THE ATTITUDE OF JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH RELIGIOUS GROUPS TOWARD THE MODERN LABOR MOVEMENT

by

Gerald J. Klein

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Rabbi and Master of Hebrew Letters.

Thesis Digest Gerald J. Klein

THE ATTITUDE OF JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH RELIGIOUS GROUPS TOWARD THE MODERN LABOR MOVEMENT

This thesis attempted to present the attitude of religious groups toward the modern labor movement. It was the author's purpose to look beyond the expressed favorable attitude of religious groups - to discover for whom they were speaking, the activities in which they engaged to implement their point of view, and the purpose behind these activities. In order to fulfill this purpose, it was necessary to divide the religious groups into their three major divisions and to ask three important questions: (1) Who expresses the Catholic attitude toward modern labor? (2) the Jewish attitude? (3) the Protestant attitude? The answers to these three questions comprise the first three chapters of the thesis. The author believes that the answers concerning Catholicism and Judaism are complete and up-to-date. No such claim can be made for Protestantism, because of the almost insurmountable number of divisions within this branch of Christianity. The next logical step was to survey the field of inter-group cooperation. This was presented in Chapter IV where joint activity and joint pronouncements were discussed.

Religious groups usually express themselves by using pronouncements, statements, resolutions, etc. All of the modern religious pronouncements which concern themselves with

labor (and were available to the author) were analyzed topically in Chapter V. The concern of religious groups for the religion of the laborer by means of labor churches, institutes, etc., was the theme of Chapter VI. The last chapter of the thesis (VII) presented what in the opinion of the author were the justifiable conclusions and suggestions for further action which this investigation warrented. Some twenty-one pages of notes and bibliography are to be found at the conclusion of this study.

PREFACE

This study is submitted to fulfill an academic requirement for graduation from the Hebrew Union College. The task did not, however, entail the drudgery that some academic requirements often do. This is not to say that I believe I had an easy job. I think that anyone would agree that an attempt to discover an attitude on the part of the great many Jewish and non-Jewish religious groups on any matter would be difficult. But, for at least three important reasons, the study and work involved in the preparation of this thesis has been thoroughly pleasant.

First reason of all is my own deep-seated conviction that wholesome organizations of labor and religious groups with social vision are potentially two of mankind's greatest benefactors. Both have made strides toward their common goals. Both need improvement and encouragement. Even if the modern labor movement were antithetical to religion (which is not the case) it would behoove professionals in the field of religion to know more about this progress on the part of laboring people. I enjoyed working on this study, because regardless of what evaluation the finished product will receive, I now know more about religion and more about the labor movement, and I still have a burning desire to know even more about both.

My second reason for enjoying this phase of my college work is the privilege and pleasure of working with Dr. Abraham Cronbach. Dr. Cronbach has been much more than the referee of this thesis.

He has been teacher, co-worker, and an endless source of inspiration and information. I am deeply grateful to him.

The guidance and encouragement which my wife has given me throughout the preparation of this study is something that I knew I could depend upon. I would have been completely lost without it. I am further grateful to my wife for helping me with the rather large amount of correspondence which this study necessitated. This is the third reason for the pleasure and satisfaction which I have found in the preparation of the study which is herewith presented.

G. J. K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Plan of Presentation

The purpose of this study is not to engage in apologetics. We are not going to try to prove that religion and labor have so much in common that they simply must be friends. This work takes into consideration one basic underlying fact. The modern labor movement, in spite of all the opposition which it has encountered, has been one of man's greatest benefactors. Regardless of the difficult road that lies ahead, the unions have brought the working man better working conditions and an improved standard of living. The U.M.W. has lifted the coal MINERS out of the depths of despair. The lot of the automobile worker has improved because of the great work of the U.A.W. The workers in the needles trades know well how the Almagamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers removed the evils of the sweatshop from them. The examples are so numerous that a religious patriot might well lament, "would that religion were responsible for the many real benefits which trade unionism has brought to thousands of working men and women! " But it is certainly not our purpose to lament about that which religion has not accomplished. Our purpose is to recognize the modern labor movement for what it is and to investigate what the many Jewish and non-Jewish religious groups have to say about

that movement and what they have actually done to aid its progress. By such an investigation we hope to fulfill the task set forth in the title of our study and to express the attitude of Jewish and non-Jewish religious groups toward the modern labor movement.

