be reached with a world population of 5,200,000,000, and that this would occur within about 150 years unless birth control was encouraged, a position to which Professor E. A. Ross also subscribed. Most of the sociology books accepted these predictions until a few years ago and advocated birth control as the only means of avoiding this impending catastrophe.

Before we attempt to evaluate these alarming predictions in the light of the latest studies made by trained statisticians, it will be well to recall again some of the causes which contributed to the rapid growth of population during the nineteenth century and, to some extent, during the eighteenth century. First of all, before the period of rapid population growth just considered, there was a dearth of scientific information concerning sanitation, health, and the prevention of disease.

[2] *Mankind at the Crossroads* (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1927).

As a result, the normal death rate was exceedingly high, even apart from the frequent recurrence of severe epidemics. We have already considered some of the marvelous progress made later in reducing the death rate. Likewise, we have seen how the use of steam in power-driven machinery, along with other mechanical inventions, greatly increased the rate of industrial production and also, indirectly, the food supply. Thus more people could marry, marry earlier, and afford to have children. In this way the force of two of the great checks upon population growth, disease and food scarcity, was greatly reduced during the period under consideration. It is the effect of these factors which is registered in the abnormally increased European population growth of the last century or so.

Returning to our analysis of the "approaching overpopulation crisis" heralded by Professors East, Ross, and others as late as 1927, and still publicized even today by an occasional neo-Malthusian, we realize now that certain significant but none too obvious population changes had been taking place in Europe and in America for several decades, changes which the population alarmists completely overlooked. This new situation was brought out in a series of studies made by trained statisticians such as R. R. Kuczynski, L. I. Dublin, and A. J. Lotka, which studies, singularly enough, began to appear simultaneously with the publication of the East and Ross books. These new studies, so different that at first they seemed almost unbelievable to sociologists, showed that, when East and Ross issued their warnings, the period of rapid population increase had already passed, and that as far as America and the countries of northwestern Europe were concerned, not only a stationary but even a declining population could be visualized for the not too distant future.

Analyzing the factors at work in bringing about the new population drift, the recent studies called attention to the fact that all through the last two centuries of rapid population growth the birth rate of the countries of northern and western Europe has been declining continuously. Even the population of southern and eastern Europe had commenced to show this same tendency during the latter part of this period. Though the European death rate fell with great rapidity during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, thus tending to more than offset the decline in the birth rate which was taking place in urbanized and industrialized countries, in recent decades it has tended to become relatively stabilized, and, as we saw in studying the American situation, many believe that it cannot drop much lower. The rather tardy recognition of the tendency of the death-rate decrease to slow up,

and the delay in seeing that the capacity of a generation to reproduce itself, or the "true rate of natural increase," is much more important statistically than the crude rate of increase, facts strangely overlooked until the new statistical studies appeared, have changed completely the complexion of the Malthusian controversy. We considered some of the statistical errors committed by the neo-Malthusian prophets in our study of American population trends. In this connection it is interesting to note that R. R. Kuczynski has devised what seems to be a very accurate way of measuring future population growth.

According to this new method of determining future fluctuations in a population, which consists in a refinement of the crude birth-rate figures, only women are considered, since they perform the actual task of reproduction. If we are to maintain a stationary population, it is necessary that each mother be replaced by one future mother. Making allowances for such factors as the death rate of children, as well as of mothers, and for the fact that some women will be sterile, Kuczynski found that the *net reproduction index* of any population is always less than the gross reproduction rate or the index referring to the average number of girls born to each mother during her childbearing years. In statistical terminology, if a population is merely to reproduce itself, the net reproduction index must be unity. Therefore, any group with a net reproduction index less than one, or unity, must decline unless existing fertility and mortality rates change.

Kuczynski's test showed that in 1927, when the neo-Malthusians were still warning of the dangers of overpopulation, the net reproduction index in most of the countries of northern and western Europe had already fallen below unity. That of England and Wales in 1933 was only .75. On the basis of 1933 fertility and mortality rates, Enid Charles estimates that the present population of England and Wales (about 40,000,000) will start to decline by 1945 and may be about 27,000,000 in 2005. (Paradoxical as it may seem, a population may continue to show a slight increase for a while, on account of an earlier favorable age composition, even though its net reproduction index is already below unity. Thus England is still growing; however, as soon as the present age composition becomes stabilized, the population will decline.) [3]

While the southern and central European countries still have a net reproduction rate higher than unity, in most of them also this index is declining. Incidentally, the net reproduction rate for the white population of the United States in 1933 is believed to have been just about

[3] R. R. Kuczynski, *The Balance of Births and Deaths*, two volumes (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928, 1931).

unity, even though America was still benefiting from the abnormal and uneven age composition caused by earlier immigration. Although the figures are not perfectly accurate, a survey shows that the present average natural increase of the world is about seven per thousand per year. According to the best authorities, any change in this world rate will be in the downward direction. Thus Dr. Dublin concludes: "It may well be reduced in a few decades to a point where the population of the world will be in or very near complete balance. In the last century the population of the world doubled; in the next, it may decline in numbers from the present levels." [4]

Whereas it was formerly the custom of anti-Malthusians to lock horns with their opponents over the accuracy of such estimates as East's by maintaining that the earth could support almost twice the maximum population estimated by the neo-Malthusians, the possibility of either world or continental overpopulation is now being abandoned as a subject of discussion by the better informed on both sides. "The Malthusian ghost has been laid," says Dublin; "nothing on the international horizon would justify the fears which a generation ago dominated our thinking on the population question." [5] Neo-Malthusian discussion has shifted to a consideration of "population pressure" in a few areas scattered over the globe, especially where this new phase of the population problem threatens to upset world peace, and the charge is made that the failure to practice contraception has brought about these danger spots.

2. A DANGER SPOT IN EUROPEAN POPULATION

Those who were concerned formerly about the alleged inadequacy of the world's food supply, and who viewed with alarm world and continental population growth, now point instead to a few nations whose tendency to overpopulation, they say, illustrates a local application of the Malthusian law and in some instances constitutes a menace to world peace as well. China and India are usually singled out to illustrate the first group, and Italy and Japan the second. What are the facts concerning Italy, first of all, since the Malthusians point her out as Europe's chief danger spot?

Italy has had a high birth rate for some time. In 1880 it ranked next to Russia, Rumania, and Poland, a position which it still seems to hold.

[4] Louis I. Dublin, *The Population Problem and World Depression* (pamphlet) (Foreign Policy Association, New York, 1936), pages 8–9.
[5] *Ibid.*, page 4.

While the Italian birth rate, like that of every other European nation, has fallen in recent years, the decline in Italy has not been quite so rapid as in most other countries. On the other hand, the decline in the death rate in Italy, especially since 1921, has been very marked, so much so that it has almost offset the decline in the birth rate. As a result, the crude rate of natural increase or the remainder derived by subtracting the crude death rate from the crude birth rate has been fairly well maintained. This rate was 12.5 per thousand in 1922 and about 10 in 1934, a smaller decline than that which took place in most other nations.

While Italy is growing faster right now than most of her important neighbors, she is not growing so rapidly as some of the other Western nations. During the period from 1928 to 1932 the estimated rate of natural increase in some of the chief Western countries was as follows: Russia, 24.9; Poland, 15.3; Bulgaria, 13.9; Italy, 10.9; United States, 7.3; England and Wales, 4.9; France, 1.3. Since Italy, rather than the countries of more rapid increase, is commonly singled out as the "overpopulated" country of Europe, the chief reason for this must lie outside the field of vital statistics. We have already seen that density of population cannot be the reason because there are other nations, such as Belgium and Holland, whose density is far greater than that of Italy. Likewise, in the number of persons per square mile of arable land, Italy with 790 persons is exceeded by Great Britain with 2,265 persons and by at least five other European nations.

The chief reasons for the present population pressure in Italy must be sought in the recent policy of other nations, especially their immigration regulations and their continued monopoly of sparsely populated areas of the globe. For several decades Italy exported her surplus population. Until the United States restricted immigration a little over a decade ago, approximately 100,000 Italians migrated here each year, while about as many went to the countries of South America. Recent immigration restrictions in almost all countries have made it necessary now for Italy to absorb a half-million increase each year.

Thrown back upon her own natural resources by the new policies of other nations, Italy found them inadequate for profitable farming. Seasonal rainfall limits productiveness. The soil is poor, the country is mountainous, and rocks and marshes abound. Wishing to imitate the earlier policy of England and other Western nations by introducing modern industrial life to support her population, Italy found that the iron, coal, oil, and other minerals so necessary for factory production are almost nonexistent within her boundaries and that her meager

colonial possessions were of little aid. All this meant that, in spite of heroic drainage and land-reclamation projects in Italy, a low standard of living must prevail under the international *status quo*.

Meanwhile, Italy looked back at the history of her more powerful neighbors. She considered how they had obtained needed raw materials as well as markets for their new factory systems through colonial expansion. She recalled how England and other nations during their periods of more rapid growth had reduced population pressure by sending out colonists. Likewise, Italy noted that large areas of undeveloped lands to the south were held by nations, such as France, whose populations were smaller and increasing much less rapidly than her own, yet whose colonial territories already far exceeded the area of their homeland. She realized that England, which, at the time of the rape of Germany at Versailles, blocked the gift of colonial lands to Italy and added them to the already swollen possessions of France and herself, would probably be worse off than Italy if it were not for her colonies. So in Ethiopia Italy followed the very same methods which at an earlier date had brought fruitful colonies to these other nations. In the earlier scramble for Africa, Italy's entrance was too late to get her aught but some rather worthless strips and a few small islands. While Ethiopia was no bargain compared with the neighboring French colonial possessions, it would help—shall we say for the time being?

The Ethiopian adventure focused the world's attention upon Italy's population problem. Instantly she became the target for international criticism, especially from the English, who had "annexed" Rhodesia in the nineteenth century, from the Americans, who not so long ago had "intervened" to protect their investments in the Caribbean, and even from the French, who had taken over a colonial empire in northern Africa by "peaceful penetration." All these critic nations joined in branding the Italian move as the most brutal kind of "war," which it probably was, although it differed scarcely a whit from the policy once pursued by the other nations—a policy which had enabled England to possess a quarter of the habitable globe. It is difficult to tell whether the disgust and alarm felt by non-Italians over the Ethiopian war was based upon a feeling that moral principles were violated or upon the challenge which Italy's move offered to the international *status quo*.

None of the nations with large colonial territories were pleased with Italy's move. For a time it appeared as if England would declare war on Italy in order to keep her out of Ethiopia. If pressed, probably most of Italy's critics would admit the sins of their own national yesterdays,

but plead that "those days" are over now. They would say that we are governed today by a higher and more civilized international ethic. Yet Italy might well ask why that "higher" ethical standard did not dictate some sort of distribution to her of the relatively unused colonial possessions of the reformed critic nations. England has large tracts of land in Africa, Australia, and Canada which are practically "empty." There are already many more Italians than French in some of France's sparsely populated African colonies.

It would seem that the "population problem" as it exists in Italy today is largely an economic or political problem, a hangover from the days of colonial expansion in which Italy failed to get her share. Just as in America a faulty distribution of wealth, followed by unemployment, has led some people to the erroneous belief that this country is overpopulated, so a faulty distribution of "territorial wealth" has created the international illusion that too many people are being born in Italy. In both instances the problem exists largely because of a failure to apply Christian principles, in one case those of social justice, in the other those of international charity, if not of justice. Some day a realization of the futility of the appeal to the sword may lead nations to the humility and unselfishness necessary for international co-operation in dealing with so-called population problems. When that time comes, such population problems as Italy's will vanish. God has provided land and raw materials enough for all; it is man's pride and selfishness which sometimes make it seem otherwise.

If Italy is a "danger spot" in the European population picture, the other nations of Europe, who from their own histories should know what may occur under such circumstances, are at least partly to blame. That Italy will continue for some time to be a "danger spot" seems evident. Some people, assuming that the international *status quo* is synonymous with justice, will probably continue to say that Italy is "overpopulated" and that overpopulation leads to war. Others, more correctly, we believe, will say that the area of humanity which the world calls Italy is overpopulated merely because of the selfishness of stronger imperialistic nations. These nations apparently expect that Italy will show weakness in the face of manifest injustice, which would seem to indict them on the count of stupidity as well as greed. Neither France nor England needs the colonies it has at Italy's door nearly as much as Italy does. Their dog-in-the-manger policy is far from being Christian and only invites Italy to strike again as soon as the opportunity presents itself. Italy may be accused of being ambitious, but have not both England and France had such moments?

3. "ASIA'S TEEMING MILLIONS"

When we turn to study the population situation in the Orient, one of the first problems which confront us is the dearth of adequate vital statistics. Attention has already been called to the fact that the Chinese statistics are so inadequate that estimates of its population vary by as much as 200,000,000. Registration of births, marriages, and deaths is available for only a few of the countries of the Far East and is admittedly incomplete. This situation lends itself perfectly to the population propagandist who wishes to use the Orient to prove his particular thesis. Fortunately, there has been some improvement in statistics in recent years, especially in such countries as India, Japan, Java, and British Malaya, which figures, when supplemented with sample surveys in the other countries, enable impartial students to describe the population picture reasonably well. In order to understand the Oriental population problem we must break it down at least into its chief units: Japan, China, and India.

Japan

The Japanese population problem has attracted much attention in recent years. It is widely known that Japan has more than doubled her population in the last half century, and her present average annual increase of nearly a million is larger than that of the United States. Likewise, the Japanese use of the overpopulation plea as a justification for military and commercial expansion has attracted world-wide attention. On the other hand, it is less well known that population experts, on the basis of present trends, predict that the Japanese population will cease to increase about 1950, thus following the pattern of many Western nations. In fact, if sufficient allowance is made for the assertion that the Japanese population increase in recent decades is partially explained by improvements in birth-registration methods, the recent growth of Japan is not greatly different from that of some European countries. At any rate, the Japanese birth rate has already commenced to decline, chiefly because of an increase in the marriage age and the adoption of contraceptives. In one of the most thorough studies of Japanese population growth yet to appear, Dr. Ishii shows that before the Meiji reformation in 1868 a number of factors, economic and social, combined to produce a family-limitation psychology which checked population growth. After 1868 population growth began to be looked

upon with favor, and efforts were made to suppress abortion and infanticide, the result being a sudden spurt in national growth.[6]

In spite of the statistician's belief that the Japanese population will probably become stabilized within two decades, it cannot be denied that Japan is suffering from growing pains today, even though they may not be as serious as their militarists would have us believe. Figured on the basis of children already born, Japan will have to find employment for about 250,000 more workers annually for the next twenty years. Dublin has estimated that Japan will reach a maximum population of between 90,000,000 and 100,000,000 within a generation. Her present population is about 70,000,000. With domestic agriculture already overmanned and with the temporary industrial boom caused by increased exports abroad and the manufacture of armaments at home on the wane, Japan faces what seems to be an acute economic situation. It seems evident that Japan will not be content to remain upon a minimum subsistence level until the population peak has been passed.

In order to improve their status the Japanese are already shifting from agricultural to industrial organization. In making this change they find that they, like Italy, are poor in natural resources and so at a disadvantage when compared with the Western nations whose earlier imperialistic policies gained control of near-by valuable Asiatic sources of raw materials. The Japanese see the markets at their very doors also monopolized by these same European nations, which at the same time attempt to throttle the struggling Japanese industries by means of high tariff walls. The Japanese are commencing to realize that, if they can gain control of the sources of raw materials as well as the markets of the Orient, they will not only raise the Japanese standard of living but actually become an industrial giant producing and selling most of the Orient's manufactured goods. Of course, such a change would ruin England's present enormous Oriental trade.

One writer, M. J. Hillenbrand, is of the opinion that, though Japan might be able to increase its rice yield by scientific methods and might, by learning to eat more meat (Japan is said to consume about one fourth of all the fish caught in the oceans of the world), make use of its untillable hillside slopes for pasture land, it will still have to import food if it is to have a better balanced diet and a higher standard of living. He believes, however, that the present "population problem," which will probably exist in Japan for the next few decades, could be

[6] Ryoichi Ishii, *Population Pressure and Economic Life in Japan* (P. S. King and Sons, London, 1937).

taken care of without emigration or further territorial expansion if Japan were allowed to engage in foreign commerce, exchanging native manufactured articles for food and raw materials. "That," he says, "is precisely what the problem of England might be, or of any other country which cannot grow and mine enough to feed its population and to keep it working—not too many people but not enough exchange." [7]

Like Italy, modern Japan is an ambitious nation. It realizes also that Western nations are unwilling to make concessions of either lands or markets in order to ease its present population pressure. Meanwhile, its highly nationalistic population has become restless. If Europe and America refuse to recognize either the needs or the aspirations of the growing Japanese nation through trade treaties, serious trouble will probably ensue. Eventually, Japan may seek outlets in near-by territory which is climatically more congenial to her people than the recently acquired Manchuria—perhaps in the Malay peninsula. Such a move may involve the colonial territory of England, Holland, the United States, and several other Western nations and so may lead to war. Will Haves give, lend, lease, or sell to the Have-nots before this crisis takes place, or must we continue to think with guns? Japan will remain a "danger spot" as far as world peace is concerned as long as the selfish interests of affluent nations prevent them from making concessions based upon a realization of her growing needs. It is difficult to find a more succinct statement of the present Japanese situation than that of one of our outstanding population experts, Professor Warren S. Thompson, who says:

> European peoples are holding some hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million, square miles of tropical lands south and east of Asia which they cannot settle and which they cannot even exploit for lack of labor, while the Japanese, who are chiefly of Malay stock and are consequently able to live and work in the tropics, are largely excluded from these lands as settlers and thus from the effective exploitation of their resources.
>
> It requires little imagination to picture the state of mind which will develop among the Japanese when the facts of this situation are fully realized. Imagine the feelings of a proud people of warlike tradition as they come to realize the injustice of being kept from using parts of the world which they greatly need, simply because other peoples who do not really need them wish to preserve them for exploitation by children they will never have.[8]

[7] "White Flag for the Yellow Peril," *The Catholic World*, Volume 146, February, 1938, page 545.

[8] *Population Problems* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935), page 396. Used by permission.

China

China's present population, as well as its rate of change, is largely a matter of conjecture. About all that can be said with certainty is that China has had periods of rapid increase alternating with periods of population shrinkage caused by famine, floods, and war. It has been estimated that the Taiping rebellion indirectly caused some 20,000,000 deaths, and at least two great famines took more than 10,000,000 each. Yet early marriage, combined with a religion which impels its members to continue to replace their families, has enabled China to grow at a rate which W. L. Holland estimates to be about the same as in some of the more prolific countries of Europe.

Even if China's rate of increase were faster than that of these European countries, it would not be accurate to say that the famines which affect the nation periodically are due to overpopulation. China is woefully mismanaged. Although it occupies a very large area, its agricultural workers, who make up about 70 per cent of the population, produce far less than they could if they had the advantage of modern agricultural methods. Many of the peasants are hopelessly sunk in debt. Interest rates of from 25 to 50 per cent are not uncommon. The government's excessive outlays for military purposes prevent the undertaking of necessary internal improvements and badly needed social reforms. In 1928, according to S. Vere Pearson, over $130,000,000 out of a total revenue of $148,000,000 went for military expenditures. China is practically without roads, a condition which handicaps economic and social development and makes the suppression of banditry impossible.

Manchuria and Inner Mongolia, still capable of absorbing millions of settlers, provide plenty of room for population expansion. Other nations still take the cream off China's resources. However, until China absorbs more of Western civilization, especially its militant nationalism, her alleged overpopulation crisis will lack the threat of serious international complications. China, which suffers periodically from floods and droughts, could cure many of its ailments through proper flood-control and irrigation projects. Commenting upon the sad state of Chinese agriculture, R. H. Tawney observed: "Neither biology and chemistry, nor mechanical transport, nor enclosure and consolidation, nor the reform of land tenure, nor co-operative marketing and credit have as yet, save in a few exceptional areas, begun to affect it." [9]

[9] Quoted by S. Vere Pearson, *Growth and Distribution of Population* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1935), page 74.

India

India is the country in which nature's rude checks upon population growth seem to have operated most sensationally. With amazing frequency plagues and famines have taken place there on a scale which almost surpasses the comprehension of Occidentals. It has been estimated that the influenza epidemic of 1918 alone carried off nearly 14,000,000 people. Even in normal periods the infant mortality rate is shocking, as can be appreciated if we contrast the infant mortality rate of the city of Bombay, over 500 per thousand, with that of New York City, 52 per thousand. In addition, early marriages (in Bengal in 1921 nearly 90 per cent of the women between 15 and 19 were married) and primitive methods of midwifery have resulted in a high maternal mortality rate. As a result of heavy mortality rates at all ages, the death rate is about 25 per thousand, which is more than twice that which prevails in Europe. The expectation of life at birth is only about 27 years in India. Yet, in spite of its enormous death rates, India continues to grow. Its population of over 350,000,000, according to the 1931 census, was more than 10 per cent larger than that of ten years before.

It is difficult to predict India's future rate of growth, especially on account of inadequate marriage statistics. The present surplus of births over deaths provides an annual increase of over 3,000,000 a year, in spite of the drastic operation of population checks. Furthermore, the growing introduction of European medical science, combined with a prevailing custom and religion which oppose family limitation, suggests that future changes, if allowed to follow present trends, will be in the direction of additional population increase. With India's population already on such a low standard of living, an increased population under its present social organization cannot be viewed without some alarm unless land in near-by Africa is made available for migration.

India is crowded only because of its antiquated social organization. At present India has fewer persons per square mile of arable land than at least seven European nations. The progress of social reform in India is blocked considerably by its religion. A peculiar fatalism combines with the climate to stifle energy and ambition. The helpful social influence which the wider introduction of Christianity may exercise is suggested by the following picture of present conditions in areas dominated by Brahminism.

Antiquated farming operations and certain obligations imposed upon Brahmins by their religious teachings are subversive of improvements in the living of the masses in many parts of India. Brahminism forbids a peasant to

kill a cow; that is bad for farming. Precious manure is burnt for fuel—again harmful to good cultivation of the soil. The average holding is a little over 4 acres. This is partly due to the fragmentation of property through the ancient laws of inheritance. Sometimes a man's holding is so split up into absurd shapes and widely scattered splinters that its useful cultivation is impossible. The priests demand high fees; for example, sometimes a wedding may cost two or more years' income. Moneylenders are resorted to. The debt becomes unpayable, and the peasant's land is foreclosed.[10]

India, like China, is in need of drastic social reforms. Child marriages should be abolished. The old methods of food production which still prevail should be brought up to date. With these social changes Indians would be a healthier and better-nourished people desirous of maintaining a higher standard of living. Dublin has suggested that, with a higher standard of living, India, with her enormous agricultural population, should become a great market for the manufactured goods of the West. Because of its present poverty India is not important in the world markets. Only in this negative sense does India's present population problem seem to affect the rest of the modern world.

Conclusion

Alarming or discouraging as the population problems in Japan, China, and India may seem to be at first sight, they can be exaggerated very easily if certain inherent factors are overlooked. First of all, the popular idea of "Asia's teeming millions" does not harmonize with the fact that the birth rates of these countries are no higher than those of some of the countries of southeastern Europe and South America. As a matter of fact, the present rate of increase of the two Americas is higher than that of Asia. Furthermore, as W. L. Holland suggests, the present Oriental rate of increase is probably lower than that which prevailed in many countries of western Europe in the early years of the last century. While it is true that the further introduction of Western civilization will reduce the Oriental death rates for a considerable period to come, judging from Western experience and that already indicated in Japan, the higher standard of living and other factors which will accompany Western improvements will probably result eventually in a lowered birth rate. It must be admitted, nevertheless, that the reduced death rate, operating sooner, will tend to increase population pressure in these countries for some time, even though this may be only a temporary condition.

Another circumstance which is overlooked in most discussions of the

[10] S. Vere Pearson, *op. cit.*, page 90.

"overcrowded East" is the fact that there are wide variations in population density between adjoining regions of the same country. In spite of fairly modern communications in modern India, in 1931 the provinces of Bengal and Madras had populations of 646 and 329 people to the square mile, while near-by Assam and Burma had only 157 and 63 respectively. In China, similarly, Shantung and Hopeh, with densities of 550 and 650 to the square mile, existed in proximity to fertile Manchuria (Manchukuo), a land as big as France and Germany combined and occupied by only about 30,000,000 people.

Summing up the Far Eastern situation, we may say that the practice of contraception will not make much progress there except possibly in Japan. Migration has taken up only a small fraction of the annual population increase so far, even when such great movements as that of the northern Chinese into Manchuria are considered. Curiously enough, Japan not only has had very little success in developing migration movements, but in addition is threatened, we are told, by the immigration of "cheap Korean labor." The only solution to the so-called population problems of these countries lies in a program of economic and social betterment, involving to a considerable extent the co-operation of Western nations. For the most part these huge populations have been tied closely to the soil and have become entirely dependent for daily subsistence upon the small-scale intensive cultivation of rice, wheat, and millet. Modern industry and scientific agricultural methods must be introduced on a much wider scale, combined with access to markets and a more effective distribution of income. With internal buying power thus increased, a higher standard of living will probably bring about a retardation in population growth.

II. New European Population Policies

At least three European countries have already recognized the new downward trend in population and are attempting to establish a national policy which will stimulate population growth. In other countries, such as England, France, Sweden, and the Netherlands, considerable concern about depopulation is being indicated, but no important national policy aimed at stopping this trend has been adopted as yet. Many observers expect to see policies whose purpose is to encourage population growth adopted in most of the countries of Europe as well as in the United States before very long. Consequently, the existing European policies and their success to date in stopping the downward population trend are being watched with great interest everywhere.

I. THE FAMILY-ALLOWANCE SYSTEM

If we recognize the adoption of the family-allowance wage system as a "population" policy, it might be said that population-increasing policies have been widespread in Europe for some time. However, since it is generally believed that the European family-allowance system, as it has been administered, has had very little effect upon population growth, it is customary to speak only of Italy, Germany, and Russia as countries which have taken measures aimed more frankly at population growth. Before examining the recent policies established in these three nations, we shall consider briefly the widely adopted family-allowance system.

The family-allowance system, treated also in conjunction with the study of poverty, has been in use in Europe for several years. At the present time some form of this plan, under which it is assumed that those parents who raise several children perform a community service and so are entitled to additional wage compensation, has been adopted in France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, the Netherlands, Bulgaria, Denmark, Sweden, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Spain, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Australia, New Zealand, and Russia. According to present indications, similar allowances to parents of the larger families will be adopted soon by other nations also. However, all plans adopted so far suffer from common weaknesses in that the allowance is too small and reaches only a minority of the workers. Furthermore, it is a question whether this system should be regarded as indicative of a population policy or merely as an economic measure in the interest of basic social justice.

In an evaluation of present European population policies on the basis of results already obtained, it is difficult to prove that the family-allowance system has been effective in either increasing population growth or preventing the birth rate from declining. In France, where the system has been in effect longest, it cannot be proved that the recent slight retardation of the decline in the birth rate is due to this plan rather than to other factors. The relatively large families of immigrants from Belgium, Poland, Spain, and Italy may have revived the French birth rate. Of course, this does not prove that, differently administered, the family-allowance system cannot act as a stimulus to population growth. Those who advocate this means of encouraging families say that it has never been given a fair trial, inasmuch as the amount of allowances paid in any country is not sufficient to make parenthood financially attractive. With the present widespread adoption of this

system, the growth of new population policies may bring about much larger payments in the future in an attempt to increase population. Undoubtedly these allowances have been of some help already, at least in so far as they encouraged better health standards for infants, and so they must have contributed indirectly to population growth by reducing the previous rate of infant mortality.

If we disregard the debatable family-allowance system, it may be said that population policies adapted to the recently recognized decline in European growth have been introduced as yet only in Italy, Germany, and Russia. Whether it is because dictatorship nations can act more quickly than democracies, where long discussion must usually precede legislation, or whether it is due to the fact that the present European dictators are ambitious and intensely nationalistic in their outlook, the fact remains that what can be called population policies definitely aimed at stimulating growth exist as yet only in Europe's three totalitarian states. The new population policies of Italy, Germany, and Russia, along with the observable results to date, are being watched very carefully by other European nations.

2. ITALIAN POLICY

Even though the Italian birth rate in 1922, when the Fascists came into power, was one of the highest in Europe, Mussolini, a former advocate of birth control, made population growth one of the chief planks in his new platform. In doing this he was frank in pointing out that depopulation was taking place rapidly in the neighboring nations, and that the new Italy should fight this growing tendency within her own borders if she wished to achieve her future destiny as a great nation. If Italy was to revive the splendor of ancient Rome, a design for living which Mussolini continually preached, the continuation of large families was a national necessity. Mussolini's population philosophy is summed up in the following excerpt from a speech given in 1927:

> To count for something in the world, Italy must have a population of at least 60 millions when she reaches the threshold of the second half of this century. . . . It is a fact that the fate of nations is bound up with their demographic power. . . . Let us be frank with ourselves: what are 40 million Italians compared with 90 million Germans and 200 million Slavs? Let us look at our western neighbors: what are 40 million Italians compared with the 40 millions of France and the 90 millions in her colonies, or with the 46 millions of England and the 450 million inhabitants of her colonial possessions? . . . With a declining population a country does not create an empire, but becomes a colony.[11]

[11] Quoted by D. V. Glass, *The Struggle for Population* (Oxford University Press, 1936), page 34.

In order to prepare for her new destiny as a power in a Western world which was failing to increase, Italy made numerous regulations aimed at maintaining the high Italian rate of natural increase. Laws with severe penalties were enacted against birth-control propaganda, the sale of birth-control devices, and the performance of abortions. Taxes were levied against bachelors and spinsters, and small families were penalized in various ways. Large families enjoyed not only liberal tax exemptions but also preference as tenants in workingmen's homes and as farmers on the new land created by reclamation projects. In an attempt to combat the city as a population-reducer, efforts were made to build up a series of small agricultural villages and to discourage the further growth of large cities. Finally, a national program of maternity and child-welfare work was introduced.

What can be said of the success of Mussolini's effort to stimulate population growth to date? From one point of view it has failed. Both the crude and the adjusted birth rate have continued to decline. The 1922 birth rate of 30.2 has fallen to 23.2 per thousand. On the other hand, the numerous health measures undertaken, especially those to improve the health of mothers and children, have reduced the death rate. The 1921 infant mortality rate of 129 fell 21 per cent to 102 in 1935, while the general death rate fell 27 per cent in the same period, that is from 17.4 in a thousand to 13.7. The new Fascist population policy seems to have been successful in only two respects: if we compare the Italian vital statistics with those of most of her European neighbors the decline in the birth rate as well as in the rate of natural increase has not been so rapid as in the other countries.

3. GERMAN POLICY

The Nazi regime took over a nation in which the birth rate had been declining faster than in any other European country. It was a nation sunk in economic difficulties and political uncertainties. War penalties had taken away Germany's colonies and ruined her foreign trade; deprived of both raw materials and the ability to exchange manufactured articles for foodstuffs in foreign markets, she faced widespread unemployment and a reduced standard of living at home. The spirit of the people was broken, and little hope could be seen on the horizon.

One of the first steps taken by Hitler was to stimulate nationalism. A new desire to live had to be enkindled in the nation before hopes could be revived that Germany might rise again to her place among the world powers. The increasing fertility of Russia, Germany's communistic neighbor to the east, was emphasized, and an increased popula-

tion to make up for the losses of the past two decades was held up as the first price of Germany's new national aspirations. True, this increase was to be recruited only from so-called Aryan stock, but the quantitative aspect of the new population program was made as important as the more notorious qualitative aspect. Having first aroused the martial spirit of Germany, Hitler had legislation passed whose object was to encourage population growth. Abortions were forbidden, and contraception was discouraged. Economic pressure was put on bachelors, while tax-reductions and first preference for future municipal jobs were held out as inducements for large families. The employment of women was discouraged, and liberal government loans were granted to young people wishing to marry.

On the surface the German policy seems to have achieved results. The marriage rate increased rapidly during 1933 and 1934 and is now one of the highest in the world. Since 1933 the birth rate has increased faster than that of any other country in the world, the 1935 rate being over 27 per cent higher than that of 1933. Meanwhile, the death rate has been pushed down to a new low, so that the crude rate of natural increase has been raised to 7.1 per thousand or seven times that of France. In explaining this increase, P. K. Whelpton, who went to Germany in 1934 in order to gain first-hand knowledge of the effect of the new German population policy, is of the opinion that the prohibition of abortion has been the most important single factor in reversing the former trend in the German birth rate. The large number of abortions which were taking place in postwar Germany, in contrast with the abrupt increase in the birth rate immediately following Hitler's new regulations against abortion, suggested this conclusion.

Whatever factor is regarded as the most important one in bringing about the change in Germany's population trend, the effect of a revived faith in the future of the nation must have been somewhat influential at least in changing people's attitudes about the desirability of having children. Thrilled with the revived vision of its national destiny and its "racial superiority," Germany has commenced to grow again. Meanwhile, serious difficulties loom on the economic and political horizon. Germany must depend upon other countries for many of her foodstuffs and most of her raw materials. Yet her prewar colonies have been taken away, and high tariff barriers have been erected by other nations to stifle her efforts to revive prewar trade. Foreign boycotts because of Nazi persecution of the Jews add to the economic difficulties.

In the face of this situation, Germany, as most of her neighbors, is increasing her armaments. What will be the political result? Will it be

necessary for Hitler to follow the methods adopted by Mussolini in order to correct what the German people believe to be an unjust arrangement forced upon them by the treaty which followed the armistice? Can Germany, like Italy, succeed in acquiring needed sources of raw materials in central Europe or elsewhere without provoking another European or world war? This is the problem which the statesmen of those nations which drew up the Versailles treaty must face. Many impartial historians now agree with the German people that the Versailles treaty, based upon the erroneous idea that Germany was the cause of the World War, was an unfair one. In view of Germany's population increase, the constant refusal of the signatories to that pact to take the lead in attempting to correct some of its injustices cannot be regarded as either Christian or practical statesmanship. Germany's recent acquisition of Austria does not seem to offer much promise of relief. Most of this area has a dense and rapidly growing population. There may be some temporary advantage in the way of trade or raw materials, but Germany's chief benefit from annexing the territory is probably psychological and military. If Czechoslovakia can be taken over without exciting France or England to armed protest, it may help the German situation considerably. However, it is hard to conceive of a contented Germany until her prewar colonies are restored.

4. RUSSIA

The Soviet Union, Germany's neighbor, resembles her in some respects and differs in others. Like Nazi Germany, Russia is now fired with a new patriotism and a deep faith in her own future. While it would be contrary to the principles of Communism for her to admit imperialistic ambitions, even the censored press releases have indicated a Soviet desire to add "new hundreds of millions to the population living under Communism at a time when the rate of population increase in capitalistic countries is rapidly diminishing." Unlike Germany, however, Russia has always had a high birth rate, also an enormous territory and ample undeveloped natural resources. The Russian birth rate today is the highest in Europe and one of the highest in the world. Its death rate has been high, but it is being reduced rapidly. The net reproduction index, to use Kuczynski's computation, is about 1.7, and it does not seem to be declining. We have already noted that this index is less than one in most of the countries of northern and western Europe. Dublin believes that the present population of Russia, 165,000,000, will double in about forty years.

Though the measures taken to stimulate population growth in the

Soviet Union are not as numerous as those in Germany and Italy, they indicate a desire to preserve, at least, the present rate of increase. The government is discouraging large-scale migration to industrial areas, preferring to keep the large masses of people on the farms. Widespread abortion and easy divorce characterized the early days of the new regime, but recent regulations frown upon both these population-reducing devices. In addition, a family-allowance plan has just been introduced.

Although Soviet leaders profess to be interested only in peace, the growing size and power of Russia, together with her hatred of capitalism and her "missionary" zeal for the spread of communism, rather than any overcrowding, constitute a threat to the peace of all her neighbors, especially Germany, Japan, and China, if not to the rest of the civilized world.

5. CONCLUSION

Summing up the European population situation, we may say that, though there is a widespread popular impression that direct measures taken to stimulate population growth in Italy, Germany, and Russia have proved effective, demographers who have studied these measures are unable to agree with this conclusion. The statistics of growth, or at least of retarded decrease, cannot be denied, but the extent to which specific measures such as family-allowance wage systems, family tax exemptions, and bachelor taxes played a part in this change is questioned. In most instances the financial leverage exercised by these measures is regarded as altogether too slight to affect childbearing, if childbearing can be so influenced.

W. S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton are of the opinion that the ordinary health measures, aimed at reducing the death rate, have had a more important influence upon the Italian population situation than those aimed directly at increasing population growth. As already pointed out, Whelpton regards the prohibition of abortion, which is considered chiefly as a health measure in Germany, as the only new regulation which has had much effect upon her recent growth. Similarly, the same authors regard the widely heralded "population program" of the Soviet Union as in effect chiefly a health program. The condemnation of abortion there has followed a realization from recent experiences that abortion is likely to be physically injurious. Russia, with its immense natural resources, will prosper for some time, no doubt, because communism, bad as we believe it to be, at least offers more hope to the masses than the hated government of the czars.

(See the references at the end of Chapter XII.)

CHAPTER XII

POPULATION POLICIES AND THE FUTURE

At least three European countries have recently adopted population policies which attempt to stem the present trend towards a declining population. Several other countries are considering a similar move. At this point the question arises as to what policy this or any other nation should adopt to meet the new population trend.

I. America's Present Policy

Considering America first of all, we find that up to the present there has been no official recognition of the new population tendency, unless we regard the modest experiments carried on under the Resettlement Administration as a veiled gesture in the direction of a new policy. At present it may be said that, in so far as we have a population policy, it seems to be still engaged in fighting the departed ghost of Malthus, for the five chief causes of American population shrinkage, already pointed out, are for the most part still pretty much ignored as far as official action is concerned. True, courageous attempts have been made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to enact social-justice measures which, if passed, might indirectly go a long way towards stopping present population shrinkage. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have been blocked or emasculated by newspapers, lobbyists, legislators, and even jurists whose concern about property rights seems to exceed their interest in human rights.

Unlike most of the countries of Europe, we have not yet even attempted to enact a family-allowance wage system. Our present tax exemptions for the married are so small that they are ludicrous. Finally, our immigration-restriction legislation is so severe that it amounts almost to complete exclusion when we consider the net gain each year. In 1937 the annual net total, after departures were deducted, amounted to only 10,504. Our financial grants in the interests of maternity and infancy are merely health measures; in fact, it is doubtful if these would have been enacted at all if there had been any suspicion that they were aimed at increasing the population, so strong is the influence of birth-

control propaganda here. The existing but poorly enforced laws against abortion and the dissemination of birth-control information were enacted years ago, under the leadership of Protestant forces inspired by Anthony Comstock, as measures in the interest of public morals. In fact, the present temper of Protestant leaders seems to be to abolish these restrictions, if they are to be changed at all.

That the American mind still flows in neo-Malthusian channels is further indicated by our Puerto Rican policy. Towards the end of the Hoover administration the American governor of our insular possession reported that the island was suffering from population pressure, and recommended that birth control be fostered by the government as a remedy for this situation. However, Catholic opposition in the insular legislature defeated the measure proposed at that time. Meanwhile, a campaign for the establishment of birth-control clinics was carried on in the island, and in May, 1937, a series of measures to encourage sterilization and to provide government birth-control clinics were passed and signed by the present American governor.

According to opinions expressed in the American Catholic press, the responsibility for this neo-Malthusian legislation rests upon the American masters of Puerto Rico. In a characteristically neo-Malthusian manner the governing class refused to take the more difficult way of dealing with the economic problems created not merely by the island's rapid population growth but by the concomitant exploitation which had established large plantations, owned and managed by Americans, in place of the small farms of which 60 per cent had been owned by individuals. Instead of making a serious effort to establish native industries through which surplus profits could be distributed to the poverty-stricken population, the governing classes advised the "inferior classes," in effect, to shrink themselves to fit the existing American pay envelopes. This strategy, by which American absentee ownership is attempting to bring about artificial depopulation, was characterized by one American Catholic editor as follows:

> Too lazy, too selfish, too intent on increasing their own dividends and too much immersed in politics and commercial strategy to face the agrarian situation that their own greed has created, the real masters of Puerto Rico slip over this degrading legislation upon a helpless people. By so doing they evade a primary ethical duty. Economically their policy is mistaken, since it leaves unsolved the sources of the poverty problem, while weakening what little moral fiber and power of resistance the poor still possess.[1]

[1] *America*, Volume 57, May 8, 1937, page 107. Used by permission.

Yet with all this poverty in Puerto Rico, we find that from 1929 to 1936 inclusive the four largest sugar companies managed to pay out dividends to stockholders—the majority of whom were presumably not Puerto Rican—to the tune of nearly $25,000,000. With most of American business on the mainland barely able to operate, the average net return on the capital and surplus of all Puerto Rican sugar mills during the entire period of the depression was 6 per cent. Still nothing can be done for the natives except to tell them to die out!

II. "Population Problems" Are Chiefly Economic

So-called population problems in most countries today are chiefly economic problems, and the regulation of any economic system today is much more than a purely national problem. Even in America we are gradually coming to realize that our own economic life must be considered in relation to the whole international picture rather than from an isolationist viewpoint. In food and other essential goods the development of machine processes has so increased productive capacity everywhere as to throw the distributive forces of the world out of gear. The competition for markets and raw materials has now become so keen that the policy of one country affects almost all the others. While the general outlook for most of the civilized world today is a smaller population, rather than overpopulation, it is apparent that some nations will probably continue to increase in size and in the quantity of their needs while many of the others decrease. The stationary population visualized by some of the neo-Malthusians, a fixed world population which they believe would reduce the likelihood of war, is a Utopian ideal. In the actual world of tomorrow the increase in population in one nation will create one set of internal economic problems, while economic problems of a different nature will confront a nation which is in the process of population decline. In either case these local economic problems not only will react upon the world picture, but most likely will remain unsettled if left to one nation acting alone.

In the past the needs of a growing population usually found an outlet in migration, colonization, and the exploitation of uncivilized areas. Today these outlets have been pretty well taken over by a few nations, and the penetration of less populous areas cannot be undertaken except through conflict with powerful and usually unwilling civilized nations. If a nation tries to increase its food supply by manufacturing and trading rather than by shipping its people to colonies, international

trade barriers usually prevent it from doing so. Thus, in the modern economic world, war becomes a constant specter, not because men exceed the bounties of the land but because a few powerful nations are unwilling to consider the needs of others in the distribution of this land and all that it implies. Commenting upon the dangers of war created by the present "every nation for itself" policy, Father Lawrence Kent Patterson, S.J., said a few years ago:

> Until the privileged nations facilitate access to foodstuffs and raw materials the prospects of securing peace are slight.
>
> Great Britain strives to mediate between France and Germany, but holds fast to the colonies she acquired at Versailles. We lecture Europe upon the merits of peace, but pursue a policy of rigid economic nationalism, and seek to check Japanese expansion in the Far East. All nations want peace *on their own terms*. As long as Japan, Germany, and Italy feel (with reason) that they are underprivileged, as long as Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and France hold in an iron grasp a virtual monopoly of many essential raw materials, war is ever menacing. Nations faced with the choice between aggression or permanent economic inferiority and depression will explode.[2]

Recognizing the general futility of modern warfare, most demographers, economists, and sociologists see international co-operation as the only intelligent solution to any nation's economic or population problems. Dr. Dublin says: "Some way must be found by which the less favored can share in the advantages of the more favored countries. The economic welfare of nations is the problem of the whole world and can be solved only by some central agency, be it the League of Nations or a similar organization." [3]

III. International Relations in a Christian Civilization

In considering the causes of American population shrinkage we saw that several ethical principles were involved. What about the international ethical problems created by population differentials? Are we morally obligated, for example, to join with other nations in formulating economic programs for the good of all? Before attempting to answer this and similar questions we shall go back and recall briefly the nature of the general Christian law of charity. In doing this we are not pretending to give an authoritative exposition of ethical principles

[2] "Drifting towards Armageddon," *America*, Volume 53, June 29, 1935, page 270. Used by permission.

[3] Louis I. Dublin, *The Population Problem and World Depression* (pamphlet) (Foreign Policy Association, New York, 1936), page 31. See also Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 13, *Colonies, Trade and Prosperity*, published at 8 West 40th Street, New York City.

but merely to apply some of these, as we find them developed by the science of ethics, to the problems under consideration.

Nations, like individuals and corporations, are bound by the precepts of justice, charity, and veracity. Since many believe that Christian teachings as they apply to international affairs have been so long ignored that even educated Catholics are sometimes unaware of them, it will be well to make an apparent digression at this point in order to present a few concrete applications of the obligations of international charity, before attempting to apply these principles more specifically to the problems of population. It might be pointed out in advance that, to readers who have been accustomed to regard the matters involved in these illustrations purely from the viewpoint of chauvinistic writers, the moral obligations laid down by Monsignor John A. Ryan, one of our best Catholic authorities in these matters, may at first sight seem a bit strange. We will consider very briefly the Catholic principles which seem to bear upon (1) the tariff, (2) war debts, (3) international co-operation in economic matters, and (4) national boundaries.

I. CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES AND THE TARIFF

An author of a searching study of America's trade policies recently referred to our past tariff policies as "the triumph of special interests over the general welfare." In the past we gloried in our "protective tariffs." Is it possible that these tariffs may have been not only economically unwise, but in a certain sense immoral when judged by Christian standards? Monsignor Ryan says "yes." Protective tariffs in our times are generally immoral, he maintains, besides being economically unsound. Likewise, the fostering of a doctrine of national economic independence by "Buy American" and "Buy British" propaganda is regarded as ethically unjustifiable.[4] It may be objected that such an application of Christian ideals would permit the admission of foreign products manufactured by cheap labor and so would ruin American industry. Granted that this might be a temporary result in a few highly protected American industries, we are told that this should not deter us from making such a move if the good of the greater number of Americans would follow, as a growing number of economists now predict. Furthermore, the temporary hardships in certain industries could be foreseen, and government aid might be granted to enable these employers and employees to adjust themselves to the new situa-

[4] "Ethical Aspects of Some International Problems, I," *America*, Volume 49, May 6, 1933, pages 105–107. For further study of the problems touched upon in this section consult the *Syllabus on International Relations* (1937) prepared by the Catholic Association for International Peace, N.C.W.C., Washington, D.C.

tion. The wisdom of such a plan is suggested by a recent "economic policy for the United States" formulated by a number of leading economists for the National Peace Conference, representing thirty-seven of the largest American organizations in the field. The report says:

One of the complaints most frequently urged against imports is that they represent the competition of foreign pauper labor with domestic labor of comparatively high standards. But constant lowering of costs is the process on which increased prosperity is basically dependent; and, generally speaking, if we would be as prosperous as possible nationally we must take advantage of relatively lower costs, wherever they are.

When investors and workers in certain industries are exposed to at least temporary hardship because of a removal in the general interest of barriers to imports, transitional aid should be provided by, for example, unemployment benefits and vocational retraining and resettlement, or by payment for transforming or scrapping equipment.[5]

2. CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES AND THE WAR DEBTS

The so-called war debts owed to the United States by her allies in the World War are another problem with an ethical aspect which many Americans overlook. Granted that these may have been moral obligations when originally contracted, what neither lender nor borrower probably foresaw at that time is now realized by all impartial students, namely, that the repayment of these huge sums is impossible. Since, as Monsignor Ryan points out, the debts cannot be paid in gold without imposing an immoral hardship upon our debtors, whom we will not permit to pay us in goods, there is no moral obligation for them to pay us, at least for the present, and it is immoral for us to press them to do so by belligerent agitation. The war-debts problem is tied up with the tariff problem, as the following editorial of the New York *Times* points out, and it is useless for us to sulk any longer over Europe's failure to pay what was not the clearest kind of debt to start with.

It is true that the existing war-debt agreements were entered into in good faith. But it is also true that the debts themselves were incurred chiefly on account of American goods which were shipped abroad. Mr. Coolidge's aphorism to the contrary notwithstanding, we did not "hire them the money." We sold them American cotton and wheat and cloth and cannon and munitions, produced with wartime wages and sold at wartime prices. And when the time came to make repayment we raised our own already exorbitant tariffs against repayment in the form in which the original loans themselves were made—namely, in the form of goods. This does not excuse the failure of our debtors to make more energetic efforts than they have actually made to abide by the terms of their agreements. But it is an important factor which can fairly be

[5] Reported in the New York *Times*, January 25, 1937. Used by permission.

taken into consideration, in viewing the record of the past and in weighing the prospects for a future settlement which would dispose at last of the troublesome problem, to the mutual profit of all concerned.[6]

3. CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES AND INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

In January, 1938, Paul van Zeeland, former premier of Belgium and professor of economics at Louvain, published a report which attracted world-wide attention. The author of this report,[7] commissioned nine months before by the British and French governments to make this study, said very frankly that the only hope for the future economic and political security of the nations of the West, the relatively independent United States included, lies in economic collaboration which shall include the lowering of tariffs, the abolition of quotas and arbitrary customs regulations, the stabilization of currencies, and ultimately the establishment of an international monetary standard, along with the facilitation of international transfer of funds and credit. Should we regard this plea for international co-operation in economic affairs as a European trick to deceive Americans or as a reflection of sound economics and good morality? On the latter point we have the words of Pope Pius XI, telling us, "It would be well if the various nations in common counsel and endeavor strove to promote a healthy economic co-operation by prudent pacts and institutions, since in economic matters they are largely dependent upon one another and need one another's help." [8]

It seems that the plea for international co-operation in economic matters is sound economically when we recall that in recent years the manufacturing industries have been increasing production rapidly behind tariff barriers, not only in western Europe and the United States, but also in Japan, and to some extent even in China and India. Such mass production has now reached a point where it far exceeds the demands of the world market. In spite of the intense competition for markets which has followed, several nations are no longer able to sell a large proportion of their staple goods either at home or abroad, the result being world-wide unemployment. If one of these nations acting alone attempts to curtail its production, others immediately scramble to seize this foreign trade. Consequently, if economic waste, increased international friction, and chaos are to be avoided, an international agreement based upon some ideal other than the preservation of the *status quo* would seem to be imperative. This should apply to the obtaining of

[6] February 25, 1938. Used by permission.
[7] Complete text contained in New York *Times*, January 28, 1938.
[8] *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931).

necessary raw materials for the operation of industries as well as to subsistence; there are plenty of raw materials, but they need to be distributed more equitably if world disorder is to be avoided. In such a necessity Christian teaching places a moral obligation upon the various nations to bring about this co-operation, according to Monsignor Ryan.

No doubt the applications made above of Christian principles to international policies governing the tariff, war debts, and economic affairs will sound somewhat novel to many Catholic Americans. The reason for this is obvious. We, like most other Americans, have had our Christian principles dwarfed by modern nationalism, which, as it has developed in the last twenty-five years, is, in the language of Monsignor Ryan, "patriotism exaggerated, perverted, gone mad." Similarly, Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes has said in his *Essays on Nationalism* that nationalism, as distinguished from true patriotism, involves a boastful attitude towards one's own nation combined with a supercilious or hostile habit of mind towards other nations; it insists that one's own nation can do no wrong. With a public press and a large group of politicians who have found it financially profitable to their own interests to foster attitudes of hatred towards other nations, it is not unnatural that so many Catholics should have forgotten somewhat that brotherly love does not stop at our shores. In our present surroundings, therefore, the Catholic teaching on international relations probably sounds strange, almost "unpatriotic," some might say. However, it is hoped that this brief digression into the field of international policies and the application of Christian ethical principles to some of them will prepare the reader to understand better the principles bearing upon the broader phases of the so-called population problem. From what we have seen already, one might well predict that Christian principles conflict with many of the population policies advocated today.

4. THE INTEGRITY OF NATIONAL BOUNDARIES AND SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

Having considered three related phases of modern international life in the light of Christian ethics, we should be better prepared now to consider the ethical problems that would seem to be basic in any discussion of the population situation, namely, the right of ownership to particular lands of the earth to the exclusion of other peoples. Put in the form of questions, the basic problem may be outlined as follows: How does a nation acquire original title to land; to what extent can it exclude others from its territory; and how might these principles be applied to the tense situation existing between the United States and Japan?

In answering these questions we must start by recalling that the earth belongs to all mankind, and that no particular portion of it was assigned by the Creator to any nation, race, or group. However, in the interests of good order, there must be some fairly stable distribution of this land, and long-time possession is generally accepted as the best way to obtain such a right. But suppose a nation with such a title to land is confronted with immigrants from a country which is undergoing hardships because it is less well equipped with rich natural resources. Has the first nation an ethical right to exclude the second group? Returning to Christian principles, we find that, while the law of charity obliges one to love his neighbor, it does not oblige him to prefer his neighbor's rights to his own, nor even to do as much for his neighbor as he would for himself. Therefore, if the admission of a large number of aliens from a less fortunate area would be a cause of grave inconvenience to a nation, the Christian law of brotherly love would not bind it to admit them. However, if the admission of a small number of aliens would cause no such inconvenience, there would be an obligation to admit them. This obligation would be even greater if the refusal to do so would engender national hatreds and so endanger international peace.

America and Japan

Applying the above principles now to an actual situation, such as the American exclusion of Oriental immigration, Monsignor Ryan believes that it may be granted that the admission of *large* numbers of Asiatics might present a problem sufficiently grave to justify our present policy. However, if the slightness of the inconvenience resulting from admitting a few Orientals (a number comparable to some of the smaller European quotas under our national-origins law) is considered, our present policy of complete exclusion (which, by the way, is being copied by the countries of South America) does not jibe with Christian principles. This is especially true in view of the ill-will unnecessarily engendered in Japan when we abolished its small quota very abruptly and enforced complete exclusion against all Orientals.

The resentment which Japan now feels towards us chiefly because of our affront to her in immigration laws, together with the ill-will stirred up here as a result of her invasion of Manchuria a few years ago, has resulted in rather strained international relations, as the sinking of the U.S.S. *Panay* in December, 1937, illustrated so vividly. Yet we should not let our emotions blind us to facts. Japan, desiring raw materials and an expanding market in order to trade manufactures for foodstuffs

and so relieve her population pressure, under the existing international "every nation for itself" policy seeks a political as well as an economic hegemony over China, in brief, an Asiatic Monroe Doctrine. Analyzing this Chino-Japanese situation two years before the Panay incident, Father Patterson pointed out that an American jingo press, combined with the influence of Franco-British propaganda, might eventually use the Chinese situation to get us into another war, this time "to make Asia safe for democracy." After pointing out that our own Chinese trade probably would not suffer very much even if Japan finally achieved her objective there, he warned us lest we be made a buffer against Japan in order to safeguard British and French trade. Perhaps Father Patterson's warning should be repeated in view of the fact that our press gives the distorted impression, so suggestive of the propaganda of 1914–1918, that Japan is *"all* wrong" and China *"all* right" in the present conflict. He said:

> Should we avoid war with Japan? The writer, a graduate of an English university, respects and admires the English nation. Their diplomacy is superb. It is astute and realistic, though often on the surface simple even to the point of naiveté. But England knows what she wants, and generally gets it. Americans should be on their guard lest Uncle Sam become a handy buffer against Japan to safeguard British and French Oriental trade. As to England's Far Eastern market menaced by Japanese competition, that's "her baby."
>
> Again, suppose that we and our potential allies defeat and ruin Japan. What then? An expanding market? Far from it. Most probably a Bolshevized China, and a red surge of Communism the world over. Stalin has predicted a capitalistic war, and then foresees in its wake the Communist opportunity.[9]

It may be objected that, whatever the merits of the present Sino-Japanese affair may be, there was no excuse for Japan's invasion of Manchuria a few years ago. Before censoring Japan too severely in the matter of Manchukuo, we should review all the facts and see whether we or any of the other Western nations acted in a thoroughly Christian manner at that time. At the time of the Manchurian incident the people of Japan believed that they needed more land for their growing population. This feeling was accentuated by domestic unemployment, brought about by the fact that the rapidly developing Japanese industries were being prevented from exporting their goods by high tariff walls set up against them in other countries. With western nations ignoring the Japanese discomfort, it occurred to the Japanese that sparsely populated Manchuria could absorb some of these surplus Japanese goods and a portion of her population as well. And, as Monsignor

[9] "Drifting towards Armageddon," *America*, Volume 53, June 29, 1935, page 271. Used by permission.

Ryan points out, Manchuria was "so near at hand that the general right of the Japanese people to live from the bounty of the earth might plausibly be converted into the specific right to occupy this territory." [10]

Though Monsignor Ryan does not exonerate Japan's occupation of Manchuria by force, in the following statement he makes the other nations of the world sharers in the guilt of Japan because of their failure to co-operate in some way to relieve the distress of the Japanese: "While these facts do not justify occupation by force, they do suggest that the interested nations were and are morally obliged to consider the conditions and claims of the Japanese people in this situation. Their failure to do so, together with their foolish exclusion of Japanese goods, makes them sharers with Japan in the moral responsibility for the conquest of Manchuria." [11] In 1937, when, as a result of the new hostilities undertaken in China, most of the American press was decidedly anti-Japanese, the Right Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, Presiding Bishop-elect of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, expressed a similar sentiment to that expressed by Monsignor Ryan a few years before; he said: "The family of nations ought to share responsibility for Japan's aggressive attitude. The only road out is for the nations who do not want her to be aggressive to help give her some outlet for commerce and industrial development." [12]

Peace and Hypocrisy

Many others are commencing to express viewpoints on international land and trade problems which are similar to those of the clergymen just considered, and for that matter not widely different from what the communists have been saying. Professor Grove S. Dow is quite frank in putting his finger upon the source of some of our recent international complications: the feeling of population pressure. He points out that the nations which are most critical of recent Japanese and Italian exploits are those which were most ruthless in carving out "spheres of influence" among the "backward" peoples during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Fearful of losing their captured treasures, they eye other nations with suspicion and, in order to maintain the very profitable *status quo,* pretend to be shocked at the evils of war and imperialism. "Having built up their empires," he says, "they are now concerned about maintaining the *status quo*—which means in frank terms preventing other countries from 'muscling in' on their own private do-

[10] "Ethical Aspects of Some International Problems, III," *America,* Volume 49, May 20, 1933, page 156. Used by permission.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] Quoted in the New York *Times,* October 26, 1937.

mains. They rationalize their own exploitative conquests in the past by arguing that they were a part of the 'white man's burden' in carrying civilization to the backward areas of the world." [13] Similarly, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, founder of the Conference for the Cause and Cure of War, brands the present possessions of powerful Western nations as war "loot," which they are unwilling to give up though they condemn similar acts in other nations. Because of our own hypocrisy in this matter, which prevents us from working towards any sort of effective international peace program, she recently suggested that "an army of the ashamed" should urge our government to atone for its having followed the "old immoral code" in the past by following the old moral code in the future. Summing up her twenty-five years of study of peace programs, she said recently:

> The pleas on behalf of peace that we are making now would leave every imperialistic nation with all loot in her safe possession while denying imperialistic aggression and conquest to others. To my mind this is the real foundation of all trouble and the hesitation to forswear war.
>
> I long to see a great army of the ashamed marching up Capitol Hill to our government in order that together we may make a gigantic apology for man's war record. We will demand that lands, mines, oils, and many another wealth producing product, shall be delivered to some authority in recompense for the sins that were committed when these were taken unjustly and by force.
>
> When nations have become sufficiently ashamed to make plans for general reparations for wrongs done to other nations, they will come speedily and in humility to insist that the old moral code, so long violated, shall be uplifted in the peace movement of the world; and the old immoral code, which has been the sponsor of every war since time began, shall be repudiated forever.[14]

References for Further Reading

Beard, Charles A., *The Open Door at Home,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1935

Bonar, James, *Malthus and His Work,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924

Carr-Saunders, A. M., *World Population,* The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1936

Charles, Enid, *The Twilight of Parenthood,* W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1934

Clark, Grover, *A Place in the Sun,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936

Crocker, W. R., *The Japanese Population Problem,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932

Donaldson, John, *International Economic Relations,* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1930

[13] *Society and Its Problems* (Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1937), pages 65–66.

[14] Quoted in the New York *Times,* January 20, 1938. Used by permission. See also the symposium on peace in *The Commonweal,* May 20, 1938.

Douglas, Paul H., *Wages and the Family,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1925
Dow, Grove S., *Society and Its Problems,* revised edition, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1937
Dublin, Louis I. (editor), *Population Problems,* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1926
Dublin, Louis I., and Alfred J. Lotka, *Length of Life,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936
Duncan, Hannibal G., *Race and Population Problems,* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1929
Edin, K. A., and E. P. Hutchinson, *Studies of Differential Fertility in Sweden,* P. S. King and Sons, London, 1936
Eppstein, John, *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations,* Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 1935
Eppstein, John, *Must War Come?,* Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1935
Field, James A., *Essays on Population,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931
Gigon, H., *Ethics of Peace and War,* Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1935
Gillette, John M., and James M. Reinhardt, *Current Social Problems,* revised edition, American Book Company, New York, 1937
Glass, D. V., *The Struggle for Population,* The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1936
Goodrich, Carter, and others, *Migration and Economic Opportunity,* The University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1936
Gray, Alexander, *Family Endowment,* Ernest Benn, London, 1927
Harris Foundation, *Population,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1930
Hayes, Carlton J. H., *Essays on Nationalism,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926
Hayes, Carlton J. H., *The Historical Evaluation of Modern Nationalism,* Richard R. Smith, New York, 1931
Hoffman, Ross, J.S., *The Will to Freedom,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1935
Hubbard, G. E., and D. Baring, *Eastern Industrialization and Its Effect on the West,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1935
Ishii, Ryoichi, *Population Pressure and Economic Life in Japan,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937
Karve, D. G., *Poverty and Population in India,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1936
Kuczynski, Robert R., *The Measurement of Population Growth,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1936
Lorrimer, F., and F. Osborn, *Dynamics of Population,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934
M. F., *Prostitution,* The Catholic Social Guild, P. S. King and Sons, Westminister, 1917
Moon, Parker T., *Imperialism and World Politics,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926

National Resources Committee, *Problems of a Changing Population,* Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1938
Parran, Thomas, *Shadow on the Land: Syphilis,* Reynal and Hitchcock, New York, 1937
Pearl, Raymond, *The Biology of Population Growth,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1925
Pearson, S. Vere, *The Growth and Distribution of Population,* John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1935
Penrose, E. F., *Population Theories and Their Application with Special Reference to Japan,* Stanford University Press, California, 1934
Plater, Charles, S.J., *A Primer of Peace and War,* P. S. King and Sons, London, 1915
Reuter, Edward B., *Population Problems,* revised edition, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1937
Robins, L. C., *Economic Planning and International Order,* Macmillan & Co., London, 1937
Roemer, William F., *The Ethical Basis of International Law,* Loyola University Press, Chicago, 1929
Sarkar, Benoy Kumar, *The Sociology of Population,* N. M. Ray-Chowdhury and Company, Calcutta, 1936
Scott, James B., *The Catholic Conception of International Law,* Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 1934
Stratmann, Franziskus, O.P., *The Church and War,* P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York, 1928
Sweeney, J. Shirley, *The Natural Increase of Mankind,* The Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore, 1926
Sydenstricker, Edgar, *Health and Environment,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933
Taft, D. R., *Human Migration,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1936
Thompson, Warren S., *Population Problems,* revised edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935
Thompson, Warren S., and P. K. Whelpton, *Population Trends in the United States,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933
United States Public Health Service, *The Venereal Disease Handbook for Community Leaders,* Washington, D.C., 1924
United States Public Health Service, *Venereal Disease Manual,* Washington, D.C., 1926
Utley, Freda, *Japan's Feet of Clay,* W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1937
Vibart, Hugh H., *Family Allowances in Practice,* P. S. King and Sons, London, 1926
Walsh, Edmund A., S.J., *The History and Nature of International Relations,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922

PART IV

POVERTY AND ITS TREATMENT

CHAPTER XIII

POVERTY: THE PROBLEM AND ITS EFFECTS

I. The Problem

Poverty is an ancient evil. Inequalities have existed since the early days of history when some men returned empty-handed to their caves after a futile search for food. As men slowly learned the need for mutual protection against enemies, differences in abilities were somewhat minimized by the development of co-operative undertakings. Common responsibilities gradually led to the development of leaders whose powers brought wealth. This distinction between the "haves" and the "have nots" became permanent and notable with the rise of land ownership: the struggle between classes began. The evolution of privilege through the inheritance of wealth tended to perpetuate the concentration of power in the hands of the few. Thus, for the masses poverty became a normal feature of existence. The doctrine of Christian charity, of course, mitigated many evils of poverty, but charity was no adequate substitute for justice.

The Industrial Revolution intensified the problems of the poor. They were crowded into cities, and eventually slum housing with its attendant evils became typical. The responsibility for the impoverished was transferred from the landlords to the state. Although the states adopted makeshift measures from time to time, the governments of all countries failed to meet existing needs. Earlier struggles were between slaves and masters, serfs and lords, and tenants and landowners. The indirect relationship of the state to the people resulted in a postponement of the issue; even so, in many countries revolution has been a tentative result of the situation.

The present depression has brought close to us many phases of the problem of poverty, but it is well to recognize that poverty is not a problem of recent origin. The labor encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, written in 1891, has pertinence for the present situation, indicating that twentieth-century problems are not unique:

> It is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond

politics and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy. The elements of a conflict are unmistakable: the growth of industry, and the surprising discoveries of science; the changed relations of masters and workmen; the enormous fortunes of individuals and the poverty of the masses; the increased self-reliance and the closer mutual combination of the working population; and, finally, a general moral deterioration. The momentous seriousness of the present state of things just now fills every mind with painful apprehension; wise men discuss it; practical men propose schemes; popular meetings, legislatures, and sovereign princes, all are occupied with it—and there is nothing which has a deeper hold on public attention.

In approaching the problem of poverty, we shall consider the situation primarily from the point of view of the present. Certain historical developments will be examined for their influence upon present conditions. The nature of this problem requires passing reference to certain other problems logically interwoven with poverty. Naturally, it would be impractical in the space allotted to treat comprehensively all the implications of poverty. Although the current situation is not unusual, its many ramifications are sufficiently vivid and compelling to point the way to certain improvements which must be made if our present civilization is to survive.

I. POVERTY DEFINED

Poverty and dependency are terms subject to loose interpretation. It is necessary, therefore, that we arrive at definitions limiting the subject matter to pertinent topics. For this reason we shall follow the definition presented by J. L. Gillin, who describes *poverty* as "That condition in which a person, either because of inadequate income or unwise expenditure, does not maintain a standard of living high enough to provide for his physical and mental efficiency and to enable him and his natural dependents to function usefully according to the standards of the society of which they are members."[1] *Dependency* in our meaning of the term is considered to exist when a person or family normally considered capable of self-support requires the assistance of others. We naturally exclude from consideration "natural dependency," that which exists when a child is supported by his father. The deserted family needing assistance from a social agency is *dependent* in our sense of the term.

The popular connotation of the word "dependency" suggests the need for a word of caution about attitudes. Many consider the condition of dependency undesirable because of certain concepts attached

[1] *Poverty and Dependency* (D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1937), page 22.

to the term. To these persons dependency implies families, lacking not only in resources but also in ambition, content to live a life of ease at the expense of others. That this kind of dependency does exist occasionally may not be denied, but it represents undue or undesirable dependency, rather than dependency as such. The term "pauper" is similarly subject to unfortunate interpretation. In many instances this word is taken as an index of shiftlessness or incompetency; actually the term has a distinctly legal meaning and simply indicates one who by reason of inadequate income must receive assistance from public funds. Such terms indicate a condition or status and are in no way descriptive of the characteristics of those who have such status. It is necessary to guard against attitudes which may make it difficult or impossible to achieve desirable results in a treatment program. Constructive results will not be got from any method of treatment which rests on the thesis that all those who require public assistance have undesirable characteristics.

The definition of poverty suggests the existence of a standard of living which will provide physical and mental efficiency as well as useful functioning according to standards of contemporary society. In general, students of poverty recognize two distinct standards of living: (1) a standard which provides for subsistence; (2) a standard which provides for decency and comfort. There is a modern tendency to accept the latter of these two standards as the desirable minimum standard, and the definition is in keeping with this tendency in its suggestion of physical, mental, and social efficiency. This obviously implies a concept of the nature of man which makes him more than a physical animal in need only of food, shelter, and clothing. There is an appreciation of social and spiritual needs which depend on a standard of living making it possible to attain these goals. It seems necessary to express disapproval of any standard which provides for mere subsistence.

There are two distinct variables present in standards of living: (1) personal choice; (2) relationship to time and place. Personal choice operates in the selection of one element when more than one element is available and only one may be obtained. Observation indicates that two families with similar incomes and similar needs tend to satisfy these needs through different channels. One family may choose to purchase a new house, which may mean the sacrifice of another element in living, such as an automobile. Another family may choose to purchase an automobile, in preference to living in a more desirable part of the community. The basis of selection of one element over

another may be good judgment, or it may be the pressure of fashion. A store clerk may sacrifice her lunches for a week in order to purchase silk hosiery. Standards of living are relative to time and place, as exemplified by the differences between a pioneer civilization and one that is highly industrialized. Thus, in the days of pioneers in this country window glass was a luxury, but today it is taken for granted.

2. DIFFICULTIES IN MEASUREMENT OF POVERTY

It is not possible to state precisely the amount of poverty existing at any time, and this fact is natural in view of the variables which have been suggested. There are three obvious difficulties: (1) the problem of establishing a level below which poverty must exist; (2) the difficulty of ascertaining the numbers of persons below such a level; (3) the question of the length of time such a level would remain constant, both as to the prices determining the level and as to the numbers below the level.

In determining the level below which poverty must exist we are faced with several considerations. In different parts of the country there are usually price variations in the necessities of life. Climatic and other conditions necessitate particular kinds of food, clothing, and shelter. Differing sizes of families make for differing needs. A family composed of two persons living on a basis close to the poverty line may be considered in poverty if additional persons are added to the family. The problem of determining the numbers of persons below the poverty line is a major one. It is difficult to suggest the amount of money necessary to provide even the necessities of life in view of the variances already suggested. If a specific sum be suggested, the families whose incomes today are below the amount determined may in a month or two have sufficient incomes to be considered above the poverty line. Conversely, the incomes of other families may show downward trends.

The fluctuations of wages and prices over short periods of time make it most difficult to depend on a fixed sum as a basis for measurement of poverty. If an estimate were to be obtained of the numbers of persons in poverty at a given time, the validity of the estimate would be destroyed almost at once by changes in wages or prices or both. Although there seems to be a certain coincidence between the fluctuations of wages and prices, it is generally agreed that wages lag behind price changes. It is to be recognized that, in spite of the many difficulties presented, there have been many attempts to measure poverty. Some conclusions may be drawn from the various studies, but

in general the most prominent tendency is to indicate the magnitude of the problem.

Methods of Measuring Poverty

There are three principal methods by which students of social problems have measured poverty: (1) studies of individual families; (2) studies of relief statistics; (3) studies of the distribution of wealth.

The first major attempt to measure the extent of poverty was made by Charles Booth in London from 1886 to 1902. His studies of families in various parts of London were based on personal observation and constant association with families in distress. Booth estimated those living in poverty to be slightly more than 30 per cent of the population of London at that time. This estimate was determined by examination of family food expenditures and self-experimentation with the effect of various amounts of food. In arriving at this estimate Booth considered also the overcrowding in tenements and used personal observations to determine the adequacy of clothing worn by the poor. He publicized his findings by means of "poverty maps" which showed the distribution of slum areas in the city. Booth's studies, published under the title *Life and Labour of the People in London,* focused attention upon the many problems involved in poverty.

Studies of a similar nature with minor differences in techniques showed somewhat similar results. Particularly notable were the surveys of the Webbs in England and those of Chapin and Kennedy in the United States. Because of the nature of such studies, they were confined to small communities or random selections of families. In general, it may be stated that studies of this type are valuable in ascertaining the specific conditions of families living in poverty rather than in indicating the total amount of poverty. Even if a microscopic examination of a small community revealed the exact amount of poverty present, the findings would apply only to that community, for no community is sufficiently like all other communities to warrant forming general conclusions.

The second method of measuring poverty is the consideration of relief statistics. Those who are receiving assistance from public relief funds may be reasonably described as in poverty, and a brief survey of the extent of public assistance gives a fair gauge of the magnitude of the problem. More than twenty million persons in the United States received emergency relief from public funds in January, 1935. This is nearly a sixth of the population. The term "emergency relief" is descriptive of general policies of relief-giving at that time. There was

no long-range planning, problems were met from day to day, responsibility for administration of relief shifted from one jurisdiction to another, legislatures failed to appropriate funds, and there was general chaos, with consequent suffering. Families were "doubled-up," evictions took place, and millions were subjected to the morale-shattering experiences so typical of mass insecurity.

At the present time there are three major types of public relief: (a) general relief, (b) the program of the Works Progress Administration, (c) public assistance under the provisions of the Social Security Act. In January, 1938, the estimated total number of cases receiving general relief was about 1,900,000, comprising 4,800,000 persons, and the estimated expenditure for the month was $46,700,000. In the same month approximately 1,900,000 persons certified as in need of relief earned about $88,000,000 for work on Works Progress Administration projects. These earnings were estimated to be support for nearly 8,000,000 persons. Public-assistance statistics indicate that about 1,600,000 aged persons, nearly 600,000 dependent children, and 58,000 blind persons were designated under the state and federal statutes to receive assistance for January. For this group under the Social Security Act, about $40,000,000 was expended from federal, state, and local funds exclusive of administrative costs.[2]

These statistics for one month show that about 15,000,000 persons received assistance at an expenditure of about $175,000,000, exclusive of certain types of assistance, such as National Youth Administration Student Aid, Civilian Conservation Camps, and almshouse care. Including all types of care, 5,600,000 households received public assistance in January, 1938. Statistics of public assistance give a moderate picture of the situation since many who are on the borderline of eligibility for assistance do not receive it. We should remember, further, that the eligibility lists are in a constant state of flux; there is constant turnover. Even though the size of the problem remains constant from month to month, this does not mean that the same families receive assistance from month to month. (We shall consider the statistics in the distribution of wealth in the following chapter.)

From our examination of the two above ways of measurement of poverty it seems evident that we are unable to suggest a precise answer to the question how many are in poverty at any specific time. Family studies show that many are unable to live on a basis of decency and

[2] These data are summarized from *Social Security Bulletin*, Volume 1, Numbers 1–3, March, 1938, published by the Social Security Board (Washington, D.C., 1938).

comfort. (Studies of the distribution of wealth reveal many incomes below a desirable standard.) Public-assistance statistics indicate that many millions are unable to support themselves and are receiving aid based upon a subsistence standard. These factors point to at least one valid statement: poverty or something closely akin to it is a common condition in this country.

The incidence or rate of poverty varies considerably from section to section. The percentage of persons receiving relief from public funds varies from 3 to 30 in various counties in many states. Thus one index of poverty is present to an extent ten times as great in one county as in another. Poverty, therefore, not only is a common condition but varies in extent from place to place and from time to time. Any consideration of the problem must include the admission that the trend of poverty in this country cannot be forecast. It is known that it exists in fact, that it affects large numbers of the population, and that it is dynamic rather than static. Careful surveying indicates that the problem is serious and deserves extended consideration.