We are working in a very broad field. Any group's attitude is difficult to study. Individuals of the same group and under varying conditions arrive at conflicting opinions. We must always take into consideration the fact that what is presented to us as the official opinion of a certain group need not necessarily be the opinion of its individual members who have democratically arrived at a certain point of view. This is especially true of organized religion with literally hundreds of councils, federations, conferences, committees, synods, assemblies, etc. etc. The World Almanac for 1947 lists over two hundred and fifty organized divisions and sub-divisions of religious bodies in the United States. The Almanac further lists sixty-seven established headquarters of religious groups. To really present the attitude of religious groups thoroughly and accurately one would need some expression from all the groups referred to above. This all-inclusiveness was impossible in the preparation of this study. An attempt was made to obtain as many expressions of religious opinions on labor as possible. Enough, in fact, to arrive at what, in the opinion of this writer, are justifiable conclusions.

There now arises the problem of the presentation and

analysis of the scattered opinions and attitudes which we have studied. In order to approach religion's attitude, we must first take cognizance of the three basic groups which make up the religious opinions with which we are concerned. Therefore, before we proceed to the heart of our subject it will be in order for us to pose the question: Who expresses Catholicism's attitude toward the modern labor movement? And, of course, we must ask the same question with respect to Protestantism and Judaism. We shall in our answers to these questions use an historical approach. An attempt will also be made to carefully designate lay and clerical opinion and, wherever possible, to compare them.

After we have answered these three basic questions about Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism, we shall investigate and evaluate the activity in which these three forces joined together for united action. This chapter will deal with two types of unified activity. One type is by official representation of officially recognized religious groups, the other is when the members of the three large divisions work together through a non-sectarian organization.

With the religious background of our subject established, we shall then turn specifically to the modern labor movement. Here again we shall have to divide and sub-divide our presentation for the sake of clarity and accuracy. We shall divide the modern labor movement into several of its most important spheres of interest and under each of these we shall set forth examples of what various religious groups have to say about the specific sphere of interest under

discussion. After we have attempted to perform this task, we shall concern ourselves with the methods that religious groups have employed to bring religion to the laborer. By this time, we should be ready to draw our conclusions.

Chapter I.

Who Expresses the Catholic Attitude Toward Modern Labor?

We start with Catholicism because its attitude toward labor (and everything else, for that matter) is the least complicated and the most centralized. Catholicism has always prided itself in its all-inclusiveness. It emphasizes works as well as faith. "The attitude of the Church toward the individual and the salvation of the individual soul is fairly well understood, not only by Catholics but by intelligent non-Catholics. What is not generally realized is the fact that the Church has a comprehensive and definite attitude toward group life, and all the great forms and manifestations of group organization."[1] The modern labor movement would, of course, come under the heading of group life and organization. Catholic opinion is always quite official. Every point of view is made to relate to some papal enunciation of some previous time. Thus for example when Ozanam and Kettler began to discuss labor in the middle of the nineteenth century their utterances are termed "at once original and traditional". They were original because no Catholic authority had ever before enunciated them. They were at the same time traditional because, "their teaching contains no innovation, and is in complete harmony with the traditional doctrines of the Fathers and the theologians".[2] Ask any Catholic individual or group about Catholicism's attitude toward labor and you will be immediately referred to Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical Letter "Rerum Novarum" issued

on May 15, 1891.

We shall see in discussing other religious groups that laymen, as members of a particular religious group, often have something to say on many current social problems including the labor question. An attempt was made in the preparation of this study to determine whether or not there exists any expression from the Catholic laity on modern labor. This involved us in some difficulty. There are two movements which can definitely be called Catholic lay organizations and we shall discuss them. But it must be noted that when it comes to the Catholic attitude toward labor, this is in the hands of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy and it is they who speak for the over 23,000,000 Catholic laymen of this country. A passing reference to what Church law says about the laity will serve two purposes, (1) It will explain the lack of official lay opinion, (2) It will emphasize that the Catholic opinion on labor is clerical opinion.

As to Jurisdiction and Administration (of the laity):

The principle is that the laity as such have no share in the spiritual jurisdiction and government of the Church; but they may be commissioned or delegated by ecclesiastical authority to excercise certain rights, especially when there is no question of strictly spiritual jurisdiction, for instance, the administration of property. The laity are incapable, if not by Divine law at least by Canon law, of real jurisdiction in the Church according to Chap.X, De Constit (lib 1 text 11) "Attendentes quod laicis etham religiosis super ecclesiis et personis ecclesiasticis nulla sit attributa facultas, quos obsequendi manet necessitas non auctoritas imperandi," i.e., the laity have no authority over things or persons ecclesiastical, it is their duty to obey not to command. Therefore no official acts requiring real ecclesiastical jurisdiction can be properly performed by them, they are null and void.[3]

When we express the Catholic opinion, therefore, it is usually handed down to us either by or through the National Catholic Welfare Conference. This conference, organized in 1919 has its headquarters in Washington, D.C. It acts through the Bishops and has for its purpose the "unifying, coordinating and organizing (of) the Catholic people of the United States in works of education, social welfare, immigrant aid and other activities."[4] Our subject is administered by its well-organized Department of Social Action. Since 1922 one of the major activities of the N.C.W.C. has been the sponsorship of Catholic Conferences on Industrial Problems.

There are several overall considerations which must be mentioned in discussing the general Catholic attitude toward modern labor. The Catholic Church is by its very nature similar in organization to a large corporation wherein only a comparative few rule over an extremely large constituency. It is of course jealous of its concentrated power which includes ownership of a vast amount of property. It is wary of any movement which leads to the dissemination of vested power. It's present concern with fighting what it interprets as modern communism is bound to find its way into its interest and concern with the labor movement. The most recent Labor Day statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference seems to be as much concerned with avoiding "more restrictive Government encroachments in the field of economics"[5] as it is with the welfare of labor.

We have alluded to the obvious and sometimes forced attempts to make modern Catholic opinion the result of some previous reasoning of a papal encyclical. We should hasten to mention that this does not prevent Catholic opinion from being blunt and specific. Compare, for example, the 1947 Catholic Labor Day Message with that issued by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in the same year. The Catholic statement deals in specific terms and suggestions and in comparison the Federal Council's Message even though quite idealistic, is vague with respect to the real labor issues of the day.

The first Catholic lay movement which concerns itself with labor and which we wish to mention is a most interesting one. This is the Catholic Worker Movement and paper founded in 1933 by Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day, which says, "that 'to give and not to take is what makes man human,' that production for use, and the service ideal must be substituted for production for profits and 'the devil take the hindmost' ideal. In Economics, as in all things, 'we are our brother's Keeper'."[6] We must take cognizance of this effort because it deals with labor and agrees with Eric Gill that the worker must gain control of production and that this will perhaps be affected partially through the labor unions, but mostly through the steady withdrawal of people to the land and small villages. Since the modern labor movement, even though it may oppose many of its tenets, has necessarily fitted

itself into the modern capitalistic system, we cannot in our study place too much significance in a movement which is basically motivated by the "back-to-the-farm" idea.