3. THE MANAGEMENT FACTOR IN POVERTY

In dealing with certain general conditions which affect the problem of poverty we have presented conditions largely from the standpoint of income. It is most difficult to avoid jumping to conclusions with such data. At this phase of study it is necessary to deal with the problem of poverty as it is affected by management. There are many situations in which reasonably adequate incomes, by reason of failure of management, do not provide adequate living conditions. There are families in poverty with incomes which should be sufficient to provide a basis of living on a level of health and decency. There are two distinct conditions which are important: (1) budgetary difficulties; (2) the personal equation.

Budgets

A budget is either a plan for spending or a record of expenditures Although budgets are affected by incomes, certain personal elements may be considered very important in their effects on budgeting. A brief analysis of food costs offers an example. One must know where to purchase food, what food to purchase, and the quantities which may be purchased most economically. There is a presumption that one knows what type of food to purchase, which presupposes an ability to plan for meals. The problem of purchasing is complicated by the thousands

of packaged commodities available and the extent of advertising and sales pressures. Even if one purchases food efficiently, there are many difficulties involved in preparation. There must be economical, efficient cooking apparatus. There must be skill to avoid waste, both in the manner of cooking and in the use of leftovers. These are the simple, basic skills. Certain other skills are necessary in the provision of meals with proper caloric contents, with a proper distribution of proteins, carbohydrates, and fats.

It can be stated reasonably that a majority of the population does not possess the requisite skills for proper management of food budgets. This factor is the cause of widespread suffering by families receiving relief, since many relief budgets or allowances are made up on the basis of skilled buying by an expert dietitian, rather than by an examination of amounts usually spent for food by families. Similarly, there are no reasonable standards for the purchase of clothing. Long-range planning for clothing expenditures either is neglected or is impractical, and the emergencies of the moment are met on an emergency basis. The pressures of fad and fashion are paramount in this question, and the important factors of durability and service are neglected. Standards of housing are less susceptible to the factors involving personal choice. The problem of puchasing adequate housing seems inherently difficult, principally because of the defects in the system, whereby low-income families are expected to purchase "tailor-made" housing by rentals subject to the vicissitudes of the real-estate market. A casual survey of any American city reveals conditions of housing typically drab, inefficient, and costly. Rural housing is no better for the most part, with notable exceptions here and there.

The simple necessities of food, clothing, and shelter offer problems in budgeting. Obviously, there are greater variations in such elements of living as recreation, education, and insurance. Some additional expenditures almost defy budgeting. Funeral costs are covered by insurance in many cases, but many persons are uninsurable, and others are not able to keep insurance protection in force because of irregular income. In any event, funerals are often unduly expensive, not because funeral directors take advantage of the emotional instability of the survivors of the deceased, but because of the simple fact that "keeping up with the Joneses" not only extends to funerals, but is perhaps best exemplified by funerals. The cost of medical care is unpredictable and presents many difficulties in budgeting. It is impossible to know when medical care will be required or the length of time it will be required. Saving for such emergencies is a desirable, but not always a

practical, solution, since illness may occur before sufficient savings are available, and of course, savings are impossible in many families.[8]

The Personal Equation

Thus far, consideration has been given to factors which seem to affect many families and for the most part are inherent in general rather than specific conditions. Thus it may be said not only that it is difficult for many families to budget adequately, but also that many lack the personal abilities which should normally result in satisfactory management. Although this subject will be treated at greater length later, it is well to point out that many persons fail to live adequately because of personal defects. These may range from alcoholism to benign extravagance. Familiar is the phenomenon of two families with identical incomes over a long period of time possessing worldly goods different in kind and in degree. Personal mismanagement may be a factor in many such instances. The inadequacy of many in the complex responsibilities of housekeeping may be sufficient to cause poverty. In a low-income family the problem of waste is serious. One may waste such a sum as forty cents weekly, but in twenty years this amounts to more than four hundred dollars. In view of these situations it seems safe to assert that, even if all families were provided with reasonable and adequate incomes, many would be in poverty because of mismanagement. This is no reason why adequate incomes should not be paid. It is simply a statement of fact.

4. THE HOPE FOR PANACEA

The emphasis upon relief problems during the present decade has resulted in the appearance of many false prophets, who offer futile panaceas to the problem of poverty. The success of these rabble-rousers is due in many ways to the universal human desire to solve major problems by some simple feat such as wand-waving. Dr. Townsend with his pension plan, Upton Sinclair and his "end poverty in California" plan, and Huey Long had much in common. Perhaps the reader can think of others who might be added to this list. Although sincere, they played on the emotions of the poor to the point where logical thinking became impossible. They preached with the sophistry of demagogues and aroused false hopes and fanatical zeal in their followers. Basically they were ignorant of many economic laws.

Before we consider the effects of poverty and attempt to analyze its

[8] For a good summary of the various budgetary studies, see J. H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems* (1937), Chapter X.

complex causes, it is important to point out a simple fact: one may not pass judgment on poverty without careful analysis of the variable factors which may be involved, whether social or individual in nature. One must approach the subject with a knowledge that present information is somewhat inadequate, that facts point to no universal solution to poverty as a social problem. No immediate cure-all is available. Centuries of experience with this problem have not resulted in its solution. Whatever the ultimate answer, it is certain that such an answer must depend upon clear and logical analysis of many phases of the problem. The necessity of stressing economic factors cannot be denied, although our concern is primarily with the social situations which may follow from economic maladjustments. This preliminary examination of the nature of poverty, the implications of standards of living, the attempts to measure poverty, and the management factors in poverty should lead to an appreciation of the immensity of the problem and of the need for serious consideration of the effects of poverty. The causes of poverty must be evaluated, and what has been done on a treatment basis should be known.

II. The Effects

It must be admitted that it is difficult to distinguish between the effects and the causes of poverty. With many social problems there is a circular relationship of cause and effect. In the interpretation of cause and effect, it is desirable to think of factors rather than specific and definite effects and causes. For example, alcoholism is often thought of as a cause of poverty. Yet it is possible that, in a given case, poverty may have resulted in a depressed morale, which in turn may have resulted in excessive use of alcohol as an escape from unpleasant reality. Health conditions bear a similar relationship to poverty, and it is often difficult to establish whether sickness caused a particular condition of poverty or is a result of it. It must be remembered that the coexistence of one social problem with another does not indicate the nature of the relationship between the two.

1. PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

With respect to the relationship of poverty to illness, four definite conclusions may be drawn: (1) there is a specific relationship between poverty and certain diseases; (2) poverty is well marked in its effects upon children; (3) there is a direct relationship between the ability to pay for medical care and rates of sickness and death; (4) other conditions associated with low incomes, such as inadequate hous-

ing and poor clothing, are factors in ill health. Because of the present controversy concerning socialized medicine, it may be said at the outset that the authors hold no brief for any specific form of medical care. Certain modifications of the present fee system seem indicated by a consideration of the facts obtained from many studies. What form these modifications take is not the concern of this study, but, since inadequacies in the present system are numerous, the defects must be remedied in some manner.

Health and Incomes

Studies show definite relationship between low incomes and ill health. The National Health Survey of 2,800,000 persons in 800,000 American families focused attention upon a serious situation. The death rate from pneumonia among unskilled workers is more than three times as high as the rate among professional workers; death rates from cancer are 50 per cent higher; rates of syphilis and diarrhea are twice as high. This survey found that the death rate from all causes is more than twice as high for the unskilled worker as for the professional. These simple facts require little interpretation. The masses of the people are subject to specific diseases of high mortality in a ratio inconsistent with the available knowledge of medical science.[4]

Children's Health

Studies of the relationship of poverty to children's health show a similar condition. It has been shown that after the first month of life infant mortality is ten times as high in the lowest economic class as in the highest income group, and that children with rickets usually come from families with low incomes and overcrowded living conditions, where poor diets of pregnant and nursing mothers were usual. There is valid evidence that children who come into life in the homes of the poor are affected by poverty even before birth. Often they are physically inferior at birth, and the conditions surrounding the period of infancy present further handicaps. It is true that any child born in poverty may in our democracy become President of the United States one day, but it is more important that such a child be given an equal chance to live with those born more fortunately. The attainment of high political office is less important than a supply of mother's milk from one who has adequate means and knowledge to provide for herself essential nutritive foods.

[4] The New York *Times*, October 6, 1937.

The Availability of Medical Care

There is, then, a specific relationship between poverty and certain diseases. Medical science has evolved methods of treatment which not only reduce the incidence of sickness but lessen its mortality. Theoretically, the best medical care is available to all irrespective of income; actually nothing could be more removed from reality. The simple fact is that medical services are available in direct proportion to ability to pay for these services. To be sure, there are charity wards, there are free clinics, there are public-health nurses who visit the homes of the poor. An analysis of this situation shows two factors which are overlooked: (1) the standard on which such services are offered generally involves an "emergency"; that is, a condition must be critical; (2) the greatest advances of science in reducing the seriousness of disease are in the field of preventive medicine or in treating the first stages of illness. As the Committee on the Cost of Medical Care states:

> As an economic activity, however, medicine has made much less phenomenal progress. The predominant economic institution in medical practice today—private individual practice—dates back to ancient times. Under this system medical services are now so provided that many persons either cannot and do not receive the care they need, or are heavily burdened by its costs. At the same time, many of the practitioners and the agencies which provide medical service are inadequately occupied and poorly remunerated. A barrier—in large part economic—stands between practitioners, able and eager to serve, and patients who need the service but are unwilling or unable to pay for it. . . .
>
> These facilities, however, are not distributed primarily according to needs, but rather according to real or supposed ability of patients to pay for service. As a result, many communities are undersupplied with practitioners, hospitals, and other facilities, while others have a surplus.[5]

The authoritative National Health Survey of 1935–36 points out that over 30 per cent of illness among families receiving relief and 28 per cent among families in the low-income group (below $1,000) received no medical care. Only 1 per cent of the relief patients received bedside care from a private-duty nurse, compared with 12 per cent in families having incomes of $3,000 or more. Disabling illness affects the poor more frequently. The same report shows that the unemployed have twice the disabling illness that the employed have; that the Works Progress Administration workers have a disabling illness rate 40 per cent higher than that of other employed persons; that one in every 20

[5] *Medical Care for the American People* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1932), pages 3–5.

heads of families on relief is unemployed because of disability, while only one in 250 heads of families in the higher income groups is unemployed because of disability. The impoverished not only do not receive medical services, but are in greater need of medical services than those who are in a position to obtain them.

Other Conditions Affecting Health

The high proportion of illness among the poor is inevitably associated with conditions concomitant with low incomes. Inadequate housing, with dark, poorly ventilated sleeping rooms, and lack of sanitary facilities offer a serious hazard to good health. Decent housing is not available to the poor. The common practice of doubling up in families during periods of depression has intensified problems of overcrowding. This practice may be resorted to voluntarily as a way of making both ends meet or may be a policy of relief agencies. In such situations the essential physical factor of congested living quarters is complicated by inadequate or insufficient food, a lack which increases the health hazard. The need of suitable clothing among the poor is another responsible element related to conditions of health. Every school teacher is familiar with instances of children who have insufficient clothing. Large numbers of children in rural and city slums have shoes which do not afford protection in wet weather. There is no doubt that such conditions directly expose children to colds and other illnesses. Since conditions in low-income families are conducive to ill health, and since the poor do not receive adequate medical care, the question resolves itself into a brief consideration of what they may do when ill. They may (a) obtain medical care through the philanthropic agencies or charitable physicians, (b) use treatment facilities other than those approved by responsible medical groups, (c) forgo medical care.

It has been pointed out that charity work does not adequately provide for those in poverty. It must be noted, however, that many do receive such assistance, both from organizations and from individuals. There are many excellent hospitals and clinics supported by voluntary contributions of small and large groups. Some cities and many counties provide superior facilities, although these do not meet all needs. Private physicians provide millions of dollars of free service annually to those unable to pay for services. Thousands of physicians knowingly donate their services to persons from whom they will not receive payment, with no other thought of reward than that of service to those in need. This, of course, is quite different from the practice of those physicians who write off their bad debts each year as "charity."

Unfortunately, many of those unable to pay for medical services from responsible sources utilize quacks and patent medicines. One may reason that, if payment to quacks can be afforded, legitimate services could also be purchased. The difference lies in the appeal made by the quacks; usually they promise immediate, inexpensive cures, and in particular they emphasize brief treatments of chronic serious ailments, which, if treated in an orthodox manner, may require long-range medical guidance. It is also recognized that many poor people patronize medical fakers at the expense of food, clothing, and shelter. The use of home remedies and patent medicines is often a substitute for medical care. Patent remedies sell for about half the physician's usual fee, and by misleading advertising many people are led to believe that the results are just as effective. The use of patent medicines not prescribed by physicians involves home self-diagnosis, which is most unreliable. Governmental regulation has reduced the problem of harmful patent medicines, but it must be insisted that even a harmless patent medicine may be harmful if it is a substitute for adequate care.

Those who forgo needed medical care often injure themselves irreparably. The human tendency, because of the pressure of needed income, is to remain at work even though one should rest at home. During the past few years there has been considerable publicity pointing out the consequences of the common cold, and there is general agreement that, if it is treated with adequate diet and rest, much can be done to forestall ill effects. Yet those who tax themselves beyond their strength may eventually contract a more serious disease.

It is apparent that many who are in poverty suffer from conditions of ill health, and we have seen that continuing and disabling ill health is often an effect of poverty. One phase of the question demands attention from the standpoint of prevalent lay opinion. Many believe that such conditions as have been described tend to produce a hardy race and to eliminate the unfit. This is a corollary of the doctrine of euthanasia, which would remove from our civilization those who are incurably ill. The doctrine of "survival of the fittest," in addition to being un-Christian, is illogical and unsound; those who survive do so in spite of and not because of the rigors to which they are subjected. An examination of the physiological effects of poverty has led many students to the conclusion that this problem will not be met satisfactorily until the United States, like most of the countries of Europe, adopts some form of compulsory health insurance. This will be discussed further in another chapter.

2. PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS

A survey of the psychological effects of poverty is difficult because of the lack of universal agreement among psychiatrists as to the precise mechanisms which motivate the emotional responses of human beings to situations of distress. Students of mental hygiene are in agreement that there are certain definite problems which accompany poverty, and these may be summarized under five main divisions: (a) insecurity; (b) family tensions; (c) penalties upon children; (d) the damage to adolescents; (e) general moral effects. These do not present a blueprint of mental hygiene problems, but serve to catalogue specific situations implied in a brief consideration of the subject.

Insecurity

Basically, insecurity results from real or threatened loss of status. The normal person wants to be secure, in the sense of being recognized as desirable by the groups of which he is a member. He must have a sense of belonging to the group and also the personal satisfaction of doing something well. With security, one may attain an integrated personality, that is, one which makes successful adjustments to varying conditions. The inability to make successful adjustments to realities within oneself or to external realities results in disorganization of the personality. Certain grave maladjustments result in a permanent break with reality characterized by gross mental and nervous diseases. Minor maladjustments, which are typical responses to insecurity, tend to produce undesirable attitudes and personal characteristics. There are certain responses to insecurity which are reasonably common. One may become rebellious and react to difficulties with belligerency. If that which causes the difficulty is out of reach, one may attack that which is at hand, members of the family, or friends. The opposite response is one of immediate acceptance of the situation, and this is likewise undesirable. An attitude of indifference or apathy may be developed; this situation is characterized by emotional immaturity, often seen in dependence on others. Many families subjected to unskilled handling by relief agencies develop this reaction. Undesirable dependency, with all that it implies, is one of the major concerns of experienced relief administrators.

Another response to unpleasant reality is an escape mechanism. This takes many forms, but is most obviously found in alcoholism and in addiction to narcotics. It must be admitted that all these reactions are

both typical and dangerous. The present fear of communism and radical agitation is possibly a realization that it is easy to play on the emotions of the poverty-stricken. Those who have no particular interest in the community in which they live, because it represents merely drab privation, may be willing to listen to the promise of any device or plan which may bring surcease from their anxieties and fears. One does not talk about revolution to employees receiving a wage which enables them to live above the poverty line. In writing of the reactions to unemployment, Dr. George K. Pratt describes certain mild departures from mental health:

> Such common attitudes are likely to be greatly exaggerated in times of stress and are everywhere encountered among the unemployed. They include varying degrees of chronic irritability; sensitiveness to fancied slights, discriminations or criticism; bitterness, sullenness, and a chip-on-the-shoulder attitude. Mental depressions, ranging from just ordinary spells of the "blues" to real melancholia, are frequent, while apathy, indifference, resignation, or hopelessness also are typical reactions in some personalities.[6]

Family Tensions

The relationship of these reactions to family life is more or less apparent. It is certain that the deprivations which are the lot of the family with inadequate income may mean a serious threat to wholesome family life. The attitude of hopelessness in failure is intensified by the normal human tendency to "blame somebody." Irritability and nagging are normal consequences; desertion is not an unusual phenomenon and is often the result of tensions within the family. Basically there may be a fundamental lack of peace and harmony, and the lack of attainment of normal, desirable goals may breed a sense of frustration. To be sure, there are many bulwarks against these conditions. Religion offers sufficient strength to many who escape the damaging effects of poverty by a spirit of self-sacrifice. Of course, voluntary poverty must be divorced from enforced poverty. The former not only does not imply loss of status, a sense of failure, or the inability to face unpleasant realities, but really acts as a strengthening influence, since its acceptance implies a well-integrated personality, able to make many and successful adjustments to difficult conditions. The ability to do this, to be motivated by the spirit rather than by the flesh, is in itself an evidence of a well-rounded personal development. To the careful observer, the virtues of voluntary poverty are as great as the evils of involuntary poverty.

[6] "Morale: The Mental Hygiene of Unemployment" (The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, 1933), page 21.

Penalties upon Children

This review of the psychological implications of poverty would be inadequate without consideration of the effects of poverty on children. Reference has already been made to the circular relationships in poverty, proceeding from cause to effect, and then finding that the effect is a cause. This "vicious circle" in poverty is illustrated by the penalties of a psychological nature imposed upon children, who will carry into their own families in the next generation the attitudes, the reactions, and the patterns fostered by their own parents. Children are born into the homes of the poor as economic liabilities rather than as the assets they were in an agricultural era. The children of the poor often live a wretched existence. Even those who would challenge the statement that "one third of the nation is ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished" must admit that the lives of millions of our children are characterized by privation and want. The novels of Dickens are graphic portraits of the extremes of such situations, but in a lesser way the children of modern poverty are subject to similar conditions all the time.

The plastic minds of children are affected by the atmosphere common in the homes of the poor. The young minds retain impressions of, and are molded emotionally by, incidents of hatred, contempt, nagging, and extreme bitterness. This condition is naturally not a universal situation, but it does exist. That it exists at all is a catastrophe. The conditions which have been described do not make for wholesome personalities, and poise and self-confidence do not readily grow out of such environments. This truth is most significant since more than a third of all babies born in the United States in 1937 were those of families on relief or having total incomes of less than $750 a year.[7]

Damage to Adolescents

The problems of those passing through adolescence are magnified by poverty. Children between twelve and eighteen years of age are in a period of growth which is not noted for stability. Youths out of school and out of work offer many problems to themselves and to others. Many become restless and adopt inadequate philosophies of life. Others become wanderers in pursuit of the pot of gold at the rainbow's end. It is certain that undesirable habits may be formed; it is equally true that patterns of escape are established whereby responsibilities are avoided. We cannot solve such problems by evading the relationship between poverty and these situations. It is necessary that we recognize

[7] *The Child*, Volume 2, January, 1938, page 144.

the implications of a social problem which offers demoralizing influences rather than constructive guidance to millions who will be parents of tomorrow's children.

Moral Effects

The preceding comments enforce a reasonable conclusion: the psychological implications of poverty inevitably result in certain moral effects. The emotional bases of the reactions to insecurity, the family tensions, the effects on children and youth, lead normally to many moral lapses. Alcoholism in its extreme form and intemperance in a milder form are typical in poverty. The desire to escape reality is present, and those who find refuge in the use of intoxicants are susceptible to many vices. Alcohol weakens the will, and the normal restraints do not operate. Case histories of homeless men during the depression revealed much use of alcohol, accompanied by gambling. It is admitted that these men were without the restraints of normal family life, and so the picture presented is perhaps abnormal, but observation leads to the conclusion that gambling is a phase of the reaction to poverty. One may ask: how is it possible for those who are in poverty to have money for drinking and gambling? Even those in dire poverty occasionally get money, usually in small amounts. This money is needed for necessities, but is diverted to vices. Drinking may involve concoctions such as denatured alcohol and extracts normally sold for flavoring purposes. Gambling usually involves small sums. The exposure of the "numbers racket" in New York by Special Prosecutor Thomas E. Dewey revealed the fact that the majority of bettors spent ten cents each time. This nefarious enterprise flourished in Harlem, where poverty is prevalent. The hope of a large sum as a reward spurs the poor to take a chance. Bookmakers who take small bets on horse races invariably report that the poor bet on "long shots" and delude themselves with the hope that their day may come. The use of spiritualists, mediums, and fortune-tellers increases during periods of economic depression, and palmistry and other false arts are often found in poor neighborhoods. Another reaction to poverty may be a disregard of the property rights of others, as indicated by stealing. It is easy for many in poverty to rationalize their situations and to conclude that to take what one wants is not immoral.

Thus the moral effects of unfortunate reactions to poverty are threefold: (1) the use of alcohol with a consequent weakening of the will leading often to immorality; (2) reliance on luck or the hope of profit from gambling; (3) theft.

3. CULTURAL EFFECTS

It is difficult to distinguish between that which is physiological, that which is psychological, and that which is cultural in its implications. The consideration of the effects of poverty has presented certain factors which were arbitrarily placed in one category or another, but which could have been treated elsewhere. With respect to the assigning of certain effects to the cultural category, it must be pointed out that such effects might well be considered elsewhere with equal facility. Cultural effects involve the relationship of individuals or families to other families or to the community. It is important to note six specific effects: (a) anonymity; (b) community disorganization; (c) cultural conflict; (d) blighted areas; (e) inadequate education; (f) economic exploitation.

Anonymity

As a class the poor are relatively inarticulate and by inability to speak are deprived of rights. Periodically laws are passed to protect them, and then the laws are forgotten. The existence of a law and the enforcement of the law are two separate conditions. A common example of this situation is the failure of building codes and sanitary regulations to protect the poor against unsafe and unhealthful tenement dwellings. Whether the cause be evasion of responsibility by property-owners through the payment of graft, or merely laziness and inadequate inspection by officials, the fact remains that the housing conditions typical of those in poverty conflict with ordinances and other regulations. Theoretically, it may be suggested that the poor have a right to vote and may replace elected officials by those of their own choosing. The very concept of anonymity is an answer to this. Those in poverty have a medium of individual expression, the power of the vote, but historically votes involve group action and stimulus. Many politicians prey on the poor; and the trading of a Thanksgiving basket for the votes of a family has been a normal experience of city life. Many elected officials responsible for administering poor relief arbitrarily decide upon low standards of relief in a nearsighted effort to save tax moneys; yet such officials, with vote-getting expediency, often preside as Santa Claus at Christmas parties for the children of those receiving relief. Often this "generosity" accomplishes its purpose; popcorn, candy, and small toys take the place of adequate relief grants.

The fact that the poor occasionally become articulate does not refute these statements. The poor do occasionally win in pitched battle.

But this victory does not prevent the growth of exploitation. That notable advances have been made and probably will be made must be admitted. Organizations of unskilled, low-income workers have by strikes and other methods obtained tangible results such as wage increases, but often increases in real prices have decreased the values received, because the employer continued to take his lion's share. If a wage scale is raised 10 per cent and prices are raised 10 per cent, there is no gain.

Community Disorganization

Community disorganization results from nonparticipation in community affairs, and is typically indicated by a stress on activities other than social. A disorganized community is characterized by objectionable and antisocial forms of commercialized recreation, factional disputes in politics, and indifference and political defeatism in both national and local affairs. There is a failure to recognize civic obligations. In such communities, political depravity is tolerated, tenement laws are violated without fear of punishment, and conditions dangerous to the young exist unchecked. This concept is related somewhat to anonymity, since individual families who do not participate in community affairs tend to become anonymous. In order to distinguish between the related concepts of anonymity and community disorganization, we may characterize anonymity as the condition, and community disorganization as the result. A community is said to be organized when its members cooperate effectively in achieving particular advances which will be of value to the community. One caution must be observed. It must not be thought that community disorganization is simply the result of lack of proper leadership. The presence or absence of leadership is almost unimportant when the basic problem is apathy and indifference. Occasionally spectacular leadership is able to overcome some phases of this evident deficiency, but a condition of organization is followed again almost inevitably by disorganization. Man is essentially social, and normally the predisposition to co-operation for mutual improvement is present. The alleviation of poverty is the solution for many situations involving community disorganization.

Cultural Conflict

Cultural conflict within a community is probably existent on a basis synchronous with poverty, rather than as a necessary effect of it. The lack of concrete data regarding the relationship of the two does not preclude treatment of the subject, however, since it is so often present

as part of the total picture of poverty. There are two distinct types of cultural conflicts: (1) those between race or nationality cultures; (2) those between members of the different generations in one family. This treatment of the subject is based principally on the fact that the homes of recently arrived immigrants are located in areas where poverty is the normal condition. These disorganized communities are subject not only to nonparticipation in community life, but to distinct nationality or race differences. Such differences frequently make it impossible to secure community-wide action. In some situations, groups oppose the activities of others despite the general good effects which might follow from sympathy and co-operation. Fear of domination by others may be the root of this difficulty. Men are inclined to be hostile toward those who are different from themselves. Men may see others as threats to racial, national, or personal pride, or as economic competitors. The epithets applied to one nationality by another are evidence of this unfortunate condition, which education has been slow in eradicating. Such movements as the Community Forum tend to break down artificial barriers, which retard community-wide action.

The Old World vs. *the New*

Cultural conflicts between the first and second generations are normally confined to the homes of individual families. The conflict of the culture of the Old World with the culture of the New World is seen most graphically in the field of parent-child relationships. There is mutual suspicion, complicated by many quarrels, and a distinct lack of co-operation and harmony. Adolescent youth is subject to many threats to its morals, and the failure to recognize parental authority is fraught with danger. At an age when youth is unstable, there is need of guidance and restraint. Parents treat the defiance of parental authority with lack of concern or with insistence that youth make and be responsible for its own decisions. Many of these situations end in permanent maladjustment. It is difficult to fix responsibility for this condition, and the solution is also problematical. Clashes between two sets of customs are unavoidable. The immigrant parents of a high-school girl may expect her to follow the customs of their own country in regard to her associations with boys. These customs may include a denial of all such associations other than those which may be feasible in their home under strict chaperonage. Crowded living conditions are not helpful to such arrangements. The standards of others in school are different, and the girl is torn between two standards which are mutually inconsistent. According to the culture pattern of the community and

of her associates, she believes she should have a certain amount of freedom, attend dances, go with boys unchaperoned. She resents her parents' attitude; she may classify them as old-fashioned and disregard their opinions. Ultimately a serious dispute may arise, causing the girl to leave school and get a job; soon she may leave her home at an age when she needs the advice and counsel of her parents. Or she may remain in the home and flaunt their authority, with the result that she attains complete and irresponsible freedom, rather than the desirable freedom necessary to normal youth. Her problems may become grave; at the very least it may be said that the situation is potentially a dangerous one.

This problem is not confined to conflicts between first and second generations in immigrant families. Nor is it confined to those in poverty. In time such a situation may become part of the general tradition of a community. Changes in standards from generation to generation may be accompanied by many conflicts. It should be remembered that moral standards do not change; it is essential that fashion and morals be not confused. The Ten Commandments do not change from one era to another. An understanding of this fact and an attempt of the two generations to understand each other's point of view are essential to a solution of these difficulties, which exist at all levels of society but are magnified by poverty.

Blighted Areas

The modern city presents many contrasts, but none are so prominent as the general appearances of contrasting neighborhoods. The phenomenon of "blighted areas" has attracted the attention of students of urban life during the past decade. These areas are characterized by colorless, unprepossessing dwellings, the homes of squalor and crowded living. Children are forced to take refuge in the streets, since their homes are unpleasant, and lack adequate play space. The intimate association of children with places of vice and crime is deteriorating. Often they may participate in the life of unsupervised gangs and adopt patterns of conduct which are antisocial. Frequently gangs in such areas are harmless in character, but, in many instances, their activities are of a quasi-criminal character. Many have strong traditions, and in some areas boy gangs have matured into adult gangs without significant loss of membership. Leadership is often based on "toughness"; constantly the leader is forced to fight with those who question his authority.

Gangs are a normal expression of growing up and are not of themselves dangerous; in fact, they are desirable as a means of developing

the co-operative spirit. Unsupervised gangs in "blighted areas" have the same psychological foundation as patrol gangs in Scouting. Scouts have formal identification with a social institution such as a school or a church. They have good adult leadership; standards of achievement are moral. The unsupervised gang is divorced from social institutions; when adult leadership is present, it may exploit the boys; standards are those of the neighborhood. Thus, in addition to the psychological depression which accompanies living in "blighted areas," there are cultural effects: one may grow up in a tradition of delinquency, and the expression of normal desires may take undesirable forms. It must be recognized that associations of this sort tend inevitably to build characteristics which may establish a similar cultural pattern for another generation.

Inadequate Education

Another cultural effect of poverty is the inadequate education of the children of the poor. Theoretically, education is available to all to an extent dependent only on ability. Many students in colleges are from homes in which poverty has been normal. Scholarships and work assistance are media through which society attempts to equalize opportunities. That this is reasonably effective none will deny, although many are unduly hampered in college work by irksome tasks, long hours of necessary employment, and sacrifices of advantages. The presence in colleges of many who have meager financial resources leads to the frequent observation that in this country no one is handicapped by poverty. Even if it be granted that no harm comes to college students who are forced to earn a major part of their expenses, it must be remembered that a selective process is in operation which begins in elementary school. Many are forced to leave school prematurely to go to work in order to supplement the family income. This condition begins with the legal minimum working age. In 1930, a depression year, 103,223 children, fourteen and fifteen years of age, received their first employment certificates permitting them to leave school and go to work. It is possible that many who leave school at the legal minimum age for employment should do so, but it is socially undesirable to base the selection, as is usually done, on the chance existence of a low income. Even when there are no jobs available, many children leave school on the pretext of looking for work, but many of these have lost interest in school, either because they know they cannot continue long or because the purchase of essentials is impossible. Many children of the poor who know that they may be forced to leave school at any time await

complacently their day of "freedom," unaware that their opportunities for a fuller and richer life are being decreased.

A phase of the inadequate education of children is found in a brief examination of street trades. Children engaged in peddling, shining shoes, and selling newspapers are subject to certain disorganizing influences and often come into contact with gambling, vice, and crime. The problem is nominal or nonexistent in the case of newsboys who deliver to homes, but there is a wide gap between them and the boys who sell on street corners until late hours. Nearly every city has ordinances controlling such work, but few, if any, are enforced, nor does one ever hear of the city newspapers conducting a campaign to have these laws enforced! In some cities this work is not confined to boys, and many young girls ten or eleven years of age are on the streets at night. Newspapers with morning editions on the street in the early evening hours are particular offenders. The children who do such work come from the homes of poverty, and neither their health, morals, nor school achievement is improved by such conditions. The captains of industry who report that their "start in life" was in selling newspapers at the age of eight are numerous. It is possible that they exaggerate their youth or, since this has become an accepted tradition, that they imagine the situation. Most newsboys of the street-corner variety learn early in life habits of petty thievery rather than "an appreciation of the value of money." If the captains of industry are truly successful, they have succeeded in spite of obstacles and not because of them.

In conclusion, many students leave school on account of academic failure. Many of these are undernourished; many have visual defects which do not receive proper attention; others are improperly clothed. Certainly it is not unreasonable to suppose that in many cases poor school work is due to the existence of these handicaps. Thus we see that inadequate education of the poor may be the result of two conditions: (1) the need for employment to supplement the family income; (2) the inability to do good school work because of deprivations and uncorrected defects.

Economic Exploitation

The subject of economic exploitation on a cultural level would justify a separate treatise, since there are many questions involved. But there are two specific problems: (1) women in industry; (2) industrial homework. The closely related subject of child labor is treated elsewhere.

The situation of *women at work* has many ramifications, and an

exhaustive treatment will not be attempted here, for it is considered also in connection with the subject of population shrinkage. The subject logically divides itself into three categories: numbers of women at work, the motivation for such work on the part of married women, and the condition of unmarried working women.

The number of domestic industries transferred to factories from homes caused the employment of large numbers of women in factories, and the mechanization of some domestic tasks has increased the opportunities for women to leave the home. In 1930 over 10,700,000 women were in gainful employment in the United States, two women to every seven men, and almost six times as many women as were so employed sixty years before.

No informed person today labors under the delusion that most women work for "pin money" rather than from necessity. The following, taken from the summary of a recent government report, indicates women's share in the support of their families:

> The responsibilities of women as contributors to the family exchequer are considerably larger than many persons have realized. Probably more than one-tenth of the employed women in the United States are the entire support of families of two or more persons, in many cases of those that are much larger. Large numbers of these are single women, many are married; they are engaged in industrial, professional, clerical, domestic and personal, and other types of employment.
>
> A very large body of women in addition to those who are the sole family wage earners are supporting dependents, either wholly or in part, and many of these are fully responsible for the support of some persons and have partial dependents as well.
>
> Many employed women contribute all their earnings, and a very large proportion turn over at least half of what they make, for the family expenses.
>
> Of the family heads in the United States one-tenth are women. This number is a minimum when extent of responsibility is considered, since the census enumerators normally report a man as the family head wherever possible to do so.
>
> In practically one-sixth of the urban families in this country the only wage earners are women. Since two or more women may be sharing the family support, this does not show the responsibility of individuals, but it does form one indication of the large share women are bearing in the financial economy of families in the United States. A further indication of women's share in this economy lies in the fact that well over one-third of all wage-earning women are homemakers as well, thus carrying a double responsibility to those depending upon them for money aid as well as for the social ministrations required in the home.[8]

[8] M. E. Pidgeon, *Women in the Economy of the United States of America* (United States Women's Bureau, Washington, D. C., 1937), pages 7–8.

Numerous studies have shown that most married women feel they must work because of economic necessity. Sample studies made of the wages paid to their husbands indicate that this belief is founded upon fact. Poverty drives the mother out of the home just as it forces the child into industry. In both instances economic exploitation is the chief factor.

The problem of the woman who must depend on her earnings for her own support is relatively similar to that of the man receiving low wages who must support a family. The Women's Bureau estimated a general level of $18.38 weekly as necessary for health and decency for women in 1920, and $15.71 for 1928, and concluded that in both years more than half the women in manufacturing in six states earned less than the minimum. The differential wage scale tempts the employer to substitute inexpensive women for costly men workers. This type of economic exploitation has made it difficult for unmarried women workers to find suitable living quarters. Residences conducted by the Y.W.C.A. and by various Catholic organizations try to meet this problem, but these are available to only a small proportion of working women. Although stress has been placed on manufacturing, it is also notable that employers in department stores, five and ten cent stores, and business offices exploit women to a marked degree. Some improvements have been made with the passage of minimum-wage laws for women, and unionization or the fear of it has prompted other employers to raise wage scales.

Industrial homework is a generic term applied to industrial activities carried on in the home on an organized basis. It may involve only one member of the family, but it is usual to find all persons in a family participating. A variety of activities is carried on, some of the more prominent being stringing tags, painting greeting cards, finishing "handmade" handkerchiefs, trimming hats, and making artificial flowers. The wages paid are very low. In many types of homework, children are utilized with unfortunate consequences to their vision, their general health, and their school work. Poorly lighted kitchens, basement rooms, and attics are the most common workrooms. Many who provide such work have "deadlines," times when the work must be finished, particularly in the instance of holiday items. Families must keep up the pace or lose their means of income. In many schools, teachers become familiar with this situation through children who cannot keep awake in class after only four or five hours' sleep at home.

Industrial homework is essentially unfair to honest manufacturers who must pay decent labor scales and overhead costs. It is difficult if

not impossible to compete on a price basis with the products of homework. The essential unfairness of this situation, founded on poverty and dependent on poverty for its continuation, is a good index to the general economic exploitation now present in society on a large scale. It may be argued that the remedy lies in teaching parents their responsibilities to their children, but it is more remarkable that poverty does not make for clear, vigorous reasoning, and that the pressures of poverty often leave little room for imaginative, constructive interest in children.

In the analysis of the factors of anonymity, community disorganization, cultural conflict, blighted areas, inadequate education, and economic exploitation, subjective comments have been presented. Many of these factors seem intangible and may not be demonstrated by statistical measurement. The effects of poverty, considered only in physiological and psychological senses, are not fully presented. Cultural factors are subtle and pervasive, but they are important. As Bossard so well states, a mere existence is one thing; living a full life is quite another. He stresses the fact that there are manifold activities and interests which are the essence of the art of living and that in connection with these income is very often a conditioning factor. In contrast to poverty, which brings about depression, he further points out that adequacy of income encourages continued effort, opens new possibilities, stimulates better performances, and softens the defeats of our failures.[9]

Conclusions

Poverty, then, has certain specific effects which are physiological in nature. The relationship of health to income and of medical care to income is apparent. Children are handicapped from birth, and their handicaps may be measured statistically. Psychological results of insecurity and family tensions on adults, youth, and children are intense manifestations of poverty. Cultural problems as they affect the disorganization of the poor are somewhat intangible, but they seem capable of causing permanent damage, especially on those children living in depressed areas and inadequately prepared for life.

Although there are many melancholy aspects to the picture of poverty as seen in our examination of the problem and its effects, there are many hopeful developments. There is no reason to despair. Many improvements have been made, and many improvements will be made.

[9] J. H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems*, revised edition (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1938), page 155.

Knowledge must precede action, and one must examine each phase of the problem closely in order to understand the essential bases of poverty. If appreciation of the magnitude of the problem in its quantitative and qualitative aspects can be achieved by a study of the numbers of the impoverished and by an estimate of the effects of poverty, then it is possible intelligently to proceed to a study of the causal factors present in poverty.

(See the references at the end of Chapter XVI.)

CHAPTER XIV

POVERTY: AN EXAMINATION OF CAUSAL FACTORS

It must be conceded that the listing of causal factors in categories is merely arbitrary. Human situations do not lend themselves to accurate measurement; hence the division made here is utilized more as a device for the purpose of arrangement than as an array of precise causes. An example will illustrate the validity of this listing: Blindness seems to be an individual or personal cause, but blindness resulting from *ophthalmia neonatorum* (gonorrheal ophthalmia occurring by infection of an infant's eyes at time of birth) is preventable. Because the power to prevent this disease and its consequences rests with the state through regulation of midwives and physicians, one may conclude that the existence of this disease is cultural in its causal relationships rather than individual.

This section will treat many phases of life which have been considered previously, but the emphasis now is on the relationship of the condition to poverty as a cause or contributing factor rather than as an effect. Poverty is a circular phenomenon; it has, as we have seen, certain effects; now it is necessary to consider how these effects cause a continuation of poverty or, in the instances in which poverty did not exist, produce a condition of poverty.

I. Individual Factors

1. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

An evaluation of the relationship between sickness and poverty leads normally to two questions: (1) What are the costs of sickness? (2) What is the extent of sickness? It is reasonable to state that, if the costs of illness are great, and if illness is widespread, then many families, normally self-supporting, will be unable to meet these costs without deprivation. Studies of the costs of sickness treat costs and extent simultaneously. For this reason it is well to consider the two as closely interrelated, rather than as distinct entities.

The Committee on Economic Security states that the annual loss caused by sickness in American families with incomes of less than $2,500 a

year in 1929 was estimated as nearly two billion dollars. Of this amount approximately one billion represents the expenses for medical care and the remainder the loss in wages due to temporary disability. The actual experience in normal times of one thousand families in large cities with annual incomes ranging from $1,200 to $2,000 is as follows: 218 had medical bills in a single year in excess of $100 and 80 in excess of $200. Of these 80 families, 16 had medical costs ranging from $400 to $700, or about one third of the year's income, and 4 families had sickness bills amounting to more than half of their incomes.[1]

It is generally estimated that at least 2 per cent of the population of the United States is ill every day. About one third of this number is composed of wage-earners and salaried employees. More than 10 per cent of the total population is disabled for a week or longer during the year, and the average worker in the United States loses at least seven days a year on account of sickness or nonindustrial injuries. The actuarial experience further shows the extent of illness. Among an average million persons, there will occur annually between 800,000 and 900,000 cases of illness. These cases of illness are not divided equally among the population. About 470,000 among an average million persons will not be sick during a normal year, 460,000 will be sick once or twice, and 70,000 will have three or more illnesses. One fourth of those ill will be disabled for a period ranging from one week to an entire year.[2]

The extent of these illnesses and the costs of care result seriously: normally more than a third of the families who have to seek public or private charity are compelled to do so because of the economic effects of accident and illness. There are three costs involved in disabling illness: (1) loss of earnings; (2) costs of care; (3) loss of health which may lead to permanent unemployment. Savings are improbable if not impossible in many low-income families. Even a normal amount of sickness each year keeps families in debt. Since adequate medical care cannot be purchased, chronic illness enlarges the vicious circle. In the case of the chronically sick adults, either the wage-earner is deprived of an opportunity to earn a livelihood for himself and his family, or he may lose the services of his wife as housekeeper, thus entailing further burdens. Disabilities such as blindness, deafness, and crippling conditions are more obvious handicaps. The difficulties of these unfortunate ones have been ameliorated to some extent by various social agencies and protective state laws. State vocational departments provide

[1] *Social Security in America* (The Social Security Board, Washington, D.C., 1937), pages 315–316.
[2] *Ibid.*

a certain amount of vocational rehabilitation, and many severely handicapped persons have found lucrative employment. There can be no doubt that in individual cases reduction to a state of poverty is usual, and, in the case of those most afflicted, the burden of caring for them may be a serious obstacle to the economic security of low-income families. In discussing the subject of disabilities we must remember that as a society we tend to treat the more obvious difficulties and to ignore the less spectacular ones. It is reasonable to say that paralysis will receive more attention than heart disease, although the latter may be more disabling than the former. Poor vision may be an industrial handicap nearly as serious as total blindness, but inadequate vision receives far less attention.

In sum, many families are reduced to poverty by the multiple costs of illness, through either direct costs of care, loss of earnings, or chronically disabling conditions. The extent of illness and its unpredictability constitute a serious hazard to the self-support of a large proportion of families in the low income group, and these represent at least a third of the population.

2. MENTAL CONDITIONS

Several precautionary comments are a necessary preliminary to any study of the relationship between mental conditions and poverty. Society, peculiarly, has defined a normal person in terms of an average of a great mass of the people. In other words, the tests to determine normality are based on what the average can do. As W. I. Thomas so aptly expresses it, tests are devised to measure intelligence, whose exact nature is unknown, and then intelligence is defined in terms of performance on the tests. In this brief survey of mental conditions three groups deserve consideration: (a) the feeble-minded; (b) the "dull normals"; (c) those afflicted with the insanities.

The Feeble-minded

The feeble-minded are classified usually in three divisions: idiots, with a mental age of less than three years; imbeciles, with a mental age of from three to seven years; morons, with a mental age of from eight to twelve years. Mental ages are determined by tests, standardized by giving them to large groups in order to determine what those of a certain age may reasonably be expected to do. The tests are of two types, verbal and nonverbal, the former being designed for those who can read and write, and the latter for small children and illiterate adults. The chronological age is divided into the mental age

(as determined by the tests) in order to find the so-called intelligence quotient, or I.Q. Idiots and imbeciles will not make an adjustment economically. Their defects are obvious; they require institutional care, and the state generally provides facilities for custody. Their mortality rate is high: idiots as a rule do not live more than a few years. In this connection it might be pointed out that, contrary to a widespread impression, the feeble-minded do not breed faster than the normal.

The morons constitute the bulk of those whom we call the feeble-minded. No one knows how many there are in the general population, and the estimates are so varied as to make them useless for evaluation. Studies of the relationship between intelligence and economic success do not give satisfactory conclusions. Studies have shown that mental deficiency is correlated to a high degree with long periods of unemployment, inability to secure or hold jobs, and work at extremely low pay. None of these studies was sufficiently widespread in numbers studied to justify general conclusions, but experience and observation show that the feeble-minded have some difficulty in making economic adjustments. To be classed as feeble-minded one may have a specific deficiency in intelligence as such or may have an unusual distribution of abilities. In either case it is reasonable to suppose that one will be handicapped. Those who are dull and those who have pronounced abilities and pronounced disabilities will have difficulty in getting along in a world in which conformity is desired. It seems probable that the relationship between economic status and intelligence is a natural one; namely, that persons who are in a superior economic status will be found in occupations showing the higher intelligence scores. The problems of many feeble-minded are similar to those of the "dull normals," although it will be more obvious to many that the feeble-minded require care. Often the "dull normals" are neglected. The stress placed on the problems of the latter group does not imply neglect of the feeble-minded.

Dull Normals

A person classed as dull normal may be in a situation more precarious than those with more pronounced defects. He is in that group often called "borderline," which is classed neither as definitely feeble-minded nor as normal (or average) in intelligence. Three economic classes are recognizable: those who seldom find employment; those able to obtain marginal employment, often at low pay, and generally irregular in nature; those who obtain adequate employment but, by reason of personality defects, may not achieve security.

Those who seldom find employment generally drift into casual labor and occasionally become transients. They furnish the residue in depressions and at an early age become unemployable. Distinctly unsuited to urban life, they are looking continually for a job that is "just around the corner." Many seem to search diligently for employment, but actually have developed to a high art the appearance of looking for work. Those able to obtain marginal work are always on the borderline of poverty if not actually in poverty. They become "odd jobs men," "pin boys" in bowling alleys, drivers for second-rate cab companies, and the like. They may be found occasionally in low-paid "regular" jobs, but move from job to job, looking for "something better." Usually they are unable to take advantage of opportunities for advancement, and thus they may be condemned for life to the lowest of occupations. Their plight is aggravated by the fact that many are the fathers of families, and at an early age their children are forced to work to supplement the family income.

The third group offers a serious problem, being composed of those who are the "square pegs in round holes." Many make a good appearance and seem very capable, and because of this much is expected of them. Many are in sales work, and in an attempt to conceal their inadequacies they substitute belligerence and aggressiveness for perseverance. Some become emotionally unstable because of constant insecurity and struggle futilely against imaginary enemies. They cause friction in offices and shops, and family tensions are numerous. These are the ones who failed in school work because of "persecution"; they leave positions because of "working like a dog for the boss and him getting rich on me." There are probably very few successes among this group and a great many failures.

It is most probable that the dull normals constitute a major social problem, the extent of which is not fully realized. There are few available objective data on which to base conclusions, but it may be suggested that an exhaustive analysis of this problem is a prime social necessity. When defects are recognizable, adequate protection may be established. A careful study of those out of adjustment is necessary. A testing of aptitudes may reveal distinct abilities to perform certain useful functions, and many could be guided into socially desirable channels. Under the present system they represent a catastrophic form of human waste. In an individualistic society in which each person is assumed to be able to find that work which is best suited to him, these problems are certain to occur. The most logical conclusion is that the inadequacies described may not cause poverty directly; yet many are

unable to make an adequate vocational adjustment, a circumstance which in turn leads to poverty. It is certain that many in this group constitute permanent or spasmodic relief problems, and the study of the abilities and disabilities of these persons should be a major concern.

The Insane

The insanities present another set of conditions which may be treated as a factor in poverty. Unlike feeble-mindedness, which consists in an absence of intelligence from birth or from an early age, the insanities do not involve intelligence and represent a breakdown of faculties which once were normal. Whether the condition presents a gross disturbance which may require institutionalization, or whether there is a slight aberration, it is certain that a social problem may exist. In the instance in which the principal wage-earner of the family is incarcerated in an institution, the family must provide its own resources or be taken care of from public or private funds. In an instance in which the aberration is slight, it may be sufficient to cause inability to maintain oneself properly in society. Even mild cases, involving "mood swings," wherein the individual presents alternate cheerfulness and moroseness, may have an effect upon ability to hold a job and may also be a distinct cause of family tensions. Sudden outbursts of temper are characteristic of such individuals, and, by and large, they do not make a successful adjustment to the world in which they are living.

It is an anomaly of our present society that institutions are provided for the care of those who are grievously ill mentally, but that very little assistance is offered those who may respond readily to good psychiatric supervision. The effect of the slight aberrations upon family expenditures may cause serious complications, and family case workers are familiar with such disturbing influences, which invariably have a relationship to the ability of a family to maintain itself. This concept does not imply gross forms of misbehavior. Many of the individuals so afflicted are again part of the vicious circle of poverty and all its manifestations. In other words, the pressure of poverty may cause a slight mental aberration, which in turn may aggravate the poverty, which, in turn, may cause a more serious difficulty. Although these relationships are somewhat intangible, there is every evidence from common reasoning for believing that many serious maladjustments are possible when the wage-earner of the family is incompetent. This is a highly competitive environment, and those who do not conform to its standards are left by the wayside. Many become poor because of such misfortunes; others have these misfortunes because they are poor.

3. PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

This grouping of causal factors at one time represented the most commonly held theory of causation. Three conditions deserve examination: (a) laziness; (b) indifference; (c) intemperance.

Laziness

There was once a tendency to assume that the poor were in such a state because of laziness, and many people today still hold that opinion. Although it seems evident that a certain number of cases of poverty may be attributed directly to laziness, it is well to bear in mind that laziness itself may be due to another cause. The caution must be observed in view of the theory formerly held about certain sections of the South, namely, that the "poor whites" were impoverished because of their innate desire to avoid work. Studies of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission indicated that a third of the rural children of the South had hookworm infection, which absorbs a considerable portion of the energy of individuals.

Indifference

Another condition, sometimes termed psychological, consists of those habits of indifference and carelessness which may mean inability to hold a job. It is believed by some that the low-wage worker has no motivation, no security, and, therefore, may not be expected to do his work in an efficient, interested fashion. Because of this factor, he does not find his place in industry, or, if he does, he is not especially desirable and is subject to irregular work. His bad habits may result in his being less efficient than is desirable and may make him unable to find an adequate place in the scheme of things. This situation becomes increasingly apparent during an industrial depression, when employers have an opportunity to select those who are not only most interested in their work but also most efficient. It may be reasoned that in a machine civilization there is no room for initiative and personal responsibility, but, whether or not this is so, it seems certain that some of those who fail do so because of their personal attitudes toward their own responsibilities.

Intemperance

To the casual observer, intemperance seems to exist as a causal factor in a large number of cases. It is interesting to note that, in some of the older studies by family welfare agencies, in a large preponderance of

cases poverty was attributed to alcoholism or inebriety. Many studies reported that more than 75 per cent of the cases were caused by this one factor. This occurred at a time when "demon rum" was blamed for everything. Naturally, the percentages have decreased in recent years. One interpretation of the results of such studies is that the investigators were previously convinced that the poor used alcohol to excess. It is apparent that a causal connection very easily made itself clear to such investigators, and it is to be remembered that these were extremely subjective ratings. Although intemperance results from a variety of causes, it has not responded particularly well to treatment, either medicinal or psychiatric. A majority of psychiatrists believe that weakness of the will is involved; where such a weakness exists, there will be symptoms additional to intemperance. Many studies lead to the conclusion that many immigrants consumed alcohol as a compensation for lack of economic success.

Although poverty is very often accompanied by intemperance, it is preferable to say, finally, that intemperance is coexistent with poverty rather than a major cause of it. It must be agreed in certain instances that the expenditure of sums of money from a small income, because of habits of drinking, is bound to have a relationship to the amount of money available for family expenditures. Finally, it might be added that the poor who drink to excess, unlike the rich, are unable to hide this fact from the general public. For this reason we are apt to exaggerate the incidence of intemperance among the poor.

II. Socioeconomic Factors

1. UNEMPLOYMENT: EXTENT AND TYPES

Two factors in poverty may be labeled "socioeconomic": unemployment and low wages. These bear intimate relationship to the social structure. Recent government activities dealing with unemployment and wages show the national scope of the problem. It is difficult to discuss this subject without becoming involved in a discussion of the economic structure of contemporary life. An effort will be made to establish the pertinent facts and to make observations which relate directly to the question of poverty without infringing upon the field of economics. It is customary to define unemployment as a situation in which workers able to work are unsuccessfully seeking employment. Unfortunately, this definition leaves much to be desired, for it does not cover those who are not really seeking a job, nor the aged ones, nor the young ones who have left school and are seeking their first jobs.

Nor does it involve those who are out of work because they have been told by their employers that they are no longer needed, nor those who are told that, when business improves, they will be re-employed. These factors complicate the situation for anyone trying to ascertain tangible elements in unemployment.

There are three ways to arrive at a knowledge of the extent of unemployment: census or enumeration; estimate, based on partial enumeration; various indices. Normal unemployment enumerations should not include the so-called unemployables. Although the latter are unemployed, their problems are vastly different and are treated elsewhere in the chapter. The 1930 census report [3] of 2,429,062 out of work is believed to be entirely misleading. Unfortunately, the census report included only those "without a job, able to work, and looking for a job." Most careful estimates placed the total at 3,800,000, which increased to at least 5,000,000 in 1931; by 1932 from 12,000,000 to 14,000,000 were unemployed. While this is abnormal, Douglas and Director conclude that the average percentage of unemployment, including illness and disability, for manufacturing, transportation, mining, and construction during the years from 1897 to 1926 was approximately 10 per cent.[4] The same authors believe that unemployment in these occupations rises as high as 20 per cent in ordinary periods of business depression.

There has been considerable improvement in unemployment statistics during the past decade, although there is still no really accurate system of reporting these data uniformly. The Social Security Board, using several available indices, reports that the average percentage of gainful workers unemployed was 12.1 in 1930, 23.2 in 1931, 34.5 in 1932, and 33.2 in 1933. The range in round numbers was from 4,600,000 to 13,300,000.[5] The federal unemployment census by the Post Office Department in November, 1937, showed the number of unemployed to be over 10,000,000. Despite inadequate statistics, a serious unemployment situation exists. No doubt savings may ease the situation for some, but, in general, the average working man is dependent upon his weekly wage and in a period of unemployment must resort to public relief within a very short time. For the older workers, each period of unemployment may become a setting for the stage of chronic dependency. With the younger workers, the emotional consequences, although less obvious, are none the less serious. Since such effects are preponderantly disturbing, it is well to examine briefly several phases of the

[3] "Unemployment," *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930*, Volume 1, page 6.

[4] P. H. Douglas and A. Director, *The Problem of Unemployment*, page 32 (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1931).

[5] *Social Security in America*, page 58.

problem of unemployment with which poverty is closely interrelated. There are six types of unemployment recognized by students of the problem: (a) cyclical unemployment, (b) seasonal unemployment, (c) technological unemployment, (d) transitional unemployment, (e) unemployment of the casual laborer, (f) the unemployment of youth.

Cyclical Unemployment

The conception of cyclical unemployment is based on the economic theory that the processes of business are carried on in fluctuating waves. At the crest of the wave is a period of prosperity; at its valley is a depression. According to Monsignor John A. Ryan, there have been twenty-nine business depressions in the United States since 1790; of these depressions fifteen could be called crises, and some of them deserve the name panic.[6] Cyclical employment takes its place as a major threat to the security of the American worker and small businessman. The world must be aware of the social implications involved when several millions of persons, through no fault of their own, are thrown out of employment. These unemployed do not determine their own economic life. The acceptance of materialistic values by many may be based upon a fatalism consequent upon these cycles of security and insecurity. Monsignor Ryan asserts that there is no solution for the problem without adequate insurance against unemployment. Unemployment compensation under various state plans has not been in operation long enough to test this theory, but it will prove ameliorative to some extent.

Seasonal Unemployment

This exists because consumers buy different goods at various seasons of the year. This obviously causes fluctuation in production and normally results in fluctuation in employment. Certain seasonal industries, such as those producing millinery, ice cream, and women's clothing, show astonishing changes in numbers employed in the slack and busy season. Many of the situations can be corrected by an earnest effort on the part of the management, as shown recently in the automotive industry and in such establishments as that of Proctor and Gamble at Cincinnati. Seasonal variations in employment do not encourage thrift among workers, since all available indices indicate that the variations themselves change from year to year and cannot be estimated accurately. It is in this connection that hourly wage rates are misleading. This is especially true in the building trades, which are

[6] *A Better Economic Order* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935), page 3.

cited very often as an example of a group paid notoriously high wages. The hourly wage taken alone would indicate that workers receive an income in excess of $3,000 annually, but, because of seasonal work, the actual income usually amounts to less than $2,000. A common practice of employers of seasonal labor is to make the poor support the poor. This is done by staggering employment, by shortening the week for each worker so that a larger number of men can be retained on the payroll. Unfortunately, individual wages are correspondingly reduced; this is tantamount to a contribution from one employee to another toward relief. One practical solution for problems of seasonal unemployment is an annual wage. The Hormel Packing Company at Austin, Minnesota, has adopted such a plan, and the results have been satisfactory. If this can be accomplished in the seasonal meat-packing industry, it should be practical elsewhere.

Technological Unemployment

This has a more direct relationship to poverty than it seems to have to the economic structure as a whole. It is defined as that unemployment due to improvements in machinery, technical changes in manufacture, introduction of new industries, and abandonment of other industries. The influence of these changes has been magnified beyond all reason by gloomy prophets, but it is true that in certain industries displacement of workers does take place. The creation of new industries and the development of old ones take up the slack to a considerable extent. On the other hand, workers are unemployed during this stage, and a problem is created. It is perhaps the more dangerous in regard to skilled workmen whose skills are no longer needed. For them, there is both a reduction of wages and a reduction in status. Most economists believe that the present industrial organization will result constantly in decreased wages for craft unionists because machinery will replace skill. Students of the problem of technology point out that elasticity of demand prevents a serious situation from developing with increasing mechanical improvements. It is a reflection upon our social processes that the maladjustments resulting from technological displacement have seldom been averted by retraining employees. It has been cheaper for manufacturers to avoid the somewhat laborious process of retraining by hiring new employees.

Transitional Unemployment

This exists whenever industries are abandoned or moved to another location. Unfortunately, many employers have had little feeling of

responsibility for the employees, and such pretexts for moving an industry as "reduction in taxes," "cheap labor," and "free water supply" are common. Such situations are disastrous in small communities, and the opportunities for re-employment elsewhere are negligible. There is extreme disorganization of the community as well as of individuals. Property values decrease, professional men cannot earn a livelihood, and a dwindling population is the result. Unemployment of this kind is probably among the most serious of all categories, for it involves a finality which is almost hopeless in nature.

Unemployment of the Casual Laborer

Migratory agricultural laborers include the more obviously maladjusted of those who are from time to time unemployed. This work attracts a great many persons who are disorganized, and the conditions of work seem to further this personal disorganization. This group moves from job to job, and its members are dependent for the most part upon mere rumor as to the next place in which their work will be needed. In good times, they work five or six months a year and spend the remaining period in the "hobohemia" of a large city. They find transportation on freight trains. They are addicted to alcoholic excesses and petty crimes, and they develop irregular work habits. It is interesting to note that among the residents of "hobohemia" there are three distinct castes: (1) the "hoboes," who will work when opportunity is presented; (2) the "tramps," who are wanderers but will not work; (3) the "bums," who neither wander nor work.

Another phase of casual labor is that of the "odd-job" man. He has received little attention from society, and yet the majority have families dependent upon them, according to common observation. Every relief agency knows them; many are dull and content with their rather miserable lot. This group is receiving considerable attention from the Cincinnati Bureau of Economic Security, and field workers report that careful surveying of odd-job opportunities has resulted many times in an increase in the amount of work available for such men. This group consists of marginal individuals for the most part, and the hourly rates of wages are low so that supplementary relief is necessary.

The Unemployment of Youth

Those who have never had a job may be facing ultimate poverty. Antisocial activities, undesirable social attitudes, and a feeling of hopelessness are results of this condition. School censuses of 1932 showed that there were a half million boys and a million girls over sixteen who

were neither working nor attending school. Attitudes and habits built up during a period of unemployment by those who have never had employment may have disastrous results when such persons are employed. Habits of work and industry are not founded upon idleness. Young persons prepared for clerical positions find that they lose ability to type through an idle period. Settlements, Y.W.C.A.'s, the National Youth Administration, and others have tried to bridge this gap, but the numbers that are helped are not appreciable, especially in the 16–18 age range. The effect of this situation in the present depression may not be made known for many years, but there will undoubtedly be a toll in terms of the decreased efficiency of many who might otherwise have been excellent workers.

2. LOW WAGES

The traditional American theory and practice, that employers, corporate or individual, must be left free to make unlimited profit, is one of the chief causes of predepression as well as depression poverty. This economic philosophy, which makes profit the sole objective of industry, began almost a hundred and fifty years ago and flourished under eighteenth-century materialism. Though it was the philosophy of Adam Smith and other British economists whose viewpoints were reflected in the textbooks used in many American colleges at the end of the last century, it has been condemned by various Catholic moralists from the beginning, and very notably by Popes Leo XIII in 1891 and Pius XI in 1931. In speaking of the division of the product between capital and labor, Pius made social justice or the "common good" rather than personal profit supreme. "Each one, therefore, must receive his due share, and the distribution of created goods must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good or social justice" (*Forty Years After*). Unfortunately, big business and its satellite press are still fighting against the "common good" as the first business objective under the cloak of such alleged "depression remedies" as tax relief, balancing the federal budget, restoration of confidence, and the encouragement of capital investment. Lump these "remedies" together, and they spell *laissez faire,* or profits first and social justice last.

A maldistribution of wealth, accompanied by low wages and unemployment, has characterized American industry in the past. Unemployment is not peculiar to the depression. Although it has existed in varying amounts for over half a century, until 1933 the victims were usually told that, by not "finding work," they alone were responsible for their poverty. Even in the prosperous days after the World War

there were always at least 1,700,000 involuntarily idle. Nor are low wages peculiar to the depression. For the most part both unemployment and low wages are due to the uncontrolled wage and job competition to which the mass of American wage-earners have been subjected while the few were amassing great wealth with little concern for the common good. This was, until recently, considered the glorious "American way." While the existing maldistribution of wealth is obvious to almost everyone, it is not easy to describe statistically because of a lack of comprehensive studies. The texts on economics usually describe several studies, all of which present a picture of gross inequality in the "distribution of created goods" in America. Probably one of the best of these studies is *America's Capacity to Consume,* a Brookings Institution study published in 1934. This report, which showed that in 1929, before the depression, 42 per cent of American families were receiving a poverty-level income, has been summarized very briefly by Dr. George T. Brown as follows:

> The study made of family incomes by the Brookings Institution for the year 1929 contributed some interesting facts. The total United States income was estimated at approximately $77 billions; the number of families, about 27.5 millions. This income was so distributed that:
>
> 1. Although $1,500 was regarded as an income yielding a poverty and subsistence existence, 42% of American families in 1929 received that much or less.
> 2. Most families had incomes of $1,300.
> 3. Ninety-two per cent of the families received less than $5,000.
> 4. The wealthiest 36,000 families received as much income as 11,600,000 families at the bottom.
> 5. One-tenth of 1% of the wealthiest families had a total income as large as 42% of the poorest families.
>
> The statement of the Institution that the figures "reveal in a striking way the wide disparity in incomes, and also the concentration of the great bulk of the families in a relatively narrow income range" is definitive.[7]

Fortunately, most economists believe that it is entirely possible for American industry to pay heads of families even more than what is considered a minimum decent urban wage ($1,600 a year according to the National Industrial Conference Board). Poverty from low wages, therefore, cannot be said to be inevitable. Nor are we without means of bringing about this reform. More will be said upon this topic shortly, but a few words by way of suggestion may not be out of place here.

[7] *Economic Power in the United States* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1937), page 9. Used by permission. For a good summary of the various studies on distribution of wealth, income, and wages, see Harold A. Phelps, *Contemporary Social Problems* (1938), pages 353–363.

Right now the achievement of the family wage ideal involves three great economic reforms, according to Father John F. Cronin, S.S., who believes also that in all probability government action will have to be taken to this end.

It is clear, then, that the attainment of the wage ideal involves the solution of three great economic problems: unregulated competition; concentration of economic power and consequent price domination; and the revival of stricken industries. None of these problems can be solved by labor alone, nor by industry alone. The absence of a genuine cooperative spirit among business men, of a widespread sense of social responsibility and a concern for the rights of the consumer, precludes such action. These problems will become far worse if we persist in the great American tradition of individualism and *laissez faire*. It seems that the only practicable solution involves some sort of guidance, regulation, and supervision by the agency entrusted with the primary right and duty of promoting the general welfare, namely the sovereign State.[8]

Again, it should be repeated, poverty through low wages is unnecessary in the United States; if, as seems evident, the classes directly involved cannot remedy the defects which produce this condition, relief must be brought about by pressure upon legislators through the ballot. It is rather significant that Pope Pius XI chose his encyclical on *Atheistic Communism* as a vehicle for saying to Christians that "social justice cannot be said to have been satisfied as long as workingmen are denied a salary that will enable them to secure proper sustenance for themselves and for their families." When social justice prevails, there will be little need to fear communism.

Depression and Recession

What of the so-called "Hoover depression" and the more recent "Roosevelt recession"? Surely they have ranked high as causes of poverty. Must we accept these as abnormalities about which nothing can be done? Catholic America's outstanding economist and moralist, Monsignor John A. Ryan, is by no means of this opinion.[9] Present conditions can be vastly improved, and the future repetition of the existing crisis can be pretty much avoided, if we are willing to face the facts squarely and then act with Christian courage. First of all, we must recall some of the factors that brought about the depression.

The depression was due in the main to the overproduction of capital

[8] "A Living Wage Today," *The Sign*, Volume 17, June, 1938, page 651.

[9] The following analysis of the causes for the depression and recession and of the needed remedies is based for the most part on an address by Monsignor Ryan printed in the Supplement to the *Congressional Record*, January 12, 1938 (65th Congress, 3rd Session), pages 587–590.

goods, according to Monsignor Ryan. Until the crash came, American investors and businessmen, abetted by economists of the "rugged individualism" school, assumed that, if goods were produced, they would somehow get sold. Production was continually stimulated as the excessive profits of owners and investors were put back into new productive machinery. No systematic measures were taken to provide the mass of consumers with sufficient purchasing power to buy this continually increased supply of goods. Naturally, productive capacity became overexpanded. Even during the prosperous years preceding 1929 our production plant was 20-per-cent idle, as production began to exceed our national ability to consume.

With the spending programs inaugurated by the Roosevelt administration it immediately became possible to purchase more consumers' goods. Many factors were involved in this business pick-up. Most of the soldiers' bonus money went into circulation immediately; payments to W.P.A. and other government workers were exchanged for goods; and installment buying in this period was greatly stimulated. None of these things were, of course, of permanent value as depression remedies. The government's spending programs could offer only temporary relief so long as labor's share of the product of industry was not increased. In other words, a genuine remedy for the depression could not be looked for so long as no provision was made for a better distribution of purchasing power and a more equitable distribution of the national income between capital and labor.

Looking back, we see now that our industrialists carefully avoided doing their share to end the depression. Statistics show that the share of labor has not increased, nor has that of capital decreased, since 1929. Yet the level of business activity in August, 1937, was within 5 per cent of the high plane reached in 1929, while the chief industrial corporations made profits during the first half of 1937 which compare favorably with their 1928 and 1929 profits. Naturally, therefore, as the effects of the stimulated spending brought about by the soldiers' bonus and government alphabetical projects began to wane, and as installment buyers reached the limit of their credit, the purchase of consumers' goods suddenly fell off, and the 1937 recession set in.

The recession did not come, therefore, because of excessive government regulation of business, for, barring the brief N.R.A. period, business generally refused to accept either advice or control from the government. Even under the N.R.A., big business refused to allow labor to be represented in the formation of the regulatory codes. When workers began to organize more effectively during and after the N.R.A

period, the increased wages achieved by labor's chief weapon, the strike, were in nearly every instance passed on to the public rather than deducted from the share received by capital in industry. The increase in prices which followed, 75 per cent of which were unnecessary and unjustified, according to Monsignor Ryan, was another cause of the recession. If the capitalist group had been less greedy, the incomes of wage-earners would have been higher and their volume of purchases larger. Furthermore, there would have been less accumulated savings to be thrown back into industry to stimulate greater production again. Like the Bourbons of France, our industrialists completely forgot the cause of the crisis and set about to reproduce the very same conditions—increased production to be brought about by the reinvested savings of those who received the lion's share of the earnings—which led to the 1929 crash. The recession, under such conditions, was inevitable.

Remedies

The remedy for the recession is, therefore, the same as that which alone would have curbed the depression—*increasing labor's share in the product.* While "pump-priming" need not cause undue alarm, in spite of the alleged charge that it increases our national debt to a danger point (since the British debt is two and one half times our own), it is at best only a temporary relief measure which will bring no permanent aid unless accompanied by a program to bring about a permanent increase in labor's share of industrial earnings. Monsignor Ryan is of the opinion that labor's share "ought to be raised from the 1936 figure of 66.5 to somewhere between 70 and 75 per cent of the national income." The 1936 figure is, incidentally, about what labor received before the depression. Unfortunately, the forces which object most vehemently to government spending are the very ones that have been fighting against any increase in labor's share. These, unfortunately, are the forces that control most of our large city newspapers as well. Their ability to obstruct clear thinking in this crisis is exceeded only by their greed.

How, then, are we to increase labor's share of the national income and so get out of the twin ruts of both depression and recession poverty? Monsignor Ryan suggests three methods: "Higher wages for that large section of labor that is now underpaid, reduction of the rate of interest, and elimination of monopoly profits"; he also indicates the means to accomplish these objectives. Wages can be raised, he says, by the organization of the unorganized workers, by a federal law for

minimum wages and maximum hours, and finally by increased voluntary action by that group which has so far been rather impotent as an influence in industry, the social-minded employers. Such a program of reform will involve, among other things, the blasting of the "superstition" of 6-per-cent interest in favor of lower rates, and government competition with concerns that cannot or will not be curbed by anti-trust laws aimed at eliminating monopoly profits.

In pointing out that the suggested reforms are in harmony with and demanded by the moral law of nature and of reason, Monsignor Ryan says, in addition: "They would be adopted by an intelligent society of pagans." He concludes as follows:

> Aside from the three legislative policies just described, adequate provision must be made for the unemployed. If this means, as it probably does, greater appropriations for work relief and public works, Congress should not hesitate to provide the appropriations. They will not only make for humane treatment of the unemployed but will be good for business. Our country is rich enough and our statesmen should be intelligent enough to enact the necessary legislation. According to the Brookings Institution volume, *America's Capacity to Produce,* if our productive plant had been operated at full capacity in 1929, all the families of wage earners who received less than $2,500 a year could have been raised to the level. According to the Survey of Potential Production Capacity, our productive plant could be so improved as to increase its capacity by about 50 per cent. Neither the unemployed nor the American people as a whole should much longer tolerate the failure of our industrial and political leaders to abolish this anomaly of devastating want in the midst of potential plenty.[10]

As a substitute for the existing competitive wage policy many have recommended the adoption of the *family-allowance* system. There are three particular facts in reference to the major problems in family allowances: (1) they are not intended for workers receiving wage rates regarded as adequate for the support of a family; (2) the base rate is assumed to suffice for the maintenance of a "standard family," and allowances are provided only for the support of additional children; (3) allowances are not drawn directly from the treasury of each individual employer but from a common fund to which all employers contribute in proportion to the number of their employees, so that workers with large families cannot be discriminated against in employment. While many believe that the system of allowances would approach the requirements of a decent family livelihood and would further tend to check the decline in the birth rate, in addition to exercising a powerful influence toward keeping alive and strengthening the worker's con-

[10] *Op. cit.,* page 589.

ception of his human worth and dignity, they doubt if it could be installed here in the near future. *Minimum-wage legislation* has been advocated by many as a partial solution to low wages. It is certain that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 improves conditions to some extent, although no plans thus far proposed would solve the problems of the large family as well as the family-allowance system. Under the present competitive wage policy, those with large families are penalized unduly.

The foregoing comments and facts tend to present the highlights of a problem that is universal and is intimately connected with any question of poverty. It seems clearly evident even from inadequate statistical data that the problem is serious in all its implications. There can be no doubt that low incomes, together with the concomitant disturbances arising therefrom, constitute a major source of the evils prevalent among mankind. More will be said upon this topic in the following chapter. No attempt has been made in this brief section to include all the possible aspects of this problem, but it is believed that sufficient data have been presented to make obvious the fact that the situation is one of widespread distress and uncertainty.

III. Cultural Factors

This is purely an arbitrary classification and does not attempt to isolate all cultural factors from other conditions. The term as used in this section is primarily descriptive rather than definitive.

1. "unemployables"

This sociological "catch-all" is used to designate those who under our present industrial system seem to be excluded from employment. The term has come into rather wide use in the past several years and is used indiscriminately. To say "he is unemployable" is to presume the question "at what?"

Superannuation

In order to think through the implications of this subject, it is necessary to distinguish between those who are unemployable under conditions as they are and those who are truly unemployable in the sense that they cannot participate in productive work under any circumstances. Concern here is with the former of the two categories, since there seems to be a sociocultural responsibility for the existence of this group. It must be admitted that there is a great deal of difficulty in

defining a retirement age. It may be set arbitrarily at 60, 65, or 70, but the chances are that there will be a considerable number in all these age groups who are able to work even if only moderately. The chronological age is only one of the many ages of man, and in terms of employability it is perhaps one of the poorest of the many indices. Many individuals at 70 are superior physically and mentally to others at 60. This problem of superannuation is peculiar to industrial civilization, since rural life still permits the aged to work, even if only doing chores about the farm. Since it has long been recognized that there are therapeutic values in work, it seems inconsiderate of society to classify many in such a way as to prohibit their participation in life activities. Psychiatrists have found that many of the feeble-minded formerly thought of as unemployable actually make good workmen under proper supervision. They are not able to compete successfully for jobs, but they can be of productive use to society and to themselves.

The Inadequate

There is another large group, the "down-and-outers," for whom little rehabilitative work is available. What percentage of this group can be salvaged no one knows, and most students believe that these persons are amenable more to penal custodial care than to reformative treatment. Another group of unemployables is the shiftless and irresponsible, but in connection with this group the principle previously established must be applied: that no conclusions may be drawn without adequate investigation of the causes of this apparent irresponsibility. Physical disease, mental affliction, or an emotional crisis may have made severe inroads upon the energy and ability of this group. The tendency should be to examine carefully in order to determine possible causes, and then to arrange for the treatment of these causes. To have the head of the household classified as unemployable is to reduce such a family to the necessity of public assistance. Even if adequate assistance is available, certain undesirable psychological effects remain. There are those who believe that no person is truly unemployable unless he is confined to bed with paralyzed arms and legs. This seems to be a more correct view than that which is typically held, and it promises at least an inquiring mind rather than gross assumptions.

2. DISASTER

Much of man's ingenuity and resourcefulness has been directed against the thrusts of nature. With modern inventions, mankind is no longer faced with many of the direct onslaughts of nature. Yet there

are instances in which the forces of nature combine against men and produce extremely calamitous results. Earthquakes in Japan, hurricanes in Florida and the West Indies, droughts in China, the United States, and Canada, and other natural catastrophes have impoverished many families. The dust storms of the past few years have been intensive, and thousands of families have found their lands destroyed. The floods of the Mississippi in 1927 and the more recent Ohio Valley inundation offer specific evidence that disaster is still an unfortunately common cause of poverty. There were floods of the Mississippi in 1897, 1903, 1912, 1913, and 1922. In the 1927 flood, 246 human lives were lost; seeded and growing crops in an area of 5,000,000 acres, more than a quarter of the entire agricultural acreage in the flooded counties, were ruined. Figures compiled by the Weather Bureau placed crop losses at $101,000,000 and other losses over $23,000,000. In some instances, the waters were many weeks in receding, and altogether 26,000 square miles were devastated.

Many means of prevention are available, and to some extent they have been utilized in averting disaster. Such devices as cyclone cellars, improved skyscrapers, and drainage canals for large rivers are to a considerable extent useful. The presence of an emergency organization such as the American Red Cross, specializing in disaster relief, is an obvious asset. One of the various lessons of the Ohio Valley flood of 1937 was that regional and not city planning is the only solution to major problems of this kind.

There is no national source which gathers statistics as to the number of families impoverished by natural disasters, but it may be concluded from the available data that the number is considerable. There is one important corollary which should be remembered: that disaster may affect only a small portion of the country, perhaps only a county, but may be very severe in its focal area. It is possible, therefore, for disasters to be buried within statistics, and the commentary on national disasters is that many similar disasters, smaller and affecting families grievously, are taking place throughout the country all the time.

The statistics may indicate that the corn crop for a given year was only 98 per cent of expectancy. This does not seem a major catastrophe, but, if the statistics are examined, they may reveal that all the loss was in the state of Kansas. Since this may mean reduction of only 14 per cent in Kansas, it may again not seem serious until we look further and find that in one county there was no production for the year. In other words, several thousand families may be placed in a situation of dire poverty because of disaster which does not become a national menace.

No program which is merely emergency in nature can sufficiently offset the human problems in disasters. There must be careful follow-up work, based upon intensive investigation and study of each family. It must be remembered that disorganization of families on a large scale will ultimately mean disorganization of the community and of the country as a whole. It is hard to ignore the emotional effects of disaster, which in some instances are more serious than mere physical necessities of the moment. The wiping out of the result of years of productive and useful work by a dust storm or a flood may bring extremely depressing consequences in terms of apathy, loss of hope, and ultimate despair.

3. WASTE

The general concept of waste is associated only indirectly with poverty, although specific instances of waste directly affect the income of the family. Briefly, there are five types of waste: (a) erosion, (b) soil depletion, (c) insect pests, (d) inferior plants, (e) marginal lands.

Erosion

The erosion of soil presents a kind of waste which seems primarily cultural, since it is possible to remedy this condition. It is possible by reforestation of hills, by establishing lateral drainage ditches, and by promoting the growth of grass to avoid most of the effects of erosion by wind and water. Many families are reduced to poverty each year by the gradual reduction of their lands to a marginal state.

Soil Depletion

Another costly type of waste is soil depletion which may be prevented by rotation of crops. This is found particularly in the backwoods regions, and there is a distinct relationship between the educational opportunities of such regions and the kind of farming that is done. State colleges, agricultural agents on a state-wide or county basis, and various federal groups have done considerable work in educating farmers how to use their land most productively. The problem is still serious, however, and year after year many families are forced into bankruptcy by these conditions.

Insect Pests

Another type of waste (although not generally referred to as such) is the ruin wrought by insect pests. Such foes of the farmer as the corn borer, the boll weevil, the fruit fly, and various rusts and fungi do considerable damage each year. Many of these are responsive to control.

But this control is very often beyond the means of the individual farmer. Regional planning in co-operation with the United States Department of Agriculture seems essential if a reduction in this loss is to be made.

Inferior Plants

Another phase of waste is the growing of inferior plants. This is particularly true when the raising of a bale of cotton per acre involves little more expenditure in time and money than the raising of a half bale of cotton per acre. The latter condition is common in certain sections of the South, and as a result many families are living on a marginal basis. Large areas of the semiarid plains have been settled by farmers, unfortunately under the encouragement of the federal homestead acts, who year after year have harvested little but dust and grasshoppers. Fortunately, the Farm Security Administration is purchasing about 9,000,000 acres of land in 207 projects in all sections of the country. Some of this area will be devoted to a combination of forestry, wild-life conservation, and recreation, the remainder to be employed under controlled grazing. About 650,000 farms, covering more than 100,000,000 acres of land unsuited to continued crop production, should be converted to grazing or conservational uses.

Marginal Land

The kind of poverty which results from the use of unproductive land makes removal from such land impossible and sentences families to years of unremitting, unrewarded toil. The wearing out of land is a typical occurrence in many sections of the country. This condition is subject to social control by such means as are now being initiated, with the addition of an adequate extension educational program. Although it is admitted that the accepted standards of living vary in every part of the country, a large number of our rural population cannot be permitted, in justice, to live on a scale which is beneath that of human dignity. "Poor whites" will remain such just so long as the nation persists in neglecting their problem. The waste of our natural resources is unjustifiable, according to Father John F. Cronin, S.S.:

> Another unfortunate aspect of individualism concerns the waste of our national resources. Partially through the heedless greed of some individuals, but mainly through sheer ignorance of the consequences of individualism, much of the basic wealth of the nation has been squandered with reckless prodigality. We are just beginning to realize, for example, the importance of what is called the "hydrologic cycle," the flow of waters to the sea and

back again in the rain-laden clouds. Destruction of natural safeguards for this flow has resulted in erosion of our most valuable soil, devastating floods, pollution of our streams with consequent danger to marine life, and the ultimate possibility of our fertile plains becoming a vast Sahara. Unwise expansion of our wheat fields into unsuitable regions has caused an equally ominous wind erosion, which bore fruit in the famous dust storms of recent years. Forests have been wasted, and are still being used up far more rapidly than they are being replaced. Oil is being squandered criminally through unregulated competition in production. Competent observers see the rapid disappearance of this invaluable resource within the next few decades. A similar condition obtains in mining industries. Coal, copper, lead, and zinc have been mined unwisely; the last three are approaching practical exhaustion. The striking fact about this rapid and basic impoverishment of America is the direct connection between this situation and the philosophy of individualism. By our following of the latter policy, we now face a real danger of national bankruptcy.[11]

4. FARM TENANCY

Any statement about farm tenancy must be preceded by an admission that farm tenancy is merely one phase of the problem of poor farmers. This is not meant to be an exclusive treatment of the problem of poverty among those who are engaged in agriculture, but it does single out, as a typical and grave problem, one which strikes at the very foundation of American democracy. As Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, points out, a million farm families in the United States have an average total income of less than $400 per year. A committee appointed by the President in 1936 has been engaged in a study of the farm-tenant problem. This committee has made an exhaustive analysis of available statistics and concludes that the plight of tenant farmers, especially the sharecroppers of the South, is serious. In seven southern states more than 60 per cent of the farms are operated by tenants, and today less than half of our farmers own all the land they operate. About 42 per cent of our farmers own no land at all. There are some 2,800,000 tenant farmers in the United States, and the number is increasing yearly by about 40,000. Poverty and insecurity are the basic problems of farm tenancy. It must be indicated that the element of tenancy itself is not the devitalizing factor. Tenancy with security is superior in every way to tenancy without security, despite the normal fact that ownership of land is a matter not only of desirability but of justice. The average tenant farmer operates under a lease of one year and moves every two or three years.

Many factors must be considered in connection with this problem,

[11] *Rugged Individualism* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1937), page 16. Used by permission.

such as the inability of some tenant farmers to become farm-owners. The condition of some people is not due to deficient character. The extremely poor farm tenants in the South, particularly in the "backward areas," have little or no personal possessions. The condition of their tenancy is somewhat unusual. They generally work the crop on the land in shares with the owner of the land and receive 50 per cent of the sale of the products. The owner of the land advances sufficient foodstuffs to keep the family alive, and small gardens make it possible to eke out a subsistence. The clothing available to such families is nearly always inadequate, and the constant shifting from one place to another makes the education of the children defective. Perhaps the most serious of the psychological effects is the failure to provide an opportunity for obtaining a foothold in any community. It is not surprising that such conditions have made it possible for radical labor organizers to make inroads.

After showing that the day is past when the American hired farm hand can easily ascend the economic ladder to farm ownership, Father Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., points out that we are rapidly developing a rural proletariat. Although the amount of farm tenancy varies rather widely in different parts of the country, he says that the cotton belt is hit hardest in this respect:

> The income of the renter or cropper in the Southern section is ordinarily much lower than that of the tenant of the North and West. In some sections of the South the average income per family among the sharecroppers is about $300 per year. In the case of many individual families it is much lower. The earnings of great numbers of agricultural wage hands are much the same. A recent study of the Division of Social Research of the Works Progress Administration showed that the average net income of wage hands, sharecroppers, and other tenants in 1934 in 11 areas of the South was $300 per family, or $73 per person. Many families received much less. The average family income for wage labor was $180 a year, varying from $213 in the Arkansas River area to $70 in the interior plains. Sharecroppers had an average family income of $312, but in the lower Mississippi Delta region the average was only $154, or $38 per capita. Some sharecroppers reported incomes of less than $100 for the year.[12]

5. ACCIDENTS

This cause of poverty is grouped with other so-called cultural factors because it is assumed that the majority of accidents are preventable. About 7 per cent of deaths reported in the United States annually are listed as due to accidents or unspecified external causes. According

[12] *Our Rural Proletariat* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1938), page 16. Used by permission.

to the National Safety Council, the cost of accidents in 1935, including wage loss, medical expenses, and the overhead cost of insurance, was $2,400,000. These financial costs are aggravated by the human costs—blighted lives, the broken health, and the dependency which so often constitute the real costs of accidents.

A few brief facts will serve to emphasize the need for attention to this question of accidents. Occupational accidents annually result in 16,000 deaths, 60,000 permanent disabilities, and over a million temporary disabilities. Before the adoption of workmen's compensation for occupational injuries, lengthy litigation was the only basis for indemnity. State workmen's compensation laws are now nearly universal and are accepted by all as part of our national economic structure. This point has an interesting ramification: it is good business for the employer to reduce insurance rates by safety measures. Prevention by eliminating or controlling causes, and a new scientific attitude, are making yearly reductions in preventable accidents. "Safety consciousness" has been emphasized by "safe-driver" rewards, by emblems to fleets of trucks that have clean accident slates, and by civic committees.

Automobiles cause over one third of all accidental deaths, taking an annual toll of 37,000 lives, 100,000 permanent disabilities, and 1,000,000 temporary disabilities. Automobile fatalities for a period of similar length exceed the American World War deaths. The financial costs to accident victims are made doubly severe by our antiquated procedure, which makes civil suit the only way to collect damages. Establishing financial responsibility by compulsory liability insurance is certainly the next step. Prevention of automobile accidents is not only possible but practical. The automobile death rate of children of school age has been lowered considerably by patrol methods. Road conditions must be improved, especially by providing "super-highways" with artificially separated lanes to segregate opposing traffic streams. The question of prevention is often confused by the current lay opinion that "accidents are accidents." When the automobile death rate of cities of the same type show such a range as in the case of Oakland, California, and Providence, Rhode Island, the former having an automobile death rate four times as high as the latter, one cannot ignore the fact that something more than mere chance is involved.

(See the references at the end of Chapter XVI.)

CHAPTER XV

THE TREATMENT OF POVERTY

MANY writers in this field consider poverty as a social problem only as it is seen on a large scale, beginning in England in the sixteenth century. However, poverty of one kind or another has existed since the beginning of time. During the earliest period of history poverty was usually due to mental or physical illness, or to crop failures and disasters. The evolution of poverty as a problem involving large masses of people has been gradual but certain. Individual and natural causations have been replaced to a considerable extent by group or social causation. This has affected concepts of treatment. Since our major emphasis here is to be on present conditions, we shall treat only the essential factors in the history of the treatment of poverty in the past. We shall be concerned especially with the auspices under which problems of poverty have been treated, for any understanding of present developments must be preceded by knowledge of the essential motivations which have at one time or another determined the source of assistance to the poor.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS

1. THE PRE-CHRISTIAN ERA

In the early period of communal tribal life, poverty was cared for within families. If an individual was handicapped by illness, other members of the family provided for his simple wants. Often the entire communal group was in poverty at the same time because of the impact of natural forces, and this problem was solved by group action through which all benefited. The problem of poverty among the Hebrews was attacked through religious motivation. Even before the appearance of communities, the Mosaic law regarded charity to the poor as a duty and prescribed three forms of relief: (1) a tithe, or one tenth of the year's income, must be given to the poor; (2) the poor must be given part of the harvest; (3) contributions must be made to the widows, the fatherless children, and strangers. The law was binding upon all, and even the poor gave within their means. Thus the protection of the

dependent was assured by the law, for the religious obligation was definite and fixed, rather than vague and haphazard. The concept of charity among the Hebrews was similar to that of justice.

The next major development in the treatment of poverty is seen in Rome. Here there was no religious motivation; expediency was the basis of action. The state became the dispenser of assistance. Poverty was not extensive, since the social institutions of the time, such as slavery and concubinage, left comparatively few individuals without some means of support. Wounded soldiers, orphans, and widows were cared for through the emperors' distribution of grain and other foods. There were some instances of private benevolence, but these were exceptional, and there is no evidence to indicate that the practice of private charity was widespread. This is not to be wondered at, since the materialistic civilization of the period, and the widespread selfishness of the ruling classes, probably had a counterpart in a refusal to recognize obligations of charity or justice. What private philanthropy existed was a condescension of the rich to the poor, a means of satisfying the pride of the wealthy by showing superiority over the common herd. Even the distribution of grain by the emperors was apparently a political device and was indirectly an encouragement to idleness.

2. THE CHRISTIAN ERA

The coming of Christianity gave great impetus to the care of the poor and the unfortunate. The parable of the Good Samaritan and that of Dives and Lazarus made a profound impression upon the early Christians, and charity became one of their outstanding virtues. The Church did more than give status to the precept of charity. Organization of Christians for charity was soon an accomplished fact. Monsignor John O'Grady reminds us that the apostles discovered that the administration of the temporal affairs of the Church took a considerable amount of time; therefore, they selected seven men of outstanding virtue to take direct control over all temporal matters. These were the deacons, who were charged with the administration of charity under the direction of the bishop.[1] In Rome the city was divided into fourteen districts, each deacon having charge of two districts. The bishop was the center of control of the early Church, as the parish did not come into being as an important unit until the fifth and sixth centuries.

The breakdown of the Roman Empire and the barbarian invasions brought about increased taxation, confiscation of land, and a consider-

[1] *The Catholic Church and the Destitute* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929), page 26.

able amount of poverty, which placed greater burdens on the Church's charities. The founding of the hospitals in the fourth century was the logical outcome of the inability of the Bishop's House and the homes of the Christian families to provide a refuge for the sick, the homeless, and abandoned children. The danger of hypocrisy and pauperism because of charity was nominal in the early Christian society, in spite of frequent assertions to the contrary. This may be attributed to the degree of intimacy with and knowledge of one another which was typical of the closely associated early Christian group. Many anti-Catholic writers attempt to prove by isolated statements from the Fathers of the Church that by recognizing the great spiritual value of charity to the giver the Church encouraged pauperism. It is alleged that alms were given to the poor for the sake of almsgiving, and not for the sake of the poor. They reason that, since the Church was active in the relief of poverty and since poverty increased, the method must have been responsible for the increase. It must be borne in mind that the economic conditions of the time, the oppression of the poor, usury, the burdens of unjust taxation, and other factors increased poverty despite all the ameliorative measures taken.

In the fourth and fifth centuries the bishops became emphatic in denouncing social injustice as responsible for much poverty and in emphasizing the doctrine of the stewardship of property. The guiding principle was that property was not given to men for their own benefit, but for the welfare of their fellow-beings. The bishops advocated that all persons be required to give a tenth of their possessions for the care of the poor. About this time the monasteries were founded, and each monastery had a hospital in which care was given the sick, the crippled, and the blind. The monasteries made a significant contribution, in that organized care was made available for those in need. The monasteries illustrate better than any other development the completeness of the Christian treatment of poverty. The Hebrews practiced individual charity. The Christians were obligated to practice charity not only as individuals but also through the Church. Charity through the Church was a means of grace, and through this encouragement there arose the religious orders and communities devoting the lives of the members to assistance of the sick, the disabled, the homeless, and the abandoned.

The rise of the religious orders gave impetus to the social doctrine of charity. The great St. Francis of Assisi in the thirteenth century typified Christian emphasis on the dignity of man. Francis was wealthy and refined, yet he associated with beggars, the diseased, and the aban-

doned. He preached the dignity of man to his followers, and his followers preached it to the world. He is rightfully called one of the world's great social workers. The beginning of the eighth century witnessed the development of the guilds and the feudal estates. The guilds were protective associations of artisans of all classes combining some features of fraternal associations and some features of labor associations. There was also an element of religious life in their organization and development. Under the feudal system, rural land was cultivated by serfs, who gave a part of the proceeds to the feudal master for the privilege of working the land for their own use. Historians generally agree that the lot of serfs was indeed difficult, but, on the other hand, the feudal lord had definite and specific responsibilities for the care of his serfs in time of distress.

At the beginning of the industrial system, there were six well-established media for relief of destitution and poverty. These were: (1) the monasteries; (2) the hospitals, which had increased in number during the wars and invasions of the eleventh century and began to devote most of their attention to the care of the sick; (3) the hospices, which continued the hospitality of the early Church in providing for travelers and strangers; (4) assistance to the poor in their own parishes under the general supervision of the bishop, although this had become the responsibility of the pastor of each parish; (5) the fraternal orders of the guilds; (6) the assistance of neighbors and friends. With the breakdown of the feudal system, the consequent influx into the cities, and the ultimate failure of the guilds in their protective activities, the problem of relieving poverty became too widespread in its implications and scope for the monasteries, hospitals, and parishes, especially since the Reformation had everywhere resulted in the despoiling of many of these institutions. The development of public relief was a logical consequence.

Juan Louis Vives is regarded as the father of modern public relief. He was a humanist, a graduate of the University of Paris, a professor in Louvain, and a tutor at the court of Henry VIII. In 1526 he wrote *De Subventione Pauperum,* which outlined a program for relief that was unusual for its time. There were eight distinct phases in his program. (1) A house-to-house canvass of the needy was to be made by two senators of the municipality. (2) The incorrigible and those unwilling to work should be sent to prison. (3) Work should be provided for the unemployed after a medical examination to determine their fitness. (4) Industrial training should be provided in order to increase the earning power of the poor. (5) The physically handicapped should

be given vocational training for trades suited to their conditions. (6) There should be an effort to find work for aged persons. (7) There should be no harshness or violence in dealing with the poor; each person should be treated kindly and sympathetically and given the type of assistance best suited to his needs. (8) No public funds should be used for the assistance of the poor until the failure of private charity should demonstrate such a need. These principles were put into effect in several municipalities and became the basis of many of the poor-relief laws of Belgium and Germany.

3. THE ELIZABETHAN POOR LAWS

The development of public responsibility for the poor in England is especially important, since it was the forerunner of our American public relief system. The magnitude of the problems of poverty in England increased with the increasing complexity of the social structure. The charity of individuals and institutions had to be supplemented and even, where the monasteries had been confiscated, replaced by governmental aid. The phenomenon of unemployment became the responsibility of the state, and gradually the state accepted additional responsibilities. Although there were minor laws in England before the act of 1601, this law (43 Elizabeth, C. 2) summarized the previous laws and brought them into a unified whole. The principles dominating the Poor Relief Act and its amendments were as follows:

(1) *Local responsibility was fixed* by making the parish the unit of relief. The parish was a civil division of the county (the term is still used in some of our southern states). The parish was responsible for the care of the poor living in the parish; that is, responsibility was defined by law. (2) *Unauthorized begging was suppressed.* Beggars had overrun England for many years and, in the eyes of many persons, had become a public menace. (3) *Employment was given as a means of assistance.* Able-bodied persons unable to sustain themselves because of inability to find work were put to work. Stocks of flax, hemp, and other materials were provided by the parish, and the able-bodied worked for the relief given them. (4) *The lame, the impotent, the old, and the blind were put together in almshouses and cared for.* (5) *Children were apprenticed* if their parents could not provide for them. The practice was to have the child work for a livelihood rather than live in idleness. (6) *A house of correction was used for the idle and for petty offenders.* The idle were the able-bodied who would not work.

The act of 1601 is considered important for two distinct reasons: it recognized with specific definitions and methods the principle of

public concern for the relief of destitution, and it furnished a pattern which was to be followed in colonial America. The principles of the act are a curious combination of humanitarianism and deterrence, ranging from the broad implication that it was a public responsibility that no one should starve to the grim deterrence implied in the punitive measures involving beggars and the idle. Colonial America preserved more of the deterrent aspects of the act than of the humanitarian. England frequently modified her poor laws after the establishment of the American colonies, making them more flexible from time to time. This fact becomes important in the light of developments in our own country, where, as we shall presently see, the laws have been less subject to modification. The early settlers brought with them the essentials of the English poor laws, but, while England modified the laws many times, the states have tended to retain the earliest laws in their most rigorous form.

4. AMERICAN POOR LAWS

A brief survey of the background of colonial conditions is important as a perspective for the later developments in the United States. The early settlers in Massachusetts brought with them the philosophy of the existing English poor laws, together with a religious outlook conducive to a personal harshness which resulted in a repressive approach to various problems of assistance. The perils of a strange country made each small group not only self-sufficient but grudgingly co-operative. Thus, in the very beginning, there was a distinction made between assistance given to the unfortunate members of their own group and assistance given to strangers who came from other groups. The latter were treated with scant ceremony and sent upon their way as speedily as possible. With regard to the problems of their own group, private assistance and neighborly aid sufficed for a considerable time.

The concept of the "worthy" poor developed early. In a pioneer age there was a certain simplicity about life; either a man was able to work or he was not. If he was not able to work, he could be assisted by (a) members of his own family, (b) friends, (c) a philanthropic member of the community. If he was able to work but unwilling to do so, he was committed to jail. Those who were unable to work and were victims of disease or accident were assisted by the town, when none of the three foregoing media were available. They were boarded in other homes or given a small allowance to remain in their own homes. In general, the sufferings of handicapped members of the community were looked upon as judgments of a stern Providence. Disdain of sympathy

and understanding was the characteristic attitude toward dependent classes. As a safeguard against dependency, towns usually required newcomers, or those who retained them, to furnish bonds against the possibility of their becoming public charges. If a destitute person returned to a locality from which he had been driven out, he was lashed.

The gradual use of the almshouse came about because of the variety of problems with which the towns were faced and the inadequate philosophy of treatment of these problems. The almshouse soon became a catch-all, a receiving home for foundling babies as well as for adults suffering from senility. In general, those who were sent to the almshouse were the poor who were not able-bodied. The disorderly poor were confined in the houses of correction and in workhouses, these latter institutions being derived directly from England. Out of this background the American system of relief developed two main trends, outdoor relief and indoor relief; it has continued to deal with poverty repressively and to base its treatment on local responsibility and the character of the recipient.

5. PUBLIC OUTDOOR RELIEF

The unit through which relief is administered in the United States is generally in accord with the political organization of the state. In New England, where the town form of government exists, relief is the responsibility of the town or township. In Pennsylvania, which follows the county form of government, relief is by counties divided into districts. In other states there is a joint county-township responsibility, and in Indiana the bills are paid out of the county treasury on authorization of the township trustee, out of taxes obtained in the township. In general, with the exception of New England, the ultimate authority rests with county commissioners. Until the past decade there has been little centralization of authority and only infrequent reporting to a central body. With few exceptions our statutes governing poor relief have descended almost intact from the old poor laws of England, resulting in crude, bungling attempts to deal with problems that require the utmost in intelligence. The system is naturally open to serious delinquencies in administration and also in the general attitude which is indicated by the statutes, namely, that relief is temporary and only for an emergency.

Since public outdoor relief is paid for out of tax funds and administered by men who are generally not superior to the average in the community, it has been the usual practice of poor-law administrators to think only of keeping expenses as low as possible, a policy which has

resulted in the shortsighted, antisocial practice of doling out inadequate amounts for relief. This follows the concept of "less eligibility," the principle by which the condition of the person under care is supposed to be kept less desirable than that of the independent working man. Linked with this principle is the concept that the poor are poor because they do not try to be otherwise. A corollary of this is that adequacy in relief-giving encourages shiftlessness and a desire to avoid work.

Modern students of public welfare have been urging adequacy in relief as an economical measure which is also bound up with principles of justice and equality. By their classification and categorizing of recipients of assistance into such groups as aged, dependent children, crippled, and blind, they have brought about improvement in standards and improvements even in local relief units. On the other hand, incompetent poor-law administrators, operating under deficient poor-law statutes and providing for the residue of those who are in poverty, that is, for those who cannot be classified as dependents under any of the above forms of assistance, generally retain their inadequate perspective and methods of dealing with those who require assistance. It is a common practice for such officials to try by various means of publicity to build up a reputation in the community as a stalwart defender of the tax rate; the public fails to realize that the costs of inadequate care in terms of lowered morale and deficient physical standards of living are increased. The gradual improvement in poor-law administration may be attributed for the most part to supervision by state departments of public welfare, which have gradually obtained more control in the past few decades.

6. THE ALMSHOUSE

Just as the township form of relief has been the despair of social workers, so, too, the almshouse has been a cumbersome bulwark against adequate treatment of the poor. In order to appreciate the reason for almshouses we must realize some of the evils which developed under the old system of public outdoor relief. Under this system, incompetent elected officials gave relief parsimoniously to some and lavishly to others and thus caused much discontent. Many persons believed that the system was degrading, that it "pauperized" and resulted in continued dependency. Another factor was cost. Poor relief administered politically by the incompetent "poor masters" was costly. Many thought that almshouse care, which would provide work for inmates, would be a deterrent and keep the lazy from receiving public help. It must be remembered that the majority of those in need were the disabled, the

handicapped, and the aged. Congregate housing seemed the most economical measure.

The almshouse, then, seems to have come into use for two reasons: the evils of the old system of outdoor relief had become apparent; and the almshouse was believed to be more economical. As a result, children, the insane, the feeble-minded, and the chronically ill were all lumped together in the almshouse, and the idea was fostered that the stigma attached to the institution would protect the taxpayer from being defrauded by the able-bodied who were too lazy to work. In counties in which the number of paupers was not large, a custom developed of leasing the poor farm and the care of the paupers to the lowest bidder, that is, to the person who would assume their care at the least expense to the county. In theory the almshouse was to be located on a large plot of ground suitable for cultivation, so that the inmates through their work would provide sufficient revenue to partially maintain the institution. Because of the growth of population, it has been possible to develop better almshouses as far as physical structure is concerned, and occasionally an abandoned farm has been transformed into a large, physically imposing building surrounded by well-cultivated acres. The name of the institution has also undergone various transformations, and in many parts of the country the poorhouse or almshouse is now known as the county infirmary.

There has been no almshouse survey in the past decade. However, in January, 1923, there were about 80,000 inmates in the poorhouses of the country. A special report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1923 on nearly all the 2,000 public almshouses indicated that the cost of maintenance of each inmate of these institutions was $334.64. The dilapidation, inadequacy, and indecency of the small almshouses, and their managers' ignorance, unfitness, and lack of comprehension of the social elements involved in the conduct of a public institution, are deplorable. Insanity, feeble-mindedness, depravity, and respectable old age are lumped together with complete unconcern. Some of the almshouses are built in two sections or wings, despite the fact that there are more than twice as many men in almshouses as women. The chief factors in the failure of the almshouse are its inclusiveness, its small size, and the laxity of regulations governing admission and discharge. Administratively, the superintendent of the almshouse, for the most part, has been charged primarily with the management of a farm and not with the care of human beings. The laws of most states require that the superintendent "have a common school education, be of good moral character, and be able to manage a farm." It is generally admitted by

students of social problems today that the almshouse should be utilized only for the aged and infirm. It is not difficult to imagine the psychological consequences for a respectable person in old age, forced to go to an institution, who is compelled to live with the feeble-minded, the insane, and other derelicts, as happens in so many of our almshouses.

Certain improvements are within range of immediate action, such as setting up district almshouses to replace the small institutions in isolated areas, and closer supervision by the state departments of public welfare. More attention must be given to almshouse management and to the decision as to who should be sent to the almshouse. In brief, the almshouse must be removed from politicians, and management must be brought under the control of trained social workers.

II. The Modern Period

1. PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE AGENCIES

With the rapid development of private outdoor relief in the last decade of the nineteenth century, there was considerable debate as to the comparative merits of public and private agencies in dealing with families in their homes. Private agencies were founded by idealists, generally persons with wealth and social standing, who could not tolerate the condition of the poor in the hands of minor political officials; in attempting to correct the evils of the public system, the private agencies became psychological competitors of the public officials. Although private agencies usually had higher standards at first, the basic difference between public and private agencies today is very often in the source of funds. Public agencies are supported by tax moneys, private agencies by voluntary gifts. For a time the result of this competition was the abandonment of public relief in such large cities as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Brooklyn, and Washington. After four decades of disputes, the situation is now one of partial understanding in the smaller communities, and general harmony in the large metropolitan areas. It is generally agreed that the two are not competitive but are in need of each other.

The tendency today is to assign to the public agencies the major responsibility for the chronically insane, the defective, the blind, vagrants, other special classes of dependents, and the major relief burden. The present function of the private agency in work with families is to offer services rather than relief as such and to supplement the work of the public agencies, especially when their relief standards are too low. In many instances today the standards of public agencies are superior

to those of some private agencies in both personnel and practices. In general, private agencies are flexible, while public agencies are somewhat rigidly controlled by statutes. The boards of directors of private agencies govern as they see fit and may change the program to conform to changing needs; legislative action is often required to enable public agencies to meet changing conditions. Sound public policy is retarded by the mistaken impression of the general public that private agencies have always carried the burden for relief of the poor in their own homes. Even in 1928, before the large influx of families who required relief during the depression, almost three quarters of all relief came from tax funds.

It is obvious that the private agencies cannot carry the burden of relief today; however, they can offer useful services to public relief agencies by experiments and demonstrations of improved methods. A further field for co-operation by private agencies is the training of workers for public agencies. The workers going from the private agencies with the best standards to the public agencies bring with them a tradition of service and a technical ability which improve the status of public relief administration. An interesting example of evolution in the private field of work exists in the United Charities of Chicago, which in two decades have been transformed from an agency whose primary responsibility was relief-giving to one whose primary responsibility is service.

2. CATHOLIC CHARITIES

The subject of the treatment of poverty cannot be concluded without a word concerning the work of Catholics in this field. In conjunction with our treatment of the subject of dependent children in the United States, reference is made to the outstanding work of Catholics in the field of child welfare. In that place it is pointed out that Catholic charities developed in the United States largely out of initial efforts to save the faith of the children of Catholic immigrants. It is shown that out of the child-welfare movement there developed what was probably our first broad, co-ordinated Catholic charity, the Catholic Home Bureau, organized in New York City in 1898 to place dependent children of that city in foster homes in other cities and states, following the lead of non-Catholic agencies in the field. From the child-welfare field likewise came, in 1910, the initial suggestion, that of Brother Barnabas, of the Christian Brothers, that a National Conference of Catholic Charities, similar to the National Conference of Social Work, be organized. Out of this conference, as a result of the tireless efforts of

its successive secretaries, the late Monsignor William J. Kerby and Monsignor John O'Grady, there developed the central diocesan bureaus of Catholic charities, to be found in nearly every diocese today, where they parallel to some degree the plan of organized public and private non-Catholic charities and like them utilize chiefly highly trained social workers. From this brief glimpse of the development of Catholic charities in America, one might easily get the false impression that Catholic charities have grown up merely as a defense against Protestant proselytizing and that our charities are purely imitative in their organization and methods. As almost everyone who has studied European history knows, such an impression is easily dispelled if one turns back the pages of history.

Going over the great European Catholic charities of the past—the organization of hundreds of homes for the aged by the Little Sisters of the Poor, the organization of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul for assisting needy families in their own homes by Frederick Ozanam in 1833, and, beginning with the early days of the Church, the establishment of hospitals under Catholic auspices for the care of the sick (space will not permit us to describe these great pioneer developments here)—we find ourselves back at the Source of Catholic charities and learn from Him why Catholic charity is not, and cannot normally be, merely imitative and defensive. The Magna Charta of Catholic charity was given on Mount Olivet by the Founder of Catholic charities when He said to His disciples: "For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink; I was a stranger and you took me in; naked and you covered me; sick and you visited me; I was in prison, and you came to me. . . . Amen. I say to you as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me." (Matthew XXV, 35–40.) By His own life and by the parable of the good Samaritan Jesus Christ interpreted beyond all dispute mankind's new social charter. The teachings of Christ can be summarized in two commandments: the first, love of God, and the second, love of neighbor. Love of neighbor was made the test of Christian faith when Christ said: "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another." It has been said, therefore, that charity is the teaching of Christ in action. Not only does it see in every man a brother redeemed by Christ and a fellow heir to the Kingdom of Heaven, but it has a predilection for the weak and unfortunate. The Church, accordingly, has always fostered works of charity and is universally recognized as the pioneer in nearly all present charitable endeavors. Furthermore, since Christians have an *obligation* to practice works of

charity, the Church, Christ's official teacher, has always tried to interpret to the people fitting ways and means of fulfilling the obligation.

Charity and Social Work

Charitable works, many of which have come to be called "social work" in recent decades, although the latter is, strictly speaking, a method and a technique and not a virtue or a philosophy of life at all, are a part of the positive ministry of the Church. Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel has summed up very beautifully the necessary relationship between charity and religion:

> The service of charity is an essential part of our religion, the fulfillment of a divine commandment, the performance of a duty binding in conscience. It is a service whose motive is not the equality or merits of our fellowmen but the love of God and of His Son, towards Whom the ministry is directed. The service of charity is for us neither a matter of choice nor a merely humanitarian activity, but a spiritual function, whose prime inspiration and ultimate object is God Himself. When we set up an agency of charity, be it an institution or a department of social service, we regard it as an extension of the Church itself, we surmount it with the hallowed symbol of the Cross and dedicate it to the honor of God, Whose grace we pray to sanctify the deed. This intertwining of charity with religion is responsible for the historic fact that wherever the faith is established there arise almost spontaneously societies and institutions of charity, which in turn become the gauge and measure of the religious life which the Church fosters. Even as the individual is to be judged by the measure of his deeds of charity, so is the Church appraised by the ministry of charity, which is centralized and vitalized in her bishops and carried out by the zeal of her clergy and laity. This intimate union with us between religion and charity naturally affects the character of the service.[2]

Since Catholic agencies now use so much of the technique of modern social work, non-Catholics sometimes wonder why Catholics still insist upon maintaining their own agencies rather than depending entirely upon those of the state. What has just been pointed out concerning the close and necessary relationship between religion and charity should be a sufficient answer to this question. However, it might be further noted that the willingness of so many Protestants today to turn over all charitable endeavors to the state is really a new policy for them, and one that has come about only with the gradual disintegration of religious faith and zeal which has been taking place recently. The recent Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy undermined the convictions of many Protestants. In conjunction with the development of the care of de-

[2] *Proceedings of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, 1932* (Washington, D.C., 1932), page 57. Used by permission.

pendent children in the United States, the social agencies of the middle of the last century were typified by a militant Protestantism in which the modern idea of mere humanitarianism had little place. In fact, it has been said that much of the private social work of the last century was the reply of American Protestantism to the philosophy of enlightenment which denied the old spiritual foundations and asserted that society and social welfare should be organized solely on the basis of science.

In addition to the basic religious motive for charities or social work, that foundation that modern Protestantism has in a large measure exchanged for the humanitarianism which last-century Protestantism fought against so earnestly, there are many other good reasons for maintaining Catholic charities. A Catholic social agency will not attempt to bring about social adjustments by means which are at variance with religious or moral principles. Family limitation by contraception will not be advocated or insinuated, nor divorce and remarriage, nor will sanction be given to those psychiatrists who advocate the elimination of sex "repressions" by immoral means. There is hardly a social case history in which the social worker under Catholic auspices will not find some opportunities for helping to bring about religious and moral adjustments in addition to providing for material needs. Time and again Catholic social workers have found, in what were regarded as Catholic families, invalid marriages that had to be adjusted and children that had to be baptized. The Catholic social worker, far from being satisfied by the religious merit to be received for his work, is ever solicitous for the salvation of the soul of his fellow man in distress. On this point Archbishop Rummel says:

> We set up our own system of charity because there are religious and moral issues which can not be divorced from the service of charity. The Vincentian brother who enters the home of a hungry, ill clad family does not stop with depositing a basket of food and a bundle of clothes at the door. He probes into the spiritual and moral life of the family and endeavors to set parents and children right with God and their eternal destiny. The social worker operating out of the Catholic Bureau of Charity does not consider her work completed when she has budgeted the family and guaranteed the necessary subsidy. She is trained and directed to work out also a spiritual and moral readjustment and to put the family in contact with the pastor, the church, and the Christian school. When death or misfortune or human failure disrupts a family and breaks up a home, the duty of Catholic Charity does not end until the dependents, be they children or adults stooped by the weight of years, have been sheltered in a spiritual and moral atmosphere, wherein the soul as well as the body is guaranteed a wholesome existence.[3]

[3] *Op. cit.*, page 58. Used by permission. See also *What Is Catholic Social Case Work?* (pamphlet) (National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C., 1938).

The economic crash of 1929 has brought about a crisis in many Catholic charities. Like all private agencies, these soon found that their funds were insufficient even to begin to take care of those in need of food and shelter. The assumption of this burden by public agencies was hailed at first as a boon to private social work. Private social work, it was said, would henceforth be able to devote its efforts to the cultural needs of man. This apparent Utopia has not proved altogether satisfactory if one can judge by recent comments in the issues of *The Catholic Charities Review*. Many incidents have caused Catholic leaders to question the wisdom of the entire assumption of relief responsibility by the government. For one thing, some have noticed a recent tendency in public agencies to return to the hard, impatient attitudes towards public-relief recipients which prevailed a century ago. At any rate, it must be recognized that there are certain types of families whose relief needs cannot be turned over to public agencies entirely, if their spiritual needs are to be attended to adequately. Neither can a Catholic justify the tendency to turn all relief-giving over to the professional workers, trained and untrained, who are attached to public agencies. Volunteer activity in the service of the poor is almost as much a part of our religion as Church attendance; it cannot be delegated entirely. There are at least two possible solutions to these difficulties: to secure a larger proportion of community-chest funds for distribution by Catholic agencies, and to establish special private funds—milk funds, shoe funds, clothing or scholarship funds—in conjunction with Catholic agencies. At any rate, it seems evident that the time has not yet come, if it is desirable that it ever should, for Catholic agencies to operate purely as service agencies for the poor.

3. PRESENT TRENDS IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Even in colonial times, the local unit was inadequate to meet the needs of certain classes in need of assistance, particularly the defectives. In the sparsely populated areas of that time, it was impossible to make adequate custodial provisions for the insane, the feeble-minded, and certain others, and gradually the state became the unit for the care of these groups. With the later development of more humanitarian points of view, the care for other handicapped persons was recognized as a state responsibility. Among the first state institutions were those developed for the deaf, the blind, and delinquent youth. As the states began to feel the weight of added expense caused by these institutions, a gradual demand for federal aid came about, culminating in President Pierce's veto in 1854 of a bill advocated by Dorothea Dix, one of our great

social reformers, to provide a grant of public lands to the several states for the benefit of the insane poor. Thus responsibility for the care of the needy came to be recognized as a state function.

In 1863 the Massachusetts Board of Charities was appointed with responsibility for supervision of institutions, and so commenced a long controversy as to the extent to which this "supervision" might go. In some states it amounted to control. There has been an additional controversy in the struggle between proponents of unpaid part-time boards and full-time paid supervisors. In some states there has been an excellent development of institutions under unpaid boards of trustees appointed by the governor. At the present time in the majority of states, control is vested in a central body. This has resulted in increasing standardization of methods of care and of selection of personnel. In the field of outdoor assistance, a similar trend toward central control is observable, culminating in the recognition of the state department of public welfare as a supervisory body for local relief units in many states. When the depression began in 1929, local units were soon found to be financially unable to maintain a mass relief program, and it became necessary for the states to grant assistance out of the state treasuries wherever that was permissible. In some instances, constitutional amendments were necessary to make this possible, for the states had constitutional power to assist only special classes, such as the insane and the feeble-minded. When it became apparent that the depression was not temporary, state funds were nearly exhausted. States began to appeal for federal assistance. Some of the states, possessing the least ability to pay, had the greatest amount of poverty and misery, and federal aid became imperative. The granting of federal aid naturally resulted in the assumption of some control by federal officials.

With this background we are now ready to consider the various federal programs developed since 1933 to meet emergency needs. Many of these programs are designed to care for needs which have existed for a long time, others are stop-gaps that will be withdrawn when the emergency passes. Emergency programs that deal with long-enduring problems may become permanent. We shall consider separately the emergency relief programs developed to meet the crisis and the social-security program.

III. Emergency Programs

1. BACKGROUND

The student must observe that the conditions under which many emergency programs were begun under federal auspices invariably

affected the results. It would be unfair to consider these programs as distinct from the critical times which existed in the period 1929–1933, some of the causes and remedies of which we saw in the last chapter. Consider, summarily, the situation from the standpoint of history. This country had been built on a basis of rapid industrial expansion coupled with "rugged individualism." Each man was considered master of his own economic destiny. If displacement in industry occurred, he could "go west." Homesteading in the West was the flexible element which made *laissez-faire* economics seemingly practical.

Rapid expansion during and after the World War, followed by an era of corporate and private spending, brought in 1929 a period of prosperity which was almost phenomenal. Practically all industrial indices of production were the highest the country had known. The Federal Reserve Board index of the physical volume of industrial production was 119 for the full year. Department-store sales were 111 per cent of the sales of the base years 1923–1925, and textile production was 115 per cent of the production of the base years. The cost of living was equal to the 1923 base, and factory payrolls were 109 per cent of the 1923–1925 base. Stock prices reached 190 per cent of the 1926 index. This era of prosperity was marked by one unpleasant fact: there were over two million unemployed before the crash came in 1929. Far-sighted persons called attention to this, but their voices were unheard. Father James M. Gillis, C.S.P., editor of *The Catholic World,* writing in February, 1929, said:

> Before we come to the precise demonstration of the fact that prosperity often disguises a fatal disease of the body politic, let me remark that I have not been so bamboozled by the campaign cry of "Prosperity" as to believe in it altogether. There are many qualifications of the prosperity of which we have heard so much. For instance, a short time ago Mr. Virgil Jordan, the chief Economist of the National Industrial Conference Board, declared point blank that this "prosperity" of which there has been so much talk, is only a "complex." He calls it even more plainly an "illusion" and he declares it to be largely fictitious. He shows specifically that in the industries which cater to the luxuries of the people there is indeed prosperity; but in the basic industries, agriculture, the textiles, coal and others, there is anything but prosperity.
>
> I am no economist, but I think that one need not be an expert to understand that all life comes out of the soil; all national life rests ultimately upon agriculture; all economic welfare comes in the last analysis from the farm; and that if the farmer is not prosperous, nobody is really prosperous. Now the farmers are discontented—almost in rebellion. What profits it, therefore, if the manufacturers of automobiles, of cosmetics, of silk stockings or any other luxury are on the top of the wave, while the farmer is discontented,

desperate, and nearly bankrupt? Furthermore, as every one knows, the textile industries are in a very bad predicament. . . .

And then there is the South, the always suffering South. They used to talk, years ago, about "bleeding Kansas." It seems to me that if any portion of the country is bleeding today it is the South. Except in a few spots where the iron and steel industry has been developed, or where by dint of low wages and child industry, certain sections in the South have stolen away from New England a great proportion of the textile industry, the South is in a bad way. Indeed the agricultural South, like the agricultural Middle West, is nearly desperate.[4]

The stock-market crash of October, 1929, was the beginning of a crucial depression, the end of which is not in sight. It is impossible in the space allotted to give more than a résumé of the developments, but the student will recognize the gravity of the situation when it is seen that the Department of Commerce estimated that national income in billions of dollars dropped from 81 in 1929 to 68, 54, and 40 in the three succeeding years. Other indices showed similar reactions, and the general situation was one of unparalleled, shocking industrial inactivity. Many causes have been advanced for the depression, but the most logical are: (1) more rapid expansion of production than of consumption; (2) low farm prices; (3) extensive, unwise credit; (4) unfavorable conditions in European countries. Evidently Americans had been living in a period of false prosperity. Unemployment jumped to about 13,000,000 by 1932, and the nation was faced with a new problem. Relief organizations, both public and private, had been treating the smaller number of unemployed before 1929 as a part of their normal responsibility. The unemployed literally were submerged in the attention given the aged, children, and others needing assistance. After 1929, however, they were numerous and obvious, and their plight was recognized. Two factors are significant: (1) Americans had no experience in dealing with mass unemployment, and (2) Americans refused to recognize that the condition was more than temporary.

Mark well the treatment of the unemployed in this period. Many leaders believed it unwise to discuss publicly the depression and the need for enlarged relief. The entire situation was temporary, they said; prosperity was "just around the corner" and would appear again if we would only become optimistic in our psychology. Each community developed its own way of meeting the situation. The unemployed sold apples on street corners, employees were asked to "share the work," and bread lines were instituted by churches and civic organizations.

[4] *The Catholic World*, Volume 128, February, 1929, pages 611–612. Used by permission.

The "block-aid" plan was extensively used: the people in each city block took care of the unemployed in that block. With the failure of these plans, due principally to their inadequate, shortsighted, temporary nature, expanded public and private relief services developed, generally through temporary emergency civic committees. Many relief commissions were created in large cities with authority restricted to a few months. The Temporary Emergency Relief Administration in New York lasted six years. Bread lines and relief shelters housing thousands of unemployed and homeless single men became familiar aspects of the American scene. By the early months of 1932 many counties and cities were bankrupt, banks were closed, mines and factories were abandoned, and children and adults were eking out a miserable existence with inadequate relief allowances.

State aid had begun in many states, but the financial inability of some of the states to carry the burden soon became apparent. Constitutional limitations on borrowing power affected other states, and the need for federal aid gradually became obvious. In December, 1931, Senators Costigan and La Follette introduced bills for federal assistance to the states, but Congress defeated the measures. The hearings under Senator La Follette brought out a significant fact: that grim destitution was the lot of 20,000,000 persons in this country. Demands from the states crystallized into action in July, 1932, when Congress finally authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (R.F.C.) to lend to the states and territories $300,000,000 of federal funds for direct relief and work relief.

Direct Relief and Work Relief

An explanation of the difference between direct relief and work relief is necessary. Since the relief acts of Elizabeth there has been a long dispute as to whether relief should be given directly, that is, by cash or grocery order to the individual or family in need, or indirectly, by providing work at low pay for those in need. The arguments for work relief may be summarized as follows: (1) it tends to eliminate the lazy from relief, since they will not work for relief; (2) it keeps up working skills which are lost by idleness; (3) it provides for necessary work projects which might otherwise remain undone; (4) it is a general deterrent to such effects of idleness as weakened morale, slothful habits, and the like. Opponents of work relief point out the following: (1) it is more expensive than direct relief; (2) it advertises that one is on relief and therefore is tantamount to public degradation; (3) many will prefer work relief to private employment because of lower standards of

effort, skill, and the like; (4) standards of work done by relief workers give a distorted idea of work, thereby constituting a bad example to all workers.

The evident justice of many statements made on both sides of the question leads to some doubt, but students of the subject generally agree that work relief is more expensive than direct relief. It should conform to the following conditions: (1) it must employ a worker at his usual occupation; (2) workers must be paid a "going wage," that is, the rate usually paid for such work in the community; (3) relief status should not be a requirement for such employment. If these conditions are not followed, many evils may develop, especially a destructive effect on the concept of the dignity of labor. Labor must not be degraded by projects which are valueless to the worker and to the community. To put men to work under improper standards is to develop a contempt for honest, constructive labor.

It must be remembered that the R.F.C. "lent" money to the states, although it was generally believed at the time that repayment would not be required. This money made possible expanded state emergency relief programs in the winter of 1932–1933. The states generally set up new commissions to meet their responsibility, composed of private citizens who had been active in local communities in dealing with relief problems.

At the time of the inauguration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in March, 1933, the situation was acute. Widespread bank panics, increasing unemployment, riots in large cities, and constant failure of the states to meet relief obligations made this period a serious crisis in American history. The subsequent experiments of the New Deal must be interpreted in the light of these conditions. The various measures taken since 1933 cannot be evaluated out of context. The danger of hungry mobs was at hand, and something had to be done and done quickly. Furthermore, we had no previous experience of this nature to provide us with a pattern of conduct. Criticism of federal activities since 1933 may be justified on several grounds, but no doubt should exist in the mind of anyone that federal aid and only federal aid saved us from national disaster in the form of mob terrorism. The unemployed had to be fed, and only federal money was available. Various federal programs were designed to meet this difficult situation.

2. THE F.E.R.A.

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration (F.E.R.A.) was created in May, 1933. The act provided for a relief administrator with

broad powers to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Harry L. Hopkins, a prominent social worker who had never been in politics, was appointed administrator, with authority to make grants to the states to aid in meeting their costs of direct relief and work relief. This act was a distinct departure from the principle established by President Pierce's denial of federal power to provide funds for general welfare purposes. It will be noted that it provided grants, not loans, and with the assumption of federal responsibility came federal control. An evaluation of the program by Professor Grace Abbott is illuminating:

> That program meant great improvement in the care of the destitute unemployed and also in the development of public social services. In spite of the fact that budgets were not adequate to meet the nutritional needs of children, that failure to pay rent in many communities meant great insecurity in the home, . . . still the job was enormously better done than it ever had been done before and great improvements were made in relief practice.[5]

The growing mass unemployment soon showed the nation that direct relief and local work projects could not carry the burden, and in November, 1933, the Civil Works Administration (C.W.A.) program was launched. This was a federal work program using state and local administrations to carry out provisions of the plan. With great speed work projects were initiated in local communities and approved by state administrations, and funds were allocated by the federal authorities, so that by the end of 1933 about 4,000,000 of the unemployed were at work again. The plan called for economically and socially desirable projects which could be undertaken quickly by day labor. About half the men employed at this time were on relief; the other half were unemployed and in the group eligible for relief. The cost of this program was about one billion dollars, but it carried the nation through the winter of 1933–1934, and demobilization came in the spring of 1934. C.W.A. workers were transferred to newly created divisions of work relief in the state administrations, the program being called the Emergency Work Program. Meanwhile the economic cycle began a slight upward swing, and early in 1935 private employment increased encouragingly, although it was estimated that 11,000,000 were still unemployed. In the fall of 1935 the F.E.R.A. was liquidated. The words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to Congress of January 4, 1935, are pertinent:

[5] "Social Workers and Public Welfare Developments," *This Business of Relief* (American Association of Social Workers, New York, 1936), page 22.

To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It is inimical to the dictates of sound policy. It is in violation of the traditions of America. Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers. The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief.

3. THE W.P.A.

The federal departure from "this business of relief" raised the question: if the local communities were unable to carry the burden in 1933, and if the burden decreased only slightly, how could the local communities meet the problem now? This was answered by a restriction of local responsibility to the so-called "unemployables" and by the creation of a federal works program under the act of 1935 to take care of those who were unemployed but able and willing to work. This was the widely discussed Works Progress Administration plan, through which funds were provided equal to a subsistence wage ranging from $45 to $60 monthly. The justification of federal responsibility for the estimated 3,500,000 employable heads of families was based on the clearly demonstrated facts that unemployment was not caused by local conditions and that local communities did not have power to remove causes. Under the act of 1935 nearly $5,000,000,000 was made available, and by December, 1935, about 3,500,000 persons were at work under the new program. Although it was the hope of many that the program would be a strictly "public works" program, employing all unemployed regardless of relief status, this hope was not fulfilled. About 90 per cent of all employees at any time were taken from the relief rolls, and eligibility for relief has been a determining factor for employment since the beginning of the program. One outstanding phase of the W.P.A. program was the development of "white-collar" projects, employing those who were let out of clerical jobs as well as many skilled persons such as artists, musicians, and writers. In this phase of its program, W.P.A. has come closest to being a satisfactory device, for these skilled workers are employed at their usual work.

This program should not be confused with the Public Works Administration, a measure "to prime the pump of business." They are distinguishable by the fact that P.W.A. provided federal funds for large-scale projects such as public buildings and power developments and employed men on the basis of merit rather than need, that is, unemployment was not a prerequisite for jobs. In general, P.W.A. work was done through private contractors and, especially in the building trades, provided means of work at the usual scale of pay to many who might have eventually become unemployed.

4. CRITICISMS OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

It is desirable to review the various criticisms of these federal programs collectively, since the public as a rule thinks of F.E.R.A., C.W.A., and W.P.A. as the same. Inefficiency, political favortism, and "vote-buying," all have been typical charges since 1933. We have already noted the conditions which led to federal aid and the speed with which the machinery of relief was thrown together. Naturally, there was inefficiency in all these programs, not designed inefficiency, but natural inefficiency. Consider the C.W.A. briefly. The task of putting four million men to work in six weeks was itself almost insurmountable. Remember that federal supervision came into being in May, 1933, and that by November the majority of state administrators were just getting used to the idea. The federal program had to deal with thousands of communities through the forty-eight state administrators, and all kinds of complications were present, including political disagreements, factional disturbances, and the common, garden variety of selfishness. Newspapers that opposed federal aid constantly criticized the plans and caused wide public misunderstanding. With these internal problems the task was increasingly difficult. When one stops to consider that this vast scheme of putting four million to work at desirable projects involved such questions as the selection of projects and the allocation of funds on an equitable basis, it is surprising that the program got under way at all.

The other work-relief program, the W.P.A., has been comparatively efficient because of the experiences with the first plan. It has been criticized widely, and certain features of the work in individual localities have deserved criticism. But this program also was initiated under trying circumstances. Designed to care for all unemployed able to work, it has never been able to do so because of insufficient appropriations. The presidential campaign of 1936 caused the program to become a political football. Although the wage allocations averaged only $55 monthly per worker, many opposition newspapers found it expedient to attack this policy as administration "vote-buying." The wages paid meant less than $700 annually, yet the objection was made that the W.P.A. competed with private industry and thus held back prosperity. Naturally, even this inadequate wage did compete with sweatshops, with the pay of seasonal workers, cranberry-pickers, and the like, but the answer would seem to be that any industry paying less than the W.P.A. should be abandoned. Many criticisms about shovel-leaning and the like were true. But it must be remembered that the difficulties

in setting up projects suggested the danger that, after a project was completed, the workers might return to direct relief. Were they to be blamed for not hurrying to end the project so as to go on direct relief? In addition, many workers were physically unfit for the tasks assigned; many were at work digging ditches who were physically unable to work at normal speed, since all on relief were anxious to obtain the higher standards of the W.P.A. By and large, W.P.A. projects have done much good, although the program could not be a satisfactory substitute for a sound long-time plan of public works. But no such plan has ever been worked out here.

The direct-relief program (F.E.R.A.) was subject to similar attack, chiefly from states where it was felt that states' rights were challenged, and from states which felt that other states were favored in fund allocations. There was some truth to the latter charge. The federal administration at no time announced the basis of grants to the states other than "need," which was not clearly defined. Certain southern states received 100 per cent of their relief costs from the federal administrator, but in other states the range was from 30 per cent to 70 per cent. The result was constant bickering between the state administrators and the federal administrator, and in some cases legislatures refused to appropriate relief moneys, believing that the federal administrators could be "bluffed" into making an appropriation. The results were felt directly by those on relief, in evictions because of nonpayment of rents, in stoppage of relief, and in inadequate relief budgets.

The Need for a Unified Plan

The least emphasized and perhaps the most important weakness of the federal programs was the failure to develop a consistent relief policy. Recall the situation subsequent to the withdrawal of federal funds for direct relief, as an example of the importance of a definite federal policy. It has been shown already that the W.P.A. did not take care of all employables. The so-called residue had to be fed, and in some cities half of those needing relief and able to work were on direct relief and were taken care of by the local communities. Where the need was greatest, there was the least ability to meet the need, since cities with greatest unemployment had the least funds for direct relief. Without going into unnecessary statistics it is sufficient to say that penny-pinching local relief administrators have progressively reduced budgets in most areas, and standards of assistance are characteristically low. The spring of 1938 saw a repetition of emergency measures of 1931–1932 in the crises in large cities, the calling of legislators to special sessions, and,

in some places, the appearance of bread lines. Large cities such as Cleveland, Chicago, and New York were most gravely affected, and the pressure of public need finally resulted in an increase of available W.P.A. funds. The most interesting phase of the development has been the constant emphasis on the "emergency" nature of the problem; the nation is still treating as "emergencies" the problems which developed in 1929 and 1930.

An increase in unemployment in the winter of 1937–1938 resulted in further federal action, initiated by the President in the spring of 1938. The President's program included: (1) increased appropriations for continuation of the W.P.A., the N.Y.A., and the Farm Security Administration (formerly the Resettlement Administration); (2) appropriations already asked for the C.C.C., the federal-aid highway program, and the flood-control program of the War Department; (3) increased amounts for a federal public building program; (4) resumption of P.W.A. lending and granting activities. The criticism of these federal "pump-priming" activities became very pronounced when the new program was suggested. How much of this criticism was justified and how much was prompted by the proximity of Congressional elections is hard to determine at this time. Many of those who reject federal activities as a denial of individual and local rights are reasoning from a very narrow point of view. They claim to foresee a breakdown of capitalism and a rise of some form of state socialism, yet it should be obvious that capitalism, as it has been experienced, cannot and should not survive. No one should lose sight of the fundamental principle that human rights are more sacred than property rights; capitalism in the past has very often reversed this evaluation.

The need for a unified, national plan is evident to all. In the spring of 1938 about twenty million were receiving one kind of relief or another. Having had sufficient experience, the nation should now be able to develop a flexible public-works program of useful projects which will employ those able to work. If the utility of projects be stressed, one can justify the additional cost of work relief compared with direct relief. Grants to the states for direct relief seem inevitable, but they must be provided on the basis of a definite formula, rather than on the basis of one man's judgment. Federal funds spent by the states should be subject to supervision, that is, standards must be set up nationally. If work relief is to be under state direction, it must be financed separately; if work relief and direct relief are financed together, most states will revert to direct relief exclusively. Federal standards should be set for administration of any relief program on a merit

basis, otherwise petty politicians will be able to dominate such welfare measures as they have in the past. A federal system is the best solution.

Four more federal programs remain to be considered. In describing them we shall say something about the general problem involved as well as the programs devised. These programs are: the transient program, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and housing.

IV. Other Federal Programs

1. THE TRANSIENT PROGRAM

There will always be transients in a country where the advantages of far-off places are stressed as they have been in the United States. Restless youth, the chronically sick looking for a more suitable climate, casual workers, and deserters have always formed a small but vital army going from place to place, without much sense of direction and without any particular objectives. Some of them work at odd jobs from time to time but in general do not remain very long in one place. Two factors are responsible for this: the attitude of local communities toward transients, and the fact that the psychological motivations for transiency are not always the same as the rationalizations advanced by those who wander. Thus the deserter of wife and children may explain his absence from home by saying that he worked in the mines and developed a cough which made it imperative that he seek outdoor work.

On the other hand, there are in this group many sincere, courageous individuals who are following the normal human impulse to better their condition. In a time of depression, the transient problem becomes severely aggravated: the stresses and strains are more pronounced, industrial opportunities vanish, irritations are multiplied, and many find, in going from place to place, a spirit of adventure and a surcease from their worries. Young boys, out of school but unable to find work, become restless and eventually leave home to try to find work elsewhere. Negroes during a bad crop season move northward from the South. Dispossessed families from the poor sections of the country go from city to city on the nebulous theory that there must be a job somewhere.

Failure of Local Programs

Municipal and private efforts to relieve transiency have been notably unsuccessful. If the standard of care is reasonably high, the good word is passed along and there is an influx of transients to that location. The restrictive settlement laws of the states and the general attitude of the

citizens of various communities have formulated a "passing on" policy, whereby individuals are merely given an opportunity to stay overnight and then resume their journey. Transients are unable to receive the same kind of treatment as residents of the community, since most state laws restrict assistance given to "nonresidents." Legal settlement for poor-relief purposes is usually obtained after one year of continuous residence in a community, although some states have even longer periods. Residence is lost through absence, so that many transients do not have legal settlement anywhere. If a man leaves Michigan, goes to California, and stays there two years, he loses his Michigan settlement after one year's absence and has no settlement in California, where three years' residence is required. The "passing on" policy has encouraged wandering rather than meeting the problem. Such publicized states as California and Florida have borne the brunt of the burden. It was estimated in 1931 that 1,200 penniless and homeless persons each day crossed the state line into California. In that state, work camps were established, but the state treasury was unable to bear the burden for any great length of time.

The Federal Program

In recognition of the problem, the Federal Transient Relief Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration was organized in September, 1933, establishing "treatment centers" in 250 cities and 350 work camps in rural areas. The purpose of the "treatment centers" was to provide individualized case-work services for those who wanted such assistance. Youths were provided transportation to their homes when that seemed to be the best solution. The policy was not repressive in nature, and a transient was allowed to stay overnight and go on his way if he wished. In the work camps, a stipend of one dollar a week was given as spending money, and each transient worked thirty hours weekly. The peak load under care was in February, 1935, when more than 300,000 persons were receiving assistance. The federal program was discontinued in the fall of 1935, and it was assumed incorrectly that the problem would yield to the stabilizing influence of the W.P.A. The transient program proved two things: that the transients were little different from the rest of the unemployed, and that they were good workmen.

The federal program of 1933–1935 was important in that this was the first attempt to deal with transiency on a federal basis. The withdrawal of this program was a distinct backward step. Since its abandonment there have been a return to the "passing on" policy and a re-establishment of

repressive methods of treatment. A national committee on the care of transients and homeless has been assisting in the development of statewide programs, but these have not been notably successful except in Michigan. It is apparent that the nation must return eventually to a federal program, since national treatment should exist for a problem that is national in scope.

The problems of transient youth must be met adequately. They constitute a potential menace, for the shiftless, nomadic life does not create attitudes consistent with good citizenship. Stabilizing of this group is a social responsibility. Repressive measures serve only to aggravate the problem and are responsible for the fact that many of these youths develop antisocial means of living. They feel that society has declared war, and the instinct to fight back is very strong. One may say, "Well, they should know enough to stay at home." This is no answer to the problem; the fact is that they are roaming from place to place, and, whether they should be at home or not, the situation must be dealt with as it exists. To be sure, job security at home would keep many from wandering, but, after transiency begins, steps to treat the problem must be taken. The failure to establish an operative national program is unreasonable and costly in terms of human waste.

2. THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The C.C.C. was established in April, 1933, for the purpose of reaching unemployed young men before they became transients. The program was designed to build up the health and renew the courage of unemployed youths by the helpful experience of working and playing together. The work performed is essentially a conservation program for national and state forests, with emphasis upon prevention, especially of floods and soil erosion. In the first two years of the existence of the C.C.C. more than a million young men aged 17 to 25 were enrolled in the camps. The program is something of a makeshift because it provides work only for a temporary period of either six months or one year, and then returns the young men to the communities from which they came, improved in health and in morale, but usually facing the same deteriorating influences.

About five million persons in the 16–25 age group (one fourth of the total number) were out of school and unemployed as late as the spring of 1935, and nearly three million of them were on relief. Since the C.C.C. program provides only for boys and only for those who do not wish to continue in school, it is obvious to many that it is but a step toward the solution of a problem and not the panacea for all problems

of youth. The C.C.C. has been the least criticized of all federal programs, mainly because the youths assisted are so obviously in need of help, and because the work projects have been useful. In the majority of cases, eligibility for relief has been a requirement for enrollment, and the earnings of twenty-five dollars monthly are sent to dependent relatives. The ability of these young men to assist their families by this means has given many a feeling of stability and improved morale. The healthful work and discipline of the camps have given many "a new lease on life." This program with certain modifications may become a permanent phase of our national life. Camp programs can be utilized for vocational training on an extensive basis and can provide a stimulating experience as a transition from school to work.

3. THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The N.Y.A. was created on June 26, 1935, by an executive order as part of the Works Progress Administration. The N.Y.A. has four distinct objectives: (1) to provide funds for the part-time employment of needy school, college, and graduate students between the ages of 16 and 25; (2) to provide funds for the part-time employment on work projects of young persons, chiefly from relief families, between 18 and 25 years of age, the projects being designed not only to provide valuable work experience but to benefit youth generally and the communities in which they live; (3) to encourage the establishment of job-training, counseling, and placement services for youth; (4) to encourage the development and extension of constructive leisure-time activities.

The program is operated in conjunction with the advice of a national advisory committee composed of thirty-two leaders of education, business, finance, labor, and youth. Each state program is administered by a state administrator and his advisory committee, representing various interests in the state. The peak month of assistance was in April, 1937, and during that time, under the student-aid program, nearly half a million young persons were receiving assistance in 20,000 secondary schools and 1,600 colleges and universities. About three fifths of the total N.Y.A. budget for 1936–1937 was set aside for the work-projects program. The work is done at hourly wage rates prevailing in the community, but the number of hours is limited to approximately one third of those allowed locally by the W.P.A. Under the student-aid program, the average monthly grant is $6 each for those attending high school, $15 each for those attending college, and $25 to $30 each for those doing post-graduate college work. The total provided yearly is about $50,000,000, the bulk of the funds going to the student-aid program. The utilization

of state and local advisory committees in the administration of the N.Y.A. program has enabled it to function effectively, since, in the last analysis, the success of any program of this kind depends upon local appreciation of the situation, and this in turn may rest upon local participation in the program. There are many who bewail the implied subsidy to education in this program, but the conditions definitely demanded a program of this type. Thousands have been able to continue in school who otherwise would be compelled to stay out of school and thus add to the already flooded labor market. The work projects have provided good training for employment, but the age limit of 18 has made some difficulty since many who are out of school and not working are 16 and 17 years of age. It may be suggested that the fault is not with the program as such, but rather that the legal school-leaving age is too low in many states. However, the program should be made more flexible so as to apply to the existing situations in the states.

4. HOUSING

In our large cities, private capital has failed to provide *adequate* housing at a cost within the reach of the average wage-earner, making it necessary for him to live in slum areas. Many cities which have tenement laws on their ordinance books have failed to enforce them, and reasonable estimates place at one or two millions the number of families living in housing conditions which are best described as deplorable.

A phase of this situation which deserves emphasis is overcrowding, with all its concomitant problems in terms of inadequate home life, such as the driving of children into the streets for their recreation and the difficulties put in the way of courtship. There are no statistics concerning the toll which grime and drabness take in terms of thwarted human desires. It is to be recognized that the right to private property is a natural right, and those who live in substandard housing conditions not only do not have the power with which to purchase private property, but are deprived of the enjoyment of any kind of property and, in fact, are made miserable by the circumstances under which they are forced to live. It is reasonable to suppose that this dreariness is responsible for keeping many apathetic and sullen.

It is true that many families try to make their houses habitable, and there is a great deal of pathos in the gaily colored pictures on the wall and the flower pot in the window which, by some kind of mesmerism, are supposed to relieve the drabness; in most cases, they simply emphasize it. In spite of the laws, windowless rooms are all too common, and many families are still without the private use of a toilet. Stairways

are often narrow and dark, and the hallways are cramped and dirty. Catherine Bauer tersely summarizes the situation:

> The combined efforts of speculative builders, building and loan associations, and individuals building for themselves, cannot supply a new dwelling at a price which even half the population can pay. And the buildings which they do construct are for the most part either built-in slums, or so badly laid out and constructed as to constitute incipient "blighted areas" from the start. The net result is that the American Standard of Living today, even in times of "prosperity," is one of the lowest in the western world with respect to light, air, facilities for group living, and even basic sanitation.[6]

Need for Public Housing

It is trite to say that there are *housing problems* rather than a housing problem. The concern here is with the housing problems which relate to the low-income group only, that group which cannot pay for adequate housing. An editorial in the Chicago *Tribune,* April 17, 1938, presented the attitude that housing could not be very bad since few were frozen to death during the winter. Any standard which considers simply provision against freezing does not belong in a modern conception of the problem. A standard applicable to human beings rather than to animals should be considered. This is another phase of our materialistic development. Housing that provides only protection against cold is not necessarily good housing for human beings. The demands of social justice may not be ignored. Theoretically, thousands could be housed in huge, heated warehouses, but this would not satisfy human needs. To determine housing adequacy by statistics of those frozen to death is to ignore any concept of the dignity of man.

Federal Programs

There have been two distinct federal programs dealing with low-cost housing, the Public Works Administration Housing Division, begun in 1934, and the United States Housing Authority, which superseded the former. The P.W.A. program was on a demonstration basis, and some mistakes were made which have been dwelt on rather widely by the press as a condemnation of all public housing. Tenancy was restricted to persons able to pay the rent, and preference was given to families with children who were occupying unfit quarters. In some cases the finished projects were more expensive than originally planned, and in others private contractors did unsatisfactory work. These criticisms are largely justified, but they should be reserved for the single

[6] *Modern Housing* (Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1934), page 242.

program rather than applied to all public housing. Furthermore, it should be recalled that this P.W.A. money went farther in effect than direct-relief money.

The United States Housing Authority was created under the Wagner-Steagall Act in 1937, for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the eradication of slums, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income. The act provides assistance to states and their subdivisions by loans and subsidies to the amount of $500,000,000 over a three-year period. It is obvious that this program is not a housing cure-all. It will not eradicate all slums, since the amount of money is vastly insufficient. But it will serve as a demonstration of what can be done.

The United States Housing Authority is often confused with two other government programs having to do with housing, the H.O.L.C. and the F.H.A. The Home Owners Loan Corporation was created in 1933 for the purpose of granting long-term mortgage loans at low interest rates to those home-owners who were in danger of losing their homes through foreclosure of mortgages. The Federal Housing Act was designed to stimulate private building by offering guaranteed mortgages at low interest to individual home-builders. Both these programs are still functioning. The United States Housing Authority, on the other hand, is concerned with financing large-scale public housing, initiated in local communities under the jurisdiction of proper legal bodies. Under the authority, no aid may be given to private individuals or corporations. The Housing Authority is permanent—the only permanent agency in the public-housing field. Its success will depend on the co-operation of local housing authorities. The policy of promoting public housing through subsidies and other devices goes back to Europe, and especially to England, where the first housing law of this kind was passed in 1852. England has had long experience with public housing and has made great strides in providing good homes for low-income workers. It is a significant point that England, with nearly a century of experience, still advocates and utilizes public housing.

Mention has been made of *housing problems.* One of these is the housing problem of persons who can pay reasonable rents of $30–$35 monthly, that is, those who earn $150–$160 a month (it is generally accepted that one fifth of one's income is the desirable proportion for rent). Some attempts have been made by so-called limited-dividend corporations and other private corporations to provide good housing for this class at a reasonable cost. Projects in New York and Washington, D.C., have been quite successful. There is need for more private

capital to provide homes for those in the income class mentioned, but costs must be kept low by low interest rates and large-scale production. Recently the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company announced plans for a model community in Brooklyn to house 50,000 persons in this income group, and this may point the way to a new trend in the private-housing field. It should offer a safe permanent investment of large funds such as insurance-company capital. After all, why not invest money in houses as well as railroad bonds?

The most easily overlooked fact about housing is that improvements in any income level tend to assist lower income groups. For example, if 1,000 new homes are built in the class that brings a rent of $8 per room per month, those who move in will vacate other spaces, which will generally be available at rates lower than formerly. This approach is widely advocated at present, but it is not a solution for the lowest income class according to any study made thus far.

There is need for thorough study of the housing needs of each community. The slums must go, and the nation can no longer afford to ignore their existence. An enlightened social philosophy cannot longer endure the squalor and the misery of the very poor. As a matter of fact, public housing must do what private housing has failed to accomplish. It is a matter of good business to do so. A Department of Commerce survey in 1934 showed one example of this. In a slum area in Cleveland lived 2½ per cent of the city's population. Yet in this area 21 per cent of the murders were committed, 26 per cent of the disorderly houses were located, and 6.8 per cent of the juvenile delinquency was centered. A mayor's housing committee of Hartford, Connecticut, recently showed that the slum areas, which occupy one tenth of the area of the city, house one fourth of the population. From these slum areas come 51 per cent of all tuberculosis cases, 57 per cent of all juvenile delinquency, and a majority of all relief cases. These examples are typical of many cities and illustrate the cost of not doing something about housing.

One aspect of public housing is that through it demonstration can be made not only of low-cost housing, but of community planning. The recent development of "green-belt" communities, described already, illustrates this. Green-belt communities are located where land is cheap, but adjacent to cities. They are planned communities with ample light, air, and recreation space. Highways skirt the community, rather than pass through, and forested areas (the green belt) encircle it. Those in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and in Maryland are already occupied, and present an example of planned living. The simple fact is that

private building of "tailor-made" homes is not possible for the average wage-earner. Public housing must to some extent help to solve this problem.)

V. The Social Security Act

The term "Social Security Act" has become a national catchword. In evaluating the act one must take care to avoid partisan or political bias, for many problems are understood not in themselves but only as they relate to political and sectional beliefs founded in prejudice and misrepresentation. Since the details of the act are summarized elsewhere,[7] the stress here will be on the nature of the act, that is, what it is trying to accomplish. To understand this, we must examine briefly the act itself and the extent of the services provided, in the light of the problems of poverty already discussed. In the next chapter the application of the act to specific classes will be considered.

It is assumed that there is no question of the need for some program to provide the necessities of life which individuals cannot provide for themselves because of lack of income. The aged, the blind, and dependent children must be cared for. Perhaps the major question is: Who is to provide for these unfortunates? Private charity cannot take care of the bulk of these problems. Individual states have been consistent in their failure to establish strong programs for any group of dependents. Seemingly federal participation is the only solution for two reasons: the base of taxation is broader, and a unified program which does not discriminate against any group is possible only through federal participation. Theoretically, all states could uniformly provide plans for social security, but actually they have never come anywhere near doing so, partly because of general disagreement as to a plan, and partly because of the fear of costs.

It has been observed that the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 reversed a previous federal policy regarding welfare expenditures to states in an emergency; the Social Security Act made permanent this new policy, namely, that the federal government is responsible for the welfare of all the people, including material assistance to those in need. Apparently this development has been both inevitable and desirable. It would seem to be far better to concentrate in one body responsibility for development of an adequate, uniform, and sound program for public welfare than to have forty-eight differing plans presenting a jigsaw pattern with social insecurity predominating. This does not mean

[7] Social Security Board, *Compilation of the Social Security Laws* (Social Security Board, Washington, D.C., 1940). This includes the original Act and the 1939 amendments. (Pamphlet, 92 pp., free.)

that the states have no responsibility. Through financial assistance and the setting of standards the federal government simply assists the states to meet their obligations better. Furthermore, it is hard to see where objectionable features such as might be involved in federal control of education can creep into social-security legislation. In regard to the question of increased activities by all governments, which is certainly part of this problem, John A. Lapp, speaking in better times, said:

> If we should follow the guidance of the believers in *laissez-faire* and shackle our legislatures more than we have already done, we would find in a generation that what is left of liberty would not be worth fighting for. Our only hope for individual freedom is the constant advance of social control and the achievement of social justice. Otherwise man will be crushed beneath the wheels of the economic Juggernaut.
>
> The discrediting of representative government by the defenders of autocracy—the Mussolini crew and their panting sycophants in this country—the ridiculous criticism of legislative bodies; the cry to the uninformed against excessive legislation; the dismantling of the regulatory commissions and the handing over of important parts of the machinery and powers of government to predatory interests; the attempt to decry public management of almost everything out of which private gain could be made, even though at the public expense, are all in full sway. Somehow prosperity has come to be associated with autocracy, and patriotism has become a brother to profiteers.[8]

The Social Security Act grew out of the investigations and recommendations of the committee on economic security appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The act provides for three distinct types of governmental services:

1. Social insurance
   Old-age benefits
   Unemployment compensation
2. Public assistance—federal grants in aid to the states for:
   Old-age assistance
   Aid to dependent children
   Aid to the blind
3. Other health and welfare services
   Public-health work
   Maternal and child health
   Services to crippled children
   Rural child-welfare services
   Vocational rehabilitation

The Social Security Board administers the public-assistance and social-insurance programs; the best-qualified federal bureaus administer the

[8] *Justice First* (The Century Co., New York, 1928), page 184.

other services. In this section the concern is especially with social insurance and public assistance.