Much more influential is the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. The A.C.T.U. was established in 1937 by a group of Catholic laymen who were members of unions and were influenced by the Catholic Worker Movement. Three years later, in 1940, the A.C.T.U. became a national organization. It set up a National Council with two representatives from each local chapter (one of the two representatives must be the Chaplain of the chapter who is appointed by the Bishop of the area - this is one of the main reasons why we cannot say that the A.C.T.U. expresses Catholic lay opinion). The A.C.T.U. constantly emphasizes that its movement is not an attempt to form Catholic unions in America. This is the usual criticizm which is lodged against it. The A.C.T.U. describes itself as "an association of Catholic men and women who are members of A.F.L., C.I.O., and other bona fide unions. It does not believe in Catholic unions in America. It does not seek to divide workers on religious grounds or create 'a Catholic bloc.'"[7] It answers most of the accusations against it by pointing to the fact that "it has often supported a slate of non-Catholics against corrupt officials with Catholic affiliations."[8] The A.C.T.U. further answers that it has "enough confidence in the Protestant approach to labor, where it is genuinely Christian, that they are anxious to share the results of their experience with Protestant

groups getting a start in the labor field."[9]

The activities of the A.C.T.U. are important and we shall give brief descriptions of them. The first major activity is education. There have been over one hundred labor schools sponsered by the A.C.T.U. The schools emphasize the papal encyclicals and teach "labor ethics, labor relations law, trade union practices, parliamentary procedure and public speaking...."[10] In addition to its schools the A.C.T.U. has held many conferences in various cities which deal with "the moral and spiritual issues of the current labor situation."[11]

The A.C.T.U. also has an energetic press. Its official national paper is "The Labor Leader" which is published twice a month. It was first published in mimeograph form on January 3, 1938.[12] The paper gives a good survey of important labor news. Its tone is violently anti-communist and is particularly concerned with purging communism from trade unions. Similar in tone is the weekly publication of what seems to be the A.C.T.U's most active chapter - The Wage Earner of Detroit. The Wage Earner, of course, concerns itself with the very important industrial situation of the Detroit area. The Wage Earner's masthead describes itself as "A Paper for All Who Work for a Living" and it is dedicated "to the proposition that the teachings of Jesus Christ furnish the only sound basis of social reform." The Wage Earner carries a rather large amount of advertising.[13]

A third important activity of the A.C.T.U. is its legal protection activity conducted by its important adjunct the Catholic Labor Defense League. This League is composed of Catholic Lawyers who offer their services free of charge "to all workers of whatever creed." The League will represent a worker against management and even against a union, if the grievance is deemed a just one. The lawyers of the League will also "advise on fair contracts and help union individuals or union groups on interpretation of clauses of union contracts, union constitutions and by-laws."[14]

Early during the last war the Chicago Chapter of the A.C.T.U. folded. There was founded in 1943 a similar organization known as the Catholic Labor Alliance. "Basically, the Alliance's objective is to build a society founded on the principles of two famous encyclicals, On the Condition of Labor and On the Reconstruction of the Social Order."[15] The aims of the Alliance have been "~~opposed~~ APPROVED and blessed" by Cardinal Stritch and it too has an officially assigned Chaplain. The Alliance's official monthly resembles in format and even in expression, the New York liberal daily, PM. From its monthly periodical and its other statements, one receives the impression that it is much more willing and anxious to cooperate with like-minded non-Catholics than are the chapters of the A.C.T.U. and even welcome them to membership. The reasoning of the Alliance seems to be that the principles enunciated in the Papal Encyclicals "are recognized as sound by all those who apply to them an unprejudiced mind and who submit

their wills to the dictates of reason and the laws of God, there is, therefore, no reason for limiting membership to our co-religionists."[16] The Alliance recognizes and enunciates the grave dangers of racial and religious bigotry and condemns what it calls the academic stand-offish approach." It quotes Pope Pius Xl who said, "The Apostles of the working-men must themselves be working-men"[17]

Chapter II.

Who Expresses The Protestant Attitude Toward Modern Labor?