I. SOCIAL INSURANCE

The social-insurance provisions of the act, for unemployment compensation and old-age benefits, provide a preventive program rather than a curative plan.

Unemployment Compensation

The unemployment-compensation plan is a federal-state co-operative system which imposes a federal excise tax on the payrolls of employers of eight or more persons within twenty or more weeks in a calendar year, excluding certain occupations, such as education, civil service, and agricultural labor. Each employer is allowed a credit of not more than 90 per cent for contributions made to state unemployment-compensation systems which meet certain standards. Thus no employer who contributes to a state system is penalized by having to compete with employers who pay no tax. All must pay the tax, and this is an advantage, since states need not hesitate to establish compensation plans on the ground of discriminating against employers in favor of competitors in other states. Employment offices are used with the plan.

Most state plans provide payments to the able-to-work unemployed up to $15 weekly for twelve or more weeks. This is far from being a cure-all, especially in times of a prolonged depression, when savings are likely to be exhausted; however, such schemes should absorb the shock of shorter periods of unemployment by avoiding stoppage of all income. These plans provide a small sum during a readjustment period and so insure the worker who may be able to find work again in a few weeks. At the present time all states have some provision approved by the Social Security Board, and over 28,000,000 workers are in jobs covered by the plan. The plan must be understood in the light of what it tries to do—absorb the shock of sudden unemployment. No one has a right to expect more than the plan is supposed to do. It must be emphasized that this is not a relief plan, but an insurance system based on compulsory contributions to a reserve to be used in time of unemployment.

Old-Age Benefits

This provision of the Social Security Act is very frequently misunderstood. This, like the unemployment feature, is an insurance pro-

gram, not relief. The basis of relief is need, but in the insurance or benefit plan persons who inherit a million dollars are eligible. The plan establishes an old-age reserve account in the treasury of the United States from which will be paid, beginning January 1, 1940, an old-age benefit in the form of a monthly life income to eligible wage-earners after they have reached the age of 65. Under certain conditions death benefits and lump-sum payments are made. Benefits are payable on the basis of the total amount of wages received from covered employment. There is no need to go into the mathematics of payment except to say that the maximum monthly benefit is $85, which would require total wages of $130,000 at the rate of not more than $3,000 from one employer annually. To give another example, a man who began work at $1,000 yearly after the act became effective and who earned that amount for forty-five years would have earned $45,000. He would then receive, from the age of 65 to his death, a monthly income of $50 in checks from the treasury.

The purpose of the old-age benefits is to provide a definite and certain income to workers for security against the vicissitudes of old age. There are 7,500,000 persons over 65 years of age at the present time, and, though many resources are available to those who are in need, these resources are painfully limited, as we shall see in a following chapter. Under the Social Security Act, by January, 1941, over 50,000,000 workers were participating in the insurance program, even though a large group made up of agricultural workers, domestics, and others are not yet included in the provisions of the act.

The social-insurance provisions of the act mark the beginning of a new era in our government's recognition of social problems. As has been indicated previously, these programs are mainly preventive in nature; in other words, short periods of unemployment and old-age insecurity are to be met henceforth by plans worked out well in advance. Thus a worker will have some protection against unemployment as well as a monthly income in his old age.

Some criticisms have been made of the unemployment and benefit provisions. An analysis of these would require more exhaustive treatment than can be given here. In general, however, it is well to keep in mind that this legislation is new and, like the similar legislation of some European nations, will no doubt require considerable modification before reaching perfection. However it may be modified on the basis of experience, fundamentally the principle of social insurance is sound. No country has abandoned it after it has been given a fair trial.

2. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Unlike social-insurance plans, public assistance is basically relief; that is, eligibility is based on need. There are three categories of assistance: aid to the needy aged, aid to the needy blind, and aid to dependent children. Since we shall treat these as categories of dependency separately in another section, it is sufficient for our purposes here to show the basis for assistance to the states and the extent of services now provided. The other phases of the Social Security Act will be explained in conjunction with other chapters.

The grants to the states are made on the basis of reports submitted to the Social Security Board by the state. In these reports the total expenditure, the amount available from state and local sources, and the estimated number of persons eligible for the particular form of assistance under consideration, are given. For the needy aged and the blind, the federal government makes grants equal to half of the total expenditure of the state and its local units up to $40, although an additional 5 per cent of this sum may be granted for assistance payments or for administrative expenses or for both. These grants are not to be used in making payments to persons under 65 or to inmates of public institutions. For aid to dependent children, the grant is one half of the total state and local expenditure for both assistance payments and administration up to $18 a month for the first child in the family and $12 for each additional child in the same family.

The Extent of Services

In presenting some statistics concerning the extent of services reported by the Social Security Board for January, 1938, we must point out that these statistics are useful only in order to show the magnitude of the problems dealt with by the act. In examining them we must keep in mind that many recipients of this assistance were without help previously, and that, though the average grants under the various titles are, with few exceptions, low, the grants are supplemented in many cases by other sources of income. Of course, these statistics change monthly.

The expenditure for 1,600,000 needy aged for January, 1938, was $131,000,000, with an average payment of $19.50, ranging from $14.53 in Mississippi to $39.60 in Colorado; payments to the blind for the same month totaled over $1,000,000 to 44,800 recipients and averaged $25.54, with a range from $9.11 in Arkansas to $48.06 in California; over 500,000 children in 218,000 families received $7,000,000, with an average family payment of $32.06, ranging from $10.45 in Arkansas to $61.18 in

Massachusetts. The needy aged were assisted in all jurisdictions; thirty-eight jurisdictions made payments to the blind; forty jurisdictions gave aid to dependent children in families.

In the field of public assistance the Social Security Act, by removing the above categories from the general outdoor relief rolls, would have marked a forward step even if nothing else had been accomplished. There can be no doubt that these federal provisions for assistance to the states are of vital importance to the development of a sound program of public assistance throughout the United States. In general, it is agreed that the public-assistance plans under the Social Security Act are superior to those of the past, and that there is a higher standard of care, better administration of funds, and a more thorough analysis of individual cases under the present plans than formerly. It is to be regretted that the categories which are eligible for public assistance are not wider in scope, for there still remains a considerable residue of persons who are in need and who are without adequate assistance. The chronically ill comprise one group who might very readily become a further category or special class.

Some states, notably Illinois and Oklahoma, have allowed political interference to sabotage the principles of the act. This has been partially remedied by the withdrawal of federal funds for old-age assistance until better state administration is assured.

It is not the purpose of this section to deal with the economics of the Social Security Act, as, for instance, the wisdom or necessity of piling up such a large reserve fund. No doubt the present law has deficiencies both in theory and in operation, but it must be remembered that this is a new program which can be changed as flaws become evident. No doubt subsequent modifications will perfect the present structure of the act; it is now permanent, doubts concerning its constitutionality having been removed.

The Future

A bird's-eye view of the present relief situation shows four types of relief: (1) the old-fashioned general outdoor relief for families in their homes; (2) almshouse relief for the dependent, chiefly the aged; (3) categorical relief (for definite groups, as the aged, the blind, dependent children); (4) work relief (W.P.A.). The trend has been toward federal participation on a wider basis and with more permanent programs. It would seem as if the line of distinction between relief and social insurance will become more plainly marked in the future. General outdoor relief for families in their homes will probably be improved under

standards similar to those provided for public assistance under the Social Security Act. Almshouses will be transformed into infirmaries for the aged and chronically ill who cannot be cared for in their homes. Categories of relief will be broadened to include the sick. Work relief will be developed into a long-time planned program of useful public works.

The need of private charity and of private organizations for charity will always persist. Poverty in most of its forms will be with us for a long time. Monsignor John O'Grady, who as secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities has long been recognized as an authority on social reform, sums up the experiences of the past and points out some of the problems to be faced in the future poor relief in the following observation:

> Gradually we have eliminated the distinction between poverty due to industrial hazards and poverty due to forces within the individual and the family. For a long time we have believed that social protection is needed against the hazards growing out of the industrial system, like industrial accidents, sickness, old age, unemployment. Much of our thinking in recent years, however, would eliminate all distinction between non-industrial and industrial poverty. There is a feeling that poverty is poverty and must be dealt with as a unit through a rounded public program, and therefore we must break down all distinctions between classes on the basis of the origin of their needs. This policy may bring us back to an old poor law system. It may eliminate private agencies from the picture, lead to the spreading of public funds very thinly over a vast area, and finally undermine family responsibility. If we were fatalists, we should be inclined to surrender to the powerful forces that are drawing us in this direction. The element of economy plays an important part and, in the last analysis, may be the controlling element. It may be less expensive to use Federal, state, and local funds to give everyone a dole than to build up decent systems of workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, public employment, old age benefits, and to let states, local communities, and private agencies struggle with the poverty that is left over. But if we are driven by the force of economy we know that in the long run the poor will be the sufferers.[9]

(See the references at the end of Chapter XVI.)

[9] *Catholic Charities Review*, Volume 21, December, 1937, page 304. Used by permission.

CHAPTER XVI

THE TREATMENT OF THE DEPENDENT CLASSES

In our historical examination of poverty we observed that special appeals were made by certain classes of dependents, and, consequently, that individual methods of treatment have developed. Some groups of dependents were withdrawn from the almshouse and cared for in special institutions. Others were taken from the rolls of the overseer of the poor and placed in separate categories receiving differentiated care. In this chapter there will be a necessarily brief summary of the treatment of these dependent classes, emphasizing questions dealing with the social implications of the problems discussed, the adequacy of care, and the next steps in treatment. The student will note that many references were made to these classes of dependents in previous chapters, particularly in the discussion of the causes and effects of poverty. Here the relationship of these conditions will be presented from the viewpoint of distinct programs for care, in contrast to the former discussion, relating the status of the dependent classes to poverty itself.

It would be impractical to discuss all programs relating to the care of the dependent, and our attention will be focused on eight special classes: the aged, the sick, the disabled, the mentally disordered, the mentally deficient, the epileptics, the blind, and the deaf. Naturally, more space is allotted to some problems than to others, chiefly because of their current importance. The problems of the aged, the sick, and the feeble-minded are considered somewhat extensively. The growing importance of the aged as a "pressure group" because of the political activities of Townsend clubs, the attention given plans for old-age pensions in this country, and widespread comment concerning the aged in industry combine to make this topic an important one. The problem of the sick presented previously, namely, the inaccessibility of medical care, demands some attention, especially as we consider next steps. The widespread interest in the feeble-minded makes this subject very important, especially to Catholics, since the plans suggested by non-Catholics for care of the feeble-minded so often involve the moral issues of birth control, sterilization, and euthanasia.

I. The Aged

At the present time approximately 6 per cent of the total population is 65 years of age and over. Statisticians and economists agree that, if the present trend continues, this may increase to 10 per cent in the next two or three decades. The number of the aged in the country is increasing because of two reasons: (1) a lowered death rate among the young, particularly in infancy, brings many more to old age than formerly; (2) the decrease in immigration has gradually changed this country from one of young adults to one with a large aged population. Let us examine now a specific implication of the present situation of the aged: insecurity. The problem of physical support of the dependent aged may not be considered apart from the mental-hygiene problems of the aged. These may be caused by conditions other than dependency, or by dependency itself, but it must be recognized that problems of dependency aggravate other conditions. Insecurity is the characteristic problem of the aged in an industrial civilization in which a man is physically young at fifty and industrially old at the same age. Gladys Fisher describes the plight of the aged today:

> At the same time that the number of those 65 years of age and over is pyramiding, we find the employment field for this age group is shrinking rapidly—and from a variety of causes. The home has lost, to a large extent, its place as a producing unit, so the less strenuous jobs there are no longer available for grandfather and grandmother. We are becoming an industrial instead of an agricultural nation. Fifty years ago half of our employed population earned their livelihood in agriculture; today this proportion is reduced to a quarter. This change affects the aged directly, since agriculture employs five times as many of the aged as industry. In industry itself the opportunities are decreasing. As machine methods prevail, there is less demand for trained skills and experience. Industry is geared to a rapid pace; old age tends to slow people down. Industry requires mental adaptability, and the older person is considered more rigid. Moreover, the introduction of pensions, group insurance, and workmen's compensation makes the employment of the older person more costly to the employer, even though his wage is the same as that of a younger man.[1]

One phase of a lengthening lifespan is the increasingly complex problems which the aged must face. Homes are becoming smaller, and the present trend to modern apartments has special significance. In an industrial civilization, the aged lack the dignity which was theirs in an agrarian environment. Formerly the torch-bearers of tradition, the aged now tend to become outworn, discarded tools. Faced with all

[1] *Mental Hygiene in Old Age* (Family Welfare Association of America, New York, 1937), page 28.

the psychological and physiological manifestations of senility, the "old folks" in many cases are considered obstacles to the progress of families, and are often the objects of indifference and rebuff. While it may be gratuitously assumed that there is no glory in a poverty-stricken old age, it would be well to examine the situation of the aged in regard to industrial superannuation before discussing the ways of caring for aged dependents.

There is disagreement among authors regarding the age one must reach to be classified as aged. Although chronological age is a relatively weak index, in general we may assume that the social problems affecting the aged begin at 65 or before. We can understand this by considering unemployment. Unemployment, especially industrial displacement, is a specific problem of the aged. Those who reach a given age may not be too old for employment in various plants, but their prospects for immediate work in competition with younger workers are not favorable. Above 45 a smaller number progressively is employed in each five-year age group, except in jobs where a specific requirement is considerable experience. The problem is most acute in highly industrialized areas and is not serious in rural territory. It must be admitted that studies of this question of industrial superannuation do not give a reliable index as to the incidence of the problem, but may be said to indicate a trend. This trend is definitely against the aging worker, especially when he is unemployed. His chances for re-employment are far less than those of the more flexible younger worker. Unionization has retarded this trend to some extent because of union emphasis on seniority rights. Consider this example: An industrial worker with thirty years of service in the same plant becomes a union member during an "organization" of the industry by industrial-union leaders. As a general rule, when lay-offs come, this worker cannot be let out until others with fewer service years are dropped from the payroll. If a plant closes entirely and then reopens, the older worker must be re-employed first. This way has offered more protection to workers than mere dependence on an employer's good-will. The authoritative *Social Security in America* summarizes the situation:

> The general conviction that the older worker finds difficulty in either obtaining or keeping employment, and that his problem is a growing one, is supported by findings of several official investigations, such as those made in New York, California, and Maryland. Although such graphic phrases as "old at 40" and the "scrap heap at 45" suggest an exaggeration of the actual facts, there is undeniable evidence of the progressive use of maximum hiring-age limits in industry. These limits automatically cut off employment op-

portunities of men who find themselves competing in the labor market in middle life. There seems to be no proof of a general policy of dismissal of older workers. It is likely that the statement made in the New York report on the older worker in industry is a fair statement of the general dismissal and employment system, to wit: If the worker has reached middle age with a long service record, he is less likely to be dismissed than the younger worker. This is because he possesses positive value for his firm. If, however, the older employee has served only short periods in the employ of any one firm in his years under 40, he is just as likely to be dismissed as any younger worker. In all cases the older man is far less apt than the younger worker to secure new employment.[2]

I. THE EXTENT OF DEPENDENCY

The exact extent of dependency in old age is not known, although all attempts to measure it show that the rate of dependency is very high. Perhaps the simplest method of measuring old-age dependency is to find out the annual incomes of old people and determine the proportion receiving less than $300 annually, which is the customary dividing line for dependency. Most studies show that half of those 65 and over have annual incomes below $300. Other studies have considered property ownership as a measure of dependency, setting $3,000 as a danger line. Obviously, these studies are difficult to evaluate because of the many questions involving accurate estimates as to true value of property, especially since property valued at $3,000 may not be salable at a given time. Property studies show that about 60 per cent of those over 65 either own property worth less than $3,000 or own no property. About one fifth of those aged 65 and over have no income or property, and this figure is verified by the present public-assistance statistics, which show that one fourth of the population 65 and over receive old-age assistance. In summary, therefore, we may say that dependency among the aged is a serious social problem, as indicated by all studies made, and we may conclude that at least half and probably two thirds of the aged are dependent upon either relatives and friends or public pensions and private charities. When one considers this in the light of the widespread poverty likewise affecting relatives and friends, the situation becomes more acute. The following examination of treatment of the aged shows that the plight of the aged has gradually become a matter of public concern.

Attitudes toward the problem of old age, to a considerable extent, determine treatment of it. For many years society insisted upon personal thrift as a guarantee of independence in old age. Today estimates

[2] *Social Security in America* (Washington, D.C., 1937), page 144.

of average incomes prove that the purchase of endowment policies through private insurance companies is beyond the reach of the majority of wage-earners, and, furthermore, that on existing wages it is difficult to budget for a period of old age, especially since length of life cannot be predetermined. The former social philosophy was influenced by fear of taxing the thrifty to reward spendthrifts and by the belief that children should support their parents. This attitude was obviously partially correct in our former agrarian civilization, but it is inconsistent with present conditions. Of course, nobody should reward the improvident, but even the improvident must be given subsistence in old age, and it must be recalled that determining improvidence is difficult; for example, should the gullible who lost money in the stock-market crash of 1929 be called improvident? Children should support their parents, but not at the expense of food for their own children. An aged person who becomes an addition to a low-income family may reduce that family to poverty, since in the low-income group, as we have seen, small expenditures may seriously affect family budgets.

2. LEGISLATION FOR THE AGED

The gradual realization that these social attitudes concerning thrift and the support of children did not solve the problem of the aged, together with the exposure of unwholesome and costly almshouse conditions, resulted in a growing demand for noninstitutional provisions for the aged. The first step in this direction came in the demands for state legislation for old-age pensions urged by the American Association for Labor Legislation and the fraternal orders, mainly the Eagles. Led by Montana in 1923, state after state passed such legislation, generally providing monthly grants of $30 or less for citizens of long residence in the community who had small assets and no relatives financially able to assist them. By the middle of 1935 thirty-five states had passed such legislation, usually providing for administration on a county basis. Even with inadequate, restricted laws, often without mandatory appropriations, 250,000 old people were assisted by the states.

The passage of the federal Social Security Act in 1935 marked the next step in old-age security. The total number of needy old persons in fifty jurisdictions receiving assistance under the Social Security Act on January 1, 1941, was 2,000,000. The lowest age limit in the various states is 65, and, until 1940, when the act made 65 the mandatory age, the pensions in many states were available only to those over 70. The operation of the Social Security Act makes more adequate treatment of the aged possible. The act has been described, but it will be advisable

here to summarize the old-age provisions. The Social Security Act attacks old-age dependency along two lines: (a) relief of present destitution (old-age assistance), and (b) prevention of future destitution (old-age benefit annuities). The old-age assistance program is based on federal grants in aid to the states and provides relief to the aged who have no other means of support. It is not a new plan, except for federal participation, but is simply an extension and unification of the state plans initiated more than a decade before.

The old-age benefits, or annuities, of the Social Security Act provide for those who reach a given age, a means of systematic protection against some of the vicissitudes of old age. The federal plan excludes certain groups such as agricultural laborers, servants in private homes, employees of the United States government, employees of the state or any other political subdivision, employees of a common carrier, and employees of nonprofit institutions operated for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes. The funds come from a payroll tax on employers and an earnings tax on employees, and the benefits will be payable after 1940. It must be emphasized that this annuity plan does not depend upon need; it is a universal contributory annuity and is applicable to those who have arrived at 65.

It must be pointed out that we have not developed an earthly paradise for the needy aged. The establishment of the federal program has been a stimulus to political reactionaries, who are loud in their criticism of old-age assistance. Political manipulation of the program has occurred here and there, but has been met by withdrawal of federal funds from erring states. However, the Survivors Insurance provisions in the 1939 amendments mark the beginning of what may well be a trend toward more adequate care by extending benefits to survivors of insured workers, and providing payments on the basis of number of children under sixteen in the family. One may anticipate the increasing adequacy of such provisions, and this should go a long way toward removing large numbers from our lists of public dependents. It is still impossible to determine what effect expanding public assistance will have on our Catholic institutions for the aged. Their social contribution has been impressive, the Little Sisters of the Poor in particular supporting fifty homes caring for more than 10,000 aged. Other Catholic institutions under religious auspices care for about 7,000 aged in ninety homes. The description of the work of the Little Sisters of the Poor by Monsignor John O'Grady is worth repeating here:

The story of the Little Sisters of the Poor in the United States is one of the most interesting chapters in American Catholic history. The rapid development of their work cannot be explained except as a reward for heroic and sanctified sacrifices. From a human standpoint it is an appealing service. The Little Sisters work and toil for the most neglected members of human society. . . .

The Little Sisters of the Poor are dedicated to the care of the aged poor. They have no desire to care for those who have saved in whole or in part for their old age. That may be the function of others. It is not theirs. If they find that an aged person has saved some money, they will not accept him until he has expended it.[3]

Whatever the developments in public assistance may be in the next few years, the Little Sisters of the Poor will find a place for their unusual services. They stand out as a wonderful example of the patience and humility characteristic of the religious orders in their care for the poor.

II. The Sick

In discussing the relationship of the treatment of the sick to dependency, we must recall four facts: (1) those in poverty have more sickness than those not in poverty; (2) care is not available to the poor in the same proportion as to the well-to-do; (3) many needless deaths occur in the homes of the poor because of the lack of medical care; (4) there is an almost complete lack of facilities for the chronic sick and for convalescent care.

In emphasizing the gravity of the situation, Edgar Sydenstricker states:

The plain fact must be faced that notwithstanding great advances in medicine and public-health protection, the American people are not so healthy as they have a right to be. Millions of them are suffering from diseases and thousands annually die from causes that are preventable through the use of existing scientific knowledge and the application of common social service.[4]

Having looked into the heart of the problem as it relates to dependency, let us examine the various resources available for care of the sick in the light of the total problem. Perhaps the situation is best presented by the answers to the following necessary questions, which relate not to dependency as such but to the larger problem of medical care of

[3] *Catholic Charities in the United States* (National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C., 1930), pages 226–227. Used by permission.

[4] "Health in the New Deal," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Volume 176, November, 1934, page 131.

the sick: (1) What is the present system of providing medical care? (2) Why is this problem of providing adequate care apparently unsolved? (3) What can we recommend as a solution to the problem, especially as it relates to the low-wage earner? We shall consider these questions in order, but in a necessarily brief manner.

I. THE PRESENT SYSTEM

There are two distinct kinds of service relating to health: (a) the public health services, largely preventive in nature, and (b) the private services, available on a fee basis, supplied by physicians, surgeons, hospitals, and nurses, the fee basis being modified by public and private organizations operating clinics, dispensaries, hospitals, and nursing services. The two different types of service are referred to commonly as "public health" and "medical care." Public health services are provided by public health departments in federal, state, and local governments, generally with legal powers to enforce laws which relate to public or community health, including those affecting such services as food and milk inspection and inspection of food-handlers, control of such conditions as typhoid fever, smallpox, and venereal diseases, and enforcement of quarantine and isolation laws. Public health activities, often under private auspices (that is, not tax-supported), in many cities have contributed outstandingly to solutions of definite problems such as tuberculosis. As witness to this work, the death rate per 100,000 of population from tuberculosis decreased from 209.1 in 1900 to 56.6 in 1934. It is generally admitted that the major factor in the reduction of our national death rate is the reduced death rate from preventable diseases during the past twenty years, especially diseases receiving attention from the United States Public Health Service and other public health bodies. Through these public health programs, research as to the causes of epidemic diseases has been carried on, and vaccines which remove the dread of certain plagues have been discovered.

In the field of medical care the situation is not so favorable. The fee basis has been a dismal failure when we consider the fact that medical care is not available to all equally, irrespective of ability to pay. As statistics given in a previous chapter show, the low-income group simply does not receive adequate medical care, despite the theoretical availability and accessibility of such care. The situation may be stated very bluntly: Under the present system the low-income group cannot receive medical care in proportion to their need of it because they cannot afford to pay for it. During 1932 and 1933 physicians and nurses were on relief because people who needed their specialized skills could not

employ them. In the height of the depression thousands were refused admittance to large public hospitals in our metropolitan communities, while at the same time thousands of beds were vacant in private hospitals. The strict fee basis has been on the way out for some time. The physicians have led the way by organizing in groups to provide common equipment, then developing "flat fees" for care in certain cases as compared with the fee-per-visit basis. Industrial firms have developed medical services for their employees, some of which are very extensive, such as the program of the Endicott-Johnson Company near Binghamton, N.Y. Yet these changes simply scratch the surface. Even the increased use of tax funds and private contributions for various kinds of service provide only emergency care for the most part, and there are many gaps in these programs. Why have we not solved this question?

2. THE COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE

The problem of providing medical care proportionate to need rather than on a basis of ability to pay has not been solved in this country for two reasons: (a) the fee basis is a gross assumption that the incidence of illness is proportionate to ability to pay, that is, that those who have no money do not become ill or, if they do, are readily cared for through "charity organizations"; (b) the reactionary attitude that a change in the present system would mean a breakdown of traditional medical responsibilities, this attitude being shared alike by most of the professional medical societies and by the "view with alarm" laymen.

We shall consider first the incidence of illness. Our surveys of income show that many could not pay even moderate costs of illness even if illness were predictable, which, of course, it is not. There are two costs in illness, the costs of care and the loss of income from wages. The irregular incidence of illness is shown by I. S. Falk:

> Unlike the costs of food, clothing, and shelter, the cost of medical care is determined only to a minor extent by regular, periodic, physiological need; it is dependent almost entirely upon the incidence of sickness and the receipt of medical care. The financial obligation for medical service would create no special problem if the average incidence of sickness applied with comparative regularity and certainty to each family or to each individual. How irregular the incidence actually is appears from the following figures. In a normal year, of all individuals:
>
> 47.1 per cent have no illness
> 32.2 per cent have 1 illness each
> 13.6 per cent have 2 illnesses each
> 4.8 per cent have 3 illnesses each
> 1.6 per cent have 4 illnesses each
> 0.7 per cent have 5 or more illnesses each

Variations like these recur year after year; but no individual or family can anticipate whether it will be the one to experience a year of life with little or no illness or the one that will be heavily loaded with the need for medical care.[5]

The fear that a change from the fee system would result in disaster to the medical profession is a prevalent and difficult hurdle. That the medical profession has been traditionally unfettered is true; but to say that any radical change in the fee system, especially the change referred to as "socialized medicine," would necessarily result in an objectionable form of "state medicine" in which all medical care would be governed by politicians, is a reckless statement. In the opinion of the authors, primary concern about what would happen if the fee system were modified simply begs the issue. The immediate question is: Does the present system need modification? If we decide that it does, then we are ready to consider the specific administration required to protect the profession and the patients under some new plan.

3. HEALTH INSURANCE

There is no panacea for all problems of medical care, but there is a way of providing costs of medical care for the low-income group on a basis that will not injure the professional relationship between the physician and the patient. To most students of the question, health insurance seems to be the next step here, an inevitable one and a necessary one. Insurance is the logical way to spread the risk when a large number of persons are exposed to a common risk entailing potential loss. The insurance principle is simply a distribution of loss based on reasonably exact calculation. Marine insurance, fire insurance, accident insurance, all are based on this principle. Furthermore, we have recognized that, when a large group of persons—the population of a state or nation—is subject to risk, then the state may measure the risk and pay the losses. This principle is seen in federal insurance of bank deposits up to $5,000, spreading the risk over all bank depositors rather than letting a few depositors suffer all the losses.

Sickness is measurable, since we know that 2 per cent of the people are sick at any one time and that sickness falls differently according to occupation, age, and sex. We know the total costs of sickness; we could develop a system similar to life insurance and spread the costs over the entire population. The British system of health insurance covering only wage-earners has been in existence for a quarter of a cen-

[5] "Fundamental Facts on the Costs of Medical Care," *The Quarterly Bulletin of the Milbank Memorial Fund*, Volume 11, Number 2, April, 1933, pages 6–7.

tury. It is a compulsory insurance plan, involving equal contributions of workers and employers and providing medical benefits limited to care from general practitioners. Workers who earn less than £250 ($1,000) annually are enrolled in the plan. Workers may choose their own physicians from a "panel," that is, a list of physicians who are co-operating with the plan. Workers may change from one physician to another, if dissatisfied, by notifying their local insurance committee. There are strong demands, approved both by the workers and by the medical societies, for an increase in the scope of benefits: the extension of benefits to dependents and the inclusion of hospitalization and the services of specialists in the types of medical care available. The British system, with fifteen million participants, is supplemented in its operation by voluntary hospital associations, and in some districts a majority of the population has complete coverage for all costs incidental to medical care. A summary of the benefit provisions of the system by Dr. Douglass W. Orr and Jean Walker Orr is given completely, not only because the British system is the most comprehensive European system but also because it takes the form which, it would seem, is most likely to be adopted here.

British Health-Insurance Benefits

(a) *Medical benefit* consists of medical care without payment of fees and of "proper and sufficient medicines" as well as various other medical and surgical supplies. It is limited to services within the competence of an average general practitioner—the doctor to be chosen by the insured person himself—but does not include midwifery or the care of conditions directly related to childbirth.

(b) *Sickness benefit* consists of a cash payment during incapacity for work "caused by some specific disease of bodily or mental disablement." This cash payment begins on the 4th day of illness and may continue for 26 weeks. It is paid in weekly checks from an Approved Society, but only upon the receipt of weekly certificates signed by the insured person's doctor and verifying the worker's incapacity. The statutory benefit is 15s. a week for men, 12s. a week for unmarried women, and 10s. a week for married women (about $3.75, $3 and $2.50 respectively in terms of dollar exchange but not of relative purchasing power). Well favored Approved Societies pay more than the statutory minimum.

(c) *Disablement benefit* is also a cash payment, just one half the amount of sickness benefit, paid weekly to insured persons who are incapacitated for work beyond 26 weeks and up to an indefinite period.

(d) *Maternity benefit* is another cash payment of £2 to an insured person whose wife has a baby. If the wife is herself an insured person, married to an insured person, this benefit is paid in respect of both husband and wife. An insured woman is eligible for sickness benefit in respect of incapacity for work due to pregnancy if there is some disabling associated condition

or if her employment is such as to make it inadvisable for her to continue at work. She is not eligible for sickness benefit for the period of four weeks following confinement.

(e) *Additional benefits* are paid by Approved Societies having surpluses. A surplus may arise from a low incidence of sickness among the members or from exceptionally good management or from both. More than a dozen additional benefits have been approved by the Ministry of Health, including dental benefit, optical benefit, convalescent care, hospital care, services of consultants, home nursing care and the like. The 17th Annual Report of the Ministry of Health (1935–36) points out that over 70 percent of all insured persons are entitled to additional cash benefits and that over 90 percent are entitled to one or more additional treatment benefits such as those listed above.[6]

In this country voluntary health insurance through private companies is too costly, more costly than a state or federal insurance plan, and so beyond the reach of those who suffer most from lack of adequate medical care.

We have had some experience with hospital insurance in this country. The financial problem of private hospitals today is a serious one; despite the general belief that endowments have solved the fiscal problems, only 2 per cent of all patients may be cared for by funds from endowments. More than a half million persons are enrolled in the ten largest hospital plans, which provide normally for payments of from $5 to $12 annually, depending on type and cost of services covered. The usual plan provides twenty-one days of hospital care in any twelve-month period at an average cost of $10. The success of hospital insurance here, even on a voluntary basis, gives further right to the opinion that the next hurdle will be taken—health insurance on a compulsory contributing basis regulated in the best interests of practitioner and patient under an amendment of the Social Security Act. The wage-earner and his dependents must have some way of obtaining good medical care: either assistance through outright tax facilities or the insurance plan. Many believe that the insurance feature of the Social Security Act marks the beginning of a comprehensive program for medical care in this country. Even the American Medical Association, which has fought bitterly against "state medicine," has shown signs of dissension within its ranks in recent years.[7]

Hospital social service, one of the developments of the past few decades, has helped to ameliorate some of the social effects of severe ill-

[6] "The Workers Say, 'Yes—and More,'" *The Survey Graphic,* Volume 27, January, 1938, page 38. Used by permission.

[7] For a good summary of this problem, see Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 10, *Doctors, Dollars, and Disease.*

ness. Medical social workers act as liaison agents between the hospital and the patient and attempt to alleviate situations which are beyond the narrow field of medical and surgical care. Monsignor John O'Grady describes the responsibility of hospital social service:

> No hospital can do efficient work to-day without reckoning with the home conditions, the habits of life, and the economic status of its patients. The hospital is giving very incomplete service if it returns the sick mother to her family without any plan for her diet, and without any provision for a rest period before she again takes up her household responsibilities. It is not doing its duty to the cardiac patient if it does not find some occupation for him which will not overtax his strength. It is not serving the victims of industrial accidents properly if it does not bring them into contact with opportunities for vocational rehabilitation. It is not serving the anemic child properly if it does not follow him into his home and see to it that the plans made for him by the physician are carried out. Doctors may formulate the most comprehensive plans for the care of patients, but their plans will not produce the desired results if there is not somebody on hand to see to it that they are carried out. Here we have a very important point of contact between medicine and social case work. Medicine has come to recognize in social case work a most useful and necessary ally in the carrying out of its plans. The doctor looks to the social case worker to render certain types of services to his patients which he himself cannot render.[8]

III. The Disabled

The problems of the disabled are somewhat different from those of the sick, principally because of the "time element"; that is, the disabled normally require extensive treatment over a long period of time. Here emphasis is placed on the care of crippled children, together with a brief synopsis of the federal rehabilitation program for disabled adults.

1. CRIPPLED CHILDREN

A crippled child is defined as one who does not have normal use of bones or muscles for education or work. Where provisions for state assistance exist, the definition in some cases includes and in others excludes such conditions as heart disorders, tuberculosis, and the like. The organization of work for crippled children is an example of the possibilities for action through interested groups and individuals when they become thoroughly aroused to the opportunities for distinct service. For the most part the crippled child is obviously deficient. His twisted arm or leg begets sympathy and is a powerful incentive to

[8] *An Introduction to Social Work* (The Century Co., New York, 1928), pages 212–213. Used by permission.

groups and organizations to "do something about it." Before examining the programs for care, it is necessary to treat general problems.

Unfortunately, the exact number of crippled children in the United States is not known. The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection (1930) reported a ratio of three crippled children to every thousand of the total general population, estimating 368,325 crippled persons under twenty-one years of age in the United States. Services for crippled children suggest the following basic needs: (1) finding the crippled children through surveys; (2) medical care, such as orthopedic surgery at clinics located in strategic places; (3) aftercare, including physical and occupational therapy, with emphasis upon retaining the child in the home if possible; (4) social work services. The last point deserves consideration, since, in crippling conditions, emotional and social consequences also are involved. There are problems, such as loss of morale, feelings of inadequacy, and egocentricity, which are susceptible only to case-work treatment. Any program which does not take into consideration the emotional results of crippling conditions as well as the physical results will fall far short of its goal. The field of medical social work has much to offer in this situation, because social relationships must be created by an individual if he is to remain fully integrated in the community and in family life.

Another problem is the education of a crippled child. In some cases it is possible for him to attend the local parochial or public school, but in other cases institutional care must be provided. There is a tendency at the present time to provide special rooms for the education of the crippled in local schools, and this is much to be desired, because it minimizes both the cost and the break in family ties. It must be emphasized that the field of prevention of crippling conditions offers a wide project for medical science. Many of the conditions which cause crippling may be removed, or at least ameliorated, by early discovery of cases and adequate treatment and diet. The reduction of accidents, and control over such conditions as infantile paralysis, would diminish substantially the loss to society due to crippling conditions.

There has been no finer example of organized private humanitarian work in the United States than the history of work for crippled children in the past quarter of a century. Rotary, through its 1,500 clubs, engages in community service for crippled children. The Lions occasionally do similar work, and the Kiwanians' and the Elks' accomplishments have been extremely important in many states. The Shriners maintain a chain of hospitals which have beds for approximately 700 crippled children and treat about 20,000 children each year in the

out-patient departments. Other organizations, including the American Legion, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Association of Junior Leagues of America have participated in special programs and also in local communities. The Warm Springs Foundation has received considerable financial support through the activities of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in sponsoring the President's Birthday Ball, an annual event. The International Society for Crippled Children, founded in 1921, is a clearing house for interested public and private organizations and publishes a bimonthly magazine, *The Crippled Child.*

The Crippled Children's Division of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor was organized in October, 1935, to assist in the administration of the crippled children's services under the Social Security Act. There is an annual appropriation of $2,800,000 authorized for the purpose of enabling each state to extend and improve services for crippled children, particularly in rural areas. The federal funds are provided on a matching basis, and each state must have an approved plan providing medical, surgical, and corrective services and care, as well as facilities for hospitalization and after care of children who are crippled or suffering from conditions which lead to crippling. The Children's Bureau, in addition to approving plans and administering the federal appropriations, is responsible for assistance to states in developing their programs, and it seems evident that adequacy in case-finding and case treatment will be assured.

2. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The rehabilitation of adults is a different situation, for adults do not make the same appeal as children; consequently, private organizations and groups give them comparatively little assistance. The program of vocational rehabilitation proposes to restore physically disabled persons to remunerative employment. The individual method is almost exclusively employed because of individual differences in regard to aptitudes, interests, personality, training, and experience. According to John A. Kratz, there are three distinct objectives: (1) through physical restoration or prosthesis (supplying artificial parts for the body) to enable the person to return to his former occupation or to enter a new one; (2) to prepare the person through training for a vocation from which he is not barred by his disability, such training being secured in public or private residence, in correspondence schools, in industrial or commercial establishments, or by tutors; (3) to place the person not adapted to formal training in a suitable occupation. A fundamental principle in

this work is to place handicapped persons in situations where they may compete equitably with persons who are normal and may earn the same wages.[9]

The federal rehabilitation program, organized under the United States office of Education, defines the disabled as "any person who by reason of a physical defect or infirmity, whether congenital or acquired by accident, injury, or disease, is, or may be expected to be, totally or partially incapacitated for remunerative occupation." The federal program authorized appropriations of $3,500,000 annually, to be allotted to the states on the basis of population and on condition that the amount expended from the federal grant be matched by expenditures from state funds. It is generally the practice to have state rehabilitation work conducted as a division of the state board for vocational education within the state department of education with headquarters at the state capitol.

The Social Security Act, in Section 531, provided for expansion and permanent extension of the vocational rehabilitation program established originally in 1920, and the appropriation to the states was increased to $1,900,000 annually. Under the federal plan there may be no expenditure of money for surgical treatment or for living expenses during the training of a person who is to be rehabilitated. State and local funds must therefore be utilized for these purposes in addition to those which are set up by the state as matching funds to meet the requirement for federal grants. To some extent this has hampered the progress of the work. Certain classes of those who are disabled, such as the tuberculous, often require protected treatment in workshops separate from those of other employees. Certain private organizations, particularly those associated with Jewish charities, have established such work as broom-making in protected workshops and subsidized the cost of operation, employing workers who are unable to work more than a few hours each day. In the case of the tuberculous the plan is one of gradual re-entry into the industrial world, accompanied by provisions for adequate rest periods and supplements to the family income until the worker is physically able to receive full-time employment. There is a considerable need for the education of employers in the use of disabled persons, for in most cases the disabled can be just as economically used as any other kind of labor. Unfortunately, this phase of the situation has been notably neglected, and during the depression the work of establishing the handicapped in employment has been retarded.

Most estimates place the cost of rehabilitation of an individual at from $300 to $500, an extremely economical cost when one considers

[9] *Social Work Year Book, 1937* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1937), page 535.

that a similar cost yearly would be necessary to take care of a dependent in his own home or in an institution. When an individual so rehabilitated is able to provide for his own support, the initial outlay need not be continued more than one year. In addition to the economic values of such a program, there is gratification in seeing an individual able, in spite of a handicap, to make a successful adjustment to life. In this connection it may be noted that the problems of those with abnormal conditions of the heart are neglected for the most part. Since these disorders are no respecter of persons, often a truck-driver with heart disease is forced to continue with his occupation at a great risk to his life because society has not provided for proper vocational placement.

IV. The Mentally Disordered

There is no problem more distressing than that of the care of those who because of their mental disorders cannot remain in the community. The insane are defined legally as those who are unable to manage their own affairs, or who constitute a menace to themselves or to others. Insanity is a legal status existing on the basis of a court decision, arrived at after testimony of psychiatrists. Those referred to as insane in a nonlegal sense usually suffer from psychoses. Psychoses are not a necessary cause for legal commitment to an institution, although many eventually require custodial care. Neuroses are minor nervous disorders; psychoses are serious maladjustments. The mentally disordered constitute a problem of dependency. J. L. Gillin cites statistics for England and Wales which indicate that, although the insane in 1933 constituted 370 per 100,000 of the whole population, they represented 8,000 per 100,000 of the dependents.[10] There seems to be a relationship between dependency and the prevalence of the insanities. Although the treatment of the dependent insane theoretically does not vary to any great extent from the treatment of the insane who are economically secure, actually there is a specific difference, because the well-to-do insane receive better care in private institutions and, in state institutions, are able to afford "extras" denied the less fortunate. Whether institutionalized or not, the insane become a burden to their families and to society. This problem presents a serious challenge to society, and we are just beginning to provide treatment that is adequate but still a long way from the ideal.

[10] *Poverty and Dependency* (D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1937), page 277.

I. EXTENT OF INSANITIES

Although there is considerable variance in opinions as to the number of persons who are insane in the United States, it is generally agreed that the number is approximately one-half million, and this figure includes only the more serious cases, that is, those in need of institutional treatment. According to the Bureau of the Census, on December 31, 1934, there were 451, 672 persons in institutions for the insane in the United States, excluding the criminal insane and the insane in almshouses. Although many current opinions exist as to the probable increase of insanity, these are based generally upon institutional population, which is an unreliable index, because it is a well-known fact that as soon as another hospital for the insane is built there are generally enough patients to fill it. Hence increases in institutional numbers represent not an increase in the insane, but an increase in the number of insane who get institutional treatment. However, we do not know for certain that insanities are not increasing. Many psychiatrists insist that the situation becomes more acute yearly. Yet those who say that the increase is apparent rather than real point out, in addition to increased hospital facilities, the following four conditioning factors: (a) the prolongation of human life; (b) the greater proportion of adults; (c) the tendency to consider mental disorders as similar to other illness; (d) the increasing emphasis upon hospitalization of those who require such treatment.

A common charge is that the foreign-born contribute, out of normal proportion, to the numbers of the insane, these statements generally being based upon crude population statistics of institutions. If age is taken into consideration, the proportion of the foreign-born white to the native-born white is as six to five. There seems to be some correlation of factors of race and nationality with the insanities, but this probably is due to economic factors and the opportunities for hospitalization in urban areas where such groups are located. Insanity is rare among children and seems to be more typical of the urban population, although this may be because of the increasing difficulty of caring for the urban insane in their homes and the greater opportunity for hospitalization.

The modern attitude towards insanity is much more hopeful than that of the last generation. Such progress has been made in the treatment of insanity that A. L. Bowen, Director of the Illinois Department of Public Welfare, objects to the use of the term "incurable insanity" in our legislation. He says:

The laws of Indiana recognize "incurable insanity," and the Supreme Court of that state has upheld the validity of such shocking statutes. Judge Walter E. Treanor, who was recently nominated to the United States Court of Appeals at Chicago, wrote the opinion of the Supreme Court upholding this law, but he indicates very plainly his opposition to it, because in his opinion he says that the legislature was "within its rights in passing the law, even though it shocks our sense of justice and fairness."

The decision came in a case involving a suit for divorce by a citizen of Indiana whose wife had been in an Indiana state hospital "for several years," and was therefore held to be "incurable."

There may be room for question or doubt whether insanity should be a cause for divorce, but there certainly can be no grounds for the absurd opinion that an insanity is incurable. It is shocking that an enlightened community would carry upon its statutes a law that condemns a mental patient to a condition of hopelessness. Our own personal view is that mental disease should not be cause for divorce any more than rheumatism, myocarditis, diabetes or baldness, for Illinois' hospitals for mental cases have demonstrated many times the futility of a diagnosis of "incurable insanity." Patients who have been in hospitals twenty and twenty-five years have been discharged to go to their homes and resume their places. Never should the word "incurable" be associated with the category of mental diseases.[11]

The modern attitude has been made possible, to a large extent, through improvements in institutional care. The modern state hospital is a vast improvement over the "insane asylums" of the past.

The first state hospital exclusively for the insane was established in Virginia in 1768. In most states, however, until the latter part of the nineteenth century, the care of the insane was confined principally to poorhouses. The efforts of Dorothea Dix and other humanitarians in the middle decades of the nineteenth century brought about the establishment of special hospitals for mental patients in many states. The treatment of the insane has varied from one period to another and generally has been in accordance with the popular beliefs regarding insanity. During the colonial period the insane were confined in jails or boarded out to such members of the community as would take care of them without payment. Barns and other outbuildings were often used as places of confinement, and in some cases cages were placed in the rear of homes for the care of these unfortunate ones. The use of the county jail and the poorhouse has not been abandoned entirely, and in most states they are the only places for temporary care pending admission to a proper institution. The reaction against repressive treatment caused the humanitarian phase, which insisted upon adequate physical incarceration in pleasant surroundings. This was followed by

[11] "On Calling Insanity 'Incurable'" (editorial), *The Welfare Bulletin* (Illinois), February–March, 1938, page 2.

the modern tendency, which, by means of expanded treatment facilities, attempts to restore the individual to society. Although it is not our purpose to examine the causes of the various insanities, it is certain that any treatment of insanity as a social problem must insist on the removal of causes wherever that is possible.

2. NEED FOR A PERMANENT PROGRAM

The numerous suggestions for the removal or elimination of insanity from our midst may be grouped under three heads: (1) general preventive measures; (2) treatment in institutions; (3) treatment outside institutions. Prevention certainly must include: (a) the removal of insecurity from the lives of many; (b) further examination of the possibilities of psychiatry; (c) education along mental-hygiene lines through every educational medium available; (d) the creation of mental-hygiene clinics available to all under the direction of competent psychiatrists with the assistance of psychiatric social workers.

Institutional treatment should include proper separation of classes of inmates, such as the violent, the chronic, and the criminal insane, and adequate provision for the use of such remedies as hydrotherapy, electrotherapy, insulin and metrazol treatments, occupational therapy, and an effective recreational program, all under the direction of competent personnel. The state hospitals have advanced in provisions for scientific care, but the personnel problem is serious. Attendants are underpaid, untrained, and often brutal in their handling of patients. Many employees are unqualified for their tasks, being chosen for political reasons rather than for competence. The continued use of county jails for detention is an archaic practice which handicaps later treatment at an institution. Treatment, therefore, must include elimination of unfit personnel and abandonment of the county jail and almshouse for detention.

Treatment outside institutions must include: (a) revision of legal procedures; (b) early discovery, and treatment by clinics; and (c) boarding care. Our present complex legal method of dealing with insanity is altogether unsuited to adequate treatment of the conditioning factors. There is a stigma placed upon the individual which may be irreparable because of community attitudes. Promptness in recognizing the early symptoms of mental disorder is of extreme importance.

Under our present system we do not institute treatment until an individual has become dangerous, and this delay supports the classical, legal definition for the insane: those who have become a menace to the community, to themselves, or to their families. The cost of out-

patient care in mental hygiene prior to commitment is very low compared with the cost of institutional care. We do not know how many would be removed from the need of institutional care by out-patient services, but there is need for study of this question. No plan for treatment of the insane is complete without provision for boarding care and parole. Many states have statutes permitting such care, but few take advantage of the values of such a program. It should obviously be reserved for mild, chronic cases, which are either unprovided for now or needlessly institutionalized. The methods of caring for the insane in this country seem comparatively unscientific when we consider the use of boarding care in Belgium, where entire towns are filled with private homes in which the chronic insane are boarded and live happy, contented lives. The colony at Gheel, near Brussels, is a well-known example of the care given under the boarding plan.

There has been some confusion as to the possible conflicts between mental hygiene and religion, since good mental hygiene of necessity must involve a plan or philosophy of life. However, strictly speaking, mental hygiene is merely a method of anticipating and treating mental abnormalities before they become serious. Mental hygiene can be assisted by religion and religion by mental hygiene. On this point Father Paul Hanly Furfey, speaking before the First International Congress on Mental Hygiene, said:

> Mental hygiene can benefit from religion. There are certain urgent questions concerned with ultimate reality whose solution every human being demands: Why am I in this world? Is there an absolute standard of right and wrong? What of the life after death? We can turn our backs to these questions; we can minimize their importance; but we cannot avoid them in the end. Human nature is like that. It cannot rest until such problems are solved.
>
> No patient, therefore, can be said to be adequately adjusted to life as long as these questions remain unanswered. Guiding principles are essential for complete living. To dodge the issue is to attempt a foolish compromise with reality. That is why the work of the mental clinic must be rounded out with a philosophy of life which cannot be empirically determined. That is why mental hygiene needs the aid of something outside of itself to complete its work. That is religion's contribution to mental hygiene.
>
> But it is equally true that mental hygiene can render a useful service to religion. During every age religion has been interested in the problems of the worried, the inadequate, and the depressed. In many cases the experienced guidance of a kindly and sympathetic human being is sufficient to assuage these troubles. But in many instances mere "common sense" is insufficient. The skilled attention of the expert is necessary. . . . As a Roman Catholic I see no reason to apologize for my enthusiastic and whole-hearted endorsement of every sane and worthy development in the field of mental hygiene.
>
> During the present period of beginnings it is perhaps inevitable that there

should be misunderstandings. Unfortunately certain mental hygienists, expressing in sensational language their own peculiar philosophy of life, have confused the popular mind. They have spoken of mental hygiene as though it were an end in itself instead of a means to an end. They have erected it into a philosophy, almost a religion. Let us try to rise above the petty bickerings which result from such confusing statements. Religion and mental hygiene are not opposed to each other. They exist on different planes. But they can and ought to be mutually helpful.[12]

In summary, we have passed through successive stages of repressive and custodial treatment to a new recognition of the need for individualized treatment whether inside or outside institutions. We have not realized in practice the complete programs now available to us, but some progress is being made. We must proceed along two distinct lines: general mental hygiene, and application of all present techniques to the program of each state.

V. The Mentally Deficient

There is no subject relating to dependency which has aroused more public interest than that of feeble-mindedness. We shall look briefly into the nature and extent of feeble-mindedness and the methods of care which have developed, emphasizing the aspects requiring special attention, such as the problems of the morons and the question of sterilization. Feeble-mindedness usually is defined as a mental defect either inherited or caused by conditions surrounding birth which prevent normal development of the mind; as a result, the person is not able to manage his own affairs and conform to the standards society demands of him. There are three recognizable ranges of mental deficiency: the idiots, whose maximum intelligence is that of a two-year-old child; the imbeciles, whose range in mental age is from three to seven years; the morons, whose intelligence ranges from eight to twelve years, and who are generally subdivided into low-grade morons and high-grade morons, the latter often being called "borderline." It must be remembered that these divisions are merely arbitrary and, especially with regard to the morons, are not particularly conclusive. There has come about an increasing recognition of the difficulty of an absolute definition of feeble-mindedness, and there is reasonable agreement at the present time that feeble-mindedness is a relative term; there are many cases of pseudo feeble-mindedness, or apparent feeble-

[12] *Proceedings of the First International Congress on Mental Hygiene* (International Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, 1932), Volume 2, page 543. Used by permission.

mindedness, in which the individual seems to lack intelligence but readily improves with a change in environment. It should be noted that the emotional responses of a feeble-minded adult with an intelligence equivalent to that of an eight-year-old child will be different from the responses of a child of that age; in other words, the definition refers only to intelligence as recorded in certain arbitrary tests.

There is wide disagreement as to the number of feeble-minded in the United States. Some estimates place the number as low as one million, and others state that the number may be nearer six or seven million. The relationship between feeble-mindedness and definite causes is not very well understood. Although there is general agreement that some cases are hereditary, there is no agreement as to what proportion of the total is the result of hereditary influences. The situation is further complicated by our failure to know which of the hereditary feeble-minded inherited their feeble-mindedness from feeble-minded parents rather than from more distant ancestors. Altogether, the situation is such that the proposals for remedies are naturally many and various.

I. THE MORONS

Before we pass on to the question of treatment, it is necessary to discuss the varied problems presented by the feeble-minded. The idiots, most of the imbeciles, and many of the low-grade morons require institutional care of some type. The idiots die young and generally do not present a permanent problem of care. The imbeciles generally cannot provide for themselves and require permanent care. The morons, who constitute the numerical bulk of the feeble-minded, do not present clear-cut needs, and it is with the morons that we are especially concerned. Any comments regarding the morons must be prefaced by the statement that no generalization may be applied to a particular case; each should be studied on its own merits. Yet there are certain remarks which apply to many, especially in the higher levels, those just below normal in intelligence. The term "moron" here is used in its psychological sense and has no relation to the term "moron" used by newspapers in referring to the perpetrators of various sex crimes. It is well known medically that the group specified in newspaper comments includes few feeble-minded and, actually, a large number of extremely intelligent individuals. The morons are the dull ones who are frequently out of adjustment with themselves and with society. As was previously pointed out, too much is demanded of them, and, unless they are located in jobs demanding little mental activity, they are unable to meet the expectations of those about them. They may resort to

defensive measures such as withdrawal, evidenced by sullenness and unresponsiveness, or they may take flight from constituted authority, as indicated by transiency or distinct rebellion. They become the misfits of industry, and very often they make unfortunate choices in marriage. They do not get along well in school, and generally they begin to fail at the third or fourth grade. Occasionally they go as far as the eighth grade, and in rare instances through high school.

This mere fact of educational retardation involves several social implications, such as the desire of one unable to impress his classmates or his teacher with his knowledge to impress those about him with his conduct. This may result in difficulties with the school authorities and eventually in truancy and expulsion from school. Petty thievery is common among this group, particularly in adolescence. Morons tend to be restive and unstable and, generally, seem unable to get along with those about them. Some are rather apathetic, often hulking in size, scoffed at by their fellows, and an easy mark for schemes of all kinds. They seem to be a benighted lot for the most part, forgotten until they get into trouble, and then they are punished severely. Ignored by [redacted]mers and often willingly following unwise leadership, they present a serious problem to the schools and to society in general. Their challenge is indeed a grave one.

Their relation to crime is not generally evaluated, although some psychiatrists indicate that their presence in prisons may prove nothing more than the fact that they are more easily caught than those who possess more intelligence. There is no doubt that the girls and women of this group often become prostitutes. On the other hand, it is possible that by reasonably careful protective work much salvaging may be done. The success of morons on parole from institutions is well known, and it is believed that, if the supervision typical of good parole were applied to a larger part of the population, there would be normally definite success among this group. With proper protection and adequate care and supervision they are extremely docile and make reasonably good adjustments, and, if proper vocational placement is made, they can get along well in industry. They do routine tasks very well and may even adjust themselves better than more intelligent persons to a humdrum existence amid modern machinery.

2. TREATMENT

The modern care of the feeble-minded is said to have commenced with St. Vincent de Paul, who established a hospital for these children in order to protect them from neglect. As stated previously, idiots die

young, and those who survive, together with the majority of imbeciles, require institutional care. This generally is provided by state schools for the feeble-minded, either through congregate housing or through "colonies." The imbeciles and low-grade morons get along very well when cared for in colonies, that is, in environments similar to small villages, where the feeble-minded live quiet, useful lives, in homelike surroundings, the boys engaged in farming, the girls in domestic work. The best-known example of colony care is at Rome, New York, where Dr. Charles Bernstein pioneered in establishing a farm colony for boys (1906) and a domestic colony for girls (1914) in connection with the Rome State School for Mental Defectives. The colony provides a controlled environment where the feeble-minded learn certain simple skills. Some are released on parole (supervision by the institution) and are expected to go into similar environments, where the skills learned will be useful and where there will be little change from colony life. Dr. Bernstein added small factories gradually, improving the range of skills considerably and permitting training of the feeble[illegible]ded in simple, mechanical tasks. An essential feature of the colony system is its low cost. On January 1, 1930, there were 3,398 enrolled inmates of the Rome State School in the state of New York. Of these about 1,600 were living outside the institution, some 1,100 of them in various self-supporting colonies, and 500 on parole. Those on parole provide entirely for their own maintenance; those in the colonies contribute about 80 per cent to their support, which is evidence that economical planning is a possible solution to the problem. Dr. Bernstein states that many of the colony boys and girls worked as textile operatives in small cities near Utica, received the prevailing rates of pay, and did acceptable work.[13] This indicates the success which can come through dealing with social problems intelligently.

Another kind of treatment for the feeble-minded, suggested by those whose viewpoints are purely materialistic, is *sterilization* by surgical operation, which removes the power to beget offspring; the operation in males is called vasectomy; in females, salpingectomy. The purpose of sterilization is to prevent the procreation of the feeble-minded in an attempt to eliminate feeble-mindedness from society. Before considering the moral aspects of sterilization, what are the practical objections? The intelligent use of sterilization implies such previous knowledge of feeble-mindedness as the exact way in which it is transmitted, who transmits it, and many other factors. But we do not know (a) who

[13] *Social Care of the Mentally Deficient* (pamphlet) (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1930), pages 11–14.

the feeble-minded are, (b) how many there are, (c) where they may be found, (d) what cases are hereditary and what cases are the result of other causes, (e) who the latent carriers of feeble-mindedness are, and (f) what families will produce feeble-minded children. Therefore, altogether apart from morality, this so-called panacea presents many insuperable obstacles. J. H. Landman says:

> Suppose we sterilize every mental defective and every mentally diseased person. If every mental subnormal now living were sterilized, the resulting decrease in number of them a generation hence would be insignificant. In order to produce any marked decrease in the total number of mental defectives and mentally diseased a generation hence, it would be necessary to sterilize, or otherwise prevent the propagation, not merely of those who are themselves feeble-minded or mentally diseased, but all those who are heterozygous, that is, latent carriers of these mental ailments.[14]

Monsignor John A. Ryan summarizes the practical situation which must be faced by those who advocate sterilization:

> It is not necessary for those mental defectives who cannot safely be left outside of institutions, nor for those whom the state should not permit to marry on account of their incapacity to bring up a family; not all defectives always produce defective offspring; by far the greater part of inherent defectiveness probably comes from "carriers" and these cannot be identified; possibly one-half and possibly more than that proportion of the feeble-minded have not acquired the defect by inheritance; sterilization is practically applicable only to defectives who have been committed to institutions and these apparently are only one-eightieth of the whole number; the practice is liable to serious abuses, either inherent or incidental; it is opposed by several of the most competent authorities; finally, it tends to prevent the consideration and adoption of genuine remedies which would deal with the feeble-mindedness which is caused by environment as well as that which is inherited.[15]

Moral Aspects

What are the moral aspects of the problem? Since Pope Pius XI in *Casti Conubii* tells us why sterilization is immoral, nothing more needs to be said than to quote his words here:

> Finally, that pernicious practice must be condemned which closely touches upon the natural right of man to enter matrimony but affects also in a real way the welfare of the offspring. For there are some who, over solicitous for the cause of eugenics, not only give salutary counsel for more certainly procuring the strength and health of the future child—which, indeed, is not contrary to right reason—but put eugenics before aims of a higher order, and by public authority wish to prevent from marrying all those who, even

[14] *Human Sterilization* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932), page 195.
[15] *Moral Aspects of Sterilization* (pamphlet) (National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., 1930), page 23. Used by permission.

though naturally fit for marriage, they consider, according to the norms and conjectures of their investigations, would, through hereditary transmission, bring forth defective offspring; and more, they wish to legislate to deprive these of that natural faculty by medical action despite their unwillingness, and this they do not propose as an infliction of grave punishment under the authority of the State for a crime committed, not to prevent future crimes by guilty persons, but against every right and good they wish the civil authority to arrogate to itself a power over a faculty which they never had and can never legitimately possess.

Those who act in this way are at fault in losing sight of the fact that the family is more sacred than the State and that men are begotten not for the earth and for time, but for heaven and eternity. Although often these individuals are to be dissuaded from entering into matrimony, certainly it is wrong to brand men with the stigma of crime because they contract marriage, on the ground that, despite the fact that they are in every respect capable of matrimony, they will give birth only to defective children, even though they use all care and diligence.

Public magistrates have no direct power over the bodies of their subjects, therefore, where no crime has taken place and there is no cause present for grave punishment, they can never directly harm, or tamper with the integrity of the body, either for the reasons of eugenics or for any other reason.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are three definite ways in which the feeble-minded may be helped: (1) segregation in institutions and colonies of those who lack sufficient intelligence to do even ordinary routine tasks; (2) intelligent supervision following vocational adjustment and training in colonies of those who can learn to do routine work; (3) careful attention to the educational and vocational needs of those who may well remain in the community, especially by adjustments in school curricula. It must be emphasized that a positive program is needed; Catholics have no quarrel with eugenics, which means simply improving the quality of the race. But when that objective is to be attained by immoral means such as birth control or sterilization, Catholics cannot assent. Such negative eugenics is unsound not only in practice but also in principle.

VI. The Epileptics

The exact number of epileptics in the United States is not known, although three per 1,000 of the population is the usual estimate, signifying a total of approximately 300,000. Epilepsy is essentially a disease of the young, more than three quarters of the known epileptics being found to have this condition before the twentieth year. In general, epilepsy is divided into three types: (a) *grand mal,* in which there are

wild seizures accompanied by convulsions and unconsciousness; (b) *petit mal,* in which the victim has momentary attacks but does not usually fall; (c) *psychical epilepsy,* which is difficult to distinguish from insanity and is indicated by an abnormal absent-mindedness and apathy.

There is no agreement as to the cause of epilepsy, but it seems to be related to other diseases of the nervous system, and certain conditions seem to predispose toward it and aggravate the condition. Epileptics have a high death rate, and the probability of cure is extremely low, although much can be done for them. According to the Bureau of the Census, in 1933 only 1.8 per cent of the males and 1.2 per cent of the females discharged that year from institutions in the United States were listed as "recovered," although only the worst 10 per cent of cases are sent to institutions. Their rate of dependency is high, about five times as many epileptics being in county infirmaries and poorhouses as would be their normal rate in accordance with the general population statistics. Some studies of juvenile delinquents show that about 7 per cent of delinquents are epileptics.

The development of care for epileptics has been neglected to a considerable extent, and they have for the most part received care with the feeble-minded or with those who are confined to the jails and county poorhouses. The Craig Colony in New York, opened in 1896, was the first to provide care separate from that for the feeble-minded, and by 1900 there were five states having special provision for epileptics in institutions exclusively for them. At the present there are only ten states with special provision for epileptics. It is generally agreed that the only adequate provision for epileptics must be made through colony care. The possibility of simulated home life in colonies, together with vocational opportunities and educational and recreational facilities, offers excellent protective service to those who do not normally adjust themselves to society. The colony, furthermore, is an economical method of care, its cost per patient being generally about $300 yearly, as opposed to nearly $1,000 for institutional care of the more formal type. This kind of protective service is definitely needed by the majority of epileptics. As children they are a constant worry to their relatives and friends, and as young men and women they do not adjust themselves very well to the demands for vocational aptitudes in a competitive civilization. The more seriously afflicted may not drive automobiles safely, nor may they work near dangerous machinery. Their fellow workers are often opposed to working with them, and, when their

condition is suspected, they are likely to be discharged immediately. They require the use of sedatives such as luminal, and, for serious cases, treatment is not available in the average community without segregation. It is significant that as a rule epileptics do not respond particularly well to individualized care, not only because of the physical conditions manifested, but also because of personality disorders which occasionally accompany the disease.

VII. The Blind

The number of the blind in the United States is estimated to be 100,000. It is generally agreed that about 10 per cent of blindness is caused by accident and about 50 per cent by general diseases such as meningitis, scarlet fever, and measles. The reduction of the incidence of these diseases in childhood has resulted in a decrease in the number of cases of blindness from such causes. The compulsory use of a silver nitrate solution in the eyes of all newborn children by physicians and midwives has lessened the incidence of blindness further by eliminating cases of *ophthalmia neonatorum*. In addition to the cases of blindness, it must be remembered, there are many instances of partial vision which are either completely or partially disabling and make occupational opportunities very few for those so afflicted.

State programs for assistance to the blind generally include: (a) cash assistance; (b) field workers who locate the blind and assist them in many ways; (c) educational and vocational training. State schools for the blind have done an excellent job of providing vocational rehabilitation for those who seem to possess distinct abilities in particular kinds of work as well as for those of normal aptitudes. There is provision for the education of the blind in every state at the present time, and in most instances the institutions are of especially high grade and operated without political domination. The use of the Braille method of reading and the assistance of "talking books" have widened the horizons of the blind to a considerable extent. Under the Social Security Act, 58,000 needy blind persons were receiving assistance January 1, 1938. In comparison with the estimated number of blind, this shows the extent of dependency in this category. The majority of states had some public provision for assistance to the blind before the passage of the Social Security Act, but the grants were very small for the most part. It has been recognized for a long time that leaving the blind to their own devices is socially undesirable, results in a considerable amount of beg-

ging, and is disastrous both to the individual and to society. Recently the Post Office Department has provided for the operation of newsstands by the blind in Post Office Buildings.

The use of dogs as leaders or guides for the blind has been prominent during the past two decades. Recently special training for dogs and the blind has become especially efficient. Each dog, known as the "seeing eye," is given a rigorous period of training with his blind companion, and the results, in mobility of the blind, are extremely interesting. This has not been extended to a large proportion of the blind population, but on a demonstration basis has proved most practical. Civic organizations, notably the Optimist Clubs, have provided the blind with white canes to designate their infirmities and to act as a warning to pedestrians and motorists. In general, with the operations of the Social Security Act, state departments of vocational rehabilitation, special schools for the blind, and private organizations and individuals, it may be assumed that care for the blind is reasonably progressive, even though not all are yet included among the recipients of assistance from these various organizations. It may be said that the blind will be handicapped only so long as they are allowed to be handicapped and only so long as they do not receive adequate assistance. Proper treatment and care for the blind will result inevitably in independence or semi-independence for the majority of them, but this achievement depends upon extensive use of all resources now available.

VIII. The Deaf

The term "deaf" as used may refer to the deaf mute or to the hard of hearing. According to the various census estimates of the deaf population, the deaf mutes probably number about 50,000. It is generally believed that one third of the deaf mutes were deaf at birth from congenital causes. In other large groups the defect was caused by childhood diseases such as scarlet fever and meningitis. State schools for the education of the deaf are available in nearly every state. Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., is operated under federal auspices. Until recently most of the education of the deaf was based upon the sign language devised by the Abbé de L'Epée. The most progressive schools are now teaching the reading of lips and the use of speech.

The dependency of the deaf is not so great as might be assumed, since most estimates indicate that nearly half of the deaf who are old enough to work are gainfully employed. It is worthy of note that contrary to common opinion the deaf are not a morbid, unhappy group,

but to a considerable extent have adjusted themselves to their situation. A large proportion of the deaf have joined in groups with other deaf, and varied recreation is available to them. They are particularly fond of dancing and substitute the vibrations of the music for the sounds heard by normal persons. They are an animated group, extremely volatile and pantomimic in their manner of expressing themselves, and enjoy greatly the company of one another. Data concerning the hereditary transmission of deafness are not complete, and although there is some slight indication of the possibility, there is no definite statistical evidence to warrant this assumption. Because of their social grouping together, many of the deaf marry other persons who are deaf. Nearly all the children of the deaf are normal.

No statistics are available as to the numbers of the hard of hearing, although some estimates are as high as 10 per cent of the population. The problem of the hard of hearing is perhaps even more serious than that of the deaf mutes. The deaf mutes for the most part are readily identified as such, and consideration is given to them because of their affliction, while the hard of hearing are often very conscious of their affliction and occasionally suffer personality maladjustments as the result of it. Churches and theaters have to some extent installed microphonic devices attached to earphones, which are useful to the hard of hearing, and the general improvement of mechanical devices, especially those involving bone conduction, may bring permanent relief to many unhappy persons. It is reasonable to assume that a severe handicap exists for many who might otherwise make a reasonably good social adjustment. Certainly, in some kinds of employment it seems that partial deafness is a deterrent to good work. Such a defect in children, when not recognized, is a serious handicap to adequate school work. There are many instances of children, condemned by teachers as "dull," who are merely hard of hearing and whose stolidity when asked a question is due to difficulty in hearing.

Early examination of all children in schools, to discern signs of this defect at the first opportunity, is needed for control of this problem. In some instances, corrective work is possible, but in all cases a child who is recognized as one laboring under severe handicap will receive more adequate treatment in the schools than a handicapped child who is not so recognized. In the larger school systems, special rooms for the deaf and partially deaf have been utilized to some extent, but this method is not universal. It should further be remembered that opportunity must be given to those who are handicapped in any manner so that they can attain some degree of independence. In many instances of

chronic dependency, persons become dependent merely because of society's attitude toward them. If we assume that a given individual is hopelessly handicapped and must be treated as an invalid, the person may respond in such fashion as to eliminate all possibilities for definite improvement. In many such instances, we adopt a philosophy of despair calculated to increase the gravity of the situation rather than to decrease it. Most handicapped persons, when given an opportunity to be as normal as possible, with sufficient protection against the more obvious dangers facing them, have responded nobly. There is no chapter in the life of humanity that is more inspiring than that of individuals who have accomplished great things even though handicapped tremendously. The perseverance of Helen Keller, who through illness lost her sight, hearing, and speech at an early age, suggests the importance of social factors in adjustment and maladjustment.

In our treatment of the dependent through special forms of assistance, we are enabled to deal with each group from the standpoint of the needs of its members. In the last analysis, individualization of treatment plans becomes as necessary as group or social treatment of problems. This need is emphasized by a recognition of the variety of programs required for the special classes considered in this chapter.

References for Further Reading

Abbott, Edith, *The Tenements of Chicago,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1936

American Association of Social Workers, *This Business of Relief,* American Association of Social Workers, New York, 1936

Andrews, B. R., *Economics of the Household: Its Administration and Finance,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1935

Armstrong, Louise V., *We Too Are the People,* Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1938

Bauer, Catherine, *Modern Housing,* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1934

Beers, Clifford W., *A Mind That Found Itself,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York, 1928

Best, Harry, *Blindness and the Blind in the United States,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934

Bossard, James H. S., *Social Change and Social Problems,* revised edition, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1937

Breckinridge, Sophonisba P., *Public Welfare Administration,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1927

Briefs, Goetz, *The Proletariat,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1937

Bruno, Frank J., *The Theory of Social Work,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1936

Cabot, Hugh, *The Doctor's Bill,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1935
Calkins, Clinch, *Some Folks Won't Work,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1930
Chapin, F. Stuart, and Stuart A. Queen, *On Social Work in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Collins, Selwyn D., and Clark Tibbitts, *On Social Aspects of Health in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, *Medical Care for the American People,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1932
Davies, Stanley P., *Social Control of the Mentally Deficient,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1930
Deutsch, Albert, *The Mentally Ill in America,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York, 1937
Donham, S. Agnes, *Spending the Family Income,* revised edition, Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1933
Douglas, Paul H., *Social Security in the United States,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1936
Douglas, Paul H., and Aaron Director, *The Problem of Unemployment,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1931
Dow, Grove S., *Society and Its Problems,* revised edition, Thomas Y. Crowell Co[illegible]y, New York, 1937
Elliott, M[illegible]., and Francis E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1934
Emerson, Haven, *Alcohol, Its Effects on Man,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1934
Epstein, Abraham, *Insecurity: A Challenge to America,* Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, New York, 1933
Ezekiel, Mordecai, *$2500 a Year,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1936
Falk, I. S., *Security Against Sickness,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York, 1936
Ford, James, *Slums and Housing,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1936
Friend, M. R., *Earning and Spending the Family Income,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935
Gillette, John M., and James M. Reinhardt, *Current Social Problems,* revised edition, American Book Company, New York, 1937
Gillin, John L., *Poverty and Dependency,* third edition, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1937
Gillin, John L., *Social Pathology,* The Century Co., New York, 1933
Haas, Francis J., *Man and Society,* The Century Co., New York, 1930
Hart, Bernard, *The Psychology of Insanity,* fourth edition, Cambridge University Press, London, 1930
Hathaway, Marion, *The Young Cripple and His Job,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1928
Hopkins, Harry L., *Spending to Save,* W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1936
Howard, Frank E., and Frederick L. Patry, *Mental Health,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935

Kahn, Dorothy C., *Unemployment and Its Treatment in the United States,* American Association of Social Workers, New York, 1937
Kerby, William J., *The Social Mission of Charity,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921
King, Willford I., *The National Income and Its Purchasing Power,* National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1930
Klein, Philip, *A Social Study of Pittsburgh,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1938
Kranch, Elsa, *A Mind Restored,* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1937
Kurtz, Russell H. (editor), *The Public Assistance Worker,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1938
Kyrk, Hazel, *Economic Problems of the Family,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1933
Landman, J. H., *Human Sterilization,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1932
Lane, Marie Dresden, and Francis Steegmuller, *America on Relief,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1938
Lee, Porter R., and Marian E. Kenworthy, *Mental Hygiene and Social Work,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1929
Leven, Maurice, Harold G. Moulton, and Clark Warburton, *America's Capacity to Consume,* The Brookings Institution, W[redacted]ton, D.C., 1934
Lynd, Robert S., and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1929
Lynd, Robert S., and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1937
MacKenzie, Findlay (editor), *Planned Society,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1937
Mangold, George B., *Organization for Social Welfare,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934
Millis, Harry A., *Sickness and Insurance,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937
Millspaugh, Arthur C., *Public Welfare Organization,* The Brookings Institstitution, Washington, D.C., 1935
Moulton, Harold G., *Income and Economic Progress,* The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1935
Mumford, Lewis, *The Culture of Cities,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1938
Muntz, Earl E., *Urban Sociology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938
Myerson, Abraham, and others, *Eugenical Sterilization,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936
O'Brien, John D., *An Outline of Psychiatry,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1934
O'Grady, John, *Catholic Charities in the United States,* National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C., 1930
O'Grady, John, *The Catholic Church and the Destitute,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929

O'Grady, John, *An Introduction to Social Work,* The Century Co., New York, 1928
Parmelee, Maurice F., *Farewell to Poverty,* John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1935
Phelps, Harold A., *Contemporary Social Problems,* revised edition, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1938
Post, Langdon W., *The Challenge of Housing,* Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1938
Queen, Stuart A., Walter B. Bodenhafer, and Ernest B. Harper, *Social Organization and Disorganization,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1935
Reed, Louis S., *Health Insurance,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1937
Rowntree, Benjamin S., *The Human Needs of Labour,* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1937
Rubinow, I. M., *The Quest for Security,* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1934
Ryan, John A., *A Better Economic Order,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935
Ryan, John A., *Seven Troubled Years,* Edwards Brothers, Ann Arbor, 1937
Schmidt, Emerson P. (editor), *Man and Society,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York,
Simkhovitch, Mary K., *Neighborhood,* W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1938
Smith, Thurber M., S.J., *The Unemployment Problem,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1932
Social Security Board, *Social Security in America,* Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1937
Sorokin, Pitirim A., *Social and Cultural Dynamics,* American Book Company, New York, 1937
Steiner, Jesse F., *Community Organization,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1930
Stewart, Maxwell S., *Social Security,* W. W. Norton and Company, New York, 1937
Strecker, Edward A., and Francis T. Chambers, Jr., *Alcohol—One Man's Meat,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938
Sutherland, Edwin H., and Harvey J. Locke, *Twenty Thousand Homeless Men,* J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1936
Sydenstricker, Edgar, *Health and Environment,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1933
Twentieth Century Fund, *More Security for Old Age,* Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1937
Vaile, Roland S., *On Social Aspects of Consumption in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Van Kleeck, Mary, *Creative America,* Covici-Friede, New York, 1936
Vernon, H. M., *Accidents and Their Prevention,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1937
Wald, Lillian D., *Windows on Henry Street,* Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1934

Walsh, Mary E., *The Saints and Social Work,* The Preservation of the Faith, Silverspring, Maryland, 1936

Warner, Amos G., Stuart A. Queen, and Ernest B. Harper, *American Charities and Social Work,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1930

Webb, J. N., *The Migratory Casual Worker,* Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C., 1937

White, R. Clyde, and Mary K. White, *On Social Aspects of Relief Policies in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937

Wood, Edith E., *Recent Trends in American Housing,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1931

Works Progress Administration, *A Survey of the Transient and Homeless Population,* Works Progress Administration, Washington, D.C., 1937

Wright, Henry, *Rehousing Urban America,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1935

Zimmerman, Earle C., *Consumption and Standards of Living,* D. Van Nostrand Company, New York, 1936

Zorbaugh, Harvey W., *Gold Coast and Slum,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1929

PART V

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

CHAPTER XVII

CRIME: ITS NATURE AND CAUSES

CRIME, in all probability, is the first social problem which modern man attempts to discuss. The close relation of crime to sin as well as to public safety usually makes it a subject for general speculation long before one really knows very much about it. Because man learns so early to discuss crime with considerable feeling, it is hard to tell him very much later on, especially if the new information differs from his preconceived notions. This educational problem is further complicated by the fact that the convictions of the average man on the subject of crime are usually confirmed by those whom he regards as authorities, namely, la[redacted] and journalists. Because of this background of informal inst[redacted]n the average student approaches the study of crime with rather definite convictions; one of the most serious, of course, is that criminologists and social workers are either deluded "sob sisters" or else malefactors themselves when they advocate anything but a "treat 'em rough" policy for offenders. In other words, the student approaches the study of criminology quite satisfied with his own ideas. Experience has shown, however, that students usually lose this satisfied certainty as their knowledge of the scientific study of crime increases, and usually their work in criminology gives them totally different views of the crime problem.

It is only through the frequent repetition of this educational process that America can hope to cope with its crime problem more successfully. Crime, like sin, will never be abolished; however, a more intelligent approach to the crime problem will greatly reduce its proportions. Criminology, the scientific study of crime and punishment, aims to provide this intelligent approach. Criminology is a branch of sociology and like the latter subject crosses over into several allied fields of university study.

I. THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF CRIME

1. CRIME AND CRIMINAL INTENT

A crime is either the commission of an act forbidden by the state or, in a few instances, the failure to perform an act commanded by the

state under penalty. There are three kinds of crime: felonies, misdemeanors, and violations of ordinances or bylaws. The last-named are minor offenses defined by cities or other small units of government, and in the minds of both the lawmakers and the public are not regarded as crimes at all. Felonies are offenses which, under the old common law of England and in the early American states, were punishable by death or total forfeiture of land and goods.

Now that most of our states have codified their criminal law, the extent of the punishment provided determines whether an offense is a felony or merely a misdemeanor. Felonies differ somewhat from state to state, but in general it may be said that, if the possible penalty provided by the legislature is a year or more of imprisonment, the offense is called a felony. "Infamous crimes" are those which may be punished either by death or by imprisonment in a state prison. Misdemeanors are crimes of lesser degree, punishable usually by a maximum of less than a year in jail. A crime is not necessarily an immoral act, nor are all immoral acts crimes. Coloring food or failing to place safety devices on machines may not be sinful, but states can make them crimes, just as the use of intoxicating liquors was made a crime a few years ago. Or consider a better example: It might not be sinful if one who had been injured by a criminal act agreed for a profitable consideration not to prosecute; yet, if the state insisted upon prosecuting, then the victim of a felony would become guilty of a crime himself ("compounding a felony") by his failure to prosecute. Finally, regardless of the offense committed, it has been customary in recent times to refer to juvenile offenders as delinquents rather than as criminals.

Although they become subject to court action through the commission of offenses, children are usually dealt with differently, because they are regarded as incapable of having a criminal intent. The treatment of juvenile delinquents will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. While it is a general principle of law that there can be no crime unless there is a criminal intent, legislatures may, if they wish, punish acts on the ground that public policy may require dispensing with the necessity of this intent in such instances as the violation of pure-food, traffic, and fish and game laws. Even in most serious offenses it is not always necessary that there be a specific criminal intent. It may suffice sometimes that there be an intention to commit a crime, even though the specific intent is not carried out. Thus, if A aimed to kill B, but, in attempting to commit this felony, killed C by mistake, intent is implied. On the other hand, there are certain offenses for which a "specific" intent is an essential element. Thus, in order that one may be charged with

burglary, it must be proved that he broke into a house with the intent to commit a felony. If his intent was only to commit a misdemeanor, his breaking and entering could not be classified technically as burglary. Yet even in the latter type of case the court may infer intent from the circumstances, under the principle that a man is presumed to have intended the natural and probable consequence of his act. In the case of alleged burglary, therefore, an intent to commit a felony at the time of entry may be inferred from the fact of its actual commission after the time of entry. Similarly, the specific intent to kill may be inferred from the fact that one person beat another with a deadly weapon.

It is largely because of such legal technicalities as those just considered that lawyers are necessary in criminal trials. In many cases criminals are freed not because the state lacked evidence to convict them, but because the prosecuting attorney overlooked some such technical legal point in the preparation of the charges. Under the present system of American justice, in which prosecuting attorneys and judges are political officers, it is easy to understand why the highly paid, experienced [redacted]hpiece" of the criminal gangster is able to outwit a political hack or his inexperienced assistant who is in charge of prosecution. Lawyers are experts in courtroom procedure; they are criminologists only by avocation.

A final word should be said about intent in connection with offenses committed by the intoxicated and by the insane. Drunkenness does not excuse from responsibility for crime except in the following cases: (a) where the drunkenness is involuntary; (b) where delirium tremens exists; and (c) in such crimes as burglary where a "specific intent" is required. The same rule applies to those under the influence of drugs. With respect to crimes committed by the insane, our law is far from being uniform or clear. In general, it may be said that: (a) such offenders are regarded as irresponsible in all states if unable to distinguish between right and wrong in the particular act in question; (b) in some states they are regarded as irresponsible, in addition, if "irresistibly impelled" to act, even though the act was known to be wrong. The "insanity plea" is one of the most intricate and controversial subjects in the entire field of law, and the use of the plea in criminal cases has sometimes held both lawyers and psychiatrists up to public ridicule. One reason for this confusion is the fact that psychiatrists think in terms of psychoses rather than insanity, the latter being a legal rather than a medical term. The whole difficulty centers around the ability of psychiatrists, sometimes termed alienists, to determine, after an offense has been committed, whether or not the defendant was capable of en-

tertaining a criminal intent at the time of the crime. Since many psychotic persons act rationally at times, it is difficult to tell whether they were legally responsible at the time the criminal act took place, the latter point being the only concern of the law.

Wrongful Acts

It has already been indicated that not every wrongful act is a crime. Perhaps this statement can be illustrated by imagining a small circle enclosed in a much larger one. The larger circle would include all wrongful acts and the small one only those that are crimes. If a third concentric circle be placed between these two, its field may be called that of wrongful acts of which the law takes cognizance, but which in the broad sense of the word are not crimes. These wrongful acts are known as torts or civil wrongs, which may be remedied by civil rather than criminal court proceedings. Some acts are both torts and crimes. Thus, as a result of an automobile accident, one may be sued civilly for damages as well as prosecuted criminally for reckless driving. It may be said that civil-law proceedings prevail when [redacted] party sues another for satisfaction with the state acting as arbiter, while the rules of criminal procedure govern where the injury is so grave that the peace of the state is endangered, the state acting as prosecutor as well as judge in the latter cases. Finally, there is a third type of procedure, known as equity, which is generally invoked now in certain cases of property rights, such as those involving trusts and trustees, foreclosure of mortgages, and injunctions. Equity procedure, also known as chancery procedure, inherited originally from the Roman law rather than from the English common law, is less formal and technical than that of our other courts. For this reason chancery procedure has been adapted for use in our juvenile and domestic-relations courts.

Apart from the exceptions already noted, our criminal procedure is rigid by design and by tradition. This inflexible, technical procedure is founded upon two somewhat contradictory old English principles: first, that which assumes that the commoner accused of a crime must be protected by technicalities at every turn lest he be convicted unjustly by a tyrannical monarch; second, that which presumes that all persons are equal before the law. Many believe that in our present-day American society the application of the first principle unduly favors the criminal and that the second principle fails to recognize the fact that no two crimes in history ever involved exactly the same combination of factors and amounts of responsibility, so that our attempt to make the

punishment "fit the crime" is too easy on some and too severe on other offenders. This last point will be clearer after we consider the causes of crime and their possible effects upon the element of consent. Perhaps it might be noted here that, if the Christian conception of responsibility for sin followed the legal "fit the crime" philosophy, few could be saved. The Catholic student might well consider the three requirements for a mortal sin in this connection, and recall that "grave matter" alone even in a sane person is not sufficient. At this point it is desirable to leave the field of crime as the lawyer knows it for crime as the criminologist knows it.

2. THE EXTENT OF CRIME

Crime statistics are far from being reliable. Until the present decade the only statistics available were isolated reports from individual cities and reports concerning the population of penal institutions. Since 1929, the Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice has been issuing quarterly bulletins of statistics concerning crime in the United States based on reports received from the police of "crimes known to the police." The reporting area for these crimes has increased considerably and for the first quarter of 1938 constituted more than 2,000 cities with a total population of over 60,000,000. The bureau estimated the serious offenses for the calendar year 1937 as follows:[1]

Murder and non-negligent manslaughter	7,859
Manslaughter by negligence	5,705
Rape	8,518
Robbery	59,786
Aggravated assault	45,478
Burglary	292,870
Larceny	780,031
Auto theft	215,569

Dr. Sutherland has pointed out five factors which affect the reliability of criminal statistics: (1) definitions of crime change with changing laws; (2) the number of crimes actually committed cannot be known or enumerated; (3) any record of crimes, such as that of arrests, may be used as an index only on the assumption that the index maintains a constant ratio to the crimes committed; (4) the only criminal statistics available for the entire United States are prison statistics; (5) statistics, to be valuable, should be correlated with population figures collected for various years in age, sex, and racial composition, but much

[1] *Uniform Crime Reports* (Washington, D.C., 1938), Volume 8, page 211.

of this information is available now only through estimates which have a wide latitude of error.[2] The value of a crime rate as an index decreases directly in ratio to the distance from the crime. Prison statistics, therefore, are much less reliable than those of crimes known to the police. On the other hand, statistics concerning crimes known to the police are inadequate because of: (1) the lack of a standard for determining what constitutes a report of crime to the police; (2) variations between cities in practices; (3) the fact that the sending of reports to the United States Department of Justice is voluntary. Because of these factors statistics in the United States are not comparable with those of other countries. England and Wales keep reasonably good statistics, but their terminology and practices of reporting differ from our own. The majority of comparisons which we hear of are invalid; however, most students agree that the crime rates of the United States are higher than those of European countries.

The homicide rates might be cited as an illustration of the difficulties involved in comparing crime rates. Homicide includes such things as "justifiable homicide" or self-defense; "manslaughter" due to negligence, such as is involved in thousands of deaths from automobile accidents; manslaughter resulting from passion; and willful, premeditated "murder." In some instances an American "homicide" rate which included all the above crimes has been compared with that of another country in which only felonious homicides were listed. It must be admitted, however, that even with the use of the new statistics issued by the Department of Justice, in which felonious homicides are isolated, our rates are still excessive. If we compare our estimated felonious homicide rate in 1931 with even the total homicide rates of other countries, we find that it exceeds those of all except Italy, being five times that of England and Wales, and nearly three times that of Canada.

Our lack of adequate criminal statistics has been the cause of much confusion. It has enabled the advocates of various cure-alls to make a plausible claim for their plans by citing alleged associations between certain factors and the crime rate. The long controversy over the wisdom of federal control of intoxicating liquor is a notorious example of the misuse of statistics. Prohibitionists "proved" to many good but unsuspecting people that "alcohol is the chief cause of crime." So, too, immigration, feeble-mindedness, and even the weather have been blamed as "chief causes" with imposing arrays of statistics to back up these assertions. It is important, therefore, to give more attention to the

[2] E. H. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology* (J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1935), pages 24–25.

compilation of criminal statistics so that we may know what correlations are really valid. The attack on the crime problem is greatly handicapped at present because of inadequate statistical knowledge. This gap in our information about crime makes it possible for sensation-seekers to announce periodic crime waves with little danger of contradiction. Many such announcements have been made in recent years, and, when local newspapers make it a point to "feature" the commission of certain crimes, which would ordinarily be placed in an inconspicuous place or not even mentioned, Mr. Average Citizen is pretty sure that a crime wave is in progress. The student can probably recall how a "wave of sex crimes" followed the commission of a single sensational crime of this nature in his own community. Newspapers are especially fond of "crime waves" that involve sex, for obvious financial reasons. In most instances criminologists have refused to take the so-called crime waves of recent years seriously. Statistics, inadequate as they are, fail to bear out the cries of alarmists. An examination of the costs of crime further illumines the extent of crime.

3. THE COSTS OF CRIME

We pay our enormous crime bill in many different ways. Briefly, they may be summarized under three different headings: the economic costs, the human costs, and the ethical costs. It would seem that the best way to arrive at the economic cost of crime is to give the estimated costs of preventing and punishing crime as well as the probable losses due to criminal acts. This was the method followed by the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, appointed by President Hoover in 1929, with George W. Wickersham as its chairman. The student will find much valuable information on crime in the fourteen reports made by this commission. According to its estimate, the crime bill, given in the nearest million, should be itemized as follows: federal cost of criminal justice, $53,000,000; administration of criminal law, $350,000,000; state penal and correctional institutions and parole agencies, $52,000,000; known insured losses against property, $47,000,000; losses due to fraudulent use of the mails, $68,000,000; cost of insurance against burglary, robbery, etc., $106,000,000; forgeries, $40,000,000; loss of productive labor of prisoners and law-enforcement officers, $300,000,000. Many estimates have been made of the total cost of crime. Some have said that it is more than five times the annual cost of maintaining all our schools and colleges. Such estimates, of course, are hazardous guesses at best, and probably one opinion is as good as another. In addition to the economic costs in-

volved in the prevention, detection, prosecution, and punishment of crime, which must include the salaries of police and court officials and the maintenance of penal institutions, there are the less tangible human costs involved in the broken lives of criminals and the effects of their disgrace upon their families. The loss which our nation suffers in prestige because of its high crime rate should be reckoned also. Nor should the sufferings of the victims of crime be overlooked. No one can measure the costs involved in the heartaches of the parents of a kidnaped child.

A final aspect of the cost of crime is the subtle perversions of ethics which it induces: tax evasion, corrupt political practices, bribery both indirect and direct, and a miscellany which might be included under the general term "fraudulent advertising." Sharp practice in many professions, such as "ambulance-chasing" by lawyers, misrepresentation by financiers, and criminal operations by physicians, might be added to the list. Perjury, one of the greatest signs of public moral decay, is prevalent in America largely on account of the violation of oaths in court proceedings. Judge Joseph N. Ulman, writing in *American Mercury* for May, 1935, said that some authorities believe that perjury is committed in half of all contested civil cases, three fourths of all criminal cases, and 90 per cent of all divorce cases. This evil is so great that some have suggested that, if the concept and real significance of God cannot be revived in the lives of our people, the oath should be abolished. Sharp practices, as well as perjury, tend to affect the moral fiber of the nation. When we consider the extent of these unethical practices, the numbers arrested for violation of law seem almost insignificant by comparison. These practices, by their bad example to others, breed contempt for law and order, and they also bring about personal deterioration in those who engage in them. Any consideration of crime must record as part of the total problem those practices which go undetected or which, when detected, are not punishable under the criminal law. There is every reason to believe that some of the quasi crimes just mentioned tend to be even more numerous than those which are handled as matters of police report. Even though numerical comparisons are impossible on an objective basis, such activities are conducted at an enormous economic cost to society, to say nothing of the political discontent which they engender. Perhaps one is justified in stating that the "white collar" criminal in his own way is more dangerous socially than the strong-arm robber. Certainly the former is more vicious when one considers the trail of bribery and special privilege he leaves behind.

II. The Causes of Crime

The first thing to be learned about crime is that it cannot be attributed to any single cause. In spite of the efforts of various hobby-riding reformers, crime is due to a large number of factors which, even in a single case, interlock completely, so that it is usually difficult, if not impossible, to isolate the chief cause. In the analysis of the various causes of crimes, four headings will be used, although it must be admitted that these divisions are somewhat arbitrary and by no means exclusive. The causes of crime can be grouped as follows: (1) physical and physiological; (2) mental and psychological; (3) socioeconomic; (4) cultural.

1. PHYSICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL CAUSES

The cause of crime has often been attributed to physical conditions. Various physical defects and abnormalities have been regarded as significant contributors to criminality. No statistical records indicate the veracity of this general conclusion, and the few studies which exist on this subject have many weaknesses. There is no doubt, however, that individual defects are of import in individual cases. If a child, by reason of physical defect, is held up to the scorn of his classmates, his reaction may result in various delinquencies. It is reasonable to suppose that a child who is ridiculed and then becomes a truant may get into difficulty because of a great deal of unsupervised leisure time, freedom that may bring him into bad companionship. Sometimes this ridicule may lead to a hatred of society and to general antisocial attitudes. One cannot say that the physical defect in this case is a direct cause of criminality, but it can be significant in individual instances of this kind. Similarly, an excess of physical energy caused by glandular disturbance may result in restlessness and a desire for new experiences and may finally terminate in such antisocial conduct as running away from home. Lombroso, the leader of the Italian or positive school of criminology, insisted in 1876 that criminals were born as such and could be recognized by physical stigmata. The stigmata included such things as a long lower jaw, an asymmetrical cranium, a flat nose, a scanty beard, and low sensitivity to pain. Supposedly, the criminal either showed a reversion to the savage type (an atavism) or else was degenerate. It was concluded that the typical criminal could not avoid crime unless he found himself in unusually favorable circumstances. This concept was based upon the measurement of criminals and was widely accepted, with minor changes, until 1913, when Charles Goring made

a famous study of criminals and noncriminals in England and found no difference in cranial measurements between them.

The subject of physical characteristics is intimately connected with the subject of heredity, and the question of the hereditary nature of crime has long been discussed. Goring maintained that the inherited element is not criminality as such, but defective intelligence. Karl Pearson, who worked with him, believed that the inherited element in criminality was "defectiveness of the social instinct." The family trees of various disreputable families have often been considered as proofs of the hereditary nature of criminality. Studies of the Jukeses, the Kallikaks, and the Zeros seem to show traits appearing in successive generations. This does not indicate, however, that the trait was inherited any more than the wearing of shoes is inherited. Goring found significant correlations between the imprisonment of fathers and sons and indicated that this was due to two factors: heredity and environment. He attempted, imperfectly, to eliminate environment and consider the residue hereditary. Most modern students of the question have concluded that heredity does not *cause* criminality. As to its contribution as a secondary influence, practically all admit that, until we know more about the way characteristics are transmitted, we shall not be able to weigh the influence of heredity accurately. Each of the endocrine or ductless glands in turn has been suspected of being, through malfunctioning, a causal factor in cases of delinquency. No studies have adequately proved this most recent theory as yet. The more conservative believe that certain instances of hyperactive thyroid, resulting in gross overweight, may have a relation to delinquency. This delinquency is due, probably, to the reaction of the individual to society's reaction to him rather than to any direct connection between the physical condition and the delinquency.

2. MENTAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

Since there has been a lack of standards of normality to which deviating traits may be referred, it is obvious that any consideration of the mental and psychological factors in causal relationship to crime must be somewhat hypothetical, especially in view of the wide differences of opinion among psychiatrists on some of these topics. Under this classification there are briefly nine different topics: (a) the psychoses; (b) the psychopathic personality; (c) the postencephalitic personality; (d) epilepsy; (e) feeble-mindedness; (f) conflict; (g) adolescence; (h) attitudes; (i) alcoholism.

The Psychoses

The American public is justly suspicious of the "insanity plea" in criminal cases. Too often it has witnessed the farce by which reasonably sane murderers, alleged to be the irresponsible victims of anything ranging from "brainstorms" to the correctly labeled psychoses, have escaped sentencing in the criminal courts only to be returned to society from state hospitals shortly afterwards as "cured" of their alleged mental affliction. In the trial of such cases it is customary for a clever defense lawyer to present a long list of family foibles and peculiarities to the jury, have the defendant's mother tell how he fell and probably "hurt his head" as a baby, and then bring in psychiatrists to answer long hypothetical questions. These methods finally succeed in so befuddling the jury that a perfectly sane person is sometimes committed to a state hospital instead of suffering the ordinary legal punishment for his criminal act. Usually such a murderer cannot be detained in a state hospital very long, for in subsequent chancery proceedings it is easy to prove by different evidence that he is sane. Once released, he may not be tried again for his crime, since this would amount to double jeopardy. Fortunately, such legal fiascos are being reduced now that states are learning how to use psychiatry in criminal cases without abuse.

Much of the confusion which surrounds the application of psychiatric knowledge to criminal procedure lies in the fact that the law does not as yet recognize degrees of irresponsibility for the mentally abnormal. In the case of a sane man the law to some extent recognizes degrees of responsibility; hence the varying degrees of murder and the distinction between crime and juvenile delinquency. Yet, if a mental abnormality is present, the criminal law is interested only in the question whether the person was sane or insane at the time of the act. Law and psychiatry will have to co-operate in this matter for the protection of society and recognize the fact that a very slight mental oddity may not be advanced as insanity and so become excuse for murder.

Some of the confusion concerning the relation between the psychoses and crime has arisen from careless and misleading statements made by such men as the late Clarence Darrow and a few rash psychiatrists, who said that all criminals are "mentally ill." Inasmuch as the perpetrator of a criminal act fails to use good logic, or rational control, or both, at the time of the commission of his act, it might be said that, in a broad sense, he was mentally ill at the time. So is the noncriminal in a dozen of his ordinary daily activities, but no one would think of excusing his foolish

actions because of his psychotic traits. For that matter, reputable psychiatrists have said that in most cases a man is not dangerous because of his insanity, but chiefly because of the peculiar personality make-up or bad character that is the basis of his insanity. Most psychotics are not dangerous; even some paranoiacs have sufficient inhibitions to prevent their committing a serious crime. The good order which prevails at state hospitals should in itself be good proof that there is no necessary or even close connection between psychoses and crime, though this does not mean that psychotic patients should not be institutionalized.

The Psychopathic Personality

Psychopathic personality, also referred to as constitutional psychopathic inferiority, causes abnormalities in emotional life. Psychopathic personalities are classified generally as the egocentric, the inadequate, and the vagabond, these descriptive terms readily indicating the nature of the problem. The great trouble, however, is that the term "psychopathic personality" is a sort of "refuse can" in psychiatry, a category into which all persons who cannot be otherwise classified are "dumped." Many recent authorities have pointed out that the extreme variance in the incidence of psychopathic personality in admissions to different penal institutions is due to the variations among psychiatrists rather than to those existing among the prisoners in these different institutions. One of the obvious difficulties in such estimates is that we have no adequate estimate of the number of constitutional psychopaths in the normal population outside prisons. The error which is made here is similar to that of Lombroso, who observed prisoners, recorded what he believed he saw, and failed to note that the same characteristics were present in the civil population.

Although true psychopathic personalities, by their very emotional instability, are likely to get into trouble, we have no certain evidence that they are found in the criminal population more than in the normal population. It is well known that the prison population is composed of both first offenders and repeaters, and it may be true that the repeaters have developed psychopathic personalities as a result of having been in prison. It must be pointed out further that, if a distinct relation between psychopathic personality and crime is to be discovered, studies will have to be more selective than those of the present, which are based largely on the prison population. It is unfortunate that both the psychiatrists and the psychologists who study prison conditions place emphasis upon whatever abnormal traits are discovered and exclude many other factors. The approach of psychologists and psychiatrists to the problem of crime

may prove fruitful if the criminal is studied, not in terms of mental deviation alone, but also in terms of how his particular mental constitution is affected by other social and environmental influences.

Postencephalitic Personality

Encephalitis lethargica, a recently identified disease commonly known as "sleeping sickness," produces bad effects on the central nervous system and frequently results in behavior problems involving irritability. It is not known what proportion of cases of this disease results in specific delinquencies, but some psychiatrists believe that the proportion is relatively high, especially among children. While it is generally believed that an injury to the neural system is the primary cause of postencephalitic delinquency, the reason why delinquency results in some cases but not in others is disputed. Some believe that delinquency occurs only when the environmental situation is one that is conducive to delinquency anyway. Because of the rather sudden change in conduct that takes place in some of these cases, most authorities are inclined to attribute the misconduct to the faulty adjustment of the victim to defects acquired as a result of the primary injury to the nervous system. Thus it may happen that the child who has recovered from the disease learned to act impulsively while under the strain of his illness and allowed this kind of action to become a habit later. Or the child's misconduct may be due to a feeling of inferiority or resentment that he experiences because of facial paralysis or other physical sequels of the disease. At any rate, whether the residuals are organic or functional—and apparently science has considerable to learn in this matter—they are striking. Often, in place of an even-tempered child, we find one who is ill-tempered and most difficult to control. Many claim to see similar changes in the personality of some adults who have suffered from this mysterious disease.

Epilepsy

Some studies seem to indicate that epilepsy is frequently associated with criminality. This relation may be explained in terms of certain peculiarities of epileptics such as variation in abilities from day to day and irritability accompanied by obstinacy. At the present time, there is no statistical evidence on the ratio between epileptics who are criminal and those who are not. It is interesting to note that Lombroso at one time believed epilepsy to be a most important factor in criminality and assigned epileptics to a class called the eleptoids. As in the case of other physical factors the theory may be suggested that the reaction of

society to the epileptic may result in many of those personality traits which to some extent seem correlated with criminality. Singer and Krohn point out three types of emotional outbreaks which suggest a more direct correlation between epilepsy and crime. First of all, there is "epileptic furor," an emotional outbreak which, though short, may be of great violence, leading the victim to react with a blind fury to anyone who opposes him. However, after an attack or two of this nature, epileptics are usually confined to institutions permanently. Other epileptics suffer mild emotional disturbances of despair, during which they may attempt to run away or even commit suicide. Finally, there may be attacks which lead to outbursts of hilarity and breach of the peace. It is thought that some cases of dipsomania are epileptic. In these cases the epileptic attack takes the form of depression accompanied by a blind headache and a craving for alcohol. A drink or two may result in a prolonged spree ending in a drunken coma. An interval of months or even years may separate such attacks, there being no desire for alcohol during such intervals. Alcohol seems to have some special effect on most epileptics, many of them showing the effects of a single drink. Naturally, therefore, in such cases antisocial conduct can easily result.[3]

Feeble-Mindedness

The relation of feeble-mindedness to crime has been a matter of controversy for a long time. Before the administration of intelligence tests to nearly two million men in the United States army in 1918, it was generally assumed that the number of the feeble-minded was between 0.5 per cent and 1 per cent of the total population. The results of the army tests indicated that 24.1 per cent of the men were of inferior or very inferior intelligence. Since the same results had previously been obtained in studies made with the same tests in prisons, it became evident that the inmates of prisons did not differ materially from the men in the draft army. The earlier impression that one fourth of the population in prisons was feeble-minded was something of a shock to the nation, but it became evident to everyone, when the soldier population was similarly classified, that the tests were not properly standardized. As we know now, the test situations were based upon standards which were not normal, and since this error has been corrected there has been considerable improvement in the use of tests. However, the publicity received by the original announcement created a lasting impression, and some persons actually believed that feeble-mindedness accounts for

[3] H. Douglas Singer and William O. Krohn, *Insanity and the Law* (P. Blakiston's Son and Company, Philadelphia, 1924), pages 144–145.

a large percentage of criminality. In recent years there has been a definite departure from this early and erroneous opinion. Dr. Herbert E. Chamberlain said in 1935, "he is uninformed or malicious who asserts that feeble-mindedness is one of the causes for juvenile delinquency," adding that, even if the feeble-minded are found in greater proportion in prisons than in the general population, the explanation may be that they are apprehended more readily than those who are more intelligent.[4] Since accurate testing depends upon the co-operation of the person being tested, it is reasonable to assume that in many cases the results of improved tests are unreliable. Prisoners have been known to give false answers deliberately. Several recent books on prison life have brought out the unfortunate fact that prisoners either fear to be frank with the prison psychiatrists and psychologists or else take them as a huge joke, although this is by no means universal.

There seems to be no doubt, however, that feeble-mindedness may be a factor in crime in individual instances. It may result in an economically insecure position from which temptations may readily lead to crime. It may result in lack of things which an individual considers desirable, and he may resort to violence to obtain what he believes is needed. There is a tendency to assume that feeble-minded girls more readily become delinquent, and there seems to be some correlation between feeble-mindedness and prostitution. It must be observed, however, that even in this matter recent studies lead us to believe that feeble-mindedness has been vastly exaggerated as a causal factor. Healy and Bronner stated in the twenties that feeble-mindedness appears among serious delinquents from five to ten times more frequently than in the general population, but there is no evidence that Healy and Bronner knew at that time just how many feeble-minded there were in the general population; their estimate is subject to grievous probable error. Furthermore, these authors failed to show that feeble-mindedness, even though existing in a large number of cases, was directly connected as a cause to the criminal situations participated in by these particular delinquents. Instead, it may have been the factor which led to their having been caught.

With the exception of sensation-seeking city editors, educated persons today are recognizing that the feeble-minded, and especially the moron group, do not constitute any alarming crime problem. With the helpless lower type of feeble-minded, the idiots and imbeciles, largely confined to institutions, the moron or upper-class feeble-minded group are our chief concern at this point. In connection with them, it is coming to be

[4] *Probation*, Volume 13, February, 1935, page 1.

an accepted view that there are good morons and bad morons just as there is a similar classification among bankers and brokers. In all probability the great majority of morons are unrecognized because they fit into their environment as honest, industrious, and accepted citizens. The morons who are making trouble in the community are those who are socially maladjusted. Often not mental defectiveness but the same personality and character disabilities which get college graduates into trouble cause the undoing of the moron. The fact that his limited mental ability keeps him on the lower rungs of the economic ladder and, therefore, in the poorer neighborhoods of the city is another consideration which should be weighed before we condemn the feebleminded offender. We should remember, too, that, though some sex perverts—the morons of the city editor—are morons in the strict sense, the majority of them are believed to be of normal mentality. After all, good character is a common denominator for both genius and moron. The modern world tends to pardon its absence in the former and to be unduly harsh towards its deficiency in the latter.

Conflict

Conflict arises when an individual must make a decision involving choice of action. Often the wishes of the individual conflict with the wishes of society. In such instances a clash results when the individual wants to do one thing but society or conscience dictates otherwise. Conflict may be either mental or overt, the latter being a spontaneous release which may subside immediately or may develop into a definite attitude of revolt against authority. Numerous examples might be given of boys brought to court as incorrigible by parents, boys who act in conformity with the approved standards of the play group and neighborhood but in violation of family traditions. In their homes an old-world family pattern persisted, based on paternal authority, severe discipline, and early participation of members of the family in the economic world. The boys are interested in sports and high-school attendance and other American ways. Thus conflict arises between parents and children, creating a situation that can easily lead to delinquency. Here the choice has to be made between two standards of conduct.

Since the reactions to conflict often take the form of antisocial conduct, environmental situations, as they affect personal relationships, are of utmost importance. As a result of environment, reactions may take place which may be described as adjustment, nonadjustment, or maladjustment. The last category often has unfortunate implications, particularly when the conflict is between two social patterns, each of which

is acceptable to its exponents. Thus a certain degree of parental authority may seem excessive to the growing youth, but normal and desirable to the parent. In a changing world in which we do not seem to have adequate definitions for many situations, there are bound to be those who are in conflict with one phase or another of their environment. Although statistical studies do not indicate that conflict is itself the genesis of crime, there can be no doubt of its important implications in personal behavior, so that it must be considered as an influence which affects the life of the individual.

Adolescence

Youth is a transition period between childhood and adult life, and transition periods are hazardous. There are many obvious problems of adolescence, such as restrictions in the home or at school, undisciplined impulses, and feelings of inferiority. It is trite to state that youth is a period of seeking new experiences. Yet it seems to be apparent that, if these experiences are not in conformity with social objectives, there will be conflict of one kind or another. The desire for new experiences may involve stealing, truancy, disregard for parental authority, and many other manifestations which tend to produce antisocial habits. The individual in adolescence becomes very emotional; he is insecure and tries to hide his insecurity with various manifestations such as braggadocio, insolence, and daredevil feats. The process of growth is extremely uneven during this period, and as a result he may not be able to meet the expectations of those about him.

A casual review of the extent to which dishonesty, stealing, and similar habits exist in schools demonstrates that very often the practice of honesty among adolescents has many of the aspects of a game: if one is found out, he will be punished; so it becomes a contest to see who is not found out. These results show that punishment alone is not an effective antidote for dishonesty; moral motives must be invoked if habits of uprightness are to exist and develop. With public schools prohibited from teaching effective moral motives and with many urban parents neglecting to give this instruction as potently as it was given a generation ago, it is not unusual for the habits formed during adolescence to produce an attitude of mind which will later lead to criminality.

While adolescence is a period of habit-formation as well as a period of instability, the madadjustments of adolescence which result in delinquency or in later crime are due in a large measure to the ignorance or neglect of the adults who should be guiding and assisting the

adolescent. After pointing out that the delinquent adolescent is very often the victim of an unwholesome environment which society has not attempted to correct, Father Raphael C. McCarthy, S.J., indicates that parents in particular are frequently the unwilling cause of this delinquency. Some parents lack definiteness and firmness, he says, and so encourage a disobedience that spreads later to larger fields. In other cases it is a lack of parental understanding that gradually leads to delinquency. "The failure of fathers and mothers to understand their own developing sons and daughters may lead to unreasonable demands that destroy mutual confidence and incite the adolescent to rebellion." [5]

Attitudes

Sutherland uses the term "maturation" to indicate that criminality in certain persistent criminals develops in a somewhat consistent pattern. The process has two phases: (a) general attitudes toward crime; (b) increasing skill in the techniques used in criminal behavior. This concept of attitude is extremely important, since one who has developed a bias for delinquent conduct is a long way along the road to crime. Although some are able by will power to stop the development into confirmed criminality, it is equally certain that in other cases nothing happens to prevent this early bias from growing to its natural maturity. There is an added possibility that one may acquire undesirable attitudes toward such phases of life as marriage, the status of the family, reform of government, and the like, attitudes which, although not criminal in themselves, may have serious consequences for community life. For example, consider the firm conviction of many young people who, having been deprived of the opportunity to work during the depression, feel that they are persecuted, and, in consequence, take an attitude of revolt against all constituted authority.

One does not usually acquire a criminal bias through easy, well-marked stages of development. On the contrary, the process may be extremely subtle and the transition may come unexpectedly, without the individual's being aware that he has made a change in attitude. The human power of rationalization makes this the most normal rather than the exceptional form of development of the criminal bias. It must be remembered that the reasons for the existence of a criminal bias may be extremely varied: they may exist in the mind of the individual, or they may be the direct result of community conditions. If the "big shot" in the community is a known racketeer, there is a tendency for

[5] *Training the Adolescent* (The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1934), page 151.

youngsters in his neighborhood at a very early age to imitate him. Their admiration of him, of his clothing, of his automobile, tends to form for them a criminal bias, or at least the beginning of one. When through a process of growth such children arrive at an age where they may be useful to criminals, the bias may mature completely through participation in minor illegal activities.

Alcoholism

Intoxication has been recognized as a social problem for many centuries, and there can be no question as to its deleterious effects on many phases of life, including economic well-being, morality, and family life. More than half of all arrests are for intoxication. There is some disagreement about the effect of alcohol on violent crimes. Estimates affirm that from one third to two thirds of all serious crimes are affected by alcohol, but it is impossible to prove such estimates. Most experienced criminologists believe that many serious crimes involve the use of alcohol, but that the indirect effects of alcohol are potentially more serious than the immediate effects. Deterioration of family life is a common indirect effect of the abuse of alcohol; in such instances nonsupport is a normal family situation. Since it is generally agreed that personal disorganization and moral deterioration are normal concomitants of drunkenness, it is not surprising to find that excessive drinking is rather common among parents of delinquents. Alcohol is probably one phase in the lives of many criminals, rather than a specific cause of their crimes. Although many criminals offer excessive use of alcohol as the immediate reason for their crimes, very often this is a rationalization rather than a fact. By this device they try to evade personal responsibility for conduct which they are ashamed of before the law if not in conscience and to blame their "other self" created by alcohol. It would seem that the alleged correlation between alcoholism and crime is somewhat the same as that between alcoholism and mental disorder. On this point Drs. Singer and Krohn write:

> Alcohol is popularly deemed one of the most important of the many causes of insanity; but the general trend of modern psychiatric opinion is to the effect that, in most instances, the tendency to excessive indulgence is a symptom rather than a cause of mental disorder. This applies particularly to prolonged chronic drinking and there is much evidence to show that only persons with poorly constructed nervous systems are liable to become drunkards. The well balanced man may, as a result of circumstances, drink to excess and become intoxicated, but, except under unusual conditions, is not likely to succumb to the chronic abuse of liquor. It is for

this reason that alcoholism is often found to run in families, the inheritance being an unstable construction rather than simply a tendency to drinking.[6]

Just as an unstable personality may lead to chronic drinking, it may lead to criminal conduct as well. In such cases the cause of crime lies not in the drinking but in the personality background.

3. SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS

The stresses of our civilization produce certain social and economic needs the satisfaction of which often seem imperative to certain individuals. Thus we find that embezzlement frequently has as its motivation the acquisition of social prestige or of splendid finery. As such, it is a manifestation of normal human reactions to a given situation. Every person is impressed with the desirability of that which he does not have. In the absence of reasonable inner controls, he tries to obtain what he wants. The range of such desires is great: it may be an elementary demand for food, or it may be the enhancement of one's social position by country-club membership. Consider here the possible correlation between crime and (a) unemployment and (b) poverty.

Unemployment

Even though most of our depression unemployment and, for that matter, a large part of the unemployment of so-called normal times exist through no fault of the unemployed, this fact does not protect the former worker from varying degrees of personality disintegration. Some are able to stand the shock of the new status without being unduly upset, but the great majority of the unemployed carry the scars of this experience with them for years. Psychologically every person needs something to give him a feeling of importance in life. Ordinarily the fact that one has a job and is filling that job in a satisfactory manner becomes the necessary foundation of his ego. At any rate, with a job as a foundation he is able to enjoy other achievements, social preferment, a family, a hobby, or a hundred other things that bring joy to men's hearts. Knock the job out from under him, and his whole castle totters or collapses.

When a man loses his position, the goals which he formerly set for himself and his family gradually recede from him. Ambition, which may have brought him a considerable way in life, can hardly register when the odds become overwhelming. The loss of a job is usually followed by the loss of savings and of the dream goals that these savings

[6] *Op. cit.*, page 104.

symbolized. As time goes on and the unemployed applicant is told again and again that employers do not need him, he begins to lose confidence in himself. Sometimes his wife or children, unable to understand his unemployment at a time when neighbors are employed, lose confidence in him also. Family friction develops. Perhaps his wife finds employment and he takes over the housework, only to lose further dignity in his own eyes and in those of his family.

Out of the many psychological ramifications of unemployment a philosophy of bitterness and rebellion often develops, which can easily lead to crimes of violence as well as to communism. Where there is less pride, unemployment may lead to nefarious ways of making money, and, once this method of living has been tried with success, it may easily become a habit. The unemployed naturally tend to gravitate toward one another and so to cement one another's grievances and antisocial attitudes. Even in the absence of good statistical data other than those which show an increase in vagrancy and theft, it would seem evident that there must be a correlation between unemployment (with its concomitant loss of status, its idleness, and its necessary social readjustments) and crime.

Poverty

Poverty is a difficult factor to evaluate objectively. Many who commit crimes are poor, but it is difficult to express poverty in terms of causal relationships. A large number of studies concerning juvenile delinquency indicate lack of economic success on the part of the parents as an extremely important causal factor. However, it must be admitted that those juveniles who commit certain offenses in poor areas are more likely to be apprehended and arrested than juveniles committing the same offenses in the better neighborhoods. Furthermore, a few studies have seemed to show that delinquency and poverty are not related.

For a long time it has been generally agreed that there is a distinct relationship between bad housing and juvenile delinquency. A recent study by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, Housing Division, confirmed this on the basis of previous studies and new data collected from 454 male prisoners in federal penitentiaries and reformatories and 521 children on probation in the District of Columbia. The conclusions were as follows:

1. Judged by household space, the housing of the delinquent members of our society is clearly much less adequate than that of the general population. This is true in both urban and rural districts. The crowding apparently arises, in many cases, through the presence in the household of

others than the immediate family group. Largely as an outgrowth of the household congestion, undesirable sleeping arrangements are apparently very common in the homes of the delinquent groups, children sleeping in the same room with adults, adolescents of different sex sleeping in the same room, and three or more individuals sleeping in one room.

2. The housing of the delinquent groups, so far as the evidence goes, is inferior to that of the population as a whole with respect to the type of dwelling unit occupied, the condition of the structures in which these individuals live, and the modern conveniences with which their homes are equipped.

3. The evidence that is available indicates that a significantly large proportion of the delinquent group comes from homes in districts where land crowding is prevalent, and where light, ventilation, and wholesome recreation space are inadequate.

4. All the evidence indicates clearly that a major portion of the delinquents studied, particularly the juvenile delinquents, came from unsatisfactory neighborhoods—sections marked not only by congestion and physical deterioration, but also by the presence of such positive bad factors as street gangs, nearby pool halls, dance pavilions, beer halls, and disorderly houses.

5. With regard to almost every housing test applied to the cases studied, the Negroes were much more disadvantageously situated than the whites, which bears out the findings of previous investigators that the housing situation of Negroes is generally poor.

6. In general, then, the delinquents studied were handicapped with respect to every aspect of their housing situation. With reference to the juveniles at least the conclusion can scarcely be escaped that the housing, if not the chief factor, was at least a very significant factor accounting for the delinquent behavior.

7. Most of the bad housing situations found, notably household congestion, poor structures, and bad elements in the neighborhood, would naturally be altered in correctly planned and adequately large housing projects.

8. It is reasonable to expect, provided the housing (including not only the structure itself, but also the immediate environment) were improved, that delinquency would decrease. This reasoning is confirmed by careful students of the problem.[7]

Perhaps the housing studies seem more definite than others in showing a correlation between poverty and crime because they all involve city-dwellers. Poverty in a large city, by forcing people to live in low-rent areas and even in degrading environments cut off from the better cultural influences, differs considerably from poverty in a small town or in the country. When one stops to consider the effect of cultural influences upon conduct, as we shall do in the following section, it is amazing that more of the urban poor are not law-breakers.

[7] *Housing and Delinquency* (Washington, D.C., 1936), pages 40–41.

Even if we ignore bad housing, it remains true that several studies have seemed to indicate a correlation between poverty, with its low wages, and crime. However, one must be cautious in using the results of these studies because of the extreme subjectivity of terms like "poor" and "very poor." It seems evident that we must have better-controlled and comparative studies in order to determine adequately and statistically direct relationships of this sort. It must be emphasized further that the term "relationship" is much more significant in any considerations of these factors than the term "cause." Our previous study of poverty gave us a perspective which should make us appreciate the need for caution in designating conditioning relationships of this kind. It may be that certain factors in the physical environment prevent the formation of positive attitudes toward society. When one lives amid physical conditions which are a constant negation of good conduct, of self-efficiency, of interest in one's home and family, an attitude is likely to develop in which the assumption of responsibility toward the community is ignored.

4. CULTURAL FACTORS

We have seen that in nearly every crime there is an interplay of causal relationships which are complex and extremely difficult to isolate. Under the heading of cultural factors, consider here the possible weight of such elements as (a) home and family; (b) race; (c) nationality; (d) religion; (e) culture areas.

Home and Family

It is generally conceded that, among the many factors which determine the development of attitudes and personality in children, the family is probably most important. In point of chronology, it is the first social grouping with which the child has contact, and it exercises a very definite influence upon his life during the impressionable years of childhood and adolescence. The habits and attitudes created by home life usually make the difference between success and failure in later adjustments to the demands of society. With the changing status of the home in our civilization and the development of other institutions to meet needs formerly met solely through the home, gaps have occurred which are not met adequately by any agency. The child in his relationships outside the home is not subject to a uniform and consistent pattern of standards and ideals, despite the tremendous recent development of supervised recreation as a factor in the lives of children. Those

who are familiar with recreational programs know that they cannot meet fundamental and basic needs which by their very nature reside initially in the home.

Broken Homes. Studies of juvenile delinquency have usually emphasized the relation between the home and the formation of character. Many of the studies have been statistical analyses of the incidence of family disorganization as indicated by broken homes. As a result of these studies, it has been pretty generally accepted that the probability of delinquency is greater among children whose homes are broken by the death of one or both parents, desertion, divorce, or separation of parents than among those who live in unbroken homes. One important study showed that 50.7 per cent of 7,598 delinquent boys confined in industrial schools in 31 states came from broken homes. The Bureau of the Census, studying more than 10,000 juvenile delinquents admitted to institutions for the first half of 1923, learned that 56.1 per cent were from broken homes. Similar reports by the Gluecks and others give the same general conclusions, namely, that from 40 per cent to 60 per cent of delinquents (principally in institutions) come from broken homes. On the other hand, most estimates of children in the total population (nondelinquents) who are from broken families indicate that the rate is only about 25 per cent.

All the foregoing studies indicated a close correlation between homes and juvenile delinquents. However, it is most important to observe that these studies did not establish control groups representing adequately the same areas and cultural groups as the delinquents. In other words, it is necessary to consider not only the incidence of broken homes in relationship to juvenile delinquency, but the incidence of broken homes in a *similar group* of the general population, in order to determine accurately whether broken homes constitute a distinct causal factor in juvenile delinquency. As an illustration of the widespread assumption that a direct correlation exists between delinquency and broken homes, it may be pointed out that in making annual reports it is almost traditional for juvenile courts to comment at length upon the number of children who are from broken homes, and then to "view with alarm" a situation which may be out of proportion to the actual situation. It is not our purpose to minimize the broken home as a possible factor, but to point out that objective considerations must be recognized before a final conclusion can be formed. The following study will suggest the wisdom of caution in accepting the usual juvenile-court report on broken homes.

Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay have made what is prob-

ably the most comprehensive study of broken homes in relationship to delinquency.[8] The first problem undertaken was to determine the incidence of broken homes in a given area rather than in the general population. The study ignored the cause of the break or the effect of the break in the home upon the behavior of the boys, thus eliminating subjective definitions, found in so many other studies, as to the probable effect on subsequent behavior. Personal interviews were obtained with 7,278 boys of from 10 to 17 years in twenty-nine Chicago public schools. The rate of broken homes (the percentage of boys in a given group who come from homes that had been broken) ranged from 16.0 to 53.0. The rate of broken homes in the schools was then divided into three groups on the basis of the delinquency rate in the square-mile area in which the school was located. These three groups ranged in delinquency from low through intermediate to high, but the percentage of broken homes fluctuated widely among schools within each of the three groups instead of conforming to the delinquency range. It was concluded that there was no very consistent relation between rates of broken homes and rates of delinquency. This study disproves many of the previously held notions concerning the reflection of broken homes in juvenile-delinquency statistics. It would also seem that there should be no comparisons made on this subject without due allowance for nationality, race, and age in the general population as well as in the delinquent population.

Further cautions may be suggested concerning the alleged correlation between broken homes and delinquency. It must be realized that boys from broken homes are more likely to get into juvenile courts than other boys. In Chicago, for example, where the majority of delinquents are handled by police officers known as juvenile police, the customary treatment is to release a child after a warning for a first offense, to call in the parents for a second offense, and after one or more additional offenses to refer the child to the court. However, a child from a broken home may be taken to court on a first offense. The hastily alleged "lack of parental discipline" in the instance of the child from the broken home may be more apparent than real. The police officer will normally follow current public opinion in this matter, but it is not unusual to find that in a fatherless home a mother can control and direct the behavior of her child most satisfactorily.

Institutional population statistics, which usually indicate a high pro-

[8] "Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency," *Causes of Crime* (National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Number 13, Part 2, Washington, D.C., 1931), pages 262–272.

portion of children from broken homes, may represent a similar reaction of juvenile-court judges to current popular opinions. Since many juvenile-court judges have developed the custom of "talking over the situation" with a boy's parents, a bias may exist toward boys who do not have both parents, and there may be a tendency to commit such boys to an institution more quickly. The importance of the additional factors which must be considered in order to make adequate comparisons is illustrated further by the Shaw and McKay study: in one area the Italian boys showed a low rate of broken homes and a high rate of juvenile delinquents, whereas the Mexican boys showed a high rate of broken homes and no delinquents.

The foregoing observations are not offered with the idea of discounting the importance of the home situation as a factor in juvenile delinquency, but merely to indicate that certain safeguards must be devised to achieve exactitude in our studies. The relation between broken homes and delinquency cannot be calculated by merely counting up the number of children in a juvenile court who are from broken homes and comparing that ratio with census reports of the total number in the population who are from broken homes.

What is a bad home? Family situations are extremely important influences in juvenile delinquency. In many cases, divorce, separation, or desertion may be less important as a factor in the life of a child than the emotional disturbances and tensions which have caused the final break in the family. The family often is defined as a unit of interacting personalities; these interacting personalities do not readily lend themselves to cataloguing on a statistical, objective basis. These intangible factors, for the most part, must be comprehended from the relationships seen in case studies. In many case studies we find delinquencies resulting from family tensions, and this domestic discord is shown to be a matter of gradual growth and development with its origin in the early experiences, personalities, and interests of the father and mother.

Since it is axiomatic that home conditions are major factors in shaping children's behavior patterns, a "bad" home is likely to be of primary importance in the genesis of a criminal career. Unfortunately for those engaged in various phases of crime prevention, it is not easy to identify a "bad" home. The fact has already been noted that broken homes have probably been overemphasized as causes of delinquency. There are several other factors which, standing by themselves, would seem to contribute to delinquency; yet, when taken in the web of

allied factors that go to make up a home, they are often offset so much as to be rather negligible influences. Thus the excessive use of alcohol by a parent, instead of leading a child to do likewise, may so repel a child that he will be a total abstainer for life. Crowded conditions caused by roomers in the home may raise the family income and so may benefit the child if the parents are careful to see that these roomers do not exercise an evil influence upon him. Such facts as these suggest that it is the interaction of personalities in the home, rather than the mere presence of this or that undesirable feature, that is most important. It should be remembered also that children who are brought up in the apartments of the well-to-do also suffer from serious handicaps. The "poor little rich child" may be continually repressed because of his parents' fear of incurring the landlord's displeasure by an injury to walls or fixtures. Outside play may be curtailed similarly because of the high value which neighbors place upon quiet and upon their flower gardens.

A worth-while analysis of the various factors that go to make a suitable home environment for the child would require among other things a long digression into the fields of mental hygiene and modern child care, a work which cannot be undertaken here. Books or pamphlets on these topics should be made required reading for all educated persons entering marriage. In the case of Catholics it is too much to expect that religious convictions with respect to the nature of marriage, even when fortified by divine grace, will alone achieve a happy home in this changing urban civilization. It is largely the success of the parent in the job of being a parent, rather than this or that element in the environment surrounding the family, that determines most often the future career of the child. In a pamphlet which might well be a primer on this subject for every Catholic college student, Father Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., points out why the formal training of future parents is more necessary now than it was in the past. He says:

> When parenthood was less difficult than it is today, formal education or specific instruction and guidance from extra-domestic sources as a preparation for family life was far less essential. Domestic life was reasonably successful without it. Parental love, native intelligence, and Christian understanding, coupled with favorable environmental circumstances, enabled many parents quite satisfactorily to fulfill their obligations towards their children. Through normal contacts within the confines of the little home world the children gradually learned the lessons of life that prepared them for the tasks of founding their own homes and rearing their own families. Step by step children became equipped with the knowledge and practice of

home making, their training usually ranging all the way from the mere physical side of housekeeping to the religious and moral training of children.

But social conditions have changed during the past few decades, and one of the unfortunate results is found in the fact that the more informal education in the homes of the past has largely broken down. The shared activities of work and play within the domestic realm have more and more gone by the way. The whole question of child training has become more difficult. Family life in general has become more involved and complex. We now have an enormously complex individual coming into contact with an equally involved and constantly changing environment.[9]

Race

Since the number of Indians and Orientals in America is rather small and confined chiefly to limited areas, this study will restrict to the Negro the examination of race as a possible factor in causing crime. The first impressive fact about the Negro crime rate is that it seems to be much higher than that of the white race, especially where crimes against property are involved. However, the anthropological value of these statistics is practically worthless when the special handicaps under which the American Negro labors are considered. In order to be able to attach any significance to race as a factor in crime causation, we should have to compare two different racial groups with the same economic and social status, a comparison which is impossible here, since no white person has to face the disabilities experienced by the man who is only seventy-five years removed from slavery. The fact that Negro women are committed to jails and reformatories ten times as frequently as native white women in proportion to population, while Negro men are so committed only three times as frequently as native white men, would in itself seem to suggest that factors other than race are involved in the high crime rate among Negroes.

Many of the factors which make the Negro's environment not only inferior, but vastly different from that of the white, even though their respective environments may seem almost identical to the superficial observer, are explained in the chapter on the Negro. At this point, therefore, it should be necessary to add only a few additional facts. We might confine our observations to the plight of the Negro in the courts of a northern city, realizing how much worse his handicaps must be in the South. In the lower criminal courts of New York City the Negro, usually unable to furnish bail, must go to jail while awaiting

[9] *Parent and Child* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York), page 4. Used by permission.

trial. If the charge against him is serious, he must rely upon counsel appointed by the court, since he cannot as a rule afford to hire a lawyer. This court-appointed counsel, unpaid except in murder cases, is not likely to be very diligent in gathering evidence, and the jailed Negro defendant is unable to gather it himself. Already at a disadvantage on account of a poorly prepared case, he has to face a jury which is anything but favorably inclined towards him. "Too often he goes on the witness stand pre-judged by the jurors, mainly because of the color of his skin—and many members of the jury who doubt his guilt dispose of the case by saying, 'In any event it won't hurt a colored man to stay in jail a while anyway, and we'll recommend leniency,' which means they are not convinced of his guilt." [10] The situation confronting the young Negro in New York throws additional light upon the plight of his race. The same observer continues:

> The other Court to be mentioned here is the Juvenile Court, which is most important to the Negro as to any other race. The Negro child is brought in for delinquency. What is to be done with him? The parents are away from home from early morning till late at night, working in service for meager salaries. No one is at home to help the child. He goes to school with a key tied about his neck, goes home at noon for a bite of cold bread and meat and possibly milk, or less. He leaves school at 3:00 or 3:30 in the afternoon with no supervision until about 9:00 in the evening, when the tired and weary mother and father come home from work, worn out and impatient with themselves and children. What is the Court to do when these children come before it? In minor cases of delinquency, there is no society of Big Brothers or Sisters to appear before the Court and offer to help the child. He is either sent to a reformatory or returned to the streets with no supervision.[11]

Nationality

There is no subject on which there seems to be more popular misunderstanding than the relation of nationality to crime. At one stage or another in the development of our country, popular opinions have averred that each nationality in turn has been responsible for "crime waves." When one considers the studies made by criminologists rather than the off-hand verdicts of nonimmigrants, he finds that immigrants in general contribute less than their quota to the criminal population of the United States, assuming that correction is made for variations in the age and sex composition of the immigrant population. One would

[10] Myles A. Paige, "The Negro in the Courts of New York City," *The Interracial Review*, Volume 6, April, 1933, page 67. Used by permission.

[11] *Ibid.*, page 68.

naturally think that, in view of mobility, poverty, language difficulties in the courts, the prejudice of juries, and other conditions surrounding our immigrants, the crime rate of immigrants would be high. Sutherland believes, however, that the respect for law and order learned in the home country is carried over and counteracts other influences here.

Different nationalities commit different crimes. Italians, often motivated by a national tradition which demands personal vengeance for certain injuries, show high rates of homicide as measured by prison statistics, but their rate for drunkenness is low. On the other hand, the Irish immigrants have always been convicted of petty offenses, such as intoxication, out of proportion to their ratio of the population, but their homicide rate is low.

The major problem of nationality in relation to crime concerns the second generation of immigrant families. Most statistics indicate that, when nativity is broken down into four distinct categories, a better picture of the total situation is obtainable than when only the typical phrases "foreign-born" and "native-born" are used. Such a division would include: (a) foreign-born; (b) native-born of native parentage; (c) native-born of foreign parentage; (d) native-born of mixed parentage. Studies show that the crime rate of these groups is in reverse order to the sequence just given, that is, the lowest amount is found among the foreign-born and the highest among the native-born of mixed parentage. Recalling the theory of conflict previously described, one should expect that the ratio would become higher where there are the greatest opportunities for cultural conflicts. Statistics concerning nationality and crime cannot be separated from those relating to environment. Delinquency areas of large cities have remained constantly in the front statistically over a period of several decades, although the nationality composition of the neighborhood changed. An area on the near northwest side of Chicago has remained consistently high in delinquency, although the nationality concentration has changed from Scandinavian to Irish and finally to Italian. This circumstance points to the conclusion that the conditions producing crime remained constant.

In the face of such evidence that the native-born population in proportion to its numbers contributes twice as many prisoners to New York state penitentiaries as does the foreign-born population in a typical year, with other states showing similar records, it is strange that the public generally should blame "foreigners" for most of our crime. Two factors have probably contributed to the formation of this false impression: first, people falsely assume that "foreign" names in crime stories indicate immigrants; second, the fact that the majority of crimes com-

mitted by the foreign-born are against persons rather than property tends to give them more prominence in the newspapers.

Religion

Statistics tell us nothing of the effect of church affiliation as such on crime. In the United States the Baptists and the Catholics have the highest rate of commitment in prisons which report religious affiliations, but studies show that most Negroes are Baptists and that most recent immigrants and their offspring are or should be Catholics. As we shall see shortly, the differentials here are explainable in terms of economic, educational, age, family, and residential factors.

It must be pointed out that Catholic residents of America have a large concentration (a) in the recent immigrant group, (b) in cities, and (c) in the economically deprived class. Including the native-born children of immigrants and mixed parentage in the first group, one can say that all three of these indices rank very high in statistics of criminals. It is also true that the word "Catholic" may mean almost anything and, as applied to the population of prisons, may mean very little indeed. In connection with the statistical relation between religion and crime, the studies of Father Leo Kalmer, O.F.M., and Father Eligius Weir, O.F.M., chaplains of Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, are illuminating. Over 90 per cent of all prisoners there reported church affiliation despite the fact that only 40 per cent of the civil population professes church membership. This situation, which was so obviously a distortion of the truth, was made the subject of study by the chaplains. Why did prisoners so evidently misrepresent themselves in the matter of religion? Upon examination the true facts, in the case of "Catholic" prisoners, were found to be as follows, to quote the present chaplain, Father Weir:

> When the present author, on entering his office as chaplain of Joliet-Stateville, undertook to interview the prisoners who were registered and committed to him as Catholics, he found that 9.75% of them had never actually joined the Church and that most of these had not even been baptized in any religion. But Baptism is the *conditio sine qua non* of membership in the Catholic Church; so much so that Catholic parents promptly submit their very new-born babes to the rite, and where the rite is neglected even thus in infancy, there is a glaring lack of even the most elementary Catholicity.
>
> Furthermore, the author's records disclose the fact that 80.29% of the Catholic convicts on entering the penitentiary had not made their Easter duty. But if there is any exterior criterion of practical Catholicity, that criterion is the worthy reception of the sacraments of Penance and Holy

Eucharist at least once a year at Easter time. Thus over 80% of the Catholic registrees had not been practicing their religion while nearly 10% were not Catholic in any real sense of the term.[12]

Further light is thrown upon the faulty religious background of the prisoners who claimed to be Catholics at Joliet-Stateville by the fact that about 12 per cent had never received their first Communion and 22 per cent had never received Confirmation. In the matter of the reception of these two sacraments, received usually between the ages of seven and fifteen, parental influence is largely responsible. The fact that nearly a quarter of the prisoners who claimed to be Catholics had not been properly guided in this matter by their parents during the most important character-forming years suggests quite definitely that they came from homes which could hardly be called Catholic. The deficiency in Catholic backgrounds prior to entering prison is indicated likewise by the attitude of so-called Catholic prisoners towards Holy Communion. It has already been noted that 80 per cent of the total number had not made their Easter duty immediately prior to their imprisonment. In other words, eight out of ten had neglected to observe the minimal requirement of Catholic practice, the neglect of which sometimes prompts the Church to refuse Catholic burial. In some cases these prisoners had ignored this minimum standard required of Catholics for five, ten, and even sixty years. Even when in a prison, where every facility was offered for the reception of the sacraments, less than 4 per cent of those registered as Catholics received Holy Communion once a month or oftener, a frequency which most average Catholics outside prison try to maintain today. For that matter there were some misgivings about the worthiness of the reception of Holy Communion by the 4 per cent, for prisoners occasionally disclosed the fact that they received unworthily and chiefly to gain the good will of the chaplain.[13]

The amazing statistics which indicate that over 90 per cent of prisoners have church affiliation while only 40 per cent of the general population is so affiliated can be explained rather easily. In compiling the United States census figures of persons affiliated with a church, only those who maintain some kind of personal contact with some specific religious body are so classified. On the other hand, in prison records the fact that a person at any time belonged to a church suffices; or wanting this, the fact that his parents belonged to some church. Such

[12] Rev. James Meyer, O.F.M. (editor), *Crime and Religion* (Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, 1936), page 23. Used by permission.
[13] *Ibid.*, page 60.

prison figures, therefore, are about as reliable indices of religious motivation as the glowing attendance reports of chaplains at certain prisons, where attendance at religious services, unlike that at Joliet-Stateville, is compulsory.

It is easy to understand why many prisoners "fake" when it comes to religious externals. They have the parole law in mind. From the time they are sentenced, "getting out" is the idea foremost in the minds of all prisoners. It is only natural, then, that they should desire to have as many favorable points on their records as possible. In addition, church workers who conceivably may interest themselves in a prisoner's behalf before the parole board are worth cultivating, especially if the members of the parole board are churchgoers, as they usually are. In this connection it is significant to note that before the operation of the Illinois parole law in 1895 the combined recorded church affiliation among prisoners at Joliet was 37 per cent. With the enactment of the parole law "the record for church members suddenly rocketed up to 80.52%" in a single year and exceeded 99 per cent in 1910.[14] No more need be said on this point.

Culture Areas

During the past two decades sociologists have observed and studied an interesting phenomenon: that crime does not exist throughout cities in a uniform, consistent pattern, but clusters in certain areas. Not only do criminals come from certain areas, but crimes occur more frequently in some districts. Where are these areas of delinquency usually to be found? Perhaps the best way to describe the situation is to explain the general pattern of large cities, following the theory of Park and Burgess. Most cities may be divided by concentric circles into five distinct zones: the loop (or center), the blighted area in transition, the zone of working men's homes, the residential district, and the suburban areas. These zones, beginning at the core and extending outward to the periphery, do not show the same rates of delinquency. It is true that many crimes are committed in all these areas, but the blighted area in transition usually shows the highest delinquency rates. An area in transition is one characterized by factories and stores moving in and families moving out. The district has become less desirable as a place of residence, and those who can do so leave. Some dwellings are razed; others are remodeled and become small shops; many become rooming houses, and in the others rents are lowered. The families which remain during the transitional period, and those who move in because

[14] *Ibid.*, page 24.

of the low rents, become the inhabitants of these well-named "blighted" areas.

Consider briefly some of the characteristics of these areas which relate to delinquency. The low percentage of home-ownership, the physical disintegration of the neighborhood, and congested living quarters are not conducive to the development of good morale. There is little participation in community affairs, there may be an intermingling of nationalities and races, there is marked dependency, and all these are not likely to produce any feeling of community solidarity. But it is in areas without community responsibility that one finds commercialized vice, hangouts of thieves, indifferent law enforcement. Children in such areas are subject to many negative forces and few positive influences. Churches are disintegrated, both physically and in loss of membership. There are no playgrounds, and there is little recreation except that available in the streets and alleys. Schools are run down in appearance, and often teachers are dissatisfied. There are no demands on the part of the community for better conditions. In other words, these communities not only foster vices but seem unable to offer antidotes of any kind. One may say that vice is common in many neighborhoods and has little effect on children. But in the blighted areas vice is open, not concealed.

These characteristics of the neighborhoods are not offset in the majority of cases by constructive family influences. Strong religious ties in families have been a counteracting influence in many homes, and in some instances the work of social agencies has helped to stabilize families. But, for the most part, the children adopt the activities of the street, and random, unguided lives are the result. In these areas, conflicts between nationalities are typical, and conflicts between standards in the homes and outside are normal. Where immigrant or second-generation families live, there may be a serious variation between the standards of children and those of their parents, a difference which results in early severance of home ties.

Too often the charge is made that delinquency in these areas is the result of a particular nationality situation. For example, the inhabitants of one area may be Italians, and the conclusion is that crime is typical of Italians. This has been disproved by many studies which show that in some of these blighted areas changes in nationality from generation to generation are not accompanied by changes in delinquency rates. The code of conduct is transmitted from one generation to another, and this is logical since the conditions which foster delinquency remain constant. The area where there is no social dis-

approval of criminal acts is one in which children are being exploited. Such children do not have the opportunity for development into normal, wholesome adults. Many do so develop, but that is in spite of the environment, not because of it. Culture patterns of delinquency and crime offer a serious challenge to society.

The absence of the constructive forces found in other areas of the city presents a picture of disadvantages which may well prove insuperable. Although the Shaw-McKay study of juvenile delinquency in Chicago included in the *Causes of Crime* volume of the Wickersham report has been referred to already (page 464), its conclusions bearing upon culture areas, as well as upon other factors involved in delinquency, deserve complete statement here.

1. Juvenile delinquents are not distributed uniformly over the city of Chicago but tend to be concentrated in areas adjacent to the central business district and to heavy industrial areas.
2. There are wide variations in the rates of delinquents between areas in Chicago.
3. The rates of delinquents tend to vary inversely with distance from the center of the city.
4. The areas of high rates of delinquents in Chicago have been characterized by high rates for a long period of time.
5. In areas of high rates of delinquents a higher percentage of delinquent boys become recidivists and the average number of times recidivists appear in court is greater than among boys in areas of low rates of delinquents.
6. The location of delinquency areas is closely related to the processes of city growth.
7. Delinquency areas in Chicago are characterized by physical deterioration, decreasing population, high rates of dependency, high percentages of foreign and Negro population in the total population, and high rates of adult crime.
8. The community fails to function effectively as an agency of social control in these areas of high rates of delinquents.
9. The greatest concentrations of delinquents occur in the areas of marked social disorganization.
10. Juvenile delinquency is traditional behavior in the disorganized areas of the city.
11. There are many positive influences leading to delinquency in the disorganized areas.
12. The racial and nationality composition of the population in the areas of high rates of delinquents changed almost completely between 1900 and 1920, while the relative rates of delinquents in these areas remained practically unchanged.
13. As the older immigrant groups moved out of the areas of high rates of delinquents the rates of delinquents among the children of these groups decreased and they tended to disappear from the juvenile court.
14. The facts concerning the distribution and variation in rates of de-

linquents revealed in the Chicago study are confirmed by the studies in the six other cities.

15. The areas of high rates of delinquents in other cities have characteristics similar to the characteristics of the areas of high rates in Chicago.

16. Juvenile delinquency is group behavior.

17. Delinquent traditions are transmitted through group contacts.

18. The delinquent code is acquired through contacts with delinquent companions and groups.

19. Participation in the activities of delinquent groups often serves to satisfy the fundamental human desires of the boy in delinquency areas of the large city.

20. There are wide differences between the rates of broken homes in different racial and national groups, and significant differences between the rates of broken homes at different ages, among unselected school boys.

21. The rates of broken homes among delinquent boys in the Cook County Juvenile Court and the rates of broken homes among boys of the same age and nationality in the school population are not widely different.

22. No consistent variation was found between rates of broken homes and rates of delinquents.

23. Case studies suggest the need for greater emphasis upon the study of the subtler aspects of family situations in relation to delinquency.

24. A delinquent career is the product of a natural process of development.[18]

Conclusion

In view of our examination of causal factors, the futility of trying to cite a unit cause for crime, even in individual cases, should be evident. The dual concepts of complexity and interrelationship must stand as our conclusion. The need for more individual case studies of offenders is apparent. The importance of the recognition of multiple-factor causation is essential to any scientific program of treatment or prevention. The problem of crime is a serious one, and the social responsibility for treatment may not be taken lightly or evaded by futile short-cut "solutions." In the study of treatment in the following chapter we shall observe constantly the need for logical, consistent programs, based on an adequate knowledge of causal factors. As a fitting keynote to this new chapter, as well as a final word on the subject of crime causation, we might repeat the conclusion drawn by Frederick A. Moran, of the New York State Parole Commission, at the end of a study of the causes of crime made for the New York State Crime Commission in 1930:

We have found no unit causes of crime and recommend no unit cures. This report stresses individual study and treatment, but it recognizes that every individual leads a social existence, and that both the treatment and prevention of crime must consider, not alone the individual transgressor,

[18] Shaw and McKay, *op. cit.*, pages 383–393.

but must involve treatment for the entire primary social group of which he is a functioning unit, whether it be family, gang or neighborhood. Further, it recognizes the necessity of carrying on broad scale programs coping with the adverse social and economic conditions whose influences are constant factors in criminal careers, as well as in the lives of many otherwise wholesome citizens.[16]

(See the references at the end of Chapter XX.)

[16] *Report of the Crime Commission, 1930* (Legislative Document, 1930, Number 98, Albany), page 172.

CHAPTER XVIII

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

If one of the functions of history is to teach us to avoid the mistakes of the past, it may be said confidently that there is much evidence to indicate that the study of the history of man's attempt to cope with crime has been sadly neglected. Time and again educated Americans propose "solutions" to the crime problem which clearly indicate their unawareness that their pet proposal has already been tried out on a large scale and found to be a failure. If we are to make any progress in attacking our crime problem, we must go forward and not backward. In the last chapter we saw that there are many causes of crime; there is no single cause. Thus we speak of the modern multiple theory of crime causation, which is in contrast to the various single-cause theories of the past. We turn now to consider public policies respecting the treatment of the criminal.

It would seem self-evident that the first step in any search for a desirable public policy in dealing with offenders must involve an examination of the public policies of the past. While it would be interesting to consider the policies of primitive tribes in this matter, it will be more practical here to commence with a study of the policies of medieval Europe. The policies of this period, referred to in the history of the conceptions of crime as those of the preclassical school, were succeeded by those of the eighteenth-century classical school. This was followed in turn by the neoclassical school, the positive school, and finally the recent positive school. Each school is characterized by a particular concept of the nature of the criminal and of his responsibility in the matter of crime. Most of these viewpoints, in so far as they relate to the cause of crime, were noted in the last chapter. After viewing the various schools of criminology, we shall make a survey of the technique of punishment used in various periods to deter others from committing crime or to reform criminals. Having thus reviewed the high points of both philosophy and methods, we shall be in a better position to study the public policies which dominate in this modern age.

I. The Schools of Criminology

Surveying the five schools of social thought which preceded the formulation of the modern viewpoint on crime, we find that they can be summarized as follows.

1. THE PRECLASSICAL PERIOD

This period included both the early and the late Middle Ages. In the earlier part of this period various barbaric concepts survived, in spite of the efforts of Christian missionaries. In the concept of some uncivilized tribes, which were being taught by the missionaries to substitute public punishment for private vengeance, various mysterious outside influences were often regarded as more important than the element of personal responsibility in crime causation. Even with the advent of Christianity, "hex" trials continued to survive, even as they occur sporadically in rural America. Though some writers leave us with the impression that the Catholic Church of that period sanctioned the trial of animals as well as other barbaric legal practices, an examination of the records of the time shows that the attitude of the Church towards free will and responsibility was essentially the same then as it is today.[1]

During the medieval period, judges, following the Roman procedure, were allowed very wide latitude in determining the punishment proper to a particular criminal. The theory was that, since individuals might differ in their measure of responsibility for a criminal act, the amount of punishment should be determined by the judge in each case. With the rise of the "equality" movement in eighteenth-century France, protests began to be made against the abuse of judicial power which made it possible for judges to spare some and wreak vindictive punishment upon others. Finally Beccaria, in his *Crime and Punishment* (1764), advocated that all law violators be treated alike on the basis of the crime committed, a proposal which was widely adopted and later referred to as the classical theory.

2. THE CLASSICAL THEORY

Hedonistic psychology (pleasure-seeking) is the basis for this theory. Every human being was believed to contemplate in advance all the

[1] For an analysis of the charge that the Church failed to recognize the element of responsibility in the Middle Ages, see Sister Mary Liguori, B.V.M., "The Trial and Punishment of Animals," *America*, February 1, 1936, pages 395–396; also *idem*, *A Preliminary Study of the Problem of Trial and Punishment of Animals in the Middle Ages* (M.A. thesis, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1932).

consequences of his action and to weigh the possibility of pleasure against the promise of pain. As a sequence to this theory, precisely defined punishments were set up by law, graduated according to the nature of the offense, and judges were required to inflict only those penalties which legislators had previously devised. The specific punishment designed for each crime was believed by the proponents of the theory to represent just a little more pain than the amount of pleasure which could be derived from the crime itself. Fundamentally this school of thought was based upon a theory of punishment to fit the crime rather than to fit the criminal. Even today many persons are still thinking in terms of "punishment to fit the crime."