The question which we pose in our section heading could be answered by saying: almost anybody. It would be well nigh impossible to express a general Protestant attitude on anything, and the modern labor question is no exception to this general rule. A large number of Protestant groups have entered the field of social action and express themselves on such matters as labor problems. We find discontent and opposing points of views within certain groups. The Methodist Church for example has an official Social Creed which was adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Church in Kansas City on May 5, 1944. This statement is of the usual cautious variety with admonitions to both employer and employee to work "for the public good", and it issues a call for the protection of the rights of both groups.[1] But there is also a Methodist Federation for Social Action which is careful to put the word unofficial in parenthesis after its name. This Federation is probably more left-wing than any other religious group organized for social action. This example therefore even precludes the possibility of our speaking of a Methodist opinion on modern labor. There have been attempts however, to organize Protestant groups for unified expression of opinion and even of action. The most notable organization striving for Protestant unity is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (founded in 1908).

The Federal Council very often seemsto set the tone for other groups in their expressions concerning labor. It is certainly important enough to receive specific treatment in this study.

The Federal Council consists of twenty-five constituent bodies including such varied groups as the Friends and the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church of America. The groups all have in common the fact that they confess Jesus as "Divine Lord and Saviour" thus eliminating the Unitarian group. According to its most recent Biennial Report, "The Council is not an association of diverse and heterogeneous faiths but a fellowship of Churches which all confess Jesus Christ as 'Divine Lord and Saviour'. Beyond this central affirmation the Council does not go into defining points of doctrine."[2] The purpose of the Federal Council seems to be in what it calls a common Protestant Heritage. In contrast and almost in opposition to the Catholic Church, though it constantly affirms that it does not take a negative or "anti" position against other groups of Christians, it leaves the door wide open for expression of opinion and action by the laity. Referring again to the Bienniel Report of the Council we find the following attitude toward laymen.

> Protestantism, in all its forms represented in this Council, affords an enhanced appreciation of the common life and labor, affirming that lay life is potentially as sacred as the professionally religious. It thus emphasizes the principle of Christian stewardship in all earthly callings, implying that the worker on the farm, or the mother in the family may serve God as truly as the priest at the altar or the monk in his cell.[3]

The Council is quite pleased with itself when it is able to enroll the assistance of "Christian laymen and women of unquestioned competence in practical affairs," so that what is says is not only the voice of clergymen "whose experience has not usually qualified them for expertness in economic and political issues".[4] When the Federal Council speaks out for or against some phase of modern labor problems, we cannot say it is expressing the views of the 27,000,000 members of the various groups which make up its organization, but the very fact that it openly desires the support of the laymen, testifies to the fact that it expresses much more than the opinion of the Protestant clergy. The fact that its President, Charles P. Taft of Cincinnati, is a layman further substantiates this observation.

The Federal Council started the practice twenty-three years ago of issuing an annual Labor Sunday Message for the day before Labor Day. The sales distribution for the 1945 Message reached 97,000 copies (in 1946 it was 80,000)[5] The Catholics now issue, through the National Catholic Welfare Conference, a similar Labor Day message. The Central Conference of American Rabbis through its Social Justice Commission for some time issued a message of social import during the Jewish Holy Days (which usually fall not long after Labor Day).

The Federal Council is organized into many departments and many of these departments are administered by

full-time personnel. Its Department of the Church and Economic Life (which has gone through a whole series of name changes) is one of its most active. This is largely because economic matters, while highly controversial, can be discussed without encroachment on time-honored theological doctrines. All that needs to be said is that Christianity or Judaism or religion in general has long sanctioned a deep concern with the physical welfare of humanity and it is possible to proceed to the discussion of the economic problem at hand. Economic problems can become intricate and involved but not nearly so much as theological ones. Thus the Federal Council is able to be energetic and creative in the economic field with which our immediate concern with modern labor is indispensably linked. We shall have to emphasize the attractiveness of economics to religious groups a number of times before concluding our study.