3. THE NEOCLASSICAL SCHOOL

The neoclassical school was essentially the same as the classical school except that it tempered the doctrine by making allowances for the immature: children, the insane, and idiots. This was a reaction against the rigidity of the previous theory. Our American system of criminal law is based principally upon minor modifications of the neoclassical theory. We depend primarily upon individual responsibility, with minimum and maximum penalties set in advance by legislatures, and allow flexibility on the part of the judges only within the limits of the minimum and the maximum. The influence of European criminology, which graded penalties to *a priori* standards of wickedness involved in particular law violations rather than to the wickedness of the criminal, is seen in the first laws of our own District of Columbia:

About the time of the establishment of the District of Columbia the European classical school of criminologists was influencing American thought. The school, of which Beccaria stands out as the spokesman, rebelled against the cruel and inhuman punishments of the age, and carrying over the ideas usually associated with Rousseau, Montesquieu, and Voltaire into the field of criminology, declared in addition that all men were equal before the law, and so, subject to the same penalties. Since individuals were held to calculate pleasure and pain in advance of each action, and to regulate conduct accordingly, a definite amount of pain in excess of the pleasure found in a particular transgression was to be measured out by statute. These punishments "to fit the crime" were to be the same for all individuals, and so exception could not be made for age or mentality, any more than for political or social status, lest such judicial discretion be abused to violate the rights of individuals.[2]

[2] Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia*, Part I (1906–1926), Senate Document No. 236, 69th Congress, 2nd Session (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1927), page 6.

4. THE POSITIVE SCHOOL

Darwin's influence upon criminology is recorded in Lombroso's theory, first proposed in 1876, according to which criminal tendencies are to be sought in hereditary throwbacks. As this viewpoint spread over Europe, criminals came to be regarded as a subhuman type that could be recognized as a rule by certain stigmata. Since nature had erred in the production of these anthropological monsters, the atavistic criminal was regarded as irresponsible for his actions. Thus determinism tainted criminology, and the viewpoint of its adherents, who felt that they now possessed a positive science (since it was reduced to the simple, objective process of measuring and classifying physical traits), is called either the Italian anthropological or positive school of criminology.

5. THE RECENT POSITIVE SCHOOL

It was not very long before the idea that one could "tell a criminal by looking at him," fostered by Lombroso, had to be abandoned. Two tendencies of this period, nevertheless, continued to prevail. One, a very fortunate influence, was that which directed attention to the study of the criminal. The other was the unfortunate conception of the criminal as wholly irresponsible for his acts. As a result of the former influence, we have learned a great deal about the cause of crime. Though a few criminologists, whom we speak of as belonging to the recent positive school, still regard various factors, such as bad environment, mental defects, or glandular disturbance, as absolutely deterministic in causing crime, their viewpoint can hardly be said to represent that of modern criminologists generally, since these, we believe, still recognize free will and responsibility as factors in human conduct.

Thus, in retrospect, we see the five chief philosophies of criminology which have prevailed in the past. As we might expect from what we saw of the causes of crime in the last chapter, the best public policies of today are based upon the belief in multiple causation. Before considering the content of these policies, however, we should know something also of the history of punishment.

II. THE STORY OF PUNISHMENT

In order to enforce its laws and establish good order, the state has found it necessary to inflict punishment upon its recalcitrant citizens. In doing so it has followed many methods and many motives. Al-

though the protection of society has always been the chief motive, whatever the method was, other motives such as retribution, repression, reformation, and prevention have ruled at times as secondary propelling forces. Though there has been a distinct tendency away from brutal punishment and toward reformation and prevention as proper motives for punishment in recent times, the history of punishment is filled with cultural lags, so that at any stage one may find remnants of older methods and philosophies still in vogue. Because of these inconsistencies, it is difficult to present a clear picture of any evolution of punishment in a short space. Perhaps the best way to treat the subject here, therefore, will be to describe the various noninstitutional or outdoor methods of punishment, following this with an outline of the various stages of development in the history of penal institutions. As the older types of punishment are described, recall that they were abandoned by society, not so much because a more refined society objected to brutality, but chiefly because these punishments failed to achieve their purpose. After all, capital punishment itself is rather brutal, yet society retains it because many still believe that it deters certain types of possible offenders. In studying society's reaction to the criminal, we are delving into that branch of criminology which is known as "penology," from the Latin *poena,* pain or suffering.

I. NONINSTITUTIONAL PUNISHMENTS

The imprisonment of offenders is a comparatively recent procedure. Before the introduction of this plan there were many methods of punishment in use, some of which are still a part of society's penological therapy. Among the chief means of punishment prior to the adoption of penal institutions were flogging, mutilation, a variety of other types of corporal punishment, capital punishment, transportation, and fines.

Flogging has long been a favorite method of punishment and is still legal in Delaware. Even where technically disallowed, the practice continues in many reformatory institutions. Instruments and methods of flogging have varied greatly from sticks and rods to the cat-o'-nine-tails. Another device was the Russian knout, which was constructed of a number of dried and hardened thongs of rawhide interwoven with wire, the wires being hooked and sharpened at the ends so they would tear the flesh when the blow was delivered. In many cases salt was thrown into the wounds to increase the pain, and certain floggers received considerable notoriety because of their ability to inflict severe wounds.

Mutilation seems to have been based on a dual principle: *lex talionis* (eye for an eye) and a desire to prevent the repetition of a specific crime. Thieves had their hands cut off, spies had their eyes gouged out, and rapists were castrated. Branding has been very generally used as a method of corporal punishment. The letter M was most commonly used, meaning malefactor. Branding was permissible under the laws of colonial New Jersey and was not abolished in England until the middle of the eighteenth century. A number of other methods of corporal punishment have been used. The stocks and pillory have been used to bring about a feeling of both humiliation and pain. Pelting with stones and other missiles was a common occurrence. Chain gangs, though still found occasionally in the southern portion of the United States, have gradually disappeared. The ducking stool was applied particularly to village scolds and gossips.

Capital punishment is the termination of the life of an individual convicted of a crime. Today there are only a few methods of executing the death penalty, such as beheading, hanging, shooting, electrocution, and the use of various poison gases. Historically, however, such devices as flaying and impaling were widely practiced in the ancient Orient and in the early days in Europe. The individual was first skinned alive and then placed upon a sharp stick, where he remained until death intervened. Death by the infliction of bites of poisonous insects and by exposure to insects was common, and the normal Roman practice was to throw the victim to wild animals. Poisoning, casting from a high place, and crucifixion are other forms of punishment which have been used from time to time. Death at the stake was the most common punishment for witchcraft. The sword has been popular for beheading, but the development of the guillotine has made it obsolescent. Hanging has always been popular, and it is said that there were about 70,000 hangings in the reign of Henry VIII. Strangulation by means of an iron band closing about the neck of the victim has been used. Pressing and boiling were carried out in France before the revolution; breaking on the wheel and sawing have had some vogue.

At the present time in the United States, one hundred or more persons yearly are put to death by methods of capital punishment. Most criminologists regard capital punishment as a deplorable anachronism. The deterrent effects are regarded as hypothetical rather than real; furthermore, persons who are executed are often less dangerous to society than those who are not executed. There has been a distinct trend away from the death penalty during the past century. In the United States in 1933, only six states had a mandatory death penalty

for first-degree murder, and eight had abolished the death penalty altogether. Much conflicting statistical evidence seems to indicate, on the one hand, that the abolition of the death penalty makes for a decrease in homicide, and, on the other hand, that the converse is true. Many charges are made that the public is unduly and emotionally upset by such experiences, and more recently the newspapers have been criticized for giving the rather ghastly details of execution. Perhaps the most important objection to the death penalty is its selectivity. Not all persons who commit similar crimes are put to death. In some states Negroes are executed out of proportion to the whole number of those sentenced to death. Another objection is the irreparability of the death penalty. Mistakes have been known to occur, and they cannot be remedied after execution has taken place. Unfortunately, the fact that some of the objection to the death penalty has come from those who denied free will has prompted some to confuse the controversy over the merits of the death penalty with that surrounding determinism.

Transportation is a method of punishment which provides for the removal of criminals to a distant place. This is a comparatively recent development and has been substituted for the former practice of exile, through sending criminals away as galley slaves and slaves in mines. The development of sail as motive power for vessels, and an increase in crime in England in the transitional period from medieval to modern times, made it necessary to develop some method of finding a place for those who formerly would have been sent out as galley slaves. The first law authorizing deportation was passed about 1600. It is estimated that by 1775 England was sending about 2,000 convicts annually to the English colonies in America, mostly as indentured servants. It is probable that a total of about 50,000 were sent before the American Revolution. The English deported convicts to Australia between 1787 and 1857; then the practice was abandoned. According to the descriptions of most observers, the lot of those who were sent to the colonies was unfortunate, and hideous tragedy was the normal consequence. Brutal floggings, together with work in swamps and jungles, characterized life in these colonies. At the present time, penal colonies are maintained by the French at Devil's Island and New Caledonia. Italy also maintains penal colonies in northern Africa and on Mediterranean islands, and Russia has used transportation to Siberia. Except where transportation has been a form of colonization, it is one of the least humane methods, valueless to society and to the individual. The present agitation against Devil's Island is a good indication that society regards

this kind of cruel exile as a penalty which is out of place in modern times.

Fines are the most frequent of all penalties; the development of fines has followed the increase in the number of trivial offenses, resulting from the growing complexities of technical civilization. Fines were seldom used until the past hundred years and have increased considerably from decade to decade, because of the increasing convenience of this method of punishment. The offender who does not pay his fine is placed in a jail or house of correction. The general custom throughout the country is for nonpayers to "work out" the fine, generally at the rate of a dollar a day. The taxpayers of the community are victims of this system. A person is fined, cannot pay, and goes to jail. The taxpayers not only do not get the fine but pay to keep him in jail, generally in idleness. The opponents of the system of fines say that it is a much greater penalty for a poor man to pay ten dollars as a fine than for a rich man. In a great many crimes, fines are almost never a deterrent, and it is particularly true in the case of chronic offenders such as prostitutes and drunkards. In Max Stern's study of imprisonment for nonpayment of fines in Chicago, he found that over 80 per cent of commitments to the house of correction were for nonpayment of fines, the amount being twenty dollars or less in over half of the commitments. He concluded: "A system which allows the imprisonment of persons virtually for their poverty only, which is demoralizing to the imprisoned persons, unjust to their families, and costly to the state, certainly warrants closer attention by responsible, socially minded persons than has been given to it up to the present time." [3]

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS

During the period when criminals were dealt with on the spot by corporal punishment or by transportation, there was no need of prisons. There was need, however, of places of detention for those awaiting trial. These, the "gaols," were at first the dungeons of baronial castles. As corporal punishments declined in popularity, there developed need of a place to punish debtors and those guilty of minor offenses as well as those who could not pay their fines, and the jails were used for these purposes also. By the twelfth century it was found necessary to provide special buildings for this purpose in all the counties of England. These jails were in charge of county sheriffs, who exacted fees from prisoners

[3] "Imprisonment for the Non-payment of Fines in Chicago," *The Social Service Review*, Volume 5, September, 1931, page 467.

for providing them with heat and other necessities, the origin of the existing American sheriff's fee system. Later workhouses, or houses of correction, were established, commonly called "Bridewells" after the original founded in the king's palace at Bridewell, London, in 1552; they served as places of employment for vagrants. Finally petty offenders also were committed to these houses of correction.

It was not until near the close of the eighteenth century that prison systems as we know them came into existence, although isolated experiments such as the world's first cellular prison, that of San Michele, established in Rome by Pope Clement XI in 1703, were being built to serve as models for later prison reformers. The available descriptions of conditions in early English jails and workhouses, where prisoners of all sorts were thrown together in large rooms, should bring joy to the hearts of the modern exponents of the "treat 'em rough" policy, who like to rouse a rabble by denouncing our present prisons as "country clubs." Some idea of the atrocious conditions that must have prevailed in these first penal institutions may be gathered by inference if we consider conditions which prevailed later in the vastly improved Chicago jails even as late as the present century. In *The Illinois Institution Quarterly* for March, 1916, we read as follows:

> Of the forty-six city jails of Chicago, only about a dozen are fit for any use whatsoever. Nineteen are underground. Through eleven run open sewers . . . when the sewers overflow the floors are flooded with the contents of the sewers. Rats and vermin are numerous. . . . The men sleep on planks. If there are more than two men in a cell, they must lie on the floor beside the open sewer. Sometimes it is necessary to put eight or ten in one small cell. . . . The cells are mere caves.[4]

It should be recalled that even these conditions represented a vast improvement over the earlier jails, improvements brought about largely through the efforts of such prison reformers as John Howard and Elizabeth Fry. Howard was the great prison reformer of England, whose *The State of Prisons in England* in 1777 brought before enlightened citizens the necessity of doing something about the situation in penal institutions. Howard's conclusions focused attention upon conditions which were making prisons little more than schools for idleness and every vice. Howard publicized the work of the new papal prison at Rome and the prison at Ghent as examples of what might be done to improve conditions; through his writings both England and America gained an intimate knowledge of current abuses and of the

[4] Quoted by E. H. Sutherland, *Criminology* (J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1924), page 217.

urgent need of reform. The period from 1770 to 1790 was one of constant agitation by Howard and other reformers, who displayed not only zeal but real ability to get results.

American Progress

The Pennsylvania Quakers took the lead in American prison reform. Their first step was to bring sufficient pressure upon the legislature to convert an old Philadelphia jail into a prison with individual cells for the confinement of hardened offenders, who crowded the jails after the number of death penalties had been reduced. The separate confinement of prisoners was an innovation in America in 1790, although, as we have seen, the idea had already been tried out to some extent abroad. In establishing an institution of this type the Quakers were copying rather frankly not only the idea of cellular construction initiated by Pope Clement but also the monastic idea of reform by labor and meditation in solitude. In fact, the name selected for this new type of American institution, "penitentiary," harked back to the medieval institution where both crime and sin could be expiated. The old Philadelphia county jail soon proved to be too small for the numbers who were being committed to it, and it was found necessary to erect a new state penitentiary in 1818. Influenced by the Pennsylvania experiment with prison reform, New York decided to establish a variation of the Pennsylvania plan in its new Auburn prison in 1824. The Auburn plan provided for solitary confinement at night, but provided for work by the prisoners in association, though in silence, during the day, in the belief that too much solitary confinement injured rather than benefited the prisoner. A verbal war soon developed between the advocates of the two systems. The Philadelphia group said that the Auburn system did away with the essential reformatory feature of the prison, repentance through meditation. The Auburn group stressed the economies made possible by the work of prisoners in association, emphasizing also the physical and moral advantages of hard work. Gradually the Auburn system received wider acceptance, no doubt because of its economies. Controversy died a natural death, about 1870, with the development of reformatories, the pioneer institution being the Elmira reformatory in New York.

Thus far we have seen the development in the treatment of crime from frank retribution to mere repression, varied only in so far as reform could be effected by aids to personal reflection. The next logical development of penological methods was one which presented certain mechanics aimed much more positively at reform. This came with the

introduction of the Elmira reformatory system, patterned after innovations in the British penal colony in Australia, where the fixed sentence had been eliminated in place of commutation of sentences for good behavior. Gradually the Australian plan was adapted elsewhere to include the indeterminate sentence and parole as well. In its early form the indeterminate sentence was a sentence for an indefinite period, conditioned on good behavior. Parole was a release, with little supervision, to be granted when the institution considered the prisoner reformed. His liberty was conditional on continued good behavior after release. These innovations attracted the attention of American reformers, and as a result the Elmira reformatory for the less hardened offenders was opened in 1877. This system stressed reformation, since the term of incarceration was dependent to some extent upon the observable improvement made by the prisoner. It must be remembered, however, that this system was introduced at Elmira in an institution for young men and did not affect the majority of adult offenders.

It has been noted previously that the neoclassical school of criminology excluded children from legal punishment as being not wholly responsible for their acts. This gradually resulted in a demand that the imprisonment of adult offenders be apart from that of the young. It was not until 1825, however, that an American institution was opened for the confinement of juvenile delinquents, and even this, the New York House of Refuge, was at first a private institution with only a part of its expenses paid by the public. The backwardness of American penology in failing to recognize the need of separating juveniles from adult prisoners is indicated by the fact that it was not until after the Civil War that our national capital erected a separate institution for juvenile offenders. However, the influence of the establishment of the New York House of Refuge and similar institutions elsewhere, as well as the conditions which prevailed in Washington before 1866, is reflected in the following quotation:

> The fame of these institutions, which not only separated the youthful from the adult offender but attempted a certain amount of intellectual, religious, and especially industrial training, spread rapidly. No doubt it was this influence which was reflected here in 1830 in the act concerning the District of Columbia penitentiary already referred to, wherein provision was made for "the separate labor and instruction of any convict under the age of 14," and the enforcement of such regulations as may "most conduce to the reformation and instruction of such youthful offenders." However, this provision seems never to have been carried out, due in all probability to the fact that the original plans of the penitentiary had to be modified through lack of adequate appropriation, so that "convicts un-

der the age of 14" labored at shoemaking, oakum picking, tailoring, carpentry, and plastering along with adult inmates.[5]

The first institution under state control was started in Massachusetts in 1847 and received some assistance from private funds. In many respects the institutions for juvenile offenders which began to appear at this time resembled schools rather than prisons, since they had a form of self-government, academic teaching, religious exercises, release on good behavior, and the indeterminate sentence. On the whole, however, in the first half century of their existence, they were primarily prisons, and their principal value was in segregating the juvenile from the adult offender. The cottage system of architecture, consisting of separate small buildings as opposed to the cell-block structure, was first used at the Ohio School for Boys at Lancaster in 1865. Because of the greater ease in classification and management, most of the institutions for juveniles at the present time have adopted a similar plan.

Looking back over the history of American penology, one can be sure that there has been no consistent or universally accepted plan of development in the United States. Since Connecticut established the first state prison by the purchase of an old mine in 1773, vast improvements have been made in some matters, but in others archaic techniques survive. It may reasonably be said that even at the present time there is no such thing as an ideal institution for adults. The establishment of state prisons rather than local prisons was one of the important developments of the last century, a reaction, after the abandonment of most outdoor penalties, to the need for providing greater security for those sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Unfortunately, public interest in penology, first aroused through the controversy between the Auburn and the Pennsylvania systems, seems to have shifted back from a concern about the reformation of prisoners to the rather primitive desire for vengeance. Perhaps this is due in some measure to the withdrawal of religious groups from the field of prison reform, a policy which has left the field very much to the political appointee.

III. Penal Institutions Today

In this section we shall consider the various types of institutions used for custodial care for prisoners today, whether for detention or for treatment. The detention institutions—the lockup, the jail, and the institutions for juvenile detention—will be considered first; then, in more detail, the administration of prisons. Treatment of juveniles in institu-

[5] Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *op. cit.*, page 8.

tions will be reserved for another chapter. There will be no separate treatment of reformatories for those over the juvenile age, for those institutions bear such resemblance to prisons in most states today that comments applicable to the latter will apply to that group also.

I. DETENTION INSTITUTIONS

The Lockup

The most important means of adult detention in the United States is the police lockup, referred to often as the police station, in which those who have been arrested are detained while awaiting appearance in court. During the first six months of 1930 almost 1,500,000 prisoners were placed in the nearly 11,000 police lockups in the United States. Many are located in city halls, village buildings, or fire stations; many of these are firetraps; many are antiquated buildings unfit for use. Very few lockups make proper provision for segregation and classification of women, witnesses, and young people. Many are also used as lodging places for tramps and vagrants. Detention of a person overnight and sending him out of town the next day is known as "floating" and is universally used in order to rid the town of undesirables. Another typical method is to fine a person for vagrancy but to remit the fine on his promise to leave town immediately. There is state supervision of police jails and lockups only in New York, New Jersey, Minnesota, and Oklahoma, with a modified form of supervision in Alabama, Georgia, and Pennsylvania.

Hart's recommendations concerning the remedies for present defects of police jails and lockups are far from being carried out anywhere. They may be summarized as follows: (1) there should be classification in each jail to separate males and females, old and young, sick and well, dangerous and harmless; (2) each prisoner should be placed in a separate cell; (3) all institutions should be strictly fireproof; (4) women prisoners should be kept entirely separate from male prisoners and under the charge of women; (5) the illegal and unregulated practice of the "third degree" (consisting of cruel physical and mental punishment for the purpose of getting a prisoner "to tell the truth") should be abolished; (6) there should be provision by law for the supervision and inspection of police stations by responsible state commissions, with power to condemn buildings unfit for use; (7) personnel such as jailers, guards, and matrons should be radically improved in quality;

(8) such institutions should be intelligently planned by competent architects.[6]

The County Jail

County jails are our most common penal institutions. They are used for detention of three kinds of prisoners: (a) principals and witnesses awaiting trial; (b) those sentenced to short terms; (c) misdemeanants committed because they cannot pay fines. About half of our jail population consists of persons awaiting trial. Since the law presumes this group to be innocent until they are tried, it seems unjust to place the innocent and the guilty in the same situation. County jails are the pits into which the social misfits eventually fall, being the temporary resting places of the feeble-minded, the habitual drunkards, and the drifters of society. Albert Morris points out the evils of the county-jail system, briefly summarized as: (1) indiscriminate mingling of the young and the old, the innocent and the guilty, the healthy and the diseased; (2) poor sanitary conditions that breed and spread disease; (3) poor food; (4) overcrowding; (5) idleness; (6) lack of a program for rehabilitation; (7) costliness and wastefulness.[7] It is generally agreed that most counties are too sparsely populated to need or to be able to support a modern institution of this kind, especially when, as sometimes happens, the average number of inmates is about seven or eight. Of over 2,500 institutions inspected and graded by federal agents of the Bureau of Prisons, only three ranked above 90 per cent, and over 1,000 failed to attain the grade of 50 per cent. These results are typical.

The use of a county jail as a political "plum" keeps this anachronistic institution in many of our smaller counties. There is occasionally considerable profit in the feeding of prisoners, since, in most instances, sheriffs are allowed a *per capita* allowance on a *per diem* basis, and, by feeding the prisoners less than the amount will purchase, the sheriff may make a profit. This is not a blanket indictment of all sheriffs, but most reports show that this practice is prevalent. The present system, at its best, offers an expensive, discriminatory means of treatment, and, at its worst, contains abuses which probably breed criminals rather than reform them. The condition of the county jails is notorious and will continue to be ghastly unless enlightened public opinion can be aroused to break the vested interest which local political rings now

[6] H. H. Hart, "Police Jails and Village Lock-ups," *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole* (National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Number 9, Washington, D.C., 1931), pages 342–343.

[7] *Criminology* (Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1935), page 394.

have in them. The use of state farms for misdemeanants of the type usually kept in idleness in county jails has been spreading in recent years. Where such institutions exist, work in a healthful environment is possible for the prisoners, a distinct improvement over the hours of idleness in county jails. The southern variation of the penal farm, the chain gang, is based upon the desire to exploit rather than to reform prisoners and is condemned by penologists.

Juvenile Detention

It is a rather strange commentary on our criminal law, which presumes a person to be innocent until he is proved guilty, that in some places children merely charged with offenses and awaiting court action are still retained in jail with adult offenders. This is especially strange since juveniles convicted of law violations are everywhere placed in juvenile institutions and thus removed from the evil influences of adult association. The separate house of detention for child offenders is a comparatively recent innovation, as the story of its gradual development in the District of Columbia discloses:

> In detaining children and adults in the same manner until 1900, the District can not be said to have been particularly remiss. Excepting the State of Massachusetts, which had taken up the idea in 1880, no State was particularly concerned with the matter until about the time of the juvenile court movement in 1899. In fact it has been found that jails are still being used for detaining children in many States. That the District did not finally abolish the old system until 1900 is not then so unusual.
>
> Like most other reforms, the house of detention came by degrees. The first step was made in the cases of children who had appeared in court, and so passed from the jurisdiction of the police to that of the court, but whose cases had not been finally settled by the court. When it was felt by the court that restraint was necessary in these cases, the traditional order was to commit to the jail. In 1892, however, after the Board of Children's Guardians was created, this tradition was broken for the first time, when the courts began to make temporary commitments to the board in these cases. The board in turn placed these children in private child-caring institutions, whenever it could find any willing to take children under such circumstances. Such institutions could be found only for a limited group of children, however, so that the courts had to continue to commit to jail for the most part, as formerly. The courts had no power to make temporary commitments to the reform schools, so that these institutions could not be used for this purpose. In the case of children who had not as yet passed from the jurisdiction of the police, no change was made, so that they continued to be held as formerly, without exception.
>
> The whole system and theory of juvenile detention was revised in 1900 and 1901. The use of jails and station-houses was forbidden in the case of a child held by the police prior to trial in 1900, and in 1901 the courts

were likewise forbidden to hold children in jail or workhouses when charged with committing a misdemeanor. The act which established the house of detention in 1900 directed that the building must be used for the "detention of children under 16 years of age, and (in the discretion of the commissioners) of girls and women over 16 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any law in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses, or held pending investigation, examination, or otherwise.[8]

In a study of juvenile detention in thirty-eight states it was found that during the 1929–1930 fiscal year 16,493 juveniles were still detained in jails and police stations. The modern tendency in the larger cities is to place these children in boarding homes or institutions. The institutions, where they exist, are under the guidance of persons who are capable of organizing educational and recreational facilities, and who do not try to make the institutions juvenile jails.

2. PRISONS

The Wickersham commission, discussing the problem of penal institutions, pointed out that the individual institutions represent many different examples of administrative arrangements, methods of control, and policies in dealing with the human material incarcerated therein. There are scarcely any uniform practices. The whole system stands as an unwieldy, unorganized, hit-or-miss arrangement, developed through centuries of local policy and local traditions. Even in states where new policies have appeared, they are so adapted, modified, and absorbed in the old local patterns as to leave our penal system nearly as complex, varied, and unstandardized as it was a century ago. Yet it would seem as if unity of objective at least should have produced a more unified plan of treatment by now. Speaking of the objective of penal institutions, the Wickersham commission concludes:

> The function of the penal institutions is protection of society. To this end all efforts must be bent and all administrative methods be adapted. All judgment upon the functioning of our prison system, or any unit within it, must be in terms of protection of society. This raises the question of how penal institutions can best contribute to this objective. There seems but one answer possible—by the reformation of the criminal.[9]

To what extent are our prisons achieving their objective? How far are they protecting society by reforming their prisoners? It will be helpful to evaluate them on the score of (a) physical conditions, (b) dis-

[8] Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *op. cit.*, pages 30–31.
[9] *Report on Penal Institutions*, page 6.

cipline, (c) personnel, (d) self-government, (e) labor, (f) education, and (g) classification.

Physical Conditions

About a hundred institutions are used for long-term confinement of prisoners today. About eighty of these are of the Auburn type, and eight which were built more than a hundred years ago are still in use. A third of all prisons still in use in the country were built over seventy years ago, and only seventeen prisons have been built since 1900. The Wickersham commission has gathered many data concerning physical conditions in prisons.[10] It points out that while the New York State Department of Correction has a minimum standard of 364 cubic feet of air space per cell, 58 per cent of the ninety-two cell blocks in American prisons are under this minimum. Nearly 90 per cent of all cells have less than the minimum physical standards set up by the federal government for its new construction. In 1930, 21 per cent of the men's prisons in the country still used buckets instead of internal plumbing either exclusively or partially.

Overcrowding is another serious problem; in 1927, prisons and reformatories, according to the Bureau of the Census, contained 19.1 per cent more than the planned capacity. Some states show even more overcrowding, such as Michigan with 78.6 per cent more than capacity, California with 62.2 per cent, Oklahoma with 56.7 per cent, and Ohio with 54.1 per cent. Overcrowding results in placing two persons in cells originally built for one, and in some instances three are so placed by the use of a double bunk and a mattress on the floor. The report of the Kentucky State Reformatory for 1930 stated that every cell in the cell house for whites contained two men, although each cell was too small for one man. This situation existed in an institution which was not equipped with either toilets or running water. Many prisons have insufficient space for recreation or group activities of any kind, with the result that many of the men are kept locked in their cells during the greater portion of the day. In the older prisons where the inside cells are built of brick, cement, or stone, moisture is a severe problem, and, as a result, many of the prisoners are afflicted with rheumatism. In most prisons there are a few well-constructed cells, these being the ones which are usually shown to visitors. In general, the same conditions were found in the 1939 Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures.

[10] *Ibid.*, pages 8–14.

Discipline

The prison as a community presents certain obvious problems of human relations. There is an *esprit de corps* among the prisoners, with a reasonably well-developed code of slang names as well as what might be called "proper" prison conduct. The guards are "screws," and those who give information to the guards or officials are "squealers" and "stools." The confining life of the prison makes minor matters assume grave importance, and, because of the general admiration of the convicts for those who resist discipline, there are many opportunities for the egocentric to demonstrate their abilities. There are other possibilities for psychological aberrations in the colorless uniforms, the routine food, the regulation of life by a clock, and the constantly recurring internal conflicts.

Rules are numerous, the rule book at the Iowa State Penitentiary having 105 rules taking up twenty-eight printed pages. The Wickersham commission's report quotes several of these rules, which illumine and give focus to the problem of prison discipline: "Strict silence must be observed; talking, laughing, or gazing about the room is strictly forbidden. If you want bread, hold up your right hand; coffee or water, hold up your cup, and soup, hold up your spoon." Punishment in many prisons may take the form of reprimand, loss of tobacco privileges, loss of letter privileges, imprisonment in solitary confinement with restricted diet, and imprisonment in solitary confinement handcuffed to a door. At the Elmira reformatory, carelessly looking at a book without studying one's lessons is prohibited.[11] There are two general ways of enforcing rules: (a) by giving time off or special privileges for good behavior; (b) by inflicting a punishment. Some form of isolation is typical of the latter, as well as bread and water diets and occasional use of a strait jacket. The strap is occasionally used for corporal punishment, and handcuffing to doors is common. Most prisoners are punished on the word of the guards, and the prisoner has no right to call witnesses. The Kansas State Industrial Reformatory reports for 1930 that 25 per cent of the total population was locked up in solitary confinement each month for punishment. On an average, each man was locked up more than five times in two years.

The problem of prison riots is a serious one, and it may well be observed that any analysis of such situations must be in terms of the general conditions within the prison rather than of estimates concerning specific rules or irritations. If the general tone in the prison

[11] *Ibid.*, pages 25–26.

community is good, if work is interesting, if there are no undue irritations, if outlets are possible for restlessness and energy, there will be few serious behavior disorders. On the other hand, if there is pressure through unnecessary irritations, a state of hysteria may develop and culminate in a riot. It is believed today that the future approach to the problem of prison discipline must be indirect, probably through education, work, and recreation.

Personnel

The warden is the chief executive officer responsible for administration of the program of the institution. In most prisons he is expected to be a successful educator, a shop manager, a practical businessman, and a humanitarian, as well as a jailer. It seems evident that these aspects of the work conflict with one another to some extent, and this conflict is further complicated by the fact that, in general, wardens are not chosen because they are educators, businessmen, or humanitarians, but because they are politicians. In some prisons the pay is low and prestige is lacking. On the other hand, the salary, which usually includes maintenance, is sufficiently high in many states so that college-trained men would gladly seek such positions were it not for the political hurdles to be leaped in obtaining them. Salaries of $5,000 and over are not uncommon. Often the warden is a man with a grammar-school education who has worked up from the position of guard through various subadministrative positions. His tenure of office as warden generally coincides with that of the governor. The Wickersham commission has summarized the basic problems adequately:

> The prison is looked upon not as a professional problem of the highest complexity, requiring men of great knowledge and ability; not as an institution having three or four thousand young people needing educational interests and activity, but rather as an institution for the repression and control of the dangerous, and for that purpose the higher type of individual is not available. Not until we recognize that a prison is a great opportunity for broad educational endeavor will we attract the kind of administrator who is needed. That is one of the first needs of the prison—a new type of institutional head, a type of administrator who could be called as the president of a great educational institution. Until then we shall make progress slowly, if at all.[12]

The position of guard in a prison should be important, for in the eyes of the convicted men he represents the state. Without competent guards, no warden can succeed in his administrative responsibilities.

[12] *Ibid.*, page 43.

Yet, in general, the guard's pay is low, and he secures his position by political appointment. He sometimes works as long as sixteen hours each day, and in some institutions his isolation is nearly as great as that of the prisoners. Petty graft often exists among the staff members, and in some instances the guards themselves are as demoralized as the prisoners. According to the New York State Crime Commission, the turnover of guards in some of the New York correctional institutions is sometimes as high as 50 per cent annually. In many instances, promotion is impossible and opportunities for advancement are few. Remedies include better pay, shorter hours, longer vacations, regular weekly periods of absence from the institution, and opportunity for advancement and promotion without political interference. There is a need to develop an opportunity for creative, constructive work, and with the selection of the right type of men it will be possible to eliminate the characteristic brutality of the guards in many institutions.

The federal government and some states, notably New York, have made recent advances by increased pay and educational qualifications for prison personnel, training schools for guards, and civil-service protection in most jobs. The Federal Bureau of Prisons now holds civil-service examinations for "warden's assistants," who must be college graduates trained in social service. The starting salaries range from $2,000 to $3,000. As more men and women of this type get into the various prison systems and work their way up to the key positions, we may expect a vast improvement in our penal institutions.

Self-Government

A misunderstood phase of prison life is self-government. Zealots often express the belief that self-government among prisoners would result in the reclamation of many of them and a more stable prison life. In one form or another, self-government has existed since the beginning of the old Walnut Street jail in Philadelphia about 1790. In 1895, William George founded the George Junior Republic for boys at Freeville, New York, basing his plan for the institution upon self-government. Thomas Mott Osborne, who advocated self-government for adult prisoners, relates many spectacular incidents to show how prisoners refused to take advantage of opportunities to escape where they had absorbed the idea of self-government. He stated that in Auburn prison, operating under self-government, the lights went out while the prisoners were assembling to attend a concert, and any could have scaled the wall, but all remained absolutely quiet until the lights went on.

In spite of the attractive arguments of Osborne and others, there are

certain disadvantages of the system: clever prisoners get control of the system and use it for their own advantage, and prisoners are likely to be more harsh in their treatment of other prisoners than the prison officers. Many institutions which once utilized the self-government system have since abandoned it. Self-government must not be confused with the honor system, which generally means rewards given by the warden for good behavior. Both systems involve placing responsibility upon the prisoners, but there are grave doubts as to the ability of the majority of prisoners to accept such responsibility.

Labor

The advantages of prison labor should be obvious. In summary it may be said that prison labor is beneficial in the following ways: (1) as an alleviation of idleness; (2) as punishment; (3) as making the prisoners pay part or all of the cost of their maintenance; (4) as a means of discipline; (5) as a means of reformation. Prison labor has been recognized as a necessity since the latter part of the eighteenth century. In spite of its manifest advantages, during its entire history prison labor has been the subject of protest from organized labor and manufacturers. The Hawes-Cooper Act (1934), by giving states the power to prevent within their borders the sale of prison-made goods from other states, seriously restricted prison industries. Realizing the problems facing the states, President Franklin D. Roosevelt recently created by executive order the Prison Industries Reorganization Administration to assist the various states in solving their prison industries problem. There are at the present time six principal systems of prison labor. These can be outlined briefly as follows:

The lease system is probably the most heinous of all systems of labor in prisons. It is gradually disappearing and is now to be found in very few places. This system involves the turning over of a prisoner to a private contractor, who for financial consideration is given complete control over him to use, feed, and discipline. The state generally retained the right of inspection but did not set up standards of any kind. The system is obviously open to all kinds of cruelties, and its virtual abandonment in the South came as a result of a series of scandals involving the beating and death of prisoners.

The contract system, which is similar to the lease system, has been practically abolished by the Hawes-Cooper Act. Under this system the state furnishes the building, provides power and light, and guards the prisoners, and the contractor furnishes machines and materials. The state is paid a fixed sum for the daily work of the prisoner. The system

places the interests of the contractor above the interests of the prisoners and gives contractors an advantage over those who use free labor. It is generally agreed that the repudiation of the contract system is entirely justified because of its demoralizing influences on the officers of the institutions, the prisoners, and those outside who suffer from undue competition. Unfortunately, the Hawes-Cooper Act goes much further in its application than restricting the lease and contract systems.

The piece-price system is a variation of the contract system whereby the contractor supplies the raw material and purchases the product from the state at a given price per piece. In this bald and blatant attempt at deception all the evils of the contract system are embodied.

The public-account system is a system of labor in which the industry is managed by the prison authorities and financed by the state, for the purpose of selling the product on the open market. The most profitable example of this system has been at the state prison at Stillwater, Minnesota. The manufacture of twine there is believed to have produced a profit for many years. Such profit, however, is the exception rather than the rule, and several peculiar and unfortunate results have been produced at Stillwater. The state prison has a virtual monopoly on the sale of binding twine, and there is virtually no competition within the state. On the other hand, if a man, trained to do nothing but manufacture binding twine, tries to get work in that industry, he will have to go out of the state to obtain such work. This system fails further to recognize special aptitudes of individuals, and it is generally agreed that it is undesirable to develop a highly specialized large-scale industry in prison even under reasonably favorable conditions.

The state-use system is one in which the state carries on the manufacturing process, but does not sell the merchandise in the open market. Public institutions operated by the state, and county and city institutions, utilize the goods manufactured. To some extent this is supposed to do away with unfair competition with free labor, but it will be seen immediately that, if certain goods were not made by the state for itself, they would have to be bought from private individuals, and to that extent there is competition. In many instances and for various reasons other state institutions will not purchase from the state prison if it is possible to avoid doing so, and most states with this system do not have a compulsory-purchase clause in their laws. One reason why some purchasing officers prefer to buy on the open market is the graft which is usually possible on large orders.

The public-works system, a variation of the state-use system, employs the labor of prisoners not for the manufacture of merchandise but for

construction and repair of the prison, roads, parks, and permanent public structures besides prisons. This system has not been successful in the past, at least in the North, chiefly on account of the difficulties of finding year-round work. It is still used rather widely in the South, and there is a growing demand for its increased use elsewhere. The Prison Association of New York in its 1937 report recommended that funds be provided for the employment of prisoners on highway construction.

The lease system, the contract system, and the piece-price system are completely undesirable because of the difficulty of controlling the work and life of the prisoners when they are subject to exploitation by private contractors. The state-use system is probably the least undesirable, although it, like all public systems, suffers from its inability to employ all the prisoners. The general conclusion reached by most penologists is that there is no ideal system at the present time, and many experiments must be made in order to develop a system which will be practical and free from the possibility of abuses and of unfair competition with those who are not incarcerated.

The importance of the prison-labor problem is due to the corrupting influence of idleness on the morale of prisoners. To substitute dreary toil under hazardous or unsanitary conditions for this idleness would not be an improvement, but it should be possible to provide constructive work. Integration of state resources, together with the combined planning of many groups within the state, might produce a system which would be agreeable to all concerned and at the same time be a protection against exploitation of the prisoners. Some experiments with payments of small wages have been made, and these should be continued, since responsibility for partial support of dependents may then be placed upon prisoners. Certain other problems of an administrative nature remain even after a good prison-labor policy is adopted, for example, the assignment of prisoners to tasks within the range of their abilities and aptitudes, work about the institution, such as cleaning, and organization of working time.

Education

Perhaps the gravest problem in penology is that of education in prisons. To define education in prisons is difficult, but, according to the Wickersham commission, it means more than book learning, vocational education, health habits, habits of labor, and formal discipline. It implies the attempt to reconstruct the basic attitudes of the individual, so that, upon release, he will adopt a different mode of life from the one which led him to prison. It is generally agreed that the prison of the

present day does not achieve this change. This is due to a great many factors, involving administrative policies, personnel, and perhaps more specifically the dynamics of human conduct. The problem of changing attitudes toward life is a difficult one, as difficult as trying to change men from one religious conviction to another. The first general educational work done in prisons in the United States was that of teaching prisoners to read the Bible. The first organized educational work in our penal institutions started in the New York House of Refuge, and consisted principally of religious instruction. The first legal recognition of penal education came in 1847, when New York provided for the appointment of teachers in the state prisons. Even if we regard prison education in the restricted sense, less than a fifth of the prisons have good educational programs today; many have none at all. The situation is somewhat better in reformatories and in institutions for juveniles.

Any basic educational program in a prison must have as its primary objective the socialization of the prisoners—that is, they must be made ready to live in society. This kind of education requires a removal of the influences which have previously operated as a deterrent to socialization, also a removal of undesirable habits and interests and the substitution of new and stimulating experiences and interests. To accomplish everything, we must face many problems. Shall the institution be organized for work or for education? What shall be the place of punishment in the regime? How shall the educational work itself be organized as to textbooks, instructors, and classrooms? At the present time, the curriculum of most institutions is confined to reading and writing, and the majority do not provide programs beyond the third or fourth grade. Many of the teachers are fellow-prisoners. There is practically no vocational education. MacCormick has stated on the basis of his 1927 survey that no prison in the country has a program of vocational education worthy of the name, and only a few reformatories for juveniles and young men have good vocational programs.

Prison libraries are inadequate and commonplace. They consist principally of cast-off books, newspapers, and magazines. Since we are dealing primarily with a problem of adult education, it is necessary to consider this deficiency a handicap to any plans of education. In many institutions the library is in direct charge of the chaplain, who has so many other obligations and responsibilities that little time is available for it. Some prisons have recently tried to develop a desire for education. At San Quentin Prison in California, more than 1,700 prisoners are enrolled in classes. Considerable stress is put upon languages and agriculture, and more than 50 per cent of class members complete each

term. Some believe that all prisoners should be allowed to take advantage of university extension courses.

Classification

Diversification of institutions, the state prison, the state reformatory, and the jail, has developed primarily on account of the need of segregating different types of offenders. Within prisons, separate housing for the younger criminal to keep him from contact with the older and more mature has been employed for some time. Illinois and New York have classification systems which permit the sending of the more dangerous offenders to one institution and the less dangerous to another. Other classifications have different objectives. Some are based upon economies. Workers in the same shop are often placed together in the same part of the cell block, which facilitates their arrivals and departures but often throws hardened and first offenders together. Conduct within the prison has brought about the separation of disciplinary offenders from those who are in good standing. There is also segregation by disease, and generally the insane are confined separately.

Most attempts at classification have been defeated by the use of congregate housing. New Jersey is making a special effort to apply the method of individualized treatment in its institutions and has done much toward setting up a real system of classification. In Indiana classification was begun on a scientific scale in 1937 at the reformatory and state prison. A system of classification based upon adequate physical arrangements should include segregation of prisoners on the basis of need for custody in maximum, medium, and minimum security buildings, with special provision for the insane, the feeble-minded, the tuberculous, contagious social-disease cases, drug addicts, sex perverts, and the aged and crippled. Few states are able yet to make all these classifications.

Conclusion

The present situation in institutional treatment of prisoners seems nothing short of tragic when we stop to consider the fact that the great majority who are committed must some time be returned to society. The prison of today is not designed to meet specific needs of prisoners or of society. Its accepted "treat-'em-rough" policy tends to hearken back to rigorous methods based primarily upon harsh punishment rather than upon plans for reform. The administration is generally inefficient and unable to contend with many of the problems presented. There has been a lack of constructive labor in prisons; there has been little

education and practically no vocational education. Individual programs of religious education have been reasonably effective from time to time, but the work of chaplains has been one of patience and fortitude in the face of grave handicaps. Physical conditions are only fair at best, and overburdening rules and regulations exist. If American prisons do anything, it is certain that they do not reform the inmates. In attempting to evaluate parole we should always keep this fundamental difficulty in mind.

A bleak picture of the present status of our prisons has been presented. Some elements are reasonably favorable. Reformatories seem to have progressed beyond prisons. Many institutions for juveniles have developed reasonably sound methods of procedure both under private and under public offices. Private institutions, such as the Houses of the Good Shepherd, have offered a system of care designed to meet the specific needs of girls. The state prisons and reformatories for women have shown remarkable advances, particularly in the past two decades. In occasional lucid intervals the press has demonstrated an ability to think through problems of prison administration without being blinded by emotional prejudices. The studies made by bodies of lay citizens have done much to inform the thinking public about developments in prisons, and official commissions appointed by governors have more recently been utilized for purposes of investigation and recommendation. Bishop Joseph H. Schlarman, of Peoria, Illinois, was recently chairman of a commission appointed by Governor Horner of Illinois to investigate conditions in the state prison following scandalous episodes at Joliet. His recent pamphlet *Why Prisons?* is a valuable survey of the prison problem. Under the heading "Abolish the System" he gives us a noteworthy summary:

> I believe it would be eminently unfair to blame any particular State Administration, or our prison officers for the obvious defects evident in the handling of penal problems. The *system* is wrong, and the *system* should be blamed. It is the *system* that makes penology start at the front bars, end at the rear wall, and reach its highest perfection in the good shots concealed in the towers on the walls. Problems of penology? Therapeutic pedagogy? Campaign problems! But the system permits and *demands* it. No riots, no escapes—why it must be a well-managed prison.—And then the public and the editors sit back in smug satisfaction. There seems to be only one solution: *abolish the system; establish an enlightened and sympathetic non-partisan Prison Commission, say, after the manner of England, aided by intelligent wardens and staffs.*[18]

[18] *Why Prisons?* (pamphlet) (The Paulist Press, New York, 1937), page 39. Used by permission.

It is evident from our consideration of the development of various methods of treating crime that interested lay persons have done a great deal to bring about reforms. The pioneer work of John Howard, Elizabeth Fry, and Dorothea Dix has given emphasis to the development of a concerned public opinion, which must not be allowed to lag. It is necessary to place our prisons on a sound basis in regard to administrative policies and programs. The average annual cost of prison care is $360 per inmate. The tremendous investment of the state in buildings, equipment, and land, as well as the extremely high cost of maintenance, should produce social dividends in greater proportion than are now available. An intelligent public interest in the treatment of crime, especially as carried on in prisons, would have a wholesome and beneficial effect upon our present-day penal problems.

The Wickersham commission has given us an excellent summary of the present situation:

> If it were possible to combine in one institution the best features actually in use in different institutions, there would be a model prison. It is not that there are no progressive institutions. It is rather that an institution which shows amazing courage and progress in one direction will continue old practices and out-of-date methods in other respects. For the future we need not go outside of experience in the development of our prison program. We need but extend to all prisons the best practices now employed in particular institutions. . . .
>
> We conclude that the present prison system is antiquated and inefficient. It does not reform the criminal. It fails to protect society. There is reason to believe that it contributes to the increase of crime by hardening the prisoner. We are convinced that a new type of penal institution must be developed, one that is new in spirit, in method and in objective.[14]

As Sanford Bates, former director of the federal prison system, has pointed out, the prison has three purposes: to protect, to deter, and to improve. It has failed in the third.

(See the references at the end of Chapter XX.)

[14] *Report on Penal Institutions*, pages 126 and 170.

CHAPTER XIX

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

In this chapter we shall examine certain phases of the methods utilized to bring offenders to trial. What has been said already concerning penology, namely, its variations from time to time and place to place, applies equally well to this subject. We shall see that here likewise there is no uniform, consistent policy in the administration of justice, but rather an unhappy combination of that which is reasonably logical and that which is obviously fallacious.

I. The Police

The police are charged with responsibility for enforcement of law. The term "police" is generic and refers either to civil agents or to those who act for private groups, with or without public commission. Under the American form of government, all political units may have police, the result being that there are such varieties as the city uniformed police, detectives, the town marshal, the constable, the sheriff, state police, and specialized agents such as game wardens, internal revenue agents, and meat inspectors.

1. FUNCTIONS

There is a difference between the American and European concepts of the powers of the police. In Europe, except for the English, the police have wide grants of power. The American development has been similar to that of England; recently, however, it has shown a trend toward the Continental system, particularly in respect to such duties as licensing and inspecting. There is a wide variance in the responsibilities and in the operations of rural police and city police. Constables, to a considerable extent, depend upon the fee system for payment for their work, and there is a distinct lack of co-operation and co-ordination of the various police units, especially in rural territories. The more recent development of state police systems has been a healthy one, and the centralization of control and direction may be expected to result in more co-operation and co-ordination of the police work

done in rural areas. The city police are of comparatively recent origin, replacing private watchmen about the middle of the nineteenth century.

The entire problem of enforcement of law and order is identified with the territorial restrictions placed upon the police. The present ease of transportation makes it possible for criminals to cross the city, town, county, and state lines in a very brief period of time, thus complicating police problems. The inauguration of the so-called Lindbergh law has enabled agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to follow up kidnaping crimes where an assumption exists that state lines have been crossed. The Mann Act, dealing with white slavery, and the Dyer Act, prohibiting the interstate transportation of stolen automobiles, are other types of federal participation in the pursuit of criminals who can be followed only with great difficulty by local police.

2. SELECTION

The bases for selection of police vary from one community to another, but at the present time some kind of formal civil-service examination is required of candidates in most large cities. Selection is usually based principally upon physical health, with some consideration of mental ability and political alliance. The picture today, however, is better than that of a decade ago, when there was no idea of policing as a profession or science. The work of August Vollmer, former chief of police of Los Angeles and Berkeley, California, has resulted in placing more stress upon educational qualities in the selection of candidates for police work and upon training police officers in scientific methods. As a result of courses in police training at Northwestern and a few other universities, many college men have become interested in police work as a career. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been a strong factor also in promoting scientific attitudes in police work.

Unfortunately, the chief of police is usually appointed by the mayor of the city with the approval of the city council or the board of aldermen. Often the tenure of the chief corresponds with that of the mayor or the reigning political forces, and turnover among the rank and file generally accompanies the change in the office of chief. In Kansas City 350 men were dismissed from the police force in 1921, and in one year the Los Angeles police department dismissed 294 men. The police department is but one of the unfortunate contacts between crime and politics, an association which has made American criminal justice the laughingstock of the world.

3. DISORGANIZATION

The widespread use of the "third degree" method of enforcing the law has been the subject of much investigation and comment. In nearly every case, the victim of third-degree brutality has no recourse, since it is his word against that of many officers. Bruises, gashes, and other symptoms of physical brutality are explained in court as "injured while resisting arrest." The use of the rubber hose, which does not inflict marks, usually makes the use of this alibi unnecessary. In order to prevent the "third degree," it has been suggested that prisoners be brought before a magistrate for a hearing immediately after arrest. In advocating that a legislative committee be appointed to investigate police brutality in New York State, the 1937 annual report of the Prison Association of New York made the following observation:

> The Federal Bureau of Investigation of the U.S. Department of Justice, some of the agents of which are popularly referred to as G-men, issues a monthly bulletin. The January, 1936, issue, Vol. 5, No. 1, contains a pertinent article entitled "The Confession and Third Degree Methods." A significant sentence reads: "By the application of scientific principles to crime detection and criminal apprehension there is no need to resort to third degree methods to obtain convictions, even in the case of the vicious mobster of today's organized crime." Another sentence reads: "The poignant challenge, 'when lynx-eyed departmental sleuths are baffled by paucity of clews (generally furnished by stool pigeons) or when they are too stupid or lazy to gather material evidence against the prisoner, they transform their tipstaffs into divining rods, and work diligently on the suspect's skull until he "comes clean"; rubber hose, which leaves no incriminating welt on face or body, being a favorite weapon with the confession snatchers,' must be refuted by a record of convictions that stand upon evidence developed through persistent, intelligent investigation." [1]

We must remember, however, that in many instances the criticisms of the police are due to unfamiliarity with their problems. They react often to public opinion and sometimes become panicky over public demands for arrests and convictions. Lack of security in the work, low pay, failure to provide for advancement and promotion are all symptoms of the disorganization which is typical of American police. Developments in the scientific field involving the use of psychometric tests, laboratory analyses, and the contributions of physics, chemistry, biology, along with nation-wide recording of fingerprints, have made the duties of the police even greater than previously and necessitate a certain amount of technical training.

[1] Legislative Document (1938), Number 62, Albany, 1938, page 20.

II. Problems of Detention

Since a great number of persons who are arrested by the police are innocent of the crimes charged to them, their appearance for trial, with all due precautions being taken to ensure appearance, should not involve hardship. Furthermore, it is a principle of the American law that all are innocent until proved guilty.

1. DISPOSITION

A person who is arrested may be taken to court immediately and tried, or he may be held for a few hours at the police lockup and then released or brought to trial in a day or two. If he is to be tried later, he may be released: (a) on his own recognizance; (b) through a writ of habeas corpus; (c) on bail. The majority of all arrests, excluding traffic cases, result in release by the police without court appearance; in most cases drunkenness is involved, in which case such procedure is known as the "Golden Rule" disposition. Writs of habeas corpus are used to make the police bring the arrested person before the court immediately and either prefer charges or release him. The police occasionally circumvent this by moving a person from one station house to another, a procedure known in Chicago as "taking him around the loop," so that lawyers are unable to have a writ of habeas corpus served. The professional criminal is generally more adept at securing his release through this writ than the first offender. Certain gangs have engaged lawyers to be on call at any hour of the day or night in order to secure writs for members who may be arrested.

2. THE BAIL SYSTEM

Bail is the most common method of release. Since many of those arrested have no friends with property, the business of professional bondsmen and surety companies has developed. Occasionally the police accept bail on minor charges, and in many cases the amounts are small, with the tacit understanding that the bail may be forfeited in lieu of appearance and fine. A major problem for the police and the court is to determine how much bail is needed. Collusion with court officials and politicians has scandalously permitted the freeing on nominal bail of many important prisoners. A fee-splitting system participated in by clerks of court, bondsmen's runners, and others has grown up. Soon after the Chicago Crime Commission was organized in 1919 by private citizens who felt that the administration of criminal justice in that city needed constant supervision by law-abiding citizens, it was found

that the city had lost millions of dollars through uncollected bond forfeitures. A large part of this loss was attributed to the loose supervision of professional bondsmen. In one instance, it was found that in a six months' period, a professional bondsman who had an equity of $6,750 in a piece of property had posted it for over $250,000 in bonds. Furthermore, it was found that, through loopholes in the law and negligence in its enforcement, forfeited bonds were collected so infrequently that professional bondsmen were able to offer "China bonds" to criminals who intended to jump their bail for China or other distant parts, at only a slightly increased rate. Since the bail system obviously must continue, it is certain that reform must be instituted. A central clearing house might be established with one responsible person having complete control of the granting of bail, the collecting of forfeited bonds, and other details of the system. Other aspects of detention, such as the physical problems of jails and lockups, have been described previously.

III. Steps in Prosecution

Prosecution begins with the arrest of the accused. This may be with or without a warrant when a felony has been committed, or when the officer has reason to believe a person arrested has committed a felony. When a misdemeanor is not committed in the presence of a police officer, a warrant for arrest is sometimes necessary. Officers usually have power to "arrest" a material witness in order to hold him for a judge's order, if there is a reasonable danger that the witness may disappear. The warrant is issued by a magistrate on the complaint and information furnished by the police or a private citizen showing probable cause to suspect a certain person of a crime. Minor offenses are tried in inferior courts and in most instances may be appealed to the higher courts. If the offense is serious, a preliminary examination is usually held by an inferior court to determine the probable cause for maintaining the prosecution, and, if such cause seems to exist, the accused may be released on bail or held to await action of the grand jury or the prosecuting attorney.

1. THE GRAND JURY

The grand jury, which is distinct from the trial jury, usually consists of from twelve to twenty-four persons. Proceedings are started before the grand jury by the prosecutor, who presents an indictment setting out the facts and evidence. The accused may not listen to the proceedings, which are private. If the majority of the grand jurors believe there is ground for prosecution of a felony, "a true bill" is written on the

back of the indictment and returned to the court. The grand jury may discharge the accused by finding no probable cause for continuing the prosecution. In about twenty states, the grand jury has been abolished for most felonies so that the prosecutor may start court proceedings at once by filing what is known as an "information" containing a formal charge. When "arraigned," the accused is brought to open court and charged with a crime, and has a choice of pleading "guilty" or "not guilty." If he pleads guilty, he is liable to immediate sentence; if he pleads not guilty, he is entitled to a trial. He may choose to be tried by the court or by a jury, and the tendency is toward more trials by the court. The entire process is fraught with many technicalities. Summary proceedings, which are used in the prosecution of minor offenses where the maximum penalty is less than $100 or a month's imprisonment, are less formal. Such is the procedure in police traffic courts.

2. THE PROSECUTOR

Since the prosecuting attorney presents the evidence to the grand jury and makes recommendations, he is of pivotal significance in prosecution. He may confer with the prisoner before bringing him to trial and may agree to compromise on a plea of guilty to a lesser charge. This is a common practice and in some jurisdictions becomes almost universal. A man charged with robbery may be told that, if he will plead guilty (thus avoiding trial, inconvenience to the prosecutor, and expense to the state), the charge will be reduced to burglary. If the accused believes that he may be found guilty if he stands trial, he is likely to accept the offer. If the prosecutor is reluctant to press charges against one who is accused, the case is dropped. The prosecutor and his assistants are generally selected on a political basis. Because of his key position in the administration of justice, his office is likely to be most important to a political machine that is tied up in any way with the criminal element. Most political machines are vitally interested in "protecting" gambling and other interests which are lucrative sources of graft.

3. THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

Since the establishment of the first public defender's office in Los Angeles about 1913, there has been a development of this system in many states and large cities. The public defender is for those who are unable to pay for counsel. Three systems for defending a person who cannot afford counsel exist: (a) assigned unpaid counsel; (b) assigned counsel paid an amount fixed by statute or court; (c) a regularly ap-

pointed full-time public defender. The last is obviously the best system, for it fixes responsibility on an adequately paid, experienced lawyer.

The plight of the poor in the courts is not pleasant to contemplate. They are subject to delays, and in criminal cases this may result in imprisonment for a long time. Of course, this is simply penalizing poverty. Court costs are sometimes excessive, thus punishing the poor but not the rich who may be involved in the same case. The expense of counsel may be justified by services performed, but many services are unnecessary and are based solely upon the traditional obscurity of legal procedures. Reginald Heber Smith, in a monumental Carnegie Foundation bulletin, *Justice and the Poor,* points out many of the amazing injustices to which the poor are subjected in civil cases, although improvements have been made in many localities by the use of small-claims courts, domestic-relations courts, and industrial-accident commissions. Legal-aid societies promoted either by the bar association or in co-operation with it have been useful in many communities. The legal-aid society provides legal advice free to those who cannot pay and charges small fees to those unable to afford to pay in full for the services of an attorney. After pointing out in a speech before the Legal Aid Society of New York that nearly 50 per cent of all defendants indicted for felonies in New York County in 1937 had no money for a lawyer, few if any friends, and no means to procure witnesses, District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey urged that more lawyers volunteer their services to that society. Because this society could handle only 389 assigned cases in the Court of General Sessions, more than 1,200 other felony cases were assigned to a group of lawyers who sat in court from day to day awaiting assignment of cases by the court. Mr. Dewey denounced "these bench-warmers, most of whose offices are in their hats," as a disgrace to the legal profession. Some of his remarks were reported as follows:

> One was a lawyer who, having been assigned to a case by the court, squeezed a $25 fee out of the defendant. He was discovered by the Legal Aid Society and after an inquiry gave up $12.50, retaining the rest for "expenses." When the expenses were found to have been 10 cents for carfare, the other $12.50 was given up.
>
> "Only recently," he said, "one of these lawyers was assigned to represent a 16-year-old defendant under indictment. Immediately he began writing letters to the boy's family in another State, demanding $250 for his services and threatening that unless he was paid the defendant would be sentenced to thirty years in prison. While every lawyer and social worker would know that no such thing was, as a practical matter, likely or possible, this lawyer delayed the trial for weeks until he completed his efforts unethically to extort a fee.

"Last month a new all-time-low was reached. A defendant in the Tombs had all his money on deposit with the cashier at the City Prison, a total of 25 cents. A member of the New York Bar was assigned to defend the case and his first act was to procure an assignment of the 25 cents from the defendant and collect it from the prison cashier." [2]

IV. The Criminal Courts

Present practices in the criminal courts of the United States are based upon a combination of the old and the new, often with needless emphasis upon tradition and technicalities that are out of place in modern society. The result is a highly technical, expensive procedure, which benefits chiefly the legal profession and the professional criminal who has learned how to circumvent the law through its technicalities. The following analysis of the work of the criminal courts is of necessity a mere résumé.

1. THE JUDGE

In most states, judges are elected, and the complications which enter into elections seem to preclude to some extent selection of the best men for the work. Adequate legal training, a judicial temperament, and personal honesty are essential characteristics, but the voters have little opportunity to know about such things. Because the office is elective, judges are usually on the alert to gain opportunity for favorable publicity. Unfortunately, this is not confined to public appearances at functions ranging from fights to funerals, but often takes the form of acting in a sensational fashion on the bench. Many have a flair for the dramatic and at every opportunity emphasize those subjects which are in the public eye, hoping that the newspapers will "play up" such statements. While the appointment of judges would eliminate some of the evils of the elective system, it also is open to many abuses. Perhaps the best suggestion that can be made is that bar associations bring pressure on party machines in order that worthy men be nominated.

When the guilt of an individual is determined, the judge has the responsibility of passing the sentence fixed by the legislature, but there is still considerable discretion given to the judge. Some of the criticism of judges for their sentences is based on a fallacy: the belief that the judge has the power to get the necessary information on which to base his decision. In most courts this is out of the question. The best that can be done in many cases in the lower courts is to guess from the appearance of the prisoner and from whatever incidental information

[2] New York *Times*, May 12, 1938. Used by permission.

has come to the judge's attention from outside sources. The use of recommendations made by probation staffs and psychiatric clinics has improved this condition in some courts, but at the present time this service is not widespread. Many suggestions for reform have been made, such as appointive life terms for judges, but, of course, this will not solve all the problems. A man of little ability, or one who does not have particular interest in the work, will not do a better job during a life term than during a short one. However, it does seem that the terms should be longer than at present, thus attracting qualified talent.

Former Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York advocated in 1927 the use of sentencing boards in the trial of felonies. The plan provides for a permanent board of three to five men, trained in fields such as psychiatry, social work, and criminology, who would take over the sentencing powers now given to judges. The judges would simply preside at trials to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused. After guilt had been determined on the legal evidence, the board would study all the facts concerning the guilty person, using the findings of physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers in order to determine what sentence is most appropriate. In this way, more time could be given to the determination of sentence, and full information rather than merely that brought out in the courtroom would be available. Though the plan would reduce the prestige of the judge somewhat in the public eye, it is logical and should receive consideration as a means of improving our present antiquated system. In a small rural community of a century ago, where everyone knew his neighbors, the present plan was satisfactory.

Another reform which should make the wheels of justice run more smoothly would be to have psychiatric examinations made soon after arrest by an unbiased state agency, so as to climinate much of the present confusion which prevails when the "insanity plea" is used in trials. In many instances, a clinic under the state department of public welfare might determine that commitment to a state hospital was necessary; on the other hand, if such a board decided that the offender was not suffering from a psychosis, it would be much more difficult for him to use and abuse the insanity plea in court.

2. THE JURY

The trial jury as we know it did not develop until the beginning of the thirteenth century, and it was largely influenced by Pope Innocent III's condemnation of trial by ordeal. In the beginning the jury performed the functions of the present jury, and in addition those of wit-

nesses, since in the small communities of that period the members were usually acquainted with the facts in question. By the beginning of the fifteenth century in England, however, the jury based decisions chiefly upon testimony furnished by witnesses. Originally, the grand jury served both to investigate the alleged crime and to accuse or indict the defendant, whom they usually knew as a neighbor. At the present time, the grand jury has turned over most of its investigatory powers to the police, the prosecuting attorney, or the magistrate, though it is used occasionally to conduct original investigations. The petit jury, generally known as the trial jury, or simply as the jury, is composed of twelve persons, although in some states a smaller number may be used. The burden of proving the guilt of the accused "beyond a reasonable doubt" rests upon the prosecution, and the accused by law has a right to be represented by counsel. Basically, the jury has only the duty of determining a question of fact: whether the accused person committed the crime.

The opposing attorneys make every effort to prejudice the jury from the moment the selection of a jury begins to the time the jurors leave the courtroom to make a decision. The selection may involve trying to obtain a jury with as little educational background as possible in order to arouse sympathy. On the other hand, the prosecutor may try to get a similar jury in order to arouse antagonism toward the accused, if he happens to be of superior educational equipment. Problems of race, religion, and politics enter into the process of selection, and it may take days or even weeks to agree upon twelve jurors. A large proportion of juries are of necessity composed of so-called "average men," since the better educated are usually able to evade jury service either by legal exemption or by various devices. Highly technical questions, which may be involved in certain criminal cases, may present an insuperable obstacle to jurors. Under the present system requiring unanimous verdicts of juries in criminal cases in most states, "hanging" a jury by bribing or intimidating one juror is said to be not only a possibility but a rather frequent occurrence. Many arguments can be given in favor of requiring a majority vote or a five-sixths vote of the jury. The technicalities of our present criminal procedure, many of which even the layman can recognize as unnecessary today, can be understood only by recalling the English and colonial backgrounds of our law. The evolution which took place in our national capital is typical.

The courts of the District began to function during the period of the so-called vindictive penalties, and future legal traditions and standards of procedure were to a large extent molded at the time. As Roscoe Pound has

pointed out, in that early period when so many offenses were capital, judges and juries hesitated in pronouncing convictions, and allowed the defendant to take every possible advantage of the technical rules of evidence. Sentiment against conviction was probably furthered by the fact that debtors were then imprisoned in the District of Columbia. Add to this such factors as the thrill given to a semi-rural community by a sharp contest in the court room, the eighteenth century conception of the "rights of man," and finally the vivid memory of bitter court experiences that had driven many from European shores, and it is easy to understand why the formal common-law rules of evidence and procedure were not only incorporated but even accentuated in these first District courts. When milder penalties for offenses committed were later substituted on the statute books, no reference was made to court procedure, so that the courts continued to try offenders according to the same formal, technical rules of the earlier period.[3]

V. Probation

In this section we shall consider probation chiefly as it applies to adults, reserving the subject of juvenile probation to another chapter. It might be pointed out, however, that much more progress has been made in the juvenile than in the adult field.

I. The Nature and Extent of Probation

Probation may be defined as the suspension of sentence or final judgment in a case, in order to give one who has been convicted of an offense an opportunity to improve his conduct while living as a member of the community subject to conditions imposed by the court and under the supervision and guidance of a social worker known as a probation officer. Probation must be distinguished from parole (a conditional release from an institution after a sentence has been wholly or partially served). Pardon is a remission of a penalty attached to a crime and is generally exercised by a high executive, such as the governor of a state. Probation has three major elements: (1) it shall be preceded by a study of the individual offender; (2) it is a form of treatment of the individual; (3) the probationer is assisted by the supervision of an officer of the court known as the probation officer. Probation is a substitute for incarceration or for other forms of punishment such as fines. Generally it is restricted to children, youthful offenders, persons convicted for the first time, and others who, in the opinion of the court, will respond to such treatment.

Although probation legally and constitutionally tends to be a form

[3] Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia* Part I (1906–1926), Senate Document No. 236, 69th Congress, 2nd Session (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1927), page 15.

of punishment, its purpose is educational and reconstructive rather than primarily punitive. The underlying principle in the theory of probation is that certain individuals who have committed a crime may, under the control and guidance of one skilled in human relationships and social adjustments, live statisfactorily in the community without repeating their offense. Therefore, it must be emphasized that probation involves the use of knowledge and skill on the part of those who control and guide, as well as the co-operation of the probationer. Naturally, it is necessary to distinguish probation as a system and as a practice, especially since there has been a manifest tendency in the treatment of crime to look for success in the system rather than in the persons who apply the system. Unless this distinction is understood, any consideration of probation is valueless.

The practice of probation originated in Massachusetts as early as 1848, when a Boston shoemaker began the practice of assisting young offenders whose sentences were suspended by the courts and who were placed in his care. In 1870 a law was passed requiring appointment of a full-time probation officer for the city of Boston. Three years later a law was passed permitting the aldermen of any city in the state and the selectmen of any town to employ a probation officer. In 1891, in Massachusetts, a law required the criminal courts throughout the commonwealth to appoint probation officers and defined their powers and duties. It was the establishment of juvenile courts at the beginning of this century, however, that gave the first real impetus to the probation movement; by 1900, six states had authorized probation with paid officers. By 1917, probation, either juvenile or adult, was authorized in every state, and, in 1931, thirty-six states, the District of Columbia, the federal government, and many European countries had adopted adult probation.

Despite the existence of statutes authorizing probation, Charles L. Chute, Secretary of the National Probation Association, believes only thirteen states can be said to have actually developed state-wide adult probation. Chute cites the general lack of standards and many ridiculous inconsistencies and restrictions in state laws. The adult-probation law of Iowa, for example, forbids the court to place on probation a person who has a venereal disease, in contrast with the law of North Carolina, which allows the use of probation only for persons who have such a disease or who have been convicted of prostitution. Appointment of probation officers is permissive in most states rather than mandatory; with the definition of probation as previously given, no system can be successful without trained probation officers. Qualifica-

tions of probation officers are not generally prescribed by law, although recent developments in New York and Indiana have resulted in the establishment of certain standards. If, as is generally agreed today, probation officers are social workers, the standards should be rather obvious. However, there is hardly a jurisdiction where such standards are mandatory in adult probation. The growth in the proportion of adult offenders placed on probation is indicated by the following records of New York and Massachusetts, two states which have had considerable experience in the use of probation:

> Since 1908 the New York courts have placed 357,559 adults on probation . . . in 1907 there were 1,672 prisoners on probation, as against 12,053 in penal institutions. In 1927, the number on probation had increased approximately fourteen times to 23,302, while the number in correctional institutions had only increased by about 50 per cent to 18,110. Between 1918 and 1927 there were for each year more people on probation than in correctional institutions. . . .
>
> The most striking evidence of the success of probation is supplied by the courts of Massachusetts. . . . Between the years of 1900 and 1929 the number released annually on probation had increased approximately five times from 6,201 in 1900 to 32,809 in 1929. During this same period, when the number on probation increased fivefold, commitments to institutions actually decreased from 27,809 to 19,650.[4]

2. EVALUATION OF PROBATION

Case histories of successful adjustments through probation are numerous and indicate that probation does not instill the bitterness and criminal attitude so typical of prisons. Probation lacks the pronounced stigma attached to incarceration. Economically, probation is comparatively inexpensive, even when adequately organized. However, the usual method of "selling" probation by citing its low cost as against institutional care is not very commendable, for probation properly administered and conducted would cost considerably more than it does in most places today. Another economic factor to be considered is the fact that the probationer remains at his employment and supports his family, whereas the state might have to assume this responsibility if he were committed to an institution. Thus, both the individual and society gain from probation properly administered. This does not mean that probation is a cure-all, but under certain conditions, with the observation of adequate standards, it is possible for most offenders to benefit greatly from such a system.

In spite of the virtues of probation, it must be admitted that it has

[4] *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole* (National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, Number 9, Washington, D.C., 1931), pages 163–164.

been "oversold" in the United States, chiefly because people have accepted the statistics on the success of probation without analysis. As a matter of fact, most of these statistics are worthless. For the most part, local probation officers follow a practice of counting the total number who have been placed on probation within a given year and weighing this against the number who have been recalled from probation and sent to a penitentiary. If, for example, the number placed on probation during a year is 100, and the number of these who violate probation so that they must be sent to a penitentiary before the year is up is 5, then the probation officer will usually announce that there has been a 95-per-cent success with those on probation during the year. The trouble with this criterion of success is that in such statistics no account is taken of the possibility that individuals will become delinquent again later, although not within the same calendar year. Furthermore, many who are placed on probation disappear and find their way into institutions in other states, although remaining in previous enumerations as successes.

The basic test in defining the success of probation should be a comparison between the success of probation as a method of treatment and other methods of treatment. Studies show that probation is successful for those who should be on probation and is not successful for those who should not be on probation. In the last analysis, success depends more upon the basis of selection and the quality of supervision than upon the mechanics of a probation system.

3. THE ROLE OF VOLUNTEERS

As previously noted, the first probation officers were volunteers. These have been supplanted for the most part by full-time paid probation officers, mainly because experience with volunteers was not generally successful. The use of volunteers was all right during the period when it was assumed that friendly counsel and admonition were the chief requisites in obtaining successful results from probation. As this concept has been modified and changed by new ideas of human behavior, it has become obvious that volunteers who can devote little time to the work are not especially effective except in a supplementary capacity through private organizations. Volunteers require constant supervision and assistance from trained workers in order to be of much value. Although the Big Brother movement has made extravagant claims for success over a long period of time, many believe that its greatest value has been in making volunteers realize their limitations

and in giving them a better understanding of the problems involved in dealing with those whom they have tried to assist.

Although the range of educational and training standards is great, in such states as New York, Massachusetts, and Indiana the use of some form of civil-service examination has improved the quality of the professional personnel entering the work in recent years. Since it is agreed that probation work is basically social case work, ultimately probation officers should be required to graduate from schools accredited by the American Association of Social Workers. The present standards in the adult field are so low, however, that it will be many years before this requirement is met even in our large cities. In many places, it is still true that probation officers are ex-ministers, retired policemen, political henchmen, widows of police officers killed in action, aged persons who have given many years to municipal services in fire and police departments, and others of similar caliber. Many of them are sincere and interested in their work but have little training or ability for it. In general, types of probation officers may be described in terms of the work they do. Hans Weiss has described three unsatisfactory types. There is the probation officer who spends most of his time doing clerical work and filling out report forms, whose only contact with probationers is in telling them to be good and to leave other persons' property alone. Another type lectures at length, and his work consists in a form of admonishment together with certain threats. Another type of probation officer may know something about the necessity of home calls and consultations but is generally lacking in the ability to plan and diagnose.

Another aspect of the personnel problem is found in the burdens which probation officers must assume. When we find probation officers inadequate to perform their tasks, or when we find that through lack of sufficient help the tasks are practically insuperable, there is just cause for alarm about the use of probation. Although there are no well-established objective criteria for gauging the amount of service necessary for good probation work, the size of the case load is a reasonably efficient measure. This means simply that the number of cases (individuals or families) for which one worker is responsible should not exceed fifty or perhaps sixty. With the average case load throughout the country today running near 200, we can see why good probation work is often impossible. In 1925, three officers in Milwaukee County were trying to supervise 839 men. In Flint, Michigan, one probation officer was responsible for 881 adults, 67 juveniles, 180 mother's aid

cases, and 409 alimony cases. Under such conditions, adequate work is impossible even with good personnel. It is really sinful to call this probation. Under such conditions, the check on probationers must rely solely upon office calls or the return of marked postcards, which comes closer to the old suspended-sentence program than to probation.

The problem of deciding who should be placed on probation is a serious one, even assuming the wisdom and tact of a good judge and the availability of good supervision by competent probation officers. The problem basically is this: Who will make the best risk? Certain classes of individuals, such as alcoholics, drug addicts, and mentally inferior prisoners with strongly developed criminal habits, are not amenable to probation. There are others who have so established themselves in criminal habits as to be decidedly poor risks. It must be borne in mind that probation does not mean leniency; it is a course of treatment and obviously must be limited only to those who are able to take advantage of it. Because of our present inadequate knowledge of human behavior, it is very difficult to distinguish between those who will adjust themselves to the community and those who will not adjust themselves; mistakes are inevitable and must be expected.

In order to make proper use of probation, the court must be in possession of certain facts concerning the background of the individual, his relationships with society as a whole, and such abilities and disabilities as he may have displayed at the time of sentence. An adequate case history provides the court with valuable information for its attempt to distinguish between those who are bad risks and those who are good risks. The best judges will always make a study of this social information. There is no quality of human judgment which makes it possible for any judge to be forever successful in his selection of those to be placed on probation. On the other hand, a careful review of the entire situation of the individual is of immeasurable assistance and explains the happy choices of many judges. The judge who is successful in using probation as a form of treatment must have at his disposal probation officers who, by reason of their abilities and interests, are able to provide for the judge adequate and honest information concerning the offender.