The Federal Council's activity in the economic sphere is not confined to just the periodic publication of a pronouncement. It attempts to go beyond this. It publishes an extensive list of pamphlets and study-aids. The Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council publishes a bulletin entitled, "Information Service" which largely concerns itself with economic and social questions. This bulletin is well edited and quite informational e.g. in the number of June 28, 1947, the Taft-Hartley Bill is not only condemned, but analyzed according to the actual provisions of the law. But the

most notable of the Federal Council's attempt to advance beyond the pronouncement-stage is the convening of conferences to deal with the pressing social problems of the times. The National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life is an outstanding example of this activity.

The Conference on the Church and Economic Life met in Pittsburgh, Pa. on February 18-20, 1947. The Conference was attended by 343 delegates and some 27 Protestant denominators were represented. It is most interesting to note the occupational relationships of the delegates. Approximately two-thirds were laymen, and one-third were clergymen. Of the entire total about one-third were actively engaged in agriculture, business and labor. In this later group there were 29 from agriculture, 58 from business and 30 from labor.[6] A few of the famous names in attendance will show the diversity of the delegates. Eric Johnson, Episcopal laymen and president of the Motion Picture Producers Association; Kermit Ely, Brethren minister, and employee of the C.I.O; Nelson Crinkshank, Methodist minister, and employee of the A.F.L. At one point there was a full-fledged debate between Boris Shishkin, Greek Orthodox layman and Research Director of the A.F.L. and Noel Sargent, Episcopal Layman and a representative of the National Association of Manufacturers.

How important was this Conference? On the surface it was just another conference. Certainly it is safe to say that not one person's economic life was changed in any way by the many

spirited debates and the numerous subsequent reports, and commentaries. Liston Pope has termed this conference, "one of the most significant Church gatherings of this century."[7] Pope observes that this was "one of the liveliest gatherings in a generation..... There were very few speeches; every delegate was given a chance to have his say, in small discussion groups and in plenary sessions. As a result, the proceedings sometimes resembled Town Hall or Columbus Circle. But the delegates were reminded in quiet worship periods of their common Christian loyalties, and the very fervor of their debate over economic issues attested to the desperate importance of the questions with which they were dealing."

We can judge the conference in two tangible ways, (1) by examining the text of the report which the conference approved (2) by examining the subsequent reactions of the various factions of our economic system.

The official proclamation of the Conference steers a middle course. There was probably no other way to keep such opposing points of views from disassociating themselves from the entire Conference. The report is in three parts. The longest part is the one which deals with "Problems of Vital Concern." This section raises a great many problems simply by asking a great many questions one after the other without attempting to find answers or solutions. Francis W. McPeek has observed that "Pittsburgh used more question marks, and to better advantage, than any other Church conference of modern times."[8] Problem numbers 6 and 7 are good examples

because they deal specifically with our general theme.

6. Upon what basis can the Church concern itself constructively with the problems of wages, prices, and profits?

7. How can industrial relations be made more harmonius, and the Church use its influence most effectively toward this attainment?[9]

The remaining two parts deal with the responsibility and program for the Church in Economic Life. The emphasis seems to be on the "Christian" right of the Church to concern itself with social and economic problems. "The basic affirmations of the Christian faith," says the report, "give them the right and the duty to speak and to give its message to all economic organizations and systems."[10]

An interesting Conference sidelight that deals with our concern with labor is the omission of any reference to the "closed shop." From the literature about the Conference we learn that this issue was injected into the discussions many times. HOMER Jack, delegate to the Conference from the Church Federation of Greater Chicago reports this interesting exchange of verbal blows:

"I don't know of anything more un-Christian than the closed shop", shouted W.L. Goldston, Houston geologist and Methodist layman. Rev. Armand Guerrero, Chicago clergyman replied, "I belong to a closed shop. I am a Methodist. Not anybody can preach in a Methodist Church." [11]

Francis W. McPeek, Industrial Relations Secretary of the Council for Social Action (Congregationalist), reports that there were so many direct and indirect attempts to

maneuver the Conference into condemning the "closed shop" [redacted] that it almost got to be a habit with the delegates to reject all such proprosals. A delegate sitting next to Mr. McPeek leaned over and whispered to him, "We certainly have some imaginative minds around here. I had no idea the closed shop could be dragged into so many different subjects."[12]

The Conference seems to have been very well covered by the regular press as well as the religious press. The general press reaction was almost what could be expected. The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph (Hearst) headlined its story on one of the pre-convention memoranda with the words "Mystery Document Preaching Socialism Puzzles Church Parley." The text of the article states that the memorandum contained "numerous veiled thrusts at the free enterprise system."[13] David Lawrence, conservative columnist and publisher, wrote a critical piece about the Conference on March 28, 1947. The very title of Mr. Lawrence's commentary is enough to give us the tenor of his views -"Mixing Religion and Politics." Mr. James O. Supple, Church Editor of the Chicago Sun called the Conference a tragedy stating that the delegates were divided into "irreconcilable camps of labor and management. In no practical sense were they united as fellow sons of Christ." Dr. Willard Uphaus, of the National Religion and Labor Foundation, liked some of the things about the conference but for the most part he was annoyed by "the timeworn stereotypes of N.A.M. economists who plagued the conference." Interestingly enough, both the C.I.O. and the N.A.M. seemed to have

been pleased with the Conference. Writing in the C,I.O. News, Charles C. Webber who is a Methodist Labor Chaplain and president of Virginia's C.I.O unions, observed that this "was one of the most significant gatherings of Church people ever held in the U.S." Mr. Webber was proud of the significant role which labor leaders played throughout the discussions.[14] The N.A.M in its publication, "Understanding" a quarterly ostensibly "devoted to cooperation between clergymen and businessmen," but obviously an attempt to win over the Clergyman to the N.A.M point of view could find little to criticize adversely, and headed its editorial about the Conference with the words, "A Job Well Done."[15]

D.E. Thomas[16] conducted a Questionaire Study of 193 (54%) of the 360 delegates and consultants to the Pittsburgh Conference. The results while certainly not conclusive, are worthy of note. The question was asked "Should the Wagner Act be amended in any way?" 68% of the total answered "yes", Business answered 94% "yes", Labor answered only 12% "yes", and the Clergy was close to the average with 64% "yes". 77% of everyone polled felt that the Conference was truly representative of Protestantism in the United States - a number of businessmen thought it was not, but only one labor representative was so inclined. Mr. Thomas sums up the various occupations by arranging them from one extreme to the other. Note that the Clergy stands about in the middle of the group.

> In terms of the answers already mentioned and of others concerning union security issues, the occupational groups fall most usually into the following pattern

between the two extremes: Business, Agriculture, Professions, Teachers, Public Officials, Clergy, Cooperators, Homemakers, and Labor.17

Why was it necessary to devote so much space to the Pittsburgh Conference? One reason is that it is perhaps the best representative of a great many others which religious groups either iniatiated or in which they participated. But a more important reason is to point out that such conferences are usually ends within themselves and lead nowhere. They create some excitement but little action. They may be compared to a political party's election year platform which tries to please everybody and usually has a few surprisingly liberal planks to woo the vote of the masses of the people. Religious groups are more cautious. Even the Federal Council of Churches which exibited not a small amount of bravery in convening the Conference on the Church and Economic Life was careful to state in a forward to the official report of the Conference that "In its Report the Conference speaks only for itself. It in no way binds or represents either the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America or the appointing Church bodies."[18] We must therefore assume that a temporary conference of a few days duration can speak only for itself and, strangely enough, not for the participating religious groups.