The most practical demonstration of the possibilities of probation was conducted by Edwin J. Cooley, in connection with the Court of General Sessions and under the auspices of the Catholic Charities of New York City, starting in 1925. Psychiatric, psychological, and physical examinations were provided for all defendants, and careful utilization of other agencies in the city for information and assistance

in treatment was an important part of the process. The case load was limited to fifty; while Cooley paid his college-trained probation officers $3,000 a year, he was careful to select only those with suitable personalities for this work. It is interesting to note that only 19 per cent of the cases investigated were recommended for probation. The Catholic Charities two-year demonstration, taken over in most of its details later by the Court of General Sessions, still stands out as the high point in adult-probation work in the United States. Though probation has made much progress in New York State, due in a large measure to the pioneer efforts of such Catholic social workers as Edwin J. Cooley, Frederick A. Moran, and the late Bernard Fagan, it still has a long way to go elsewhere before it can begin to measure up to possibilities and expectations. On this point, the Wickersham commission observed:

> The members of this committee are unanimously agreed that, properly conceived and administered, probation is a very valuable instrument indeed in the handling and treatment of offenders. We believe it is a disservice to probation, however, to make claims for it which the facts, in view of its inadequate application, do not justify. Because probation has been inadequately financed and poorly staffed; because 14 States still have no adult probation laws; because, even in most States possessing such laws, many courts make no use of probation; because probation officers, in general, have been underpaid, untrained, and chosen with little eye to their fitness; because volunteer probation officers have been used too widely; because the "case load" . . . is usually too heavy; because supervision of the probationer is therefore lax and perfunctory . . . for these and other reasons probation has fallen short of its promise in the United States so far.[5]

VI. Parole

Parole may be defined as the conditional release of a prisoner from a penal institution into the community under the authority and supervision of an official agency. It is essentially administrative and implies two functions: (1) selection of the prisoners to be paroled; (2) supervision during the parole period. Parole is thus distinguished from probation, which is a judicial responsibility, and from pardon, which, unlike parole, affords a restoration of citizenship and complete freedom without supervision. Parole is not a substitute for imprisonment, since it takes place after the period of imprisonment has expired. In parole, the state generally sets up conditions the violation of which will result in reimprisonment without further court action. Every imprisonment ends with either death or release. Release must be outright or under supervision. Parole is release under supervision. The basic question in dis-

[5] *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole*, pages 186–187.

cussions of the merits of parole is this: Do we prefer outright release or supervised release?

1. THE INDETERMINATE SENTENCE

The indeterminate sentence is necessary in a system of parole. Theoretically, the indeterminate sentence presumes that one is sent to a penal institution for a period which is entirely indefinite. No state has yet passed such a law, however, so that an "indeterminate sentence" really means that a prisoner may be confined for an indefinite time within the minimum and maximum limits set by the legislature and judge. Thus there are sentences of "not less than five years and no more than fifteen years" or "one year to ten," the date of the expiration of prison confinement being left to parole officials. Since its origin in New York in 1869, in connection with the Elmira reformatory, the indeterminate sentence, though widely adopted, has been subject to much criticism. Though there are certain practical disadvantages to the strictly indeterminate sentence, it is strange that no state has tried it out, since it is essentially sound in theory. An analogy with disease is pertinent. A physician, in discovering a disease, cannot cite the precise date at which the individual will recover. So, too, it is impossible for a legislature meeting many years before a crime is committed to decide when the individual who will have committed that crime will have sufficiently readjusted his habits and point of view so as no longer to constitute a menace to society. In some instances, the use of the minimum limit is unfortunate; on the other hand, the maximum penalty probably offers a more serious challenge to society since certain obvious situations may develop in which an individual probably will not, at any time in his life, become readjusted, something which no legislature can determine in advance. Where power to detain this type of offender for a longer period than his sentence calls for is denied the parole board, the criminal must go out, be caught committing another crime, and then be recommitted in a new trial. Yet the habitual offender in such a case will probably be regarded as "a product of the iniquitous parole system" by rabble-rousing newspapers.

2. THE PRESS AND PAROLE

Parole for the past few years has been an object of bitter newspaper attacks, and in many metropolitan communities, through a malicious or ignorant interpretation of parole, newspapers have made very strong efforts to do away with the system entirely. It must be reiterated that there are but two alternatives, outright release and supervised release,

and these two are mutually exclusive. The present newspaper attitude of "playing up" news stories concerning the activities of "paroled prisoners" is somewhat comparable to railing against medical science because a sick man who calls a doctor eventually dies. We do not deny here that the parole system is probably more deficient in its execution than any other phase of treatment of criminals, and that its defects are not only numerous but at times incomprehensible. Nevertheless, the more logical approach to the problem is an attempt to remove these deficiencies rather than to attack the system indiscriminately. In an article in which he criticized the unintelligent manner in which newspapers and certain public officials are calling for the abolition of parole, Sanford Bates, at that time Director of Federal Prisons, United States Department of Justice, made the following analysis:

> If it were possible by newspaper acclaim to immediately abolish all parole, what would be gained? The result would simply be that all men would have to be kept in prison forever or that they would be turned out without even an attempt at control or supervision. The facts in the case calmly and dispassionately considered do not justify such a proposition.
>
> What's wrong with parole? What's wrong with electricity? Nothing, if we know how to use it, but very dangerous if carelessly handled.
>
> What's wrong with social work? Nothing, if administered by skilled, intelligent, independent people; useless if operated through political favoritism.
>
> What's wrong with religion? Nothing, except that we don't practice it.
>
> And so we might say that there is nothing wrong with parole when intelligently and fearlessly operated with sufficient financial backing.[6]

The defects in parole administration consist in the selection of parolees, in their supervision, and in the appointments of parole boards and parole officers. The way to improve present evils is to ferret out these deficiencies and correct them.

3. PAROLE AND LENIENCY

About half of all prisoners released from prisons and reformatories today are released on parole. The Wickersham commission states that, of the 44,218 prisoners who were set free by American prisons and reformatories in 1927, 42 per cent had been held to the expiration of their full sentences, 49 per cent were paroled, and 9 per cent were released by all other means. Parole was used as a method of release in 66 per cent of the releases in California and Michigan, 70 per cent in New Jersey, 83 per cent in Illinois, 86 per cent in New York, 87 per cent in Massachusetts, 89 per cent in Indiana, and 98 per cent in Washington.

[6] *The Welfare Bulletin* (Illinois), Volume 28, February, 1937, page 1.

Florida, Mississippi, and Virginia are the only states in which no prisoners are paroled. This does not mean, however, that the majority of prisoners are released before their term expires. As a matter of fact, about 95 per cent of all who are committed to prisons must be released some time. They can be released on parole or without restrictions. Nor should it be thought that parole is granted as soon as men become eligible for it under the law. During the first nine months of 1938, according to Governor Herbert H. Lehman, 71.6 per cent of the initial applications for parole in New York were rejected.

Parole is not to be associated with leniency or short sentences. In all likelihood, parole lengthens rather than shortens the sentences that would be given if there were no parole. In a speech to the 1937 New York State Conference of Social Work, Governor Lehman brought out this last point very clearly:

> There is a general impression that parole shortens the sentence of prisoners. This is entirely untrue. The limits of all indeterminate sentences have been fixed by the Legislature for different crimes. The compensation to the prisoner for good behavior is fixed by the Legislature. Within the limits fixed by the Legislature, the judge, after conviction, imposes in his discretion indeterminate sentences and thereby fixes the minimum and maximum period of sentence. The Parole Board cannot reduce the minimum sentence imposed by the court. They cannot increase the allowances for good behavior which are granted only by the prison administrator. They cannot act in any instance until all the conditions of the law have been met. On the other hand, the Parole Board can and frequently does refuse to release a prisoner short of his maximum sentence even though the court has imposed a minimum and a maximum; and it also frequently refuses to recognize allowances for good behavior even though these are recommended by the prison authorities. Parole, therefore, instead of shortening sentences fixed by law frequently actually extends them. . . .
>
> There is a belief that if fixed sentences were given as punishment instead of indeterminate sentences there would be an improvement. This reasoning, I believe, is fallacious. A fixed sentence would not be substantially longer than a minimum sentence now imposed under our system of indeterminate sentences. In other words, a prisoner who now receives an indeterminate sentence of from 10 to 20 years would probably, under determinate sentence, receive a flat sentence of 10 years. In the case of the indeterminate sentence, the man remains under parole supervision until the expiration of his maximum sentence even though the maximum sentence may extend 10 or 20 years beyond the time of his parole.[7]

[7] Quoted in the 1937 annual report of the Prison Association of New York, pages 113–114.

4. PAROLE SELECTION

It has been pointed out that there are two major problems involved in parole: selection and supervision. If selection of parolees is inadequate or based upon a lack of evidence, adequate supervision will be impossible. A brief examination indicates that at present selection is primarily based upon careless examination of inadequate case materials Fourteen states have created agencies to deal specifically with parole but six of these rely on part-time unpaid boards to perform the task of selecting parolees, while three use a single official to select all prisoners for release. Only Illinois, Ohio, Massachusetts, New York, Texas, and the federal government have full-time salaried parole boards.

Boards do not have sufficient time or sufficient data with which to do work in selecting prisoners for parole, and as a result they are influenced by extremely unreliable factors. The range of these factors is naturally wide, but, in general, consideration is given to such factors as the past record of the prisoner, his behavior in the institution, the offense committed, and an analysis of the prisoner's appearance and manners before the board. These items imply certain ridiculous presumptions such as the ability to read character by such signs as uprightness of figure and looking one straight in the eye. Good conduct in prison may be due to apathy, or more often to a determination to avoid trouble in prison so as to get out as soon as possible, without any desire or plan for reform after release. Again, there are assumptions that a first offender is necessarily a good risk on parole and a second or third offender is a poor risk. These assumptions do not work out in practice. Altogether, it is difficult to see how good selection can be made on such tenuous bases. This view should not imply that an unpaid board or a part-time board is necessarily ineffective. If the data presented to the board are comprehensive and exhaust the possibilities of the situation, an analysis of the data may be of great value. Such data are seldom available, however.

The difficulty in determining when a man is fit for parole is illustrated very well in the case of John Dillinger. Contrary to popular impression, Dillinger was not paroled, but received a commutation of sentence from the governor on recommendation of the Clemency Commission. Yet, the Clemency Commission, in making its recommendation, acted in accordance with information which would have been available to a parole board had Dillinger been committed under an indeterminate sentence rather than a flat or fixed sentence, so that our comparison is valid for all practical purposes. To the prison authorities,

Dillinger was a first offender who had received a long and apparently an unfair sentence for a comparatively minor offense. The physician and psychiatrist of the Indiana State Prison, from which he was released to launch immediately one of the most amazing crime careers in history, describes this prisoner as follows:

> Many members of the Warden's staff were scarcely aware of Dillinger's presence in the penitentiary. He was detected in many minor infractions of the rules and was sent to solitary confinement on several occasions, but so were many other inmates. He appeared to be nothing more than a Hoosier farm boy who had gone wrong. Little did we realize that this youngster would some day be hunted by the police over all the nation and that eventually the Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice would have to track him down and kill him like a mad dog. . . . John Dillinger suffered from heart disease. He had a distinct heart lesion. The disease was organic. I told Dillinger that he should never subject himself to great mental or physical strain, because it might hasten his death. I was confident he would follow my advice. He appeared to be such a meek, unassuming character that I felt when he finally was released he would settle down to a placid and peaceful mode of living.[8]

Surely this peaceful cardiac patient ending his first sentence would have seemed to be a good risk to a parole board as he left for his father's farm. What could not be seen, of course, was the "education" in crime methods that he had acquired through constant association with hardened criminals in prison and the resentment which burned in him over what he considered an unfair sentence for his first offense. Yet, released in June, 1933, he held up his first bank on July 17 and within a few weeks became a supercriminal. Is there any reason to believe that conditions would have been different if he had not been released but allowed to remain a few months longer in the institution?

Fortunately, there are certain indications of progress in selection. In Indiana and New Jersey, the salient practice now includes the following: The prisoner is examined upon arrival at the institution by a classification committee composed of the major administrative officers of the institution. Each examiner submits his findings in writing to the full committee, which thereby considers the case and draws up a tentative program for the prisoner, with the ultimate purpose of preparing him for release. Records of progress are kept, and changes are made in the programs from time to time. The parole office has been preparing, in the meantime, to receive each prisoner for parole supervision. There is an investigation and study of the home and environmental background

[8] Patrick H. Weeks, M.D., *The Big House of Mystery* (Dorrance & Co., Philadelphia, 1938), pages 148–149.

of each prisoner immediately after he is received into the institution and again prior to his release. This system offers a better opportunity for careful and intelligent selection. In New York, a division of parole has been set up within the state executive department, with jurisdiction over the four state prisons and the men's reformatory. It is interesting that the members of the Parole Board in New York are paid more than $10,000 yearly, and the executive director, who is the board's administrative officer charged with responsibility for methods of investigation and supervision, receives a salary of $9,000 annually. It is believed that, if salaries comparable to those of the judiciary are paid, equally competent officials worthy of the public's confidence can be entrusted with the supervision of a parole system. Yet even in New York, with its high-salaried officials and college-trained parole officers, the system costs only $60 a year per parolee, whereas it costs approximately $550 a year to maintain an individual in a state prison, excluding the capital of the prison itself.

One reason why a competent full-time parole board is desirable is the difficulty involved in determining when a person is fit for parole. Since Hornell Hart suggested in 1923 the possibility of applying to penology statistical methods of determining probabilities, as in the actuarial rates used by insurance companies, there has been a development of studies and experiments in regard to predictability of criminal conduct, especially in connection with parole. One of the most comprehensive of these studies was made by Bruce, Harno, Burgess, and Landesco in Illinois. This study considered the records of 1,000 men paroled from three institutions, Joliet, Menard, and the Pontiac reformatory, in 1926. There were twenty-two facts concerning each offender. Unfortunately, however, the social data upon which the studies were based could not be considered complete, and there was no weighing of the factors; in other words, all factors were considered of equal importance. Without attempting to weigh the results thus far obtained in several studies which have improved upon the Illinois study, we may say that this method is one which seems to have considerable promise. The attempt to establish diagnostic tables is a forward-looking movement and, while not yet in the objective state, is superior by reason of its attempt to measure rather than to guess at the various factors involved in parole success.

5. PAROLE SUPERVISION

A cursory examination of the parole situation as it affects supervision reveals difficulties similar to those considered under probation.

Beyond the common requirement that the parolee have a job, such factors as the administration of the parole office, the case load, and the qualifications of officers vary little or not at all from similar situations in probation. The same crude use is made of statistical material concerning success, except in the Gluecks' studies, which indicate that a total of 60.3 per cent of Massachusetts parolees committed "serious breaches of parole." The majority of these violations were not felonies, however. Since parole is primarily a case-work responsibility, the present trend is to place the supervision of parolees under the state department of public welfare rather than under parole agents working out of the individual institutions. The development of the new Indiana system is being watched with interest, since parole supervision has there been made a responsibility of county departments of public welfare. This means that the parole officer is a case worker of the county department, asssigned to parole work and restricted to the county, rather than an institutional agent responsible for parolees from one institution in ten or twelve counties, as is the case in most states. New York has reasonably high standards of parole supervision, and an effort is made to keep the case loads below seventy-five; in most states it is still near two or three hundred.

The Wickersham commission has given us a rather thorough summary of the essential features of a good parole system. Such a system would involve the following elements, which, it may be added, are rarely found today:

1. An indeterminate sentence law, permitting the offender to be released conditionally at a time when he is most likely to make good, not at the end of a term fixed arbitrarily in advance.
2. Preparation for parole in the institution. This means little more than preparation for normal social living. Specifically it involves, however—
   (a) Looking upon parole as the logical, natural way to terminate a prison term.
   (b) Getting the offender to regard it in the same light.
   (c) Instructing the offender, while he is still in the institution, in respect to the things that will be expected of him on parole—and not putting off such instruction until the last day.
   (d) Bringing the offender and his parole officer into contact before the offender leaves the institution.
   (e) Making sure that the parole officer is familiar with the home and environmental conditions of his charge before the latter leaves the institution.
3. Selection of persons to be paroled on the basis—
   (a) Of all the competent information concerning him possessed by the institution, particularly the examinations and recommendations of the scientific members of the staff.

(b) Of supplementary information concerning his home, environmental situation, etc., when this is necessary.
(c) Preparation, in advance, of a suitable environmental situation into which to release him, such as proper home surroundings, employment awaiting him, etc.

4. Supervision by trained, competent parole officers. This means:
(a) Maintenance of an adequate number of officers to insure that the number of parolees being supervised at any one time will not exceed 75 and, if much traveling has to be done, 50.
(b) Appointment of officers possessing, as nearly as possible, the following qualifications: a high school education, and, in addition, one of the following—(1) at least three years' acceptable experience (full-time basis) in social-case work with a social agency of good standing or (2) a college education, with at least one year of satisfactory training either in a social-case work agency of good standing or in a recognized school of social service. The parole officers should also be persons of tact and good address, possessing personalities making it likely that they will be effective in influencing the behavior of others.
5. Supervision should be careful and intensive, in the manner of social-case work.
6. Flexible arrangements for the release of offenders from parole, not automatic release at the end of a year or some other similar period. (When sentences carry maxima, it will probably be illegal to hold offenders on parole beyond the expiration of their maxima.) Supervision can be relaxed as the offender demonstrates his ability to do well.
7. Establishment of adequate standards and techniques for investigations and supervision.
8. An organization to supervise the work of parole officers and make sure that the foregoing standards are lived up to.
9. Payment of salaries to parole officers commensurate with their training, abilities, and duties.
10. Prompt return of offenders who commit further crimes, or indicate that they are likely to become public menaces.
11. A record system which will include the keeping of full, useful and accurate case histories of all parolees.
12. Appropriations adequate to all these purposes, since . . . parole is far cheaper than institutional care.[9]

By way of conclusion, it may be stated that we must continually look for the truth about parole and make reforms based on facts rather than assumptions. In this matter, our newspapers have a serious public responsibility. Since we have mentioned thoughtless newspaper criticisms as a constant source of annoyance to those who are seriously interested in reforming parole, it is only fair to recognize occasional efforts on their part to inform rather than inflame the public. Such a purpose is evident in the following New York *Times* editorial:

[9] *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole*, pages 324–326.

John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while paying lip service in his Pittsburgh speech to the principle of parole, referred to the "blatant outcry from these crime-coddlers," to "these self-appointed ambassadors of the open cell-block," to the "ignorant blatherings of either ill-informed or selfishly motivated persons," and so on. He drew an appalling picture of the sex criminal—as though anyone of consequence seriously proposed to turn loose these "filthy, prison-bred reptiles."

The effect of such speeches as this is not to produce a scientific attitude toward crime and criminals. It comes near being a stimulus to mob action. If Mr. Hoover cares to inform himself on the subject of parole he can easily do so. In New York State, as Governor Lehman recently stated, parole is not a system for coddling prisoners—it is an arrangement for controlling, guiding and re-educating them after the inevitable release. As to sex offenders in this State, over a period of seven years less than 1 per cent of those released were convicted of new sex crimes. Proper medical attention can probably reduce even this figure.

The Bureau of Investigation has done a good job. So have local police forces who have sometimes cooperated or competed with the bureau. But neither Mr. Hoover's prestige nor that of his G-men is aided by such impassioned utterances as those he made on Tuesday. We cannot keep permanently in jail all persons who have shown criminal tendencies. The provisions made for release and for control and guidance after release, whether called parole or by some other name, are just as important as the provisions for catching criminals. We need both, and a scientific penology will include both.[10]

(See the references at the end of Chapter XX.)

[10] November 12, 1937. Used by permission.

CHAPTER XX

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Catholic Church has always recognized the fact that the future of any institution lies in its children. That realization lies back of our parochial school system with all its sacrifices. The same may be said for the state; without good young Americans, the future welfare of America will be jeopardized. Catholics, therefore, with their profound appreciation of the importance of child training, should be the first to support every attempt to solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. At first sight the extent of the problem might seem to be indicated by the fact that approximately 200,000 children come before the juvenile courts annually because of delinquency. This amount of delinquency dealt with by the juvenile courts is, however, determined not only by the amount of delinquency in the communities served by the courts but also by policies of the police departments and other agencies in referring cases to the courts, as well as by the policy of the juvenile court itself. In other words, the number coming before the juvenile courts in no way expresses the incidence of delinquency as such. The actual number of delinquencies that come to the attention of the police and other agencies far exceeds the figure which we have considered. Nor do we find delinquency spread evenly throughout the population; rather it is an expression of conduct peculiar to certain neighborhoods and communities. The study of the treatment of juvenile delinquency today is largely a study of the juvenile court. As we shall see, this institution has developed into much more than a strictly legal institution, so that, rightly or wrongly, it is a social agency reaching out and touching nearly every phase of the delinquency problem. We shall begin our study, therefore, by an examination of the court itself, first as a legal institution, and then as a social agency. In its latter capacity, we shall see that it has utilized and even shaped the policies of many other agencies engaged in either the prevention or the correction of delinquency. Thus, any study of the court will involve juvenile probation, institutional treatment, and the work of various protective agencies as well.

I. The Juvenile Court

1. BACKGROUNDS

Although the juvenile court is of comparatively recent origin, the legal principles underlying it may be traced far back into the history of jurisprudence. Though most juvenile courts have been created by special statute, the primary basis of the juvenile court is said to be the common law. There is some dispute as to whether the procedural basis is one of chancery (or equity), or whether it is primarily criminal in nature. If we isolate the functions of the juvenile court one from another, we find that they have a basis in both criminal and chancery procedure. Much of our juvenile-court procedure is based upon the old English doctrine that the king is father of his country and so the ultimate parent of all minors who require special care and protection. At an early date the chancery courts of England, representing the king, dealt with children who were neglected, dependent, or destitute. In the United States, the inclusion of delinquent children under chancery has been generally accepted, with the recent growth of the juvenile court, as a logical extension of the principle of chancery and of guardianship. A substantial body of opinion holds, however, that the basis for the treatment of delinquents in the juvenile court was in a revision of the procedure of the criminal courts rather than in the adoption of chancery procedure. The question as to the legal basis of the court, largely academic at present, becomes important when proposals are made to extend juvenile-court methods to adult courts. Some go so far as to maintain that the existing juvenile court is a legal monstrosity which should be shorn of its social-agency aspects and left as a strictly legal institution. Even though the origin remains somewhat obscure, there are two general conclusions which we may draw: (1) it is probable that the juvenile court as we know it today originated both in criminal and in chancery courts; (2) procedure or treatment in the juvenile court resembles chancery procedure more than criminal procedure, despite the fact that some traces of criminal procedure remain in present-day juvenile courts.

English and early American law always made a distinction between the crimes of children and those of adults, although this distinction was so slight, involving only the matter of responsibility, that it seems almost shocking to us today:

> The common law, following the Roman law, conclusively presumed a child under the age of 7 years to be incapable of committing a crime, on

the theory that he could not distinguish between right and wrong in a particular action, and so was not amenable before the law. Between the ages of 7 and 14 a child was brought before the courts, tried and punished as an adult, with this exception—there existed a presumption of incapacity which the State had to rebut before a conviction could be had. Malice supplied for want of age in the case of a child over 7. In an early English case it was decided that where a boy of 10 years of age killed his companion and hid himself afterwards, the act of hiding indicated the ability to distinguish between good and evil, and so the boy was hanged. (I Hale P.C. 25.) The common-law period of conclusively presumed incapacity was later extended by statute in some States—Texas 9 years, Illinois and Georgia 10 years, Arkansas 12 years. (31 L.R.A. 196.) [1]

The later growth of the law in treatment of juvenile offenders may be seen in the history of Massachusetts. A law of 1869 provided for the presence of a visiting agent or officer of the State Board of Charities at the trial of juvenile cases. In 1870, separate hearings were required for the trial of juvenile offenders in courts in the County of Suffolk. A law of 1872 extended the requirements to the police districts and municipal courts of the state, authorizing the government to designate and commission certain justices to try children's cases. In 1877, separate sessions were instituted for juvenile offenders with separate records and dockets. Similar departures from the ancient procedures in other states such as New York, Indiana, and Rhode Island preceded the official establishment of the juvenile court as such.

The first juvenile court in the United States was established by statute in 1899 in Chicago and was known as the Juvenile Court of Cook County. Under this law, the delinquent child received essentially the same care, custody, and treatment as was formerly accorded to neglected and dependent children. Within five years, juvenile-court laws were passed in Colorado, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, New York, Maryland, California, Missouri, New Jersey, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio. With the establishment of these courts, there gradually developed a new legal attitude toward offenses committed by juveniles. The juvenile-court attitude has been described as follows:

> The delinquent child is not to be proceeded against as one who has committed an offense against the State for which the State must mete out punishment, but is a subject for the State's special protection, care, and guardianship in exactly the same degree as the child who is neglected or homeless. The power of the court to extend this protection to the delinquent child is the same power which the courts in England and in the United States have long exercised in respect to destitute or neglected children and

[1] Rev. Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C., *The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia*, Part I (1906–1926), Senate Document No. 236, 69th Congress, 2nd Session (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1927), page 5.

is derived from the capacity of the State to act as the ultimate parent of its children.[2]

2. JURISDICTION AND ORGANIZATION

Under our present system, the juvenile court is based upon statute, and, therefore, its power and jurisdiction are defined by the laws of each state. Some courts are independent and as such are separate courts; others are merely branches of court systems. The jurisdiction of the court may be either exclusive or concurrent. There has been some confusion in regard to concurrent jurisdiction, particularly in situations involving felonies. In some states, juvenile courts have jurisdiction over adults in case of offenses against children. The juvenile court is subject to specific age limitations defined by the statute creating it. In 1933, the maximum age for boys in juvenile courts of thirteen states was 16 years, in twelve states it was 17 years, and in nineteen states it was 18 years. In California and Arkansas, the limit is 21 years. In certain states, a child for whom the court assumes responsibility may remain under the court's jurisdiction until majority, provided he does not commit a new offense after he has passed the juvenile-court age.

A question often raised in connection with the juvenile court is: What right has the state to interfere with the rights of parents in the care of their children? The state has rights both affecting the family as a unit and affecting individual members of the family, but these rights exist only when the family fails to function properly. As Monsignor Francis J. Haas states:

> The juvenile court represents the effort on the part of the civil authorities to do for these children what their homes fail to do for them. This activity of the state cannot be regarded as an invasion of family rights, inasmuch as the average juvenile court offender comes from a home that, as such, is inadequate. It should be added that an efficient juvenile court with its probation system always aims to reconstruct the home in order to give the child a normal home life.
>
> Intervention by the state in family life is, therefore, justified when the home fails to function properly. . . . Consequently, the state may intervene only up to the point where it does not weaken parental control or responsibility. If it goes beyond this point, it exceeds its powers and defeats its own purposes.[3]

There have been many challenges to the constitutionality of various juvenile-court acts, involving chiefly the following issues: (1) denial of the right of trial by jury; (2) deprivation of liberty without due

[2] Evelina Belden, *Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases,* Children's Bureau Publication Number 65 (Washington, D.C., 1920), page 7.

[3] *Man and Society* (The Century Co., New York, 1930), page 152.

process of law; (3) violation of the guarantee of a public trial. However, the status of the juvenile court has been generally upheld. To cite Miss Belden's summary of the situation:

> The fundamental principles of the juvenile court, as expressed in the first juvenile court law, have been sustained by a large number of judicial decisions. That proceedings instituted under juvenile court acts and similar statutes are not criminal in their nature has frequently been affirmed by the courts. . . .
>
> The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has stated—"The act is not for the trial of a child charged with crime, but is mercifully to save it from an ordeal, with the prison or penitentiary in its wake, if the child's own good and the best interests of the State justify such salvation. Whether the child deserves to be saved by the State is no more a question for a jury than whether the father, if able to save it, ought to save it. The act is but an exercise by the State of its supreme power over the welfare of its children." [4]

There is a distinction between delinquency and dependency, although for practical purposes this does not become important as an aspect of jurisdiction. The delinquent child is one who violates a law or ordinance, or is incorrigible, or associates with criminals, or absents himself from home without cause, or is an habitual truant. The dependent or neglected child is usually defined as destitute, homeless, abandoned, dependent upon the public for support, living in a home that is unfit because of neglect, cruelty, or depravity on the part of the parents, or living in surroundings dangerous to morals, health, or general welfare. In most states the adult courts still have the right to try juveniles who commit crimes punishable by death or life imprisonment.

Because of the many social problems encountered in the disposition of cases involving delinquency and dependency, it is generally agreed that the judge should have not only legal training but a practical knowledge of social work and social problems as well. While the judge works within the framework of the law and must have a knowledge of its structure, the problems with which he deals are human problems, and an understanding of modern methods of dealing with these problems is essential to adequate judicial action. In some instances, a judge's lack of familiarity with social-work methods has been compensated for by the appointment of a referee. Juvenile referees have the general powers and duties of referees in chancery cases, such as receiving petitions, hearing the testimony of witnesses, and certifying the findings to the judge, together with a recommendation as to the disposition. In some jurisdictions, the selection of a probation officer as

[4] *Op. cit.*, page 10.

referee is usual, since the referee need not be a lawyer. The use of women as referees in order to hear cases involving girls has become widespread.

Juvenile-Probation Officers

The services of full-time probation officers are absolutely essential to the work of the juvenile court. In fact, the probation staff is the heart of the court and is much more important than the judge as far as results are concerned. Volunteers are useful only as a supplement to paid agents of the court. Organizations such as Big Brothers or Big Sisters are especially useful under certain conditions, and various other private organizations from time to time have provided supplementary services valuable to the court. The selection of probation officers varies from one state to another in regard to standards and procedures. In some states there are civil-service examinations that provide eligible lists from which appointments are made. In other instances, large cities hold similar competitive examinations without statutory authority. The Committee on Standard Juvenile Court Laws recommends specifically a competitive examination under the supervision of a bureau or commission of probation having state-wide authority.

College students contemplating future careers should be particularly concerned about the maintenance of high standards regulating the appointment of probation officers in their communities. These appointments should be beyond the reach of political bosses and open only to college graduates with special training in sociology and social work. While the educational standards have been commensurate with salaries in many areas in the past, the gradual boosting of the educational requirements and the salaries of probation workers makes this an attractive field for college graduates. Salaries ranging from $1,800 to $3,000 are common, with even higher salaries for the more experienced executives. Where good social-work standards prevail, this field offers an attractive life-time career to those with proper training and personality. While the probation officer must have sufficient "book interests" to keep up with new books and reports in his field, he must be interested especially in people. Not every college graduate can be successful as a probation officer. An attractive and inspiring personality is essential. Both Cooley and Fagan always insisted upon this point at the same time that they campaigned for better-educated probation workers on their court staffs in New York City. A good research person seldom makes a good probation officer. Relative to this, at the 1935 Governors' Conference on Crime, the Criminal and Society, Leonard Mayo, him-

self a professor in a school of social work, said: "You cannot talk to young men. They can only be changed by personalities that are wholesome and virile, that they can admire, and by activities which include the correction of physical and emotional difficulties." The college student with social-science credits who wishes to consider this or any related field of social work as a career should, if possible, "try himself out" by working with some volunteer agency, such as a St. Vincent de Paul Society before undertaking graduate training.

The organization and the work of the court depend to a considerable extent upon the functions outlined in the particular juvenile-court law. The courts having responsibility for mother's pension cases and family relations obviously will have a different organization of work from those whose concern is solely with juveniles. As a general rule, administrative responsibility rests with the chief probation officer (where there is more than one officer), and division of responsibility among the officers may be made on the basis of specialization either as to district or as to the age, sex, race, or religion of delinquents.

3. THE MACHINERY OF THE COURT

The juvenile court is basically a legal institution, so that certain regulations and formalities of procedure must be followed. However, the way in which these legal requirements have been interwoven with social-work methods presents an amazing evolution in our court system, which is ordinarily characterized by extreme conservatism. Perhaps the easiest way to get a picture of the procedure prevailing in the average juvenile court is to follow the steps which a case goes through, starting with the complaint.

A complaint is a formal report by any person or agency to the court, concerning a condition that in his opinion or belief requires investigation. This does not involve an initiation of court action as such, but, if the complaint is investigated, jurisdiction by the court may be obtained by filing a petition alleging the facts which bring the child within the provision of the law. This petition, though brief and informal, includes the name, age, and residence of the child and the names and residence of the parents or legal guardian or other persons having his custody. Where arrests are necessary, the best courts arrange to make them discreetly and without recourse to the publicity of transportation in a police car, transportation of girls being taken care of by a woman officer. When a date is set for the hearing, a summons is served, often by a probation officer, requiring the parent or guardian to appear with the child in court at the appointed time. The summons is less formal than a

warrant, and does not involve arrest. Occasionally it is necessary to provide for detention or temporary custody of children during the interval between apprehension and the disposition of the case. Mature adolescents who have committed serious offenses or run away from other jurisdictions, or children with dangerous or degrading environments at home, are usually the only ones requiring detention.

Before the case is taken up in court, a complete study should be made of it, following the usual methods of social-work technique. This study will include a social history of the child. The details which should be observed in making this study are described in the following outline suggested by Lenroot and Lundberg:

(1) The cause of the complaint.
(2) The child's developmental history, habits, and conduct, including previous delinquencies.
(3) Home conditions:
  (a) Composition of the family; occupations, earnings, and characteristics of its members; assistance of social agencies.
  (b) Type of dwelling, and living and sleeping arrangements.
  (c) Conditions in the home which may have a special relation to the child's conduct.
  (d) Constructive possibilities in the home.
(4) The child and his school:
  (a) Present standing with reference to academic progress and conduct.
  (b) School history.
(5) The child's working history (if he has been employed).
(6) The child's recreational activities and connection with churches, clubs, and other organizations.

The sources of information with reference to the preceding points should include:

(1) An interview with the child.
(2) A visit to the home and an interview with one or both parents (preferably both).
(3) Interviews with relatives, neighbors, and companions.
(4) Interviews with principals, teachers, and officials of the school-attendance department; school records.
(5) Interviews with employers, past and present.
(6) Inquiry of social service exchange and social agencies that have known the child or family.[5]

The necessity for physical and mental examinations should be clear after a study of our previous chapter on the various causes of anti-social behavior. Since both the behavior of the child and his environ-

[5] K. F. Lenroot and E. O. Lundberg, *Juvenile Courts at Work*, Children's Bureau Publication Number 141 (Washington, D.C.), pages 163–165.

ment are necessarily interrelated and interwoven, the situation must be seen as an integrated whole. Although some courts have provision for physical examinations, the number with provision for adequate psychiatric and psychological examinations is still too small. To treat children without knowing possible physical or mental factors involved is both unscientific and wasteful.

A great many cases reported to the juvenile courts are dealt with "unofficially" by the probation staff. An interview with a complainant may reveal that the situation is trivial, and a further study of the situation may indicate that an unofficial warning to the child, or to his parents, is sufficient treatment. Official juvenile-court hearings are usually private and informal, without the procedure used in criminal cases. These hearings are conspicuous by the absence of the robed judge on the bench and of all the abracadabra of the courtroom, the uniformed police, and spectators' benches, and the legal terminology. Since the allegation contained in the petition must be proved, the procedure must follow certain rules of evidence. Although the practice varies from one court to another, it is generally assumed that the hearing should have an informal, friendly atmosphere. When cross examination takes place, it is done casually and on a friendly basis, rather than with the formal methods typical of the criminal courts. At the end of the hearing, the court may dispose of the case and administer treatment in any one of five different ways: (1) dismissal; (2) continuance; (3) probation; (4) placement in a foster home; (5) commitment to an institution designed for the purpose of reformation or custodial care. Since foster-home care will be considered in conjunction with child welfare, and probation was discussed in conjunction with the administration of criminal justice, only institutional care needs to be mentioned at this point. Before we take up this subject, however, something should be said about the future of the court.

4. THE FUTURE OF THE COURT

Reference has been made to the large number of informal or unofficial cases handled by the juvenile court. This has resulted in an interesting controversy: Should the court be expanded to include additional social-work functions or restricted to merely legal questions? In order to understand the implications of the controversy, we must recognize several factors. When the juvenile court was first established, it took the form of a reaction against harsh methods of punishment. Despite the fact that there were able and wise advocates of the juvenile court, the institution of the court was accompanied by a certain amount

of hysteria. Someone has aptly said that one cannot sell an idea to legislators without deviating from the truth. At any rate, much of the sudden tendency to approve the court was based upon false assumptions about the work it could do. A thought that was predominant in the minds of many was that the juvenile court was a cure-all for crime. It was believed that, with a process of scientific treatment, it would be possible to "cure" youthful offenders and in that way prevent their growing to maturity and taking their places with other adult offenders.

Unfortunately, this has not happened, nor could it have reasonably been expected to happen. The juvenile court on its own merits, providing individualized treatment of children who are delinquent, has a definite place in society today. But to hope that juvenile courts could act as a panacea for crime was illogical. It is natural that, when a product is "oversold," there may be a reaction against it. In 1935 the legislature of Illinois seriously considered a bill to remove from the juvenile courts all juveniles over 10 years of age who had committed felonies. The most expressive argument in favor of the bill was that it would do away with "leniency," on a supposition that juvenile courts mean leniency rather than adequate treatment.

It is not unusual to find that the juvenile courts themselves succumbed to the popular point of view and assumed that in regard to the welfare of children their work was all-embracing. Thus we find an expansion of the program of the court to include various phases of social work, such as truancy, mothers' aid, and domestic relations. The tendency has further been reflected by the gradual increase of unofficial cases handled by the courts. The courts literally have been setting themselves up as child-welfare agencies primarily responsible for all problems involving lack of adjustment in children. Where may the most adequate treatment for problems of children be found? Since the scope of child welfare is so broad, it is not unusual to find that the juvenile court is only one of the many agencies assuming a certain amount of responsibility for children. The schools, churches, private child-welfare societies, public welfare departments, and other resources in the community are likewise interested in the welfare and adjustment of children. The court by its very nature is created to deal only with maladjustment. But the degree of maladjustment which brings a child to a particular court depends, to a considerable extent, on the definitions of delinquency, dependency, and neglect in the statutes of the particular state.

While it is too soon to say what the future of this juvenile court will

or should be, those who suggest that the court should confine itself to the most grievous problems of maladjustment set forth their case as follows: (1) in most jurisdictions, the court is inadequately staffed to take care of anything other than the most serious forms of maladjustment; (2) the court by its very nature as a legal entity is associated in the minds of the general public with a certain stigma which automatically attaches itself to those who are under the jurisdiction of the court; (3) wholesale casual treatment of children by the court tends to relieve other organizations such as the schools of their legitimate responsibilities; (4) the court operates both judicially and administratively, and there is no reason why its administrative functions should be extended to all children in the community in view of the existence of other social agencies for such purposes.

II. Institutional Care

There is no question in connection with the treatment of juvenile delinquency which causes so much controversy as that of institutional care. There are those who favor institutions, and there are those who are violently opposed to them. Some say that there is no such thing as an ideal institution, that, even if the best personnel were recruited, the institution would still be unfit for children, since there is nothing in the life of the institution which bears a remote resemblance to life outside the institution. Others say that institutional care is necessary for certain types of children, no matter how efficient probation or foster-home care may be.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS

Institutions for delinquents are associated as a rule with the idea of harsh punishments. A review of the treatment of children in colonial days shows that even the worst sort of institutional care today is mild compared to the punishment meted out in the colonies. In his description of the development of punishment of children in Connecticut, Bailey calls attention to the following clause in a code established in 1650 and revised in 1673:

> If any Child or Children above sixteen years old, and of sufficient understanding, shall Curse or Smite the natural Father or Mother, he or they shall be put to death unless it can be sufficiently testified, that the Parents have been very unquestionably negligent in the education of such Children, or so provoked them by extreme and cruel correction that they have been forced thereunto to preserve themselves from death or maiming. If any man

have a stubborn or rebellious Son of sufficient understanding and years, viz., sixteen years of age, which will not obey the voice of his Father, or Mother, and that when they have chastened him, he will not harken unto them; then may his Father or Mother, being his natural Parents, lay hold on him and bring him to the magistrates assembled in Court, and testify unto them, that their Son is Stubborn and Rebellious and will not obey their voice and chastizement, but lives in sundry notorious crimes, such Son shall be put to death.[6]

The great majority of children coming before juvenile courts for official hearings are placed on probation. Although, unfortunately, the existence or lack of trained probation officers in a particular court, as well as the social knowledge of the judge, usually determines the ratio between those placed on probation and those sent to institutions, there are certain conditions under which juvenile delinquents must be committed to institutions. The White House conference in 1930 described five types of delinquent children who need institutional care:

(1) Children whom the local community through its varied social resources has failed to adjust.
(2) Children whom probation has not benefited.
(3) Children who prove unsuccessful in foster homes.
(4) Children in need of special observation.
(5) Children who for special reasons must be removed from their local community.[7]

The foregoing standards would have seemed strange to the early students of delinquency. A century ago, delinquents of all sorts were sent to "houses of refuge," which scarcely pretended to be anything more than prisons for children. In fact, even this luxury was such an innovation to an age that considered only what the offender did, and not why he acted in an antisocial way, that the early institutions for delinquents had to depend partly upon private individuals for support. At an early date, these institutions came to be known as "reform schools," the entire emphasis still being upon the idea that the fault was to be found entirely in the individual, and that, after reforming in an institution his evil ways of thinking, he needed only to be sent home with a simple admonition to go and sin no more. The idea of removing the occasions of his sin was not considered a community responsibility. Gradual progress towards the concept of possible environmental relationships to delinquent conduct was reflected in the third type of title used for state institutions, namely, "industrial schools" and "vocational

[6] *Children before the Courts in Connecticut,* Children's Bureau Publication Number 43 (Washington, D.C., 1918), pages 10–11.
[7] *The Delinquent Child* (The Century Co., New York, 1932), page 298.

schools." Many institutions for delinquents are still known by such titles, although there is a growing tendency to use a simpler title, "state home for boys," or even a name such as "St. Charles' School," which completely disguises the purpose as well as the administration of the state school. The chief advantage of names which do not indicate too much is discoverable in the after career of the delinquent. To be known as a "reform-school graduate" is a handicap which many have found hard to live down.

2. INSTITUTIONS TODAY

Institutions for the training of delinquent boys and girls are provided by all states and the District of Columbia. There are approximately 125 public and private institutions, both state and local, the largest group including more than 100 state schools. Since the development of the programs in the various states has not been uniform, we naturally expect to find considerable divergence both in equipment and in programs. There is a tendency today to consider the large congregate buildings of the past as obsolete and to recognize the need for small cottage units. Cottage units are preferred because they present a semblance of home life in contrast to old congregate buildings with their dormitories and mass treatment. On the other hand, some of the older buildings have been remodeled so as to make possible most of the features of the cottage-plan construction. The conclusions concerning the cottage and congregate plan, as developed in the chapter dealing with dependent children, apply also to the care of delinquents. Programs within the institutions vary so extensively that any general statement about them would be hazardous. The range is from extremely poor programs to very good ones. The status of programs is dependent on many factors. Admission policies are very often based on chance rather than definite standards of selection. Since the majority of children are committed by courts, the criteria used are usually dependent upon the interpretations of the judges, so that public institutions are often helpless when it comes to correcting intake defects. In view of the common inability of courts to provide adequate physical, psychiatric, and psychological examinations, some children are sent to institutions because the courts cannot determine what else should be done for them. Some of the more advanced institutions have surmounted this difficulty by utilizing clinical services at the time of admission of the child, followed by a periodic check-up of his activities. In this way it is usually possible to arrange for a transfer to a specialized institution, like one for epileptics, when this seems desirable.

Discipline

While most of the problems involved in the institutional care of juvenile delinquents differ only slightly from those involved in the institutional care of dependent children, the type of discipline and education is more important in the conduct of an institution for delinquents. At first, the discipline of "reform schools" differed little from that of the adult prison. In fact, corporal punishment seems to have survived longer in institutions for juveniles than in the adult institutions. Even today, corporal punishment is found to be the ultimate persuasive influence in some of our more backward children's institutions. Whatever the merits of the "spare the rod and spoil the child" adage may be, it should be remembered that it makes a world of difference, both in the effect of the punishment and often in the extent of it, who is administering the rod—a parent or a state employee. Our best institutions for delinquents have found that, where their facilities are adequate, it is possible without resort to the older disciplinary methods to control even the "pesky" youth who so often finds his way to the institution. In some of the modern schools, this is achieved by a credit system, awards and deductions being made on the basis of conduct. Where these rewards are related to special privileges, they become an incentive to good conduct. In some cottage-plan institutions, the residents are assigned to different cottages on the basis of conduct after a period of time at a rather strict receiving cottage. The preferred cottages offer advantages not only in physical equipment but in play hours and other details attractive to youth. It is felt that such systems are beneficial not only in helping to keep good order in the institution but more especially in teaching the delinquents that good conduct pays. Of course, the development of self-control is a necessary step to this good conduct and its institutional rewards.

As an illustration of the distance which some institutions have traveled from the older concepts of discipline, consider the remarks of H. V. Bastin, Superintendent of the Louisville and Jefferson County Children's Home (Ormsby Village) at Anchorage, Kentucky, concerning the problem of escape in an institution dealing with youths who are only minor offenders:

> In the first few days or weeks of the child in the institution, when all is new and strange around him, when he is subjected to a course of routine that is regular and systematic, when he eats and sleeps and works and goes exactly on the minute, when his father and mother no longer greet him in the morning—do you wonder that he grows homesick and runs away?

In my judgment, for the benefit of the child, I think it is infinitely better that the doors be open and the way made clear for him to run away rather than forcibly detain him. If the matters are anticipated properly and the cases handled sympathetically, many that are tempted to go will not go. Those who have refrained from going will build up within themselves the feeling that they have won, and will have a conscious victory over their weaker natures. Those who go will often soon return themselves, or can easily be picked up, and they are much easier to handle afterwards than if they had been forcibly detained in the first place. . . . Of course, the feeble-minded and the defective run away from time to time, but with tolerance, wise, and careful supervision, the number of these should not be disturbing.[8]

The George Junior Republic is a unique example of discipline without corporal punishment or harshness. This institution, first established at Freeville, New York, in 1895, and since duplicated in several other places, is basically an educational institution and a training school in citizenship. It utilizes self-government rather extensively and provides for the earning of clothing, spending money, and the like. There are an academic school unit, a carpenter shop, a plumbing shop, a print shop, a general mechanics building, and eleven cottages varying in size, one of which is used as a kitchen and dining room for the entire group. There are also a gymnasium, a chapel, and an inn for visitors. An essential feature of the unit is the town hall and government building, and the "citizens" of the Republic conduct elections and operate model municipal offices. The institution deals with several different types of children, many of whom are listed as predelinquent and delinquent. The majority are over 16 but under 20 years of age. An essential feature of the program is the republic's own currency, which is paid out for duties accomplished, including school work. Each "citizen" budgets his weekly wages and is able to choose between second-class and first-class food, according to his income. He also pays taxes, fines imposed by the court, and medical and dental costs. Those who are unable to pay for their lodging are "evicted" and placed in a detention room in the town hall.

Education

The educational program is most important in any institution for delinquents. This program may be divided into three parts, formal academic training, trade training, and education through special activities. The training in the three R's must differ at least in its methods from that given in the ordinary school system, since in a great many

[8] "City and County vs. State Institutions for Dependent, Defective, and Delinquent Children," *Proceedings*, National Conference of Juvenile Agencies (1930), page 147.

instances the delinquent has already developed a dislike for schooling. To catch his interest requires extremely capable teachers. Furthermore, the program must be sufficiently flexible to absorb children from widely different areas at any time during the school year. To make these children feel that schooling is worth while is a real challenge to teachers. As a rule, trade training for boys in the past has centered around printing, plumbing, carpentry, and farming. On account of the difficulties often experienced after discharge in securing positions in these fields, it is generally felt preferable that general mechanical training be given rather than specialized training. Adequate equipment is necessary, of course, if this training is to be of any value. Even though most of the juvenile delinquents come from the city, it is believed that training in agricultural pursuits is valuable as a help if not as a vocational measure. It is much easier to provide vocational training for girls (homemaking, sewing, laundry work, or typing) than for boys.

The vocational program presents many problems, notably the range of ages in most institutions, from 8 or 9 to 19 or 20. The use of clinical examinations to determine aptitudes is important, as well as the provision for meeting the needs of individual children. There should, of course, be a correlation between the skills learned in the institution and the use of such skills in normal community life. A problem exists as to how the maintenance and production work of the institution can be done as part of the vocational training, with a proper balance between the performance of necessary work and vocational aspects of the program. Many of the manual-training shops have not kept up to date in the methods or in the equipment for teaching. There has been increasing use of a general shop, or "multiple-experience" shop, to explore the interests of the boys and their possibilities. The question of personnel is important. There are variances from one state to another in the method of selection, but, in general, salaries are comparatively low and turnover is high. It seems evident that there should be a definite correlation between the manual work and that given in the academic courses.

Special Activities

In addition to academic and vocational training, there are many special activities which the best institutions encourage because of their character-building influences. Among such activities are dramatics, music, debating, sports, and scout troops. In many instances a newfound sense of importance acquired through some unexpected achievement in one of these extracurricular activities has become the foundation for a whole new attitude toward life. All institutions recognize

the therapeutic value of recreation, including athletics. Occasionally, however, some of the larger schools which are able to engage full-time athletic or recreation leaders make the mistake of hiring a person for this position because of his fame as an athlete without regard to his training or his ability to organize and maintain sound recreational programs. The better institutions are now engaging for these important positions men and women trained in physical education and group work.

Religious Education

If there is any argument at all for parochial schools, religious vacation schools, and other forms of religious education for the normal child living in his own home—and non-Catholics in increasing numbers are coming to admit the wisdom of the Catholic viewpoint on this subject—the case is doubly strong for the religious education of children who have been committed to an institution for delinquency. Although, unfortunately, some modern social workers are infected with the idea that "goodness without God" is possible not merely in the "minor moralities" which differ very little from good manners but in the more vital relationships of life as well, most of those who have come in direct contact with children in institutions feel that religious and ethical training is absolutely essential. Unfortunately, state institutions are greatly handicapped in this matter, since the strictly religious program must be limited as a rule to a short service once a week. For this purpose chaplains are employed, and these are very often men with no special training in dealing with delinquents of the type found so often in institutions. Because of the importance which people of all creeds have been accustomed to attach to religious education for juvenile delinquents, many Catholic institutions have developed in the United States, receiving in most instances public aid, for Catholic children committed to their care by the courts. Perhaps the best-known and most widely distributed private institution of this type is the House of the Good Shepherd for girls. Since the portals of these institutions, for obvious reasons, are not open to the general public, a brief description of their organization and program is desirable here.

The Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, or the Good Shepherd Sisters, as they are known throughout the world, came here from France, where they worked for the conversion and instruction of penitents. Unlike most religious communities, which were forced to deviate from their original purpose by the educational needs of the new country, ever since their arrival here the Sisters of the Good

Shepherd have confined their efforts solely to work with delinquent or predelinquent girls. In 1930 they operated forty-four homes, scattered over the nation, and a branch of the community, the Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge, operated eleven similar institutions. In describing the work of the Good Shepherd Sisters in his *Catholic Charities in the United States,* Monsignor John O'Grady says: "The work of the Good Shepherd Sisters was something entirely new in the United States. It represented an idea entirely at variance with the Puritan tradition which hardly extended aid to the woman who had become a victim of sex vice." [9] Although the social policies of the House of the Good Shepherd vary somewhat in different areas, the following characteristics, according to Monsignor O'Grady, are found in their best houses. Admission is determined by outside case workers, frequently those attached to a near-by Catholic Charities Bureau. In this way, dependent children who were formerly taken into the Houses of the Good Shepherd when other institutional facilities were unavailable are kept out and sent to institutions better suited to their needs. Likewise, through the persuasion of a social worker, it is possible very often to readjust a delinquent or predelinquent girl in her family so as to make institutional care unnecessary. Through this preadmission study, valuable information is gathered also, facts which enable the Sisters to classify and guide the girls more effectively after admission. Case workers associated with the institution or with an outside agency are utilized likewise in helping the girl to find employment and to adjust herself to the outside world after her discharge from the House of the Good Shepherd.

The health record is extremely important in the care of these girls. The procedure followed at the Good Shepherd home in Cleveland is described by Anna Elizabeth King as follows:

> All girls committed by the juvenile court receive a complete physical examination before entering. Those received through other courts or privately are examined immediately upon entrance. All girls pass through the special clinic which is held twice a week at the school. The Wassermann and Neisser tests are part of the examination requirements. Dental examinations take place in the weekly dental clinic. Extractions and fillings are taken care of at once. Eye, ear, nose and throat specialists make routine examinations three or four times a year. Tonsil and adenoid operations are performed at the school.[10]

Once in the Good Shepherd home, the girl becomes part of an educational, vocational, and recreational program which is usually quite

[9] *Catholic Charities in the United States* (National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C., 1931), page 166.

[10] *The Catholic Charities Review,* March, 1925, pages 106–107. Used by permission.

similar to that in the best of state schools for girls. The religious program, however, differs widely from that found elsewhere, and this, along with the intimate and friendly understanding which the Sisters have of their charges, is regarded as the chief factor in the success of these homes. Through a kindly, sympathetic approach to the unfortunate girl, aimed at helping her to understand herself, a technique which has been transmitted by the Sisters ever since their establishment in 1641, the new arrival is usually induced to return to the practice of Confession and Holy Communion. In some houses fully 60 per cent of these girls gradually become daily communicants. In addition to providing formal instruction in religion, the Good Shepherd Sisters exercise a subtle but nevertheless strong influence over their charges through their constant daily association with the girls. Thus, without apparent effort, they maintain good order, which is often amazing to those associated with girls of this type in some state schools. A very remarkable feature of the religious program of the Good Shepherd Sisters is the department of the Magdalens. This consists of women who, after showing evidence of perseverance during a period of at least three years, express a wish to take vows and remain for life in the institution, living according to the rule of St. Theresa. The fact that some women, who like themselves once tasted the dregs of wrongdoing, have, as Magdalens, become members of the Good Shepherd family acts as an inspiration and source of encouragement to the newcomer trying to mend her ways. While the Magdalens do not leave the House of the Good Shepherd, remaining to help the Sisters with younger unfortunates, they are bound to remain, of course, only through the force of their vows.

3. CONCLUSIONS

There has been much speculation but very little fact-finding concerning the success of institutions for juvenile delinquents. Superintendents, as a rule, will estimate their percentage of successful cases at anywhere from 70 to 90 per cent. Questioning will usually disclose that this means only that this number of delinquents is presumed to have "made good" simply because they have not been heard from after discharge. In recent years, some studies of particular institutions, frequently the best ones, have indicated that the percentage of success is more likely a minority than a majority. In 1929, Healy, Bronner, and others (authors of *Delinquents and Criminals, Their Making and Unmaking*), came to the final conclusion that foster homes are to be preferred to institutions for delinquent children. The study mentioned

above showed that 61 per cent of boys and 46 per cent of girls who had "graduated" from certain institutions were "failures" later on. Similarly, Mabel A. Elliott found that, a few years after being released from a high-type cottage-plan institution, 76 per cent of the girls had serious difficulties and were no better in their conduct than they were before they were sent to the institution.[11] Finally, in one of the great studies made by the Gluecks, it was found that, of 510 young men committed to the Massachusetts reformatory, approximately 80 per cent were guilty of criminal offenses after release.[12] Studies of the type just considered, together with the commonplace observation that many of our serious crimes are committed by ex-convicts whose institutional careers started with juvenile training schools and reformatories, have suggested to many observers the need of entirely new methods or philosophies in our "modern" programs for reforming juvenile delinquents in institutions. Call these plants what we will, it is pretty generally admitted that they are still basically high-type prisons founded on the outworn belief that enforced punishment combined with distasteful work in an atmosphere of resentment will automatically arouse feelings of penitence and an effective desire to reform. As to the value attached to the educational features of these institutions, we generally overlook the fact that the informal education gained in the reformatory yards from fellow inmates usually more than offsets the "character-building ideals" involved in the official program of the three R's. It would seem that any system which in order to reform first breaks down a youth's pride, initiative, and self-respect can hardly hope to succeed. Recently a nationally known employer, after pointing out the crudities of our punitive systems, in which prisons spoil more men than they save and reformatories are universities for crime, answered the oft-made criticism that industry will not hire a person who has been "sent up" by issuing the following challenge to the state: "Keep your convicts or make citizens of them. Don't ask industry to do it." In the foreword to the Gluecks' study of reformatory results just referred to, Dr. Richard C. Cabot seems to have put his finger on the crux of the whole problem by pointing out that our state reformatories have entirely missed an essential element in what should be their chief objective, habit formation:

Why, I say, should such men change all these bad habits and acquire good ones merely because they are confined for a little over a year in an

[11] M. A. Elliott and F. E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization* (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1934), pages 116–117.

[12] Sheldon Glueck and E. T. Glueck, *500 Criminal Careers* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1930), page 191.

institution where they are forced to do work in which they have little or no interest? . . . Why should this regime reform anyone? In my experience there are few tougher and more unyielding structures in the world than a bad habit. It does not change as the result of a few months of forced, unpaid, and unpalatable labour. I doubt if anyone knows what will change such habits within a short time and under the conditions of institutional life. So far as I have seen such reforms or heard of them from others, there has been at least one necessary condition: *that someone should come to know and to understand the man in so intimate and friendly a way that he comes to a better understanding of himself and to a truer comprehension of the world he lives in.*[13]

Four years after making this observation, Dr. Cabot was moved by another study of the Gluecks to raise again the question as to the value of so-called modern, "scientific" approaches to the delinquency problem, although institutional treatment was not the subject of analysis in this instance. In their *One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents* (1934), Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck reported upon a thousand delinquent boys who had been referred to the Judge Baker Foundation by the Boston Juvenile Court. The Gluecks showed that five years after treatment was supposed to be finished, the careers of 923 boys who could be located indicated that 88 per cent of them had continued their delinquency during these five years, two thirds of them having been sentenced for serious crimes. The amazingly high percentage of failures among these youths who had had the advantage of so much of the modern scientific technique of reform was characterized by Dr. Cabot as indicating "a stupendous waste of time, money and effort." In commenting upon this study in 1938, Professor James H. S. Bossard wrote: "Considering the very high quality of the diagnostic services these boys received and the fact that their treatment followed methods more generally approved by the social work profession, this study is the most dramatic and challenging indictment of social work in its entire history." [14]

A New Program

After reading this indictment of the program for handling the delinquency problem, one should not be surprised to learn that an important study appeared in 1938 in which it was advocated that we practically abandon our efforts to provide additional psychiatric, vocational-counselor, and social-work services for our present reformatories,

[13] *Op. cit.*, page ix.

[14] J. H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems,* revised edition (Harper & Brothers, New York, 1938), page 782. Used by permission. It should be noted, however, that adequate facilities for treatment did not exist in the majority of these cases, in spite of excellent diagnosis. Consequently social workers maintain that this study is an indictment of the treatment of juvenile delinquents in Boston, but not of modern scientific methods.

admit that the wholesale reformation of offenders cannot be effective within large groups, and instead devote our money and efforts to an entire reorganization of the existing system of dealing with delinquent youths. In this challenging study, *Youth in the Toils,* it is urged that youthful offenders between 16 and 21 be grouped into four classes according to their estimated capacities for rehabilitation.[15] A disposition board with continuing jurisdiction would be created, empowered to make changes in the classification and treatment of these boys as they seem to be needed. The first group would be made up of delinquents who, because of abnormal personalities, cannot make social adjustment; the second group would consist of those who are judged capable of reformation after a somewhat prolonged period of isolation in a completely controlled environment; next would come those who need only slight environmental changes; finally, there would be the group capable of adjustment with their families.

In order to provide the particular kind of control and environment deemed necessary for each group, Harrison and Grant go on to suggest four different types of treatment. (1) The unrehabilitable would be segregated indefinitely in institutions or colonies, the protection of society, however, rather than vengeance being the motive controlling these plants. (2) Those judged to be ultimately reformable would be dealt with in special training schools and work camps where vocational aptitudes and interests would be emphasized. These youths would be kept under close supervision. (3) The most promising offenders, who could reform if better environment opportunities were provided, would be placed in hostels. (4) Those deemed capable of reformation under occasional supervision and guidance would be placed on probation and left with their families. The underlying principle in treatment would be to reverse the present system, which is believed to emphasize punishment first and rehabilitation last. Furthermore, by providing four methods of treatment instead of the present two, it would allow greater flexibility and individualization.

The hostels to be provided for the third type of boys would be an innovation here, though they are already in use abroad. Some of the Borstal institutions in England are using them. These would be homelike places where a small group could live under supervision while going to school and participating in community activities. If the hostels were kept small, it would be possible to provide the proper grouping of boys in each hostel. In the case of older working boys, these hostels could be wholly or partially self-supporting. The house master would

[15] L. V. Harrison and P. Grant (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938).

be a person of the highest type, capable not only of adequate supervising but of gaining the confidence of his boys and of inspiring them towards new goals. Since the state moves slowly in adopting reform, Harrison and Grant suggest that private hostels be opened and that in all probability the state would soon see the wisdom of granting subsidies for their maintenance. After all, it would seem as if these hostels, emphasized so much in *Youth in the Toils,* are practically the same as some of our larger foster homes, where several children are cared for by a full-time foster mother. The ratio of success in foster homes, according to Healy, Bronner, and others, far exceeds that of any institution at present, although, of course, the selection of children who go to foster homes probably accounts for some of this.

III. Prevention

One after effect of the various "evaluation" studies that have recently awakened us to the fact that neither probation nor institutional care plus parole is producing expected results is a renewed interest in crime prevention. Since habits of delinquency tend to become confirmed and difficult to eradicate, it is much cheaper for society to spend its money in eliminating those conditions which are conducive to bad habits. The points to be attacked, of course, are those believed to be possible causes of crime, already treated in another chapter. Preventive work can be divided roughly into two phases—the protective and the educational. The protective phase involves chiefly special legislation such as laws on contributory delinquency and the age of consent, which protect minors against unscrupulous adults. The enforcement of laws regulating dance halls, motion pictures, and burlesque shows, and suppressing the trade in obscene literature, is a part of the attack on this front. Policewomen, juvenile bureaus of police departments, and such organizations as the Big Brothers and the Big Sisters can exert a powerful preventive influence.

1. The Schools

The schools are coming to accept greater responsibility for the prevention and early treatment of delinquency. Instead of expelling a mildly delinquent boy and turning him over to the courts as a truant or incorrigible, up-to-date school systems now provide for his care within the school. To meet this new need, special schools and special classes have been provided and visiting teachers engaged. The visiting-teacher movement in American schools has made considerable progress

against very serious opposition from the traditional narrow attitude of the school toward its responsibilities. The impetus for the visiting-teacher movement came partially from social work and partially from the educational field, and today there is a realization in the progressive school systems of the need for some kind of liaison service between the home and the school. The function of the visiting teacher is the adjustment of conditions in the lives of children that they may make normal school progress. The visiting teacher is a link between the home and the school, and utilizes treatment resources in the community. She must be trained in social case work and also have definite experience in the field of education. The visiting-teacher movement began in Rochester, New York, with the appointment of one woman as a visiting teacher in 1913. The movement, which has since spread to many cities, has been curtailed somewhat by the depression. Along with the visiting-teacher movement there has developed a new type of compulsory-attendance officer, whose special training and attitude differ widely from those of the old-time truant officer.

It is realized now that many truancy problems which often provide the start of a delinquency career are due to a misunderstanding between the child and his teacher. The compulsory-attendance officer or visiting teacher can usually iron out these difficulties, transferring the child to a different school, if need be. If the problem is more deep-rooted, the child is often benefited by a change to a special class or special school, where a different curriculum is followed under a specially trained teacher. With child-labor laws compelling many children who have no interest in school to remain there, school authorities are at their wits' end trying to educate these children without merely amusing them, especially since the recent economic upheaval has weakened the appeal of most trade training.

As an illustration of the many difficulties that must be faced in dealing with truancy, we might note the complications that develop very often in conjunction with special schools or ungraded rooms for retarded children. In many cases it has been found that the ungraded rooms are known to the boys and girls of the school as "dummy rooms," and little can be done to escape such a stigma. As a remedy, it has been suggested recently that the proper method of dealing with problem children is to segregate not only the dull but those who are accelerated beyond their years and give both groups special treatment in the same classroom. This would involve no class recitations as such, but would provide for individual work done under direction of the teacher. Combining such a method with the project method would allow certain

details of projects to be worked out by students, and those with peculiar abilities or possessing only manual ability could utilize their abilities in the actual work of creating the project. It is a maxim of education that all should be given an opportunity to enjoy success, and by such a method success would be provided for both the advanced and the dull without endangering the self-sufficiency of either group.

2. RECREATION

One of the unique customs of the American people is the widespread habit of participation in commercial recreation. Commercial recreation represents both the high and the low in standards of conduct; commercial recreation is not of itself vicious. Dancing, for example, has a proper place in society and, conducted under normal, desirable standards, is a healthful, beneficial means of social entertainment. On the other hand, the taxi dance halls and dancing in cheap taverns usually have a demoralizing effect on the participants. Through the efforts of various organizations, particularly the Legion of Decency, motion-picture shows for the most part have been "cleaned up" considerably in the past two or three years. However, there is a residue of entertainment which is unfit for children, and the regulations concerning admission of children to theaters are seldom if ever enforced. The existence of commercial recreation is based simply on interests of normal persons. Using this basis of interest, many noncommercial, constructive recreational programs have been devised and are supported by taxes or by private groups interested in the welfare of others.

There has been a wide development of public playgrounds, though they are insufficient as yet to meet the needs of all. Such large playground systems as that of the Chicago Park District provide a well-rounded program of athletics, crafts, social games, and opportunities for leadership which, if fully utilized, would do much to direct the young properly. National organizations such as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and the Camp Fire Girls provide wholesome training and stimulation for the young in different age groups. These programs are widely accepted and adopted, but, unfortunately, do not exist to any great extent in the worst parts of communities, where they are most needed. Opportunities for summer camp outings, programs which serve a specific need, are available now to the children of many large cities. Some social agencies provide camps for mothers and children, and this is especially effective in such large metropolitan areas as Chicago and New York. The settlement movement has done much to provide for the recreational needs of the poor in large cities. The settle-

ment is a residence where men and women with a sincere interest in their fellowmen live in the neighborhoods of the poor and serve as volunteers in the conduct of various phases of the program. There are generally paid group workers in each settlement whose duty it is to administer and carry out the details of the program. Programs include a physical-education program in a gymnasium, Americanization classes for immigrants, discussion groups for young men and young women, playgrounds, music and art clubs, day nurseries, and other activities designed to meet the particular needs of the residents of the area. Such settlements as Hull House and Henry Street have gained world-wide attention.

Among the various Catholic activities in the field of youth work three deserve special mention: the Columbian Squires program, sponsored by the Knights of Columbus, the Catholic Youth Organization, commonly called the C.Y.O., and the Youth Bureau established by the American Hierarchy. The *Columbian Squires* program is one phase of the work of the Boy Life Bureau of the Knights of Columbus and is a good example of slow steady growth rather than the erratic, over-advertised mushrooming so characteristic of many youth organizations. The Columbian Squires have a program offering varied spiritual, cultural, physical, and civic objectives for boys of high-school age. There are now more than 5,000 boys in 150 circles, as the units are called, and more than a thousand adult leaders guide and supervise the activities. Perhaps the most important contribution of the Squires program is its stress on trained leadership. This has been characteristic since Brother Barnabas, F.S.C., founded the work in 1925, and is in large measure due to the emphasis on education and training given by Brother Barnabas. The education and training of leaders is one of the functions of the Boy Life Bureau, which sponsors six-day intensive training courses at strategic points during each summer. At these institutes, adult leaders are given guidance in meeting the problems of youth of all ages, although stress is placed on work with boys in their teens. Of course, it must be stressed that this training for youth work is not a substitute for training in social work. Occasionally persons trained in such institutes attempt to use this background as a basis for work with delinquents, and this is to be condemned as a modified form of social quackery. There is a vast gulf between recreational work with normal boys and case work with the maladjusted individual.

With the stimulus of Bishop Bernard J. Shiel, of Chicago, who did pioneer work in that city, the *Catholic Youth Organization* has been developed in many parts of the United States. Contrary to popular

belief, the C.Y.O. is not a program as such, but is an organization designed to co-ordinate, integrate, and stimulate parish and interparish youth programs. It does not replace, but furthers, the work of sodalities and parish clubs. Although the athletic side has been widely publicized, the work of the organization in its best form includes many cultural and spiritual activities as well. Some who criticize the emphasis which the C.Y.O. places upon boxing for youths, many of whom live in delinquency areas, fail to realize that crime is not only a livelihood but an adventure as well. Only those programs that provide stirring interests for youth can hope to compete with crime. As a matter of fact, Bishop Shiel's interest in delinquency problems of youth came during his service as chaplain of the Cook County Jail, where he saw the failures of society and conceived the idea of formulating a type of work which would try to prevent the formation of delinquent habits in youth. The C.Y.O., however, is not for delinquent youth as such, but rather is organized so as to appeal to all youth, including delinquents. A chief value of the C.Y.O. is the essential integration of youth with parish activities. In modern city life, the relationship of youth with the parish has too often been attendance at Mass only. This minimum is not a satisfactory one, and the development of Catholic leadership through the C.Y.O. and other organizations is one of the most hopeful aspects of the present recreational outlook.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference maintains a *Youth Bureau* to serve as a fact-finding agency in the whole field of youth work and as a means to co-ordinate such work. Though of rather recent origin, it has already assisted in the establishment of several diocesan programs for boys and girls; it works in close co-operation with the National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women. The Youth Bureau, located in Washington, is able to keep in close touch with legislation and with agencies affecting youth and to serve as a source of information concerning the organization of various youth programs. It is impossible in the brief space allotted to go into detail concerning the programs of various other recreational and cultural groups, including such diverse activities as the Sodality Movement, the Junior Holy Name, public recreation systems, community centers, boys' clubs, settlement houses, the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. programs, the Catholic Boys' Brigade, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and the Camp Fire Girls.

The work of these organizations does not lend itself readily to analysis, since there are very few objective quantities which can be measured. Membership certainly cannot be considered an adequate index

of the work accomplished. The statements made by many organizations are open to suspicion of bias, generally through cheerful optimism rather than malice. Considerable stress is placed by many of these programs on their relationship to prevention of delinquency. Extravagant claims are made for certain ones, especially the Scouts, the boys' clubs, and activities of the park and playground systems. All these organizations, when properly staffed and equipped, do a considerable amount of good work in the prevention of delinquency. On the other hand, they are not cure-alls which by their very extension will automatically wipe out conditions that direct children toward criminal activities, and it is unfair to consider them as such. It is unfortunate that many attempt to justify the existence of such programs by the estimated amount of delinquency either prevented or cured, but such is the normal reaction in defense of these programs. It would seem more reasonable to estimate success in terms of the intelligent direction of a sound program in its normal cultural and recreational effects upon a community rather than to try to measure such success in preventing delinquency. Statistics are often advanced by such groups indicating that a delinquency rate is, let us say, 15 for each 100 boys of a given age in a community, and only 5 for the members of the boys' club or the Scout troop. The suggested conclusion is that the recreational program has prevented delinquency in 10 in every 100 boys. This conclusion is fallacious, since it is chiefly those who will not join and conform to programs such as Scouting and boys' clubs who become delinquents.

These programs have a place in the community and should be extended wherever possible. In the long run, they are bound to have a desirable effect upon the useful direction of the energies of their members. However, it is necessary to confine discussion to logical interpretation of the values of such programs rather than to conjure with statistics which do not tell even a reasonable part of the total story.

3. CO-ORDINATING COUNCILS

In any attempt to deal with problems of delinquency and crime, a logical step is consideration of a program aimed at integrating the various ameliorative forces of the community. The idea of community organization itself is not recent, but the attempt to develop a definite program with specific objectives on a large scale has been a product of the past decade. The Los Angeles County Co-ordinating Council plan was launched in April of 1932 by the judge of the juvenile court and the chief probation officer. The Probation Department of Los

Angeles County has taken the initiative in organizing councils, and, between 1933 and 1936, 58 co-ordinating councils were established in the one county. The co-ordinating council is organized to conduct studies, surveys, and conferences, in order to discover the individual children or groups of children and areas needing the attention of social agencies. The information gathered is turned over to the agencies best equipped to meet the needs which are discovered. The plan involves forming committees. An adjustment committee tries to adjust the problems of individual children. A character-building committee provides for the leisure-time programs for children either individually or in groups. An environment committee tries to stimulate the local community to face the responsibilities for community conditions affecting children. The plan is basically that of co-ordinating and integrating the work of various agencies and lay persons interested in children in the community into a unified program for the treatment of special problems arising in individuals, groups, and the community.

At the present time, more than a hundred co-ordinating councils have been formed in various parts of the United States, although the concentration is heavy in California. The probation departments in California have given the services of probation officers to the movement. In any plan of this nature leadership is essential, and the leadership must be adequate to the responsibility imposed. To meet adequately all the problems presented to a co-ordinating council requires not only a trained social worker, but one who is possessed of the special qualifications of community organizer. The co-ordinating council movement at the present time is in the first flush of optimism, and it is to be hoped that the development will be gradual rather than overaccelerated, for the program will rise or fall with its leadership. Juvenile courts throughout the country are extremely interested in the movement, but the juvenile probation officers for the most part are already carrying more work than reasonably can be expected of them. To impose upon them the additional task of working out the problems of co-ordinating council organization means that either the work of the co-ordinating council or the work of the court will suffer. Furthermore, the majority of probation officers are not trained for their own responsibilities. It is certain that the work of a co-ordinating council requires even more knowledge, abilities, and skills than that of probation officers. The movement is wholesome and basically correct. The more we get together in an attempt to understand and prevent delinquency, the sooner will we be able to relinquish our present concern about the large number of juvenile delinquents who later become adult offenders.

References for Further Reading

Ackerson, Luton, *Children's Behavior Problems,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931

Aichhorn, August, *Wayward Youth,* The Viking Press, New York, 1935

Armstrong, C. P., *660 Runaway Boys,* The Gorham Press, Boston, 1933

Bates, Sanford, *Prisons and Beyond,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936

Beard, Belle B., *Juvenile Probation,* American Book Company, New York, 1934

Beeley, Arthur L., *Social Planning for Crime Control,* The University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City, 1935

Benedict, Agnes E., *Children at the Cross Roads,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1930

Blumer, Herbert, and Philip M. Hauser, *Movies, Delinquency, and Crime,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1933

Bond, Earl D., and Kenneth E. Appel, *The Treatment of Behavior Disorders Following Encephalitis,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1931

Brearley, Harrington C., *Homicide in the United States,* The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1932

Cantor, Nathaniel F., *Crime, Criminals, and Criminal Justice,* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1932

Chamberlain, Rudolph W., *There is No Truce,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1935

Cohen, Morris R., *Law and the Social Order,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1933

Conwell, Chic, *The Professional Thief* (annotated by Edwin H. Sutherland), The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937

Cooley, Edwin J., *Probation and Delinquency,* Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York, 1927

Ettinger, Clayton J., *The Problem of Crime,* Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1932

Fenton, Norman, *The Delinquent Boy and the Correctional School,* Claremont College Guidance Center, Claremont, California, 1935

Fox, Lionel W., *The Modern English Prison,* G. Routledge & Sons, London, 1934

Furfey, Paul Hanly, *The Gang Age,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926

Gault, Robert H., *Criminology,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1932

Geisert, Henry A., *The Criminal,* B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1930

Gillin, John L., *Criminology and Penology,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1935

Gillin, John L., *Taming the Criminal,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1931

Glueck, Sheldon, *Crime and Justice,* Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1936

Glueck, Sheldon (editor), *Probation and Criminal Justice,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1933
Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor T. Glueck, *500 Criminal Careers,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1930
Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor T. Glueck, *Later Criminal Careers,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1937
Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor T. Glueck, *One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1934
Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor T. Glueck (editors), *Preventing Crime,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1936
Goldstein, Jonah J., *The Family in Court,* Clark Boardman Company, New York, 1934
Hagerty, J. E., *Twentieth Century Crime,* The Stratford Company, Boston, 1934
Harrison, Leonard V., and Pryor Grant, *Youth in the Toils,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938
Hartsough, Mildred, and George Caswell, *The Relation between Housing and Delinquency,* Housing Division, Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, Washington, D.C., 1936
Hartwell, Samuel W., *Fifty-Five "Bad" Boys,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1931
Haynes, Frederick E., *Criminology,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1930
Healy, William, and others, *Reconstructing Behavior in Youth,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1929
Healy, William, and Augusta F. Bronner, *Delinquents and Criminals,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926
Healy, William, and Augusta F. Bronner, *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment,* Yale University Press, New Haven, 1936
Hopkins, Ernest J., *Our Lawless Police,* The Viking Press, New York, 1931
Kalmer, Leo, O.F.M., and Eligius Weir, O.F.M., *Crime and Religion,* Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, 1936
Kent, Frank R., *The Great Game of Politics,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York, 1935
Lane, Francis J., *Twelve Years in a Reformatory,* The Elmira Reformatory, Elmira, New York, 1934
Laune, Ferris F., *Predicting Criminality,* Northwestern University, Chicago, 1936
Lavine, Emanuel W., *The Third Degree,* The Vanguard Press, New York, 1930
Lawes, Lewis E., *Life and Death in Sing Sing,* Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York, 1928
Lunden, Walter A., *Juvenile Delinquency,* University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, 1936
MacCormick, Austin H., *The Education of Adult Prisoners,* National Society of Penal Information, New York, 1931
Millspaugh, Arthur C., *Crime Control by the National Government,* The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1937

Moley, Raymond, *Our Criminal Courts,* Minton, Balch & Company, New York, 1930
Monachesi, Elio D., *Prediction Factors in Probation,* The Sociological Press, Hanover, New Hampshire, 1932
Morris, Albert, *Criminology,* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1934
National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Causes of Crime,* Number 13, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole,* Number 9, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
Pound, Roscoe, *Criminal Justice in America,* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1930
Reckless, Walter C., and Mapheus Smith, *Juvenile Delinquency,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1932
Reeves, Margaret, *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1929
Robinson, Louis N., *Should Prisoners Work?* The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, 1931
Robison, Sophia M., *Can Delinquency Be Measured?* Columbia University Press, New York, 1936
Sellin, J. Thorsten, *On Crime in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937
Shaw, Clifford R., *Delinquency Areas,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1929
Shaw, Clifford R., *The Jack-Roller,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1930
Shaw, Clifford R., *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931
Söderman, Harry, and John J. O'Connell, *Modern Criminal Investigation,* Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1935
Sullenger, Thomas E., *Social Determinants in Juvenile Delinquency,* John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1936
Sutherland, Edwin H., *Principles of Criminology,* J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1934
Tannenbaum, Frank, *Osborne of Sing Sing,* The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1933
Thrasher, Frederic M., *The Gang,* second revised edition, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1936
Vold, George B., *Prediction Methods and Parole,* The Sociological Press, Hanover, New Hampshire, 1931
Waite, John B., *Criminal Law in Action,* Holston House, Sears Publishing Company, New York, 1934
Warner, Florence M., *Juvenile Detention in the United States,* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1933
White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, *The Delinquent Child,* The Century Co., 1932
Young, Pauline V., *Social Treatment in Probation and Delinquency,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1937

PART VI

CHILD WELFARE

CHAPTER XXI

A SURVEY OF CHILD WELFARE PROBLEMS

It may be said that all problems are child-welfare problems and that all child-welfare problems reach into the very heart of society. Poverty, for example, could be considered a major division in an alignment of child-welfare problems. Crime is also directly related to problems of child welfare, and, if we run the gamut of human problems, it becomes difficult to separate them from the intimate problems of child welfare. In this section, it is our purpose to single out certain problems of child welfare which have not been emphasized elsewhere.

I. The Present Status of Children

The status of children today, compared with that of a century or more ago, reveals marked and interesting differences. Numerically, children are fewer. A casual survey of census material shows that for every 1,000 adults in 1790, there were 2,000 children under sixteen years of age; for every 1,000 adults in 1930, there were about 880 such children. In many ways we are tending more and more to make this an adult world. Evidences of this are all around us, even in the design for living which characterizes American homes. We see this particularly in the increased tendency to build apartment houses which omit play space and reduce living space for children. Not only are children unwanted by parents in many instances but they are also unwelcome to the social group when, by their physical presence, they intrude upon adults. Entertainment is designed to meet an adult level; the large motion-picture audience of children is forced to live in an emotional world far beyond its years. Schools are regulated in the interests of adults, and during the depression school boards with marked casualness have closed schools for many weeks at a time. If an individual child decides to stay away from school for a day, the adult world in the personage of the truant officer makes much ado about it, usually without taking time to find out why the child dislikes school. The children constitute "the younger generation" always so heartily reviled by adults, who fail to see in these children the reproduction of their own mistakes.

It is commonly observed that the children of today are the products of a generation which has been influenced by two distinct phases of *laissez-faire* pioneering. The pioneers who opened up and settled the country were replaced by industrial pioneers. In the early stages of development of our country, children had natural places in which to play but by reason of being economic assets had little opportunity for play. Today, by artificially created laws, we have given children an opportunity to play without always providing play space for them. A highly developed and mechanized city life, artificial rather than natural, was the contribution of the industrial pioneers. The child who was formerly something of an economic asset has become an entire liability. The functions of family life have changed, and many functions, formerly the responsibility of the family, have been institutionalized. The place of the wife and mother in the home has changed considerably, and, by mechanical devices and outside agencies such as laundries and bakeries, she is relieved of many household responsibilities which once were essentially hers. The father is employed away from the home for the most part, and it may be said that remote control has been substituted for direct control of the children.

Education was at one time the distinctive function of the home, first on the mother's knee, and then beside the father in the fields. Though the parent still retains the primary right as well as the obligation to educate, this function is now thoroughly institutionalized, and schools and educators for the most part exercise this responsibility. The problem of trying to keep up with an ever-changing civilization results in wide disagreement among educators as to just what education is supposed to do for children. There is also the problem of "education" without religion. Many find cause for alarm in our system of public education, which is handicapped by a legal inability to inculcate virtue on the basis of objective moral standards and belief in a personal God. Our knowledge of mental hygiene has increased our awareness of children's personality problems. Personality handicaps may not be more numerous or more damaging to the individual than formerly, but there is a general belief that the problems of adjustment are more serious in our highly competitive civilization than in one in which neighborliness, friendliness, and responsibility of families were the paramount rules of life. Our problem, therefore, is one of utilizing available resources as best we can and of creating new ones where necessary in order to conserve childhood in the midst of a rapidly shifting family life. A world in transition necessarily implies the existence of certain social pathologies and disorganizations which must be met by

a broad program of child welfare and protection. This concept of protection does not preclude normal development of independence on the part of any child. It does not imply overprotection, or coddling. In terms of an objective, it seems that we must give heed to the factors which present themselves as social problems in order to remove baneful influences and give children an opportunity to live wholesome, responsible lives.

On the other hand, there is a growing tendency to recognize children for their own importance and for their importance as later adults. As a society, we have been conscious of the exploitation of children for a long period of time, but more recently we have begun to take steps against this exploitation. There is still a consciousness of the need for adequate remedies. The results of this consciousness should be expressed in terms of vigorous action through legislation and education. Psychology has much to offer to the proper development of children, and medical science is progressing in a well-defined course. Consciousness of our responsibility toward children must be expressed in adequate protection of them. That there is need of protection no one can deny, especially in view of the various findings of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, which have been widely quoted but only meagerly translated into action. From this conference we learned the size of the child-welfare problem. Among the 45,000,000 children in the United States, the White House conference reports,

35,000,000 are reasonably normal
6,000,000 are improperly nourished
1,000,000 have defective speech
1,000,000 have weak or damaged hearts
675,000 present behavior problems
450,000 are mentally retarded
382,000 are tubercular
3,000,000 have impaired hearing
18,000 are totally deaf
300,000 are crippled
50,000 are partially blind
14,000 are wholly blind
200,000 are delinquent
500,000 are dependent [1]

These estimates become all the more startling when we realize that the conference believed that the proportion of these children who would probably receive adequate care was approximately 20 per cent.

[1] *White House Conference, 1930* (The Century Co., New York, 1931), page 8.

The Children's Bureau

In a discussion of White House conferences, the very influential United States Children's Bureau is likely to have importance. The Children's Bureau was established in the Department of Labor in 1912 as a direct result of the first White House conference, summoned by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909. Briefly, the functions of the Children's Bureau are to investigate problems of child life and to publish the results. The subjects considered the legitimate responsibility of the Children's Bureau include child labor, infant mortality, maternity care, dangerous occupations of children, mental defectiveness, malnutrition, illegitimacy, and delinquency. Concomitant with the work of the Children's Bureau, but not necessarily related to it, was the development of children's code commissions in many states. This development culminated in the Minnesota legislature in 1917 with the enactment of thirty-five bills relating to child welfare, which set up a correlated, progressive code of laws. Ten years after the White House conference, in 1919, the United States Children's Bureau arranged for what is sometimes called the Washington Conference on Child Welfare, during which specific standards were incorporated as a basis for action in various states. These two conferences and the White House conference of 1930 stand out as the three great milestones in the progress of child-welfare standards in America. The work of the Children's Bureau has been noteworthy in many respects. Its personnel has been of the highest quality, and the absence of politics in its administration is suggested by the fact that during its history there have been only three chiefs of the bureau: Julia Lathrop, Grace Abbott, and Katherine Lenroot. These able women have gathered about them staffs of experts in the several fields with which the bureau is concerned, and the statistical studies and reports of the bureau are everywhere considered scholarly and authoritative documents. The bureau has been the spearhead in the formation and development of improved programs of child welfare throughout the nation.

II. Infant and Maternal Mortality

1. INFANT MORTALITY

One of the encouraging developments of the past thirty years in the United States has been the marvelous decrease in "infant mortality" rates, that is, in the number of babies who die before they are one year old. In 1900, the infant mortality rate per 1,000 births in the registration

area was 149.4; by 1934 this had been reduced to 60.1. Even now, the rates vary widely in different parts of the United States and among foreign countries. Although the rate has generally been higher in rural than in urban districts since the introduction of public health measures, the rate for the city of Memphis (101) in 1930 was twice that of the state of Oregon (50). The higher Memphis rate was due in great measure to its large colored population. Among countries, we find that in 1934 Japan's rate (121.3) was twice our own, but that New Zealand's (32.1) was only about half our rate.

New Zealand has long set the pattern in attacking the causes of infant mortality through appropriate social legislation. Although medical knowledge which would have enabled us to save hundreds of thousands of babies' lives had been existent for some years, it was only at the end of the last century that we awoke to the fact that a social-legislation program was necessary to make this available and so to reduce the infant death rate. Our country, one of the last to relinquish the *laissez-faire* ideal, at first regarded the necessary legislative program as too "radical" and "socialistic." However, the startling contrast between our high mortality rate and that of New Zealand could not fail to attract attention and arouse a public opinion that finally succeeded in bringing about a change here. The new program which we adopted has emphasized the following points: (1) scrupulous attention to cleanliness in the public milk supply; (2) infant-welfare centers where mothers receive instruction in infant care; (3) new emphasis upon competent obstetrical care, along with facilities for prenatal care.

Now that we are finally aroused, there are indications that we may even carry the baby-saving campaign on to new goals. The New Zealand program emphasized reaching the parents of every newborn baby as soon as possible; we are now campaigning to bring medical information to the mother soon after pregnancy commences. The infant-mortality campaign is an integral part of our attack on social injustice. It has been found, for example, that at a certain point the infant mortality rate rises as the father's earnings decrease, as well as when mothers are employed before or after the birth of the child. In view of the great progress made in recent years one cannot but wonder how far it is possible to go in reducing this death rate. As we approach a stationary population, there will probably be more and more concern about this point. Doctors affirm that most of our recent progress in reducing infant mortality has come through the reduction of deaths from the so-called gastrointestinal diseases, diarrhoea and enteritis, during the first year. The chief causes of death now are those surround-

ing birth, and it is for this reason that efforts are being made to get in touch with mothers before childbirth takes place. In this way, undernourishment can be prevented, certain diseases (such as syphilis) can be cleared up, and, if a difficult delivery is anticipated, proper obstetrical care can be provided beforehand. Further reduction of the infant mortality rate will depend largely upon the progress of medical science in dealing with birth conditions. One curious fact has been brought out by modern research in this field, namely, that the old-fashioned idea that breast feeding is superior to bottle feeding is a sound one. It has been found that the infant mortality rate is three to four times as high among artificially fed babies.

2. MATERNAL MORTALITY

In 1920 the United States practically led the world with its high maternal mortality rate. This fact, taken in conjunction with the campaign which was reducing the infant mortality rate so rapidly, caused Americans to ask why. Studies were made by the Children's Bureau and other agencies, and the results showed that between one half and two thirds of these maternal deaths were preventable. Educational campaigns were then undertaken, and the idea was fostered that maternal care must be regarded as a community problem and responsibility. As a result of this new attack on maternal mortality, deaths have dropped, especially since 1930. Instead of a rate of 80 per 10,000 live births as in 1920, the rate had been reduced to 62 by 1933. Yet even this rate is much too high and is still one of the highest found among the nations of the western hemisphere. In that year, England's death rate was 43, and Italy's (30) and Sweden's (27) were less than half of our own. By 1935 we had further reduced our rate to 57, but this was still far in excess of what many other nations reported. George B. Mangold says that, if our rate were as low as that of Sweden, "we would save annually approximately 7,500 women, the lives of whom are now sacrificed either to our ignorance or our indifference." [2] Surely this is a matter which should concern us all! The 1938 reduction to 43.5 is encouraging.

The progress which we have made in reducing America's maternal death rate is due chiefly to a reduction in deaths from only one cause, toxemias of pregnancy, conditions which are preventable largely through good prenatal care. According to Dr. Martha M. Eliot, Assistant Chief, Children's Bureau, there are three chief causes of maternal death, all of them to a great extent preventable. Concerning these she writes as follows:

[2] *Problems of Child Welfare* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936), page 63.

Infections (puerperal sepsis) were responsible for 41 per cent of maternal deaths in 1935; more than two-fifths of these deaths due to puerperal infection followed abortion. Death from septic conditions is nearly always preventable. To prevent infection there must be education of the mother regarding proper care during the prenatal period and there must be skilled medical and nursing care at time of delivery and during the postnatal period.

Toxemias of pregnancy stand second among the causes of maternal death, accounting for 22 per cent of maternal deaths in 1935. Eclampsia, a severe type of toxemia, caused a large proportion of these deaths. Eclampsia is preventable to a considerable degree by means of adequate prenatal care. Such care must include a complete history of the patient, a careful physical examination with blood pressure and urine examination repeated throughout the prenatal period. These must be provided for every pregnant woman if the danger signals of toxemia are to be heeded in time to prevent eclampsia.

Hemorrhage ranks third among the causes of maternal death, being responsible for 11 per cent of maternal deaths in 1935. Hemorrhage cannot always be prevented, but when it occurs immediate and proper treatment and transfusion of blood when indicated lessen the danger of a fatal outcome and in many cases will save the life of the mother. Here again the need is for skilled medical and nursing care at the time of delivery and during the postnatal period.[3]

Unlike infant mortality, maternal mortality is higher in the city than in the country. The greater incidence of poverty, undernourishment, and tuberculosis in the city is believed to be the chief factor in this difference. The fact that interruptions of pregnancy in the earlier months, commonly referred to as abortions or miscarriages, are estimated to be over twice as frequent in the city would also seem to be a great influence in this differential. A report adopted at the White House conference in 1930 estimated the minimum ratio of abortions to confinements in the United States to be 1:2½ in cities and 1:5 in the country. "Twenty-two per cent of maternal deaths in 1935 were directly due to abortion," according to Dr. Eliot. It should be kept in mind, of course, that not all abortions are criminal.

Although records do not indicate the extent of death due to criminal abortion, it is evident that the campaign against maternal mortality must include the professional abortionists. But, in addition, it must include economic and social measures aimed at improving the health and well-being of mothers. The Children's Bureau is already engaged in determining how the provisions of the Social Security Act, which call for the promotion of services for the health of mothers and children, can best be carried out in order to reduce maternal mortality. Mean-

[3] "Causes of Maternal Mortality," *The Child*, Volume 2, October, 1937, pages 72–73.

while, every community should see to it that steps are taken to provide adequate care for prospective mothers. It would seem as if Catholics, whose reverence for motherhood is allied with their very religion, should take the lead in seeing that this care is provided for every mother in their communities. Proper care, says Dr. Eliot, includes the following:

> Facilities for diagnosis and treatment of the complications of pregnancy, for proper care at delivery in the home by a qualified local physician assisted by nurses trained in obstetrics, for consultation service by obstetricians and pediatricians, and for hospitalization when necessary—all these must be available for all communities if lives of mothers and infants are to be saved.[4]

In an attempt to arouse greater interest in infant and maternal welfare throughout the nation, particularly in rural areas where the infant death rate was so obviously affected by lack of adequate medical knowledge and care, Congress enacted the Sheppard-Towner Act in 1921. This measure, called the "Maternity and Infancy Act," provided for the appropriation of $1,240,000 annually for five years, to be distributed by the Children's Bureau among the states which agreed to set up certain standards of work. In this instance, as in many subsequent federal activities, the principle of grants in aid was followed, and appropriations were made to states on a matching basis. The federal government said to the state: We will give you an amount not exceeding a certain sum if you will provide an equal amount and set up a state agency to provide an acceptable program to meet problems of maternity and infancy hygiene. The prospect of receiving assistance from the federal government on such a basis induced many backward states to spend money on this work which they would not have undertaken otherwise. The act was later extended for two years but in 1929 was filibustered out of existence. In the forty-five co-operating states, over 700,000 expectant mothers and four million infants and preschool children were reached by the various state agencies in one way or another. It is somewhat discouraging to find that, although the law helped to create a new public attitude toward maternal and infant welfare, less than two thirds of the states made legislative appropriations for maternal and infancy hygiene in 1932, after the abandonment of federal assistance. In many instances, however, the clinics set up previously were continued by local appropriations and by private subscriptions.

The principle of the Sheppard-Towner Act was re-established, though in a somewhat different form, by the Social Security Act of 1935. This law provides for an annual appropriation of $3,800,000, to be allotted to

[4] *Op. cit.*, page 75.

the various states chiefly on a matching basis. In order to receive these funds, states are required to have their programs approved by the Chief of the United States Children's Bureau, the purpose being to require certain minimum standards of maternal and child-health activities. On the other hand, a certain latitude is permitted in order to meet the peculiar needs of the locality. All the states, along with the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, had qualified for these grants by the end of the year 1936.

III. The Dependent Child

Since the causes of poverty have been examined elsewhere, we need only consider here the programs for the treatment of dependent children. However, since these modern programs can be understood best when seen with a perspective which includes the earlier American developments in this field, an attempt will be made to give a brief résumé of this background, emphasizing particularly Catholic experiences and traditions in this field. In acknowledging an indebtedness to Monsignor John O'Grady's *Catholic Charities in the United States,* which is the chief source of our historical material at this point, we suggest that the student, whenever it is possible, should consult this source in order to learn what Catholics have done in allied fields, such as the care of the sick and the aged.[5]

1. CATHOLIC EXPERIENCES

We may divide the history of the Catholic care of dependent children in the United States into four periods: (a) that which preceded 1840; (b) the period between 1840 and the Civil War; (c) the postwar period; (d) the modern period, beginning in 1898.

The Catholic Pioneers

The history of the care of dependent children in the United States is closely interwoven with the history of immigration. Before 1840 the dependent-child problem was not a great one; after 1840, when the larger groups of immigrants began to come here, the problem suddenly became acute. Considering the earlier period, we find, first of all, that there were sixteen Catholic institutions for dependent or neglected children before 1840. That established in New Orleans in 1729 by the

[5] For a brief description of the European backgrounds to Catholic charities, see Rev. Henry S. Spalding, S.J., *Chapters in Social History* (D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1925).

Ursuline Sisters, probably the first professional elementary school teachers to come here, is generally recognized as the first special institution of any sort for dependent children in the territory of the present United States. It was made necessary by a massacre of the whites by the Natchez Indians, which had left many orphans in Louisiana. Soon after 1805, the Visitation Convent at Georgetown, D.C., was caring for orphan girls, as were Mother Seton's Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg, Maryland, in 1809. Within the same decade the care of orphans and poor children was provided for by schools established by the Sisters of Charity in Philadelphia and New York and by the Sisters of Loretto and the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth in Kentucky. The following decade saw the Sisters of St. Dominic engaged in the same work in Kentucky and the Sulpician Father Joubert, the "Apostle of the Colored Catholics in America," according to Monsignor O'Grady, working in Baltimore among the poor colored children from San Domingo. As a result of his efforts there, Father Joubert was able to found a colored religious community, the Oblate Sisters of Providence in 1829. During this same decade the Sisters of Charity had opened up orphanages in Baltimore, St. Louis, and Cincinnati as well.

In the pioneer period of Catholic charities which ended in 1840, the work of education and charity went hand in hand. However, since the greatest need and first objective of the foundations made in this period was Catholic education, the care of dependent children was incidental to education. The number of homeless children was not yet great, since most of them could be adopted by relatives or neighbors. Because of this fact, the Sisters were usually able to support the orphans from the earnings derived from pay pupils.

The Immigration Crisis

With the coming of large numbers of Catholic immigrants, particularly the Irish and the Germans, after 1840, the care of dependent children of necessity soon became more than a side line in Catholic education. Along with increased numbers, there was the dreadful situation brought about by the epidemics of Asiatic cholera and yellow fever in northern cities, epidemics which carried off large numbers of immigrant parents. Under these conditions, the care of dependent children became too much for private resources, and large numbers of the children were sent to public almshouses. In response to this situation, a few Protestant and Catholic groups began to establish private orphan asylums, although the poverty of the latter group made this work a terrible sacrifice. Though juvenile reformatories were already being operated by several

states, separate state institutions for dependent children did not come until after 1860. It might be said that at this point the history of American Catholic charities was simply the story of the Catholic immigrant's fight for the faith of his children, a characteristic which was to color Catholic charitable programs for many years to come. The Catholic immigrants soon recognized the fact that the Protestant majority not only regarded his religion as un-American but believed that the "Americanization" of his dependent children in non-Catholic institutions included the destruction of their Catholic faith. The heroic sacrifices of the recently arrived, poverty-stricken Irish and German immigrants in establishing numerous orphanages before the Civil War can only be fully appreciated when we recall that they were at the same time trying to build churches and schools to take care of their religious needs. Necessarily, they could not hope to begin to cope with the situation alone and had to fall back upon public as well as Protestant institutions. Monsignor O'Grady summarizes this period:

> Before the Civil War the immigrant who needed assistance had to look to Protestant sources. In fact, the public institutions were just as Protestant in character as those operated by the individual denominations. Their agents were often ministers or ex-ministers, or women who were aggressively evangelistic. The Protestant religion was a part of their life and their spirit. When the friendless children of the Irish were brought to them their only thought was to preserve them from the errors of "Romanism." [6]

While nearly every diocese in the period which preceded the Civil War made some provision for children under 12 in Catholic orphan asylums, those over 12 had to be sent to public and Protestant institutions or be placed out for adoption. According to Monsignor O'Grady, the Holy Cross Brothers seem to have taken the first step in providing for Catholic boys from 12 to 16, by the establishment of a manual-training school for orphans in connection with the University of Notre Dame in 1846, and the Holy Cross Sisters provided a similar training school for older girls at near-by Bertrand, Michigan. Nevertheless, the development of Catholic programs for older children elsewhere seems to have come almost entirely after the war. This was the period when older children "able to work" were being indentured to farmers by state and Protestant institutions, after which they were left without public or other supervision and expected to work until the age of 21, when the farmer was required to release the child.

[6] Rt. Rev. John O'Grady, *Catholic Charities in the United States* (National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C., 1931), page 147. Used by permission.

After the Civil War

Following the lead of Massachusetts, the more progressive states commenced to remove dependent and neglected children from the almshouses in the decade following 1860. It was during this period also that many of the states determined their more or less permanent child-care policies. Some states, such as New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and California, placed their children in private institutions, paying for their care pro rata or else by an annual appropriation. Others, following the lead of Michigan, established separate state institutions, usually referred to as state schools; finally a few followed the Massachusetts pattern, in which younger as well as older children were taken out of the state institutions and placed for adoption in farm homes as quickly as possible instead of being educated in institutions. No state, however, was able to care for all its needy children, and private agencies continued to play an important part in the child-care program everywhere, although a more important one, of course, in those states where public funds were contributed for their maintenance. As Catholic children's institutions grew up rapidly with the aid of public grants during the period between the end of the war and the end of the century, not merely orphanages but specialized institutions such as infant homes and industrial training schools for older children appeared. Protestant institutions and agencies, receiving fewer children as a consequence, began to "view the situation with alarm" and to protest against what they said was an approaching union of the Catholic Church and the state. For a period, there was considerable bitter feeling between Catholic and non-Catholic social workers over this issue, but, as legislative committees looked into the matter and saw the economies possible in Catholic institutions on account of their consecrated personnel, very few changes were made. In the newer states, however, there has been a tendency to develop public child care.

To those who know of the cordial relations usually existing between non-Catholic and Catholic social workers and their agencies today, it is something of a shock to realize that such hardly existed during the period following the Civil War. At that time Protestant philanthropy, and nonsectarian philanthropy also, were committed to the policy of either ignoring the faith of Catholic children in institutions or else frankly striving to destroy it. As Catholic leaders began to develop after the Civil War, when Catholics, numerically powerful in some of the eastern states, commenced to bring pressure through the ballot, the preservation of the faith of dependent children was made a public issue.

When, about 1885, the movement to place orphans with private families rather than educate them in institutions began to gain momentum, a new source of complaint arose because Catholic children in eastern cities were being shipped by public and Protestant agencies to the Middle West, where, deliberately placed with Protestant farmers, they lost their faith. The primitive placement methods of the early part of this period are described by Father Francis E. Lane, O.M.I., who says:

> A clergyman in a Western town would recommend a certain number of families requesting children. A group of children, about thirty in number, would be then dispatched to this place under the guardianship of an agent of the society. When the children arrived, a public meeting was called and the children were placed on exhibition. Thereupon the applicants selected those they liked and the ceremony was over. Supervision of the children thus placed was also effected by correspondence. Letters were repeatedly sent to the guardians and if no answer was forthcoming, the case was dropped.[7]

In one year, a single New York Protestant society reported having placed 921 Irish children in this way, the great majority of whom, it is safe to say, were Catholics. After a long controversy, this matter was brought to a head finally in Connecticut, in 1893, when the legislature passed a law requiring institutions and agencies to place children in homes of the same religious faith as their parents. This Connecticut policy, which ended the period of proselytizing through child welfare there, came to be generally accepted as the public policy of the various states by 1900, although unfortunately practice sometimes lagged behind the adoption of this policy.

Thus ended the long uphill fight which the Catholic immigrant had to wage here to preserve the faith of his dependent children, first in institutions and later in foster homes. In both instances he won recognition only when his numerical strength required that he be given a hearing. As a result of the fight he had to wage he built up a system of child-caring institutions and agencies which are a monument to his faith. It will be impossible to enumerate here even the chief institutions established during the period following the Civil War, when this fight for the faith had to be waged so tirelessly, or even to mention the leaders who will always stand out as immortals in American Catholic charities. This was a period when leaders had to be fighters as well as organizers, the period that produced such leaders as Dr. Levi Silliman Ives, former Protestant Bishop of North Carolina, who as a Catholic convert brought about the establishment of the Christian Brothers' New York Catholic

[7] *American Charities and the Child of the Immigrant* (Ph.D. thesis, Catholic University, Washington, D.C., 1932), pages 81–82.

Protectorate in the 60's; Archbishop Spalding, who brought the Xaverian Brothers from Belgium to establish St. Mary's Industrial School in Baltimore about the same time; and, at the end of the period, Mother Cabrini, who brought her Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart here to establish several orphanages for the children of Italian immigrants.

The Modern Period (1898–)

We have seen that the first thought of Catholics during the two previous periods was to build their own institutions in order to preserve the faith of their dependent children. After 1885, most public and non-Catholic agencies had introduced the use of child placing, following up the first experiments with "placing out" inaugurated by the New York Children's Aid Society in 1853. These agencies felt that, with the aid of the new social-work technique, this placing-out policy was superior to the widespread use of institutional care. Another social-work trend at this time was that towards co-ordinated rather than independent agencies. However, Catholic groups hesitated at first to place their children in foster homes, recalling earlier experiences when many of these children had been abused and had lost their faith when placed in Protestant homes by non-Catholic agencies. It was at this point, in 1898, that a group of laymen, members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, organized the Catholic Home Finding Bureau of New York and arranged with Vincentians and Church authorities in the Middle West for suitable Catholic homes for the children that were now overcrowding the New York institutions. Thus, under the leadership of Thomas M. Mulry and Edmond J. Butler, began the first system of child placing under Catholic auspices, the first break with the old system, which soon was to lead the way to other new developments in Catholic charities in America. The new method of placing out, which non-Catholic social workers had recently devised, differed considerably from the methods followed in the 50's, when "immigrant parties" of children were shipped to the West to almost any Protestant who would take them, no further check of consequence being made. Shortly after this change in New York, the St. Vincent de Paul Society of Baltimore went a step further and introduced a new pattern for American Catholic charities by putting all Catholic social work on a unified, city-wide basis, rather than on an independent parochial and religious-community basis. Both these efforts at co-ordination were copied quickly in other cities. In 1910 the National Conference of Catholic Charities was formed, closely followed by the establishment of diocesan bureaus of charities providing the necessary leadership, which enabled Catholic workers in every field

of charities to utilize the best of the technique of modern social work without losing sight of their traditional guiding philosophy, the Charity of Christ. Thus in the modern period we find Catholic charities abandoning the policy of isolation that was necessary in the earlier period and following the procedure of social work generally. At the present time, therefore, it may be said that the technique of social work is basically very much the same among both Catholics and non-Catholics.

2. MODERN CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

In order to appreciate the modern philosophy of child care, we must go back to the White House conference of 1909. At that meeting, which was a milestone in American social work, the controversy over the relative merits of foster homes and institutions was brought to a head. As a result of long discussions, basic social-work principles were formulated, largely through the efforts of the Vincentian leaders Thomas M. Mulry and Edmond J. Butler, doctrines which are still adhered to by public and private agencies. According to these principles, institutional care of dependent children was approved and recognized as a permanent need, provided that the "cottage plan" of organization was introduced. However, there was also an emphatic endorsement of the doctrine that "the carefully selected foster home is for the normal child the best substitute for the natural home," with the proviso that "such homes should be selected by a most careful process of investigation, carried on by skilled agents through personal investigation and with due regard to the religious faith of the child," and that even for temporary care "contact with family life is preferable for these children, as well as for normal children." In a word, it might be said that the 1909 conference recognized the home as fundamental to the progress of American civilization.

Mothers' Aid

The 1909 conference was not long in producing fruits. Two years later, Illinois and Missouri, following the White House principle that no child should be removed from the care of his parents for poverty alone, went a step further by passing what at that time was called a mothers'-pension law. The theory of such laws, better known now as mothers'-aid legislation, is that, whenever a needy mother would ordinarily be required to go to work in order to support her children, the state will save in the long run by granting financial aid to her so that she can remain at home and care for her children. So widespread was the conviction of the importance of a mother's care in the prevention of delinquency alone that all but three states had such laws by 1935. While there was a

tendency at first to limit this aid to widows with children, it has been extended in many places to include also those whose husbands are permanently handicapped physically or mentally or who are in prison. There are, however, still many inadequacies in much of this legislation, the chief one being a failure to pay an adequate amount to the mothers of dependent children. The Social Security Act has stimulated some improvement by federal assumption of one half of the total cost of monthly payments made to relatives who undertake the responsibility of rearing dependent children. On account of this "priming" and the fact that state plans must be approved by the Social Security Board if federal aid is to be received, there has been a tendency to increase the amount of aid, the number of families eligible and the quality of supervision. Commenting upon the results of the Social Security Act in stimulating mothers' aid, Jane Hoey of the Social Security Board wrote in the fall of 1937 as follows:

> By October 15, 38 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii were participating in this program and, with Federal cooperation, were aiding some 488,500 children in about 196,400 families, according to estimates based on reports for past months. This current total is nearly twice as large as the number aided from Federal, State, and local funds in October, 1936. The average monthly grant to families with dependent children has also shown a significant increase—from about $27 in August 1936 to approximately $31 in August 1937, the last month for which reports are available.
>
> The Social Security Act has thus already helped the States to give assistance to many more dependent children and in somewhat more adequate amounts. This is due to two facts—first, with the Federal Government now paying one-third of their total expenditures, up to $18 for the first child and $12 for each additional child in the same home, the States have more money available; and, second, the more liberal interpretation of eligibility requirements stimulated by the Social Security Act has brought more dependent children within the scope of State programs.[8]

Mothers' aid, or aid to dependent children, as it is now called, has been a success, where the old-fashioned outdoor relief failed, solely because of the development of social casework techniques and policies. Outdoor relief was administered usually by politicians; mothers' aid is or should be administered by trained social workers who are free from political ties and who look upon their work as a profession.

[8] "Current Developments in Aid to Dependent Children," *The Child*, Volume 2, October, 1937, pages 80–81.

Foster-Home Care

Just as there is a world of difference between the old outdoor relief and the administration of aid to dependent children by trained social workers, so too there is a wide gap separating the placing-out methods of the middle of the last century, described above, and those of today. When children are to be placed in foster homes today, a very careful examination is made, first, to determine what kinds of homes are available in the particular community, second, to find out just what the particular problems of the individual child are, and, third, to select the home which shall best meet the peculiar needs of each child. Furthermore, after placement, the home is subject to periodic visits from the placement agency in order to see that the child's rights are being protected. In placing the child, there are four well-defined types of foster-family care: boarding homes, free homes, adoption homes, and wage homes.

In the boarding home the foster parents are paid for their services—and by service is meant not merely food and shelter, but such personal care and training as a child should receive in his own home. *In the free home* exactly the same care is given without money compensation to the foster parents. *An adoption home* is a free home accepted with the understanding that if the situation proves satisfactory the child will be adopted. In case of adoption the foster parents assume all the legal and social obligations and privileges of actual parents. *In the wage home* the child is on the same footing as in the free home, that is, he should be a member of the family, not a servant, although he is paid for definite work performed; under changed industrial and social conditions it has become increasingly difficult to find this type of home.

For children in boarding, free, and wage homes the placing agency, whether or not legal custody has been given, stands in the position of guardian and protector of the child and retains the privilege of supervision and removal. After the completion of adoption proceedings, the agency no longer has any such privileges.[9]

A worth-while program of foster-family care presumes a careful study not only of the individual child to be placed but also of the foster-family before placement. This must be considered applicable to any kind of foster home, even to a wage home. The gradual development of both private and public societies for the placing of children in foster homes has resulted in highly specialized services for this procedure, particularly in the metropolitan areas. Various state-wide societies such as the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society provide similar facilities in rural

[9] *The ABC of Foster-Family Care for Children*, Children's Bureau Publication Number 216 (1936), page 11.

territories. In the typical child-placing agency at the present time, there are both a case worker known as the home-finder, who spends all his or her time investigating applications for children and evaluating them according to definite standards which have been developed for the selection of homes, and a social worker who is in charge of the supervision of the children placed in homes. State licensing of foster homes has also improved standards. The power of inspection and licensing usually resides in the department of public welfare. Standards for adoption homes have not been as high, generally, as those for boarding care, because of legal problems connected with the question of adoption. The laws vary from state to state, but in the majority of states there is no examination of the home into which the adoptive child is to be taken, since the adoption procedure is primarily legal rather than social. It seems absurd that judges may permit a child to be adopted for life by foster parents when only their general moral character has been ascertained; social agencies in providing temporary care make exhaustive studies of the characteristics of both foster parents and the child, in order that the child may be placed under the kind of care which will provide the best opportunity for his development. Certain institutions for foundlings secure periodic publicity through the adoption of children under their care by various celebrities, including motion-picture stars and others in the limelight, after a brief court hearing. The possibility that such persons may provide excellent homes cannot be denied, but the failure to study the various social factors involved and the making of financial responsibility the chief test are reprehensible.

As a result of the development of mothers'-aid legislation, the majority of dependent children receiving public aid are being cared for in their own homes today. The other two methods of child care, however, the foster home and the institution, are still very important factors in child care. Since the acceptance of the "family first" policy, the best agencies have adopted the plan of using foster-home placement and institutional care only in those cases where careful study indicates either of these as the preferred method. According to the census figures of 1933, exclusive of mothers'-aid cases, nearly half of the dependent children under care were in institutions, with foster-home care ranking third in importance as a method of care. The number of dependent children has been greatly increased by the depression, since, after all, child dependency is a product chiefly of poverty, even though factors affecting physical and mental health, such as accidents and disease, and factors bringing about family maladjustments, such as divorce and desertion, must be reckoned with also.

Institutional Care

Institutional care is still a common method of treatment for dependent children in the United States. On December 31, 1933, according to the Bureau of the Census, 140,352 children were receiving institutional care. An evaluation of the statistics shows a slight decrease of the number in institutions compared with the previous census study in 1923. Publicly supported institutions for children are generally for certain classes of dependent children, such as children of soldiers and sailors. Privately supported institutions are often under religious auspices, Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, the Protestant institutions still predominating. Sometimes they are sponsored by fraternal orders such as the Moose and the Yeomen. In some instances they may be endowed, as are the Girard, Carson, Ellis, and Hershey colleges. The latter group are generally designed for specific classes of dependent children, and occasionally changing circumstances make their existence unnecessary. The decrease in the number of the nation's children will no doubt cause some of these institutions to close as soon as the depression ends.

Generally, an institution today is of one of three physical types: (1) congregate; (2) semicongregate (pavilion); (3) cottage. The cottage organization, with cottages small enough to resemble family dwellings, provides an environment as nearly normal as possible for children needing institutional care. The large congregate institution generally has one building constructed in H or U style with boys on one side and girls on the other. There are a large central dining room, large dormitories, and a central playground. The semicongregate institution does not differ very much from the congregate institution and generally has a congregate dining room, although an attempt is made to make each part of the building distinct from all other parts, even to the extent of referring to the various divisions of specialized groups and their habitations as "cottages." The cottage type, recommended by the 1909 White House conference, is of many varieties and may even include the use of a central dining hall.

Regardless of the physical structure of the institution, individualized care through small groups rather than mass treatment is the objective. Likewise, if the institution is in a city, the participation of the children in community life is possible regardless of architecture. As an aid to this individualization policy, social case work has become an integral part of institutional care with regard to both admissions and discharge. Today no good institution or agency will take children "with no questions asked." In fact, every effort is made to rehabilitate families and to

avoid institutional or foster-home treatment if possible. When children are accepted by institutions, a close contact is maintained with the parents and an effort is made to make the child's institutional days as brief as possible. In addition to having full information about every child accepted, institutions are utilizing social workers to investigate and maintain continued supervision over the homes to which their charges go, and to help the older children to adjust themselves to social life when they go out "on their own." The similarity in the use of case-work methods naturally makes one wonder how it is possible to determine which mode of care should be preferred when a child is to be removed from his own home. This point is by no means easy to decide, although nearly all agree that many children cannot be placed in foster homes until they have experienced considerable discipline and control in an institution. Some, because of handicaps, can best be dealt with in institutions. Likewise, it sometimes happens that there is a shortage of good foster homes; however, this deficiency is due, usually, to a failure to appropriate sufficient funds to encourage good foster homes.

The work of the institution is done under hazardous conditions, especially when mental health is considered. Father John M. Cooper, writing in *Children's Institutions,* the most complete study of Catholic child-care institutions made thus far, points out some of the emotional problems presented:

> If his home be a good one, the child's basic cravings tend to be satisfied in greater or lesser measure without extraordinary deliberate planning on the part of parents, although, of course, even in the home mental conflicts are common enough in children. In the institution, however, it is more difficult to provide suitable satisfactions for such cravings, and by the circumstances of the case the hazard of such mental conflicts is very much greater than in the home. The institutional child can easily be lost in the crowd, become part, as it were, of the vast machinery of the institution, and both fail of receiving individual recognition and fall short of acquiring individual status and success. He can likewise easily become undernourished and starved emotionally for want of individual affection, love, and understanding. He can be caught in the unending monotony and routine of daily rules and bells and duties. When these things happen to him, we say he becomes "institutionalized." It is questionable whether even the most successful institution can ever completely and adequately meet those emotional and affective needs of the child. But a good institutional program can, at least in large measure, meet such needs and forestall such hazards, provided special pains be taken through wise, kindly and deliberate planning.[10]

[10] *Children's Institutions* (The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, 1931), page 175. Used by permission.

The issue is further complicated by the problem of religious education. On this subject, Monsignor O'Grady writes as follows:

> Students today assume that both the institution and the foster home are necessary parts of any well-rounded system of child-care. Non-sectarian social agencies lean toward the boarding home rather than the institution for the care of most dependent and neglected children. They believe that the institution serves a very useful role as a place for the observation and study of children, for children needing disciplinary care, and for physically and mentally defective children. Catholic agencies, as a rule, prefer the institution to the boarding home for the care of the great majority of dependent and neglected children. They feel that the institutions under the direction of the sisterhoods have decided advantages in religious training of children. They believe, moreover, that contact with the religious is an excellent means of getting parents to recognize their religious responsibilities.[11]

In spite of such touching names as "Home for the Friendless" and "Orphan Asylum," the great majority of dependent children in institutions today are not full orphans. Many are "divorce orphans." In fact, unless children's institutions are on guard, an occasional parent will try to utilize its facilities as a sort of low-priced boarding school. While there is some difference of opinion as to the relative costs of institutional and foster-home care, it is pretty generally admitted that the cost of good institutional care exceeds the cost of good foster-home care, in spite of the economy possible in Catholic institutions where the staff is made up chiefly of religious.

IV. The Illegitimate Child

Statistics as to the number of children born in the United States in 1933 whose parents had not married each other show a total of 77,167. This number is probably an understatement, since in many instances reports are not made accurately about the status of the parents at the time of the birth of the child. There seems to be an upward trend, however, although this is not definitely known. At the present time, the rate of illegitimate births is about 40 per 1,000 births. There is a heavy concentration of these births among Negroes, the Bureau of the Census reporting that more than half of the total number of children registered as born of unmarried parents in 1933 were of this racial group.

The occupations of the mothers are generally those which are in notably low-income groups, such as domestic service. Most studies in-

[11] *An Introduction to Social Work* (The Century Co., New York, 1928), page 116. Used by permission.

dicate that the mothers are generally under 25 years of age and that they received very little formal education. Many authors indicate that there is a correlation between morons and illegitimacy, but this has not been proved beyond dispute. Ruth Reed presents statistics which indicate that the illegitimate child is about three times as likely to be cared for in institutions and foster homes as the legitimate child.[12] This is a clue as to the dependency of this group of children. The general picture of treatment of the unmarried mother and her child is not especially promising. There are various agencies, often religious in nature, which attempt to provide for this situation, such as the Salvation Army Rescue Homes, the Florence Crittenton Circles, the Church Mission of Help (Episcopal), and Catholic institutions.

As a general rule, the unmarried mother finds it difficult to keep her child with her. This statement should be interpreted in the light of accepted medical statements which indicate that the mother and child benefit during the nursing period. All studies indicate that the mortality rates for breast-fed babies are considerably lower than those for babies who are artificially fed. The attitude of society has for the most part ostracized the mother, and she finds it difficult to keep her baby with her. She often re-enters domestic service, frequently at a lowered rate of pay, and may struggle for a year or two trying to keep her child. In the majority of cases, she becomes convinced that the handicap is too severe and relinquishes the child by placing it in an institution where adoption may take place. This relieves the mother of responsibility, which is not desirable, although it must be recognized that a condition which makes her work under too severe a handicap is also not desirable. As a principle of good care, it must be stated emphatically that the mother must be allowed to remain with her child whenever it is at all possible to arrange for it. Not only is the child given protection, but in most instances the mother is thereby given responsibilities and inspiration which cause her not to lose hope for herself or her child.

It should be a principle that no child should be handicapped at birth by reason of the sin of his parents. There seems need for additional state protection for these children, and some improvements have been made. "Baby farms," which attempt to make a profit through the care of these infants, have been eliminated for the most part through activities of state departments of public welfare. Several states, including Minnesota, Massachusetts, California, and New York, have laws provid-

[12] *The Social Work Year Book, 1937* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1937), page 73.

ing that birth certificates need not disclose the marital status of the child's mother; this is a forward step. In some states aid to dependent children is provided under certain conditions.

Greater emphasis must be placed on the responsibility of the father of the child. In many cases the mother is victimized by seduction. The legal responsibility of the father generally includes payment of a small sum weekly until the child is sixteen years of age. The sum is low, usually from two to five dollars, and is seldom collected for any length of time unless the agreement is fortified with court action, which makes later default more difficult. One fact is definite: no decisions can be made in cases involving unmarried mothers and their children without thorough case study by competent social workers. In a great many instances, through good case work, it is possible to have the mother retain custody of the child without having to make an open confession of her lapse to the community.

V. Child Labor

The subject of child labor, together with methods of abolition, has been much controverted, but in general there has been substantial agreement that children should not be forced to do labor that is detrimental to their best interests. According to the census of 1930, there were 667,118 children between 10 and 15 years, inclusive, gainfully employed, of whom 197,621 were in nonagricultural occupations. A total of 235,328 were between 10 and 13 years. There was a sharp decrease in child labor later, due to the various codes of the N.R.A., but immediately after the invalidation of the N.R.A. reports from twelve states and 107 cities in twenty other states showed that 55 per cent more permits to work were issued to children under 16 than in the entire N.R.A. year of 1934. The term "work permit" refers only to children who are released from school for full-time employment. The legal protection of child workers varies from state to state, and the ages at which children may enter industry vary greatly. It may be said that in most states the general age minimum is 14 years, but many exemptions exist. Children under 18 are prohibited from working in so-called hazardous occupations or at night by practically all state laws. The hours of labor are not very carefully controlled by statute, and exceptions even in the moderate laws are numerous.

In general, there are two principal reasons why children go to work when they might otherwise remain in school: the need of earnings at home, and dissatisfaction with school work for one reason or another.

Studies reveal a relationship between ability to do school work and dropping out of school; and it is found that children who go to work are often retarded in their school work, with scores on mental tests below standard for their age. Dissatisfaction with school may be related to inadequacy of school curricula, and this probably is especially true in the instance of dull children. There is some difference of opinion concerning the dull child: Should he remain in school or be sent out to work? The tendency at the present time is to assume that a dull child needs as much schooling as a brighter child, if not more, but this schooling must of necessity be somewhat different from that offered the normal child. Furthermore, modern industry demands certain standards of work which dull ones find difficulty in meeting unless they have received excellent training and supervision. At present the question seems to be pretty well answered by the fact that it is ridiculous to place children in industry when millions of adults are without employment.

INDUSTRY AND CHILD LABOR

Reputable employers generally realize that child labor is not profitable. Exploitation occurs chiefly in the sweatshops and in the "fly-by-night" businesses. One of the unfortunate phases of the child-labor problem is that age is not the most significant index of employability. Since it represents an average, it is reasonably useful, but individualizing the situation seems to be a more intelligent method. However, after long study the Children's Bureau has indicated that a minimum age for the entrance of children into industry should be not less than 16 years, since it is recognized that the physiological and psychological readjustments incident to pubescence place special demands upon the vitality of the child and that he should be protected against physical and nervous strains. Problems of child welfare are most acute in certain occupations and industries. Isolated canning communities employ very young child workers. In a survey of fruit and vegetable canneries in seven states, a study of the Children's Bureau showed that, of all the employed children under 16, one third were under 14. Not only are the labor camps in which many of the children are forced to work unsanitary, but moral and other conditions exist which are detrimental to the best interests of children.

Industrial homework is another situation in which children are exploited. No one knows the number of persons engaged in homework, although surveys from 1920 to 1930 in such centers as New York City and New Jersey have found several thousand children doing homework

in each place. The majority of these children are under 12, and from a fourth to a third are under 10. Homework, in general, is extremely varied and includes finishing clothing, embroidering, and making artificial flowers, handkerchiefs, lamp shades, and cheap jewelry. For children there are special kinds of work such as stringing tags and carding buttons. Since some of this work is seasonal, children are forced beyond their endurance and usually work in the poorly lighted and ventilated kitchens of their homes. There has been some licensing of homework, but this has not been effective.

Street work is another phase of child labor which has received considerable attention. It includes the delivering of newspapers on routes, selling newspapers, and employment as messengers, delivery boys, and errand boys. The news-carriers on routes are generally in the majority and as a rule do not present a problem. In many cases the work is beneficial and forms good habits. On the other hand, the newspaper-sellers on the street present a serious problem, especially since large proportions of them are under 10 years of age. The hours of work are excessive, particularly on Saturday night, and on other nights in cities where morning papers issue a late evening edition. In many instances the influences and associations of the work are demoralizing. This factor is probably the most important, for examinations have indicated that schoolwork does not necessarily suffer to a great extent except in individual cases, and school attendance is reasonably satisfactory. The legal situation is chaotic, for municipal ordinances governing the situation are rarely, if ever, enforced, largely because of a fear of unfavorable publicity in the press.

In summary, we may state: (1) that child labor seems to be decreasing; (2) that it is especially dangerous under 16 years of age; (3) that it probably interferes with adequate education and training; (4) that it becomes repellent in certain abuses of the canning industry, industrial homework, and the street trades. State regulations have been notably ineffective to control special problems, although generally they tend to be useful in the great mass of industry. It must be recognized that the problem of child labor today is no longer a problem of immature children working long hours in mills and factories. Probably it is true that the majority of manufacturers have deep personal convictions in opposition to child labor. On the other hand, such situations as industrial homework not only exploit children but offer unfair competition to honest manufacturers, since the cost of transportation of materials to the homes of the children is extremely low compared with the overhead cost of factories and adult labor. There has been a tendency to berate all

manufacturers or even manufacturers as a group rather than to attempt to isolate the problem; of course, reputable manufacturers, suspicious of interference as a matter of principle, have opposed necessary state and federal regulations.

The Child-Labor Amendment

The history of federal attempts to regulate child labor is interesting. In 1916 Congress passed a law prohibiting shipment in interstate commerce of goods produced: (1) in mines or quarries which employed children under 16 years; (2) in manufacturing establishments which employed children under 14 years; (3) by concerns employing children between 14 and 16 years for more than eight hours a day, for more than six days a week, or at night. The Supreme Court in a five-to-four decision in 1918 declared this law unconstitutional. The next attack was made in the Revenue Act of 1919, which included a tax upon the net profits of any establishment in which child labor was used. This was declared unconstitutional in 1922. Finally, in 1924, Congress passed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which so far has been ratified by only thirty of the necessary thirty-six states.

The fight for the amendment is being led by the National Child Labor Committee with the assistance of two national groups of outstanding citizens: the Non-Partisan Committee for Ratification of the Amendment and the Catholic Citizens' Committee for Ratification of the Amendment, organized in 1934 and 1936, respectively. Many national organizations, civic, religious, and fraternal, include ratification of the amendment in their programs for action. Opposition to the amendment is being carried on by the National Committee for the Protection of Child, Family, School, and Church, organized by the Sentinels of the Republic in 1934. Other national organizations active in opposition include the American Bar Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, the International Circulation Managers' Association, and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

During the past two years there has been increasing opposition to the amendment from Catholic sources, although there is no doubt that a division of opinion still exists in those circles. In other words, one cannot say that there is any "Catholic teaching" on the wisdom of the amendment. The proposed amendment provides: "The Congress shall have power to limit, regulate and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age." Catholic objections to the amendment seem to concentrate about the use of the word "regulate"; it is believed to be

too elastic. Some believe in addition that the word "labor" might be stretched to include education and so lead ultimately to federal control of education. Others believe the age proposed is entirely too high. The proponents of the measure maintain that these are grossly exaggerated fears, suggested originally and constantly fostered by such pressure groups as the National Association of Manufacturers. It is obvious that no cursory survey of this problem can evaluate adequately the specific points at issue.

Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan has attempted to meet all these objections by proposing a substitute amendment to read: "The Congress shall have power to limit and prohibit the employment for hire of persons under sixteen years of age." This was submitted to Congress in June, 1937, and was immediately passed upon favorably and unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The term "employment for hire" seems to be more specific than "labor" and is probably less likely to be misinterpreted. However, the proposal aroused no great interest, and it is impossible now to evaluate the possibility of action from this source. It is to be regretted, however, that the opponents of the amendment have waited fourteen years to introduce an acceptable revision. State regulation has failed to protect children for several reasons: (1) the fear of states that employers would be driven to other states; (2) the desire of state officials to "co-operate" with local canners, sweatshop owners, and the like; (3) the backwardness of many states whose goods compete with those of states with high labor standards. At the time of this writing, it seems that the federal Fair Labor Standards Act, so ably sponsored by Representative Mary Norton of New Jersey, and passed in June, 1938, will establish fairly adequate federal control of child labor. Nevertheless, since this, the Wages-Hours law, does not apply to intrastate industries and agriculture, many still believe that a child-labor amendment to the Constitution is needed. The effectiveness of federal regulation is indicated by our brief experience in regulating child labor under the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. This has been summarized as follows:

> In 1933, with the adoption under the National Industrial Recovery Act of national child-labor standards higher than most of the State standards, the trend of child employment for the first time diverged from the general economic trend. In the face of a sharp increase in general factory employment, the number of first regular employment certificates issued in these 33 representative cities, which had fallen to 23,393 in 1932, continued to fall. In 1933 it was 14,933 and in 1934, the only entire calendar year when the child-labor provisions of the NRA codes were in operation, the number of employment certificates issued in these cities fell to 4,737.

In order to show clearly the effect on child employment of the removal of national child-labor standards, following the invalidation of the NRA codes in May 1935, the figures for the post-NRA year, from June 1, 1935, to May 31, 1936, are preferable to those of the calendar year 1935.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER, RATE, AND PER CENT OF CHANGE—CHILDREN 14 AND 15 YEARS OF AGE FOR WHOM EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATES WERE ISSUED, 1927 TO 1934 AND POST-NRA YEAR [a]

Year	Children 14 and 15 years of age for whom first regular employment certificates were issued		
	Number [b]	Number per 10,000 children of these ages	Per cent of change in rate as compared with previous year
1927	55,450	920	
1928	52,351	844	— 8.3
1929	55,858	876	+ 3.8
1930	39,588	605	— 30.9
1931	30,428	456	— 24.6
1932	23,393	344	— 24.6
1933	14,933	222	— 35.5
1934	4,737	70	— 68.5
Post-NRA year [c]	13,579	202	+ 188.6

[a] This table includes figures from 33 cities with 100,000 or more population (1930 census) reporting to the Children's Bureau each year of the period: Atlanta, Baltimore, Buffalo, Chattanooga, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Fort Wayne, Grand Rapids, Indianapolis, Kansas City (Kans.), Knoxville, Los Angeles, Louisville, Lowell, Lynn, Minneapolis, Nashville, New York, Oakland, Omaha, Peoria, Providence, Rochester (N.Y.), St. Paul, San Francisco, Somerville (Mass.), South Bend, Springfield (Mass.), Washington (D.C.), Wichita, Wilmington (Del.), and Yonkers.

[b] Figures for Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Providence are for 15-year-old children; laws do not permit issuance of certificates for 14-year-old children.

[c] June 1935–May 1936.

In this post-NRA year the number of certificates issued in the 33 cities represented in table 1 rose to 13,579, an increase of 189 per cent as compared with 1934. In the calendar year 1936, although in the latter part of that year New York and Rhode Island adopted a 16-year minimum-age standard, a total of 21,910 first regular employment certificates were issued in all the States and cities that reported to the Children's Bureau.

Effectiveness of Legislative Restrictions

The direct result of the adoption of a 16-year minimum age for employment in most industries on a national basis under the NRA codes, as has been shown, was a drastic curtailment in the employment of children 14 and 15 years of age while the codes were in operation.

An indirect result of this national restriction on child labor was the stimulation of State legislation. Since 1932 a basic 16-year minimum age for employment has been established in six States in the reporting area: Wisconsin and Utah, in 1933; Connecticut and Pennsylvania, in 1935; and Rhode Island and New York, in 1936. In the last two States there was a decrease of 94 percent in the number of children going to work in the last 6 months of 1936 as compared with the last 6 months of 1935. In areas where the minimum age for employment was not raised, however, a comparison of the number of employment certificates issued in the same two periods shows an increase of almost 50 percent.[18]

VI. Educational Problems

One of the developments of the child-welfare movement has been the establishment of closer relations between the fields of social work and education. This is shown by the establishment of courses in educational sociology in every teacher's college and by the development of courses dealing with the problems of the school child in schools of sociology and social work. Educational problems cover a wide field; for obvious reasons we shall restrict ourselves to a few here. We shall consider (a) the problem child, (b) school attendance, and (c) the preschool child.

1. The problem child

One of the surprising discoveries of modern psychology is that many children are seriously handicapped for future education and social adjustment before they even start to attend school. This is due in most instances to the failure of parents to appreciate the importance of their positions as educators. We have no statistics on the number of children who in their homes present difficult behavior problems. We know that minor personality maladjustments are common to all children, but we do not know statistically how many of these minor maladjustments are treated inadequately by parents. Although this field of education is still highly speculative, it will become more important as the best-known methods of dealing with children come into wider use. Those who come into contact with children and with families, whether social case workers, recreation workers, school teachers, or physicians, know that in the so-called normal homes there are often grave problems of behavior of children. Although these may not seem serious, they may cause serious future maladjustments. Since most parents understand so little about these problems, there is a tendency on the part of some to decry all efforts at improvements and at study, and to state defensively that what

[18] "Child-Labor Trends of a Decade," *The Child* (Children's Bureau monthly news summary), Volume 2, December, 1937, pages 128–129.

we need is more punishment, or more rigidity in discipline. Like some oldsters who occupy editorial chairs, they still cherish a desire to return to "the good old days."

Two things are necessary before parents and educators develop the use of scientific methods of dealing with children: an appreciation of the problem, and a desire to "do something about it." The behavior disorders of children cover a wide range of problems, many of which seem to be brought about by unskilled handling of children on the part of parents. Temper tantrums, "spoiling," and the like are common, and comparatively few parents know how to deal with these situations. Those who are emotionally attached to a past when there were no "educationalists" and psychologists delight occasionally in pointing out that children, even though improperly handled, often became well adjusted in adult life, which admittedly is true. On the other hand, it probably is more true that many of those who are maladjusted in adult life were unskillfully handled in childhood or early youth. The present pattern of family life, with many "only children," and with a social organization which makes the normal work disciplines of the old farm and village home impossible, aggravates the situation.

Socialization, which is an important phase of growth, often does not begin in the smaller, neighborhoodless, city families of today until the period of entrance to school, and this often results in complications which may have a direct effect upon the entire school life of a child. Overindulgent parents, as well as inconsistent parents, find their own reactions typified in their children. A wife who is dissatisfied with her husband may be too responsive to a child or, on the other hand, may neglect the child entirely. In great measure, these problems do not need attention as long as the child remains in the confines of the home, but school attendance brings the problem into focus. Then, when these children are brought to a clinic for attention, parents assume that the problem is merely an educational one. In most cases the problem lies in the manner in which the child is handled in his own home. Every phase of life tends to become a reflection of early home life. Despite our ignorance concerning the numerical quantities of such problems, we can state that they are very important and that the facilities for treatment not only are inadequate, but, what is even more tragic, are, to a considerable extent, not even utilized. While no informed person today will deny that child-guidance clinics are necessary, it would seem that education for parenthood is far more necessary. Drs. Healy and Bronner, in their recent *New Light on Delinquency,* a study for the Institute of Human Relations, make this observation:

As a logical outgrowth of our study which shows that parent-child relationships play such a huge part in the production of delinquent proclivities we are inclined to believe that the single direct attack of greatest value may be through widespread parental education—to be sure not an easy task. However, national and local organizations are taking steps in this direction. Not that the mere reading of newspaper columns or periodicals on child care, or attendance at a course of lectures will suffice. Parents must gain insights into the fact that their own emotional attitudes, so often unconsciously motivated, as well as the feeling life of their children are involved in any behavior problems presented. . . . Only greater public awareness of the value of parental education plus social cooperation can bring about the more general establishment of both.[14]

American family life has been so thrown out of adjustment by our changing social order that it is hazardous for parents to assume that good intentions will guide them in the proper home training of their children. Pope Pius XI has written in his encyclical *On Christian Education:* "We wish to call your attention in a special manner to the present day lamentable decline in family education. The offices and professions of a transitory and earthly life, which are certainly of far less importance, are prepared for by long and careful study; whereas for the fundamental duty and obligation of educating their children, many parents have little or no preparation, immersed as they are in temporal cares."

A child-guidance clinic, in its most simple form, is organized for the careful study and treatment of children with behavior disorders. A minimum staff for a clinic is composed of a psychiatrist, a psychologist and a psychiatric social worker. A survey by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene in 1928 showed 355 clinics staffed by 529 psychiatrists, 300 psychologists, and 344 social workers, who cared for 44,296 children. Although at first glance this number seems impressive, it gives only a superficial notion of the problem. Approximately thirty-four states have psychiatric clinic service and about half of this service is tax-supported. Twenty-seven of the largest cities are reasonably well equipped, and rural traveling units have become numerous. Demonstrations of psychiatric child guidance by such organizations as the Commonwealth Fund have brought about a wholesome appreciation on the part of certain educators and parents. Clinics have increased their scope by emphasizing the importance and responsibility of other agencies in treatment and especially by calling the attention of parents to their own deficiencies. Unfortunately, however, the advice of child-guidance clinics, since it is fundamentally of an educational nature, is not always

[14] *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1936), page 217.

in keeping with Christian morality. Some of the larger cities have solved this problem by establishing Catholic child-guidance clinics. Where clinics are supported by public funds, Catholics should see to it that the extreme viewpoints of certain psychiatrists do not color the advice given to parents and children who come to the clinic.

2. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

The 1930 census reports show the average rate of illiteracy for the United States to be 4.39 per cent of the population of 10 years and over. In fifteen states and the District of Columbia, the rates of illiteracy are less than 2 per cent of the population of 10 years and over. On the other hand, seven states have illiteracy rates of 10 per cent or more; most of these have a large Negro population. While one might be tempted to say that illiteracy today is a local rather than a national problem, the fact that demagogues elected by illiterate constituents may inflict themselves upon Congress and do irreparable injury to the nation must be remembered.

The explanation of the illiteracy rate lies in the several distinct factors which affect the rates: (1) the general character of the population; (2) the efficiency of the school system; (3) the length of the school term; (4) the proportion of children of school age enrolled. Since the character of the population is often determined by education, it is readily seen that the educational system of the states seems to have a direct effect upon the illiteracy rates. A comparison of census reports regarding illiteracy is very difficult because the definition has changed from one census period to another. In general, there is evidently an extreme downward trend in illiteracy. Advances have been made through each census period, and reports from the several states since the most recent census indicate that the downward trend is continuing. At the present time all the states have laws regulating school attendance under certain ages, but there is variation from state to state in the age at which children may leave school, sixteen being the usual age. Some states make provision for those excused from school by work permits to continue their education through extension schools or continuation schools, which the working child attends one or two days a week for a year. The wholesome development and integration of the programs of such schools with the work of older children should be extremely beneficial.

A comparison of census data for several periods shows a marked increase in school attendance. A complete analysis of the reasons for improved school attendance would include the following: (1) an increasing recognition by citizens and particularly by parents of the need

for education; (2) the reflection of this attitude in increasing age requirements and laws for compulsory school attendance laws and in the various child-labor laws; (3) the development of the curricula of schools, particularly the emphasis upon manual training, which gives much-needed opportunities to children with nonacademic skills. The use of so-called prevocational schools and vocational schools, with a curriculum sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of individual children, probably has been of more benefit in keeping children in school than in actually training them for work outside the schools when they leave. Children are used in agriculture to the detriment of their education, especially in certain sections of the South. The Negroes, who still lack adequate school facilities, are especially deprived. Irregular school attendance or nonattendance has been the unfortunate result in many poor agrarian communities.

3. THE PRESCHOOL CHILD

According to the census reports, there are at the present time nearly 10,000,000 children in the United States between the ages of two and six years. During the past two decades it has been recognized that many problems develop at an early age and that more attention must be given to this group. About three fourths of all children enter school with one or more serious physical defects which could have been remedied if detected at an earlier age. The emotional problems of this period have been mentioned already. One of the agencies which have arisen to provide for the needs of preschool children is the nursery school. Nursery schools attempt to provide necessary environment and guidance for the development of children from two to five years of age. Nursery schools also have been used extensively for research and as centers of demonstration of the best practices of child education and welfare. In its best aspects this school is not a substitute for the home and must constantly correlate its work with that of home and parents. It serves as a supplement to the home and helps parents to understand problems presented by their children. In 1936, in thirty-five states, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, there were 285 nursery schools which reported to the United States Office of Education, excluding emergency nursery schools supported by federal relief funds (there were 203 in 1932, and 157 in 1930). The federal emergency nursery schools have been comparatively widespread; since they were authorized in October, 1933, about 2,000 emergency nursery-school units have been organized under the control of state and local public-school systems.

Kindergartens were first established as public-school projects in St.

Louis in 1873. For many years prior to that time, they were maintained both for the well-to-do and, through private donations, for the children of poor parents. Kindergartens, in general, attempt to do for children of four and five years those things which nursery schools do for younger children. The programs are different to some extent, largely because of the greater maturity of the children. Of the nearly 5,000,000 children in the United States of four and five years, only 12.3 per cent were in kindergartens in 1934. Although there has been a tendency in some quarters to decry the kindergartens and nursery schools as expensive luxuries, there is general evidence to indicate that the results more than justify the expenditure. Children receiving such attention have an increasing ability to adjust themselves to life situations. They represent a worth-while attempt to offset some of the injury inflicted upon the child by modern urban family life.

Conclusion

Until rather recently public interest in child welfare was restricted to the obviously handicapped child. Public care, as well as the organized care sponsored by private groups, was confined chiefly to children who were homeless, destitute, physically or mentally defective, or delinquent. Most of the child-welfare programs of the past dealt largely with the dependent child. Even as late as 1909 we find that the principles laid down by the first White House conference dealt almost exclusively with dependent children. Largely as a result of the stimulus furnished by the United States Children's Bureau, which started to operate in 1912, the broader scope of child-welfare work began to be appreciated. It was realized then that there were certain essentials of normal child care which were being neglected and that these deficiencies needed attention just as much as did the welfare of the dependent child. Consequently, in the recommendations of the Washington Conference on Child Welfare in 1919 we find a statement of minimum standards for the health, education, and work of normal children, as well as for the protection of special groups of handicapped children.

Along with the extension of the meaning of the term "child welfare" there has come a second appreciation, namely, the importance and promise of preventive work. In this, as in so many other phases of its recent development, the child-welfare movement has become more closely integrated with the whole social-work movement. As it has become increasingly evident that economic individualism has permitted the sacrifice of the American child to material prosperity, entire codes of laws, called children's codes, have been formulated and made a part

of the statute law of most of our progressive states. A more direct blow at the economic causes of child-welfare problems, though still only a stopgap measure, was registered in the Social Security Act of 1935. The progress which has been made in child welfare in the present century has been aptly summarized by Father Paul Hanly Furfey as follows:

> During the present century the State has taken a more intimate and effective interest in the well-being of the child than ever before. Public-health work has succeeded in adding several years to the child's life. The juvenile court movement and mental hygiene have helped to combat dis orders of conduct. A totally new conception of public relief work has suc ceeded in preventing much child dependency and in treating the remainder in a more humane and wiser manner. An altogether changed conception of the school has brought it into closer relationship with life and has been preparing the child for his vocation in a more adequate manner. Altogether the newer interest of the State in the social problems of childhood constitutes a most remarkable chapter in the Twentieth Century's story of achievement.[15]

It is becoming increasingly evident, however, that the stopgap measures of the past must be followed up by more fundamental reforms which will reach to the heart of our social order and so place the welfare of the entire group above that of the privileged and powerful few. Thus we see that the subject of child welfare is integrated with the advocacy of sweeping changes in our economic and political system. Recognizing that the child is the bridge to the future, social workers are striving to secure for every child what the wisest parent believes to be necessary for his children. Thus prevention, though costly at first, should in the long run prove to be a saving.

4. THE CHILDREN'S CHARTER

In 1930 probably the largest group of experts in the various branches of child care ever to gather in the national capital assembled to consider the needs of children. After listening to many reports on present progress and future needs, this White House Conference on Child Health and Protection composed a statement of ideals for the guidance of practical effort on behalf of American children, which, because of its importance, has been called the "children's charter." According to this set of standards, the rights of the child, the realization of which should be the aim of future child-welfare programs, are as follows:

I. For every child spiritual and moral training to help him to stand firm under the pressure of life.

[15] *Social Problems of Childhood* (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929), pages 1–2.

II. For every child understanding and the guarding of his personality as his most precious right.

III. For every child a home and that love and security which a home provides; and for that child who must receive foster care, the nearest substitute for his own home.

IV. For every child full preparation for his birth, his mother receiving prenatal, natal, and postnatal care; and the establishment of such protective measures as will make childbearing safer.

V. For every child health protection from birth through adolescence, including: periodical health examinations and, where needed, care of specialists and hospital treatment; regular dental examinations and care of the teeth; protective and preventive measures against communicable diseases; the insuring of pure food, pure milk and pure water.

VI. For every child from birth through adolescence, promotion of health, including health instruction and a health program, wholesome physical and mental recreation, with teachers and leaders adequately trained.

VII. For every child a dwelling-place safe, sanitary, and wholesome, with reasonable provisions for privacy; free from conditions which tend to thwart his development; and a home environment harmonious and enriching.

VIII. For every child a school which is safe from hazards, sanitary, properly equipped, lighted, and ventilated. For younger children nursery schools and kindergartens to supplement home care.

IX. For every child a community which recognizes and plans for his needs, protects him against physical dangers, moral hazards, and disease; provides him with safe and wholesome places for play and recreation; and makes provision for his cultural and social needs.

X. For every child an education which, through the discovery and development of his individual abilities, prepares him for life; and through training and vocational guidance prepares him for a living which will yield him the maximum of satisfaction.

XI. For every child such teaching and training as will prepare him for successful parenthood, home-making, and the rights of citizenship; and, for parents, supplementary training to fit them to deal wisely with the problems of parenthood.

XII. For every child education for safety and protection against accidents to which modern conditions subject him—those to which he is directly exposed and those which, through loss or maiming of his parents, affect him indirectly.

XIII. For every child who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early discover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability. Expenses of these services should be borne publicly where they cannot be privately met.

XIV. For every child who is in conflict with society the right to be dealt with intelligently as society's charge, not society's outcast; with the home, the school, the church, the court and the institution when needed, shaped to return him whenever possible to the normal stream of life.

XV. For every child the right to grow up in a family with an adequate

standard of living and the security of a stable income as the surest safeguard against social handicaps.

XVI. For every child protection against labor that stunts growth, either physical or mental, that limits education, that deprives children of the right of comradeship, of play, and of joy.

XVII. For every rural child as satisfactory schooling and health services as for the city child, and an extension to rural families of social, recreational, and cultural facilities.

XVIII. To supplement the home and the school in the training of youth, and to return to them those interests of which modern life tends to cheat children, every stimulation and encouragement should be given to the extension and development of the voluntary youth organizations.

XIX. To make everywhere available these minimum protections of the health and welfare of children, there should be a district, county, or community organization for health, education, and welfare, with full-time officials, coordinating with a state-wide program which will be responsive to a nation-wide service of general information, statistics, and scientific research. This should include:

(a) Trained, full-time public health officials, with public health nurses, sanitary inspection, and laboratory workers.
(b) Available hospital beds.
(c) Full-time public welfare service for the relief, aid, and guidance of children in special need due to poverty, misfortune, or behavior difficulties, and for the protection of children from abuse, neglect, exploitation, or moral hazard.

FOR EVERY CHILD THESE RIGHTS, REGARDLESS OF RACE, OR COLOR, OR SITUATION, WHEREVER HE MAY LIVE UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG [16]

References for Further Reading

Cooper, John M., *Children's Institutions,* The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, 1931

Davis, Maxine, *The Lost Generation,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936

Fitch, John, *Vocational Guidance in Action,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1935

Forman, Henry J., *Our Movie Made Children,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1933

Furfey, Paul Hanly, *The Growing Boy,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1930

Furfey, Paul Hanly, *The Parish and Play,* The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, 1928

Furfey, Paul Hanly, *Social Problems of Childhood,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1929

Furfey, Paul Hanly, *You and Your Children,* Benziger Brothers, New York, 1929

[16] *White House Conference, 1930* (The Century Co., New York, 1931), pages 45–47. Used by permission.

Glover, Katherine, and Evelyn Dewey, *Children of the New Day,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1934

Kelly, William A., and Margaret R. Kelly, *Introductory Child Psychology,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1938

Mangold, George B., *Problems of Child Welfare,* third edition, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1936

McCarthy, Raphael C., S.J., *Training the Adolescent,* The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1934

McGovern, John T., *Your Son and Mine,* Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, 1931

Nimkoff, Meyer F., *The Child,* J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1934

Pendry, Elizabeth R., and Hugh Hartshorne, *Organizations for Youth,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1935

Reed, Ruth, *The Illegitimate Family in New York City,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1934

Reeder, Rudolph R., *Training Youth for the New Social Order,* The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1933

Sayles, Mary B., *The Problem Child at Home,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1928

Sayles, Mary B., *The Problem Child in School,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1926

Sayles, Mary B., *Substitute Parents,* The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1936

Schmiedeler, Edgar, O.S.B., and M. Rosa McDonough, *Parent and Child,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1934

Steiner, Jesse F., *On Recreation in the Depression,* Social Science Research Council, New York, 1937

Thomas, William I., and Dorothy S. Thomas, *The Child in America,* Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1928

Thurston, Henry W., *The Dependent Child,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1930

White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, *Dependent and Neglected Children,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1933

White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, *The Handicapped Child,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1933

White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, *Organization for the Care of Handicapped Children,* D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1932