As we stated in our Plan of Presentation it was not possible to cover every Protestant group which ever said anything about labor, but the organization of many Protestant denominations is such that our task is somewhat simplified. In comparatively recent times, Protestant denominations (and also

the Jewish groups as we shall see in our next section) have set up special groups to deal with social problems. Thus, to cite a few examples, the Evangelical and Reformed Church has a Commission on Christian Social Action, the Congregational Christian Churches have a Council for Social Action, The United Church of Canada has a Board of Evangelism and Social Service, and there is also a Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice. It is largely from such groups that Protestant attitudes on modern labor can be found. It seems to be a valid generalization that those Protestant denominations which have set up separate branches to deal with social problems tend to be more sympathetic with organized labor and more willing to support specific items with which labor is concerned.

These organized religious groups have cooperated with an overall agency known as The United Christian Council For Democracy.[19] The writer attempted to correspond with this organization to determine its present status but was not able to obtain a reply. In 1945 an elaborate Labor Day Message was issued by this organization and we shall have occasion to refer to this message in another chapter. At that time the U.C.C.D. listed six cooperating agencies. In a later publication of the U.C.C.D. (exact date is uncertain) the name of the Presbyterian Fellowship for Social Action is not listed. The five remaining organizations are perhaps the most energetic of all groups which help form the Protestant attitude toward the modern labor movement. These five groups may be said to comprise the "left-wing" of modern Protestant

social thought. We record their names and latest available addresses for the purpose of giving to our study as much completeness as possible.

1. Evangelical and Reformed Council for Social Reconstruction
   317 E. 187th St. Bronx 57, New York
2. Methodist Federation for Social Action (unofficial)
   150 Fifth Ave. New York 11, N.Y.
3. Church League for Industrail Democracy (Episcopal)
   155 Washington St. New York 6, N.Y.
4. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice
   25 Beacon St., Boston 8, Mass.
5. Rauschenbusch Fellowship of Baptists
   557 South 78th St. West Allis 14, Wis.

One of the most popular means of discovering attitudes today is by means of scientific sampling and polling. We shall soon refer to a study made of the attitude of American Rabbis, but we must now refer to a study made of the social action engaged in by American Protestant denominations. This study was conducted by Professor Judson T. Landis of Michigan State College. The study was published in the May issue of the American Journal of Sociology. It was summarized by Information Service.[20] Dr. Landis sent questionnaires to the offices of 240 religious bodies in the United States. He divided Church bodies in four groups according to size. First group: those with 1,000,000 or more members, Second group: those with 100,000 to 1,000,000 members. Fourth group: those less than 5,000 members. As it turned out size is an important factor in determing interest in social problems. This was most clearly brought out in our field of interest. The two larger groups listed labor relations among those activities which require major emphasis. The interest in labor

relations diminished with the size of the group. The smaller groups, of course, included a great many so called fundamentalists who consider social action superfluous in religious practice.

Dr. Landis discovered a number of other interesting items. For example he felt that his study revealed that the greatest amount of cooperation in social action comes from youth and women's groups with ministers following and laymen and state denominational leaders making up the most reluctant group. Dr. Landis, in studying budget and personnel of religious social action groups, concludes that most of the full-time executive offices date from 1930 or later, and observes that the "favorable attitude toward social action is one which has emerged rather recently."[21]

Dr. Landis's summary on the present state of Protestant social action indicates that "...although the churches are interested in social action, their programs are still embryonic and have not developed into a potent force in modern society. Much social action is still placed in the hands of committees who, at state and national conferences, take the occasion to formulate and publicize resolutions on the social evils of the day."[22]

Chapter III.

Who Expresses The Jewish Attitude Toward Modern Labor.

When we express a Modern Jewish Attitude toward labor we can never ignore the Central Conference of American Rabbis which throughout the larger part of its existence has expressed concern for the laboring man. The Pittsburgh Platform of 1885 set the stage for this activity when it stated that it was Judaism's concern to deal with "the problems presented by the contrasts and evils of the present organization of socity."[1] As early as 1909 the CCAR listened to a lengthy paper delivered by Rabbi Solomon Foster on "The Workingman and the Synagogue."[2] This paper was bitterly attacked by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise on the floor of the conference for its "platitudinous pomposity" and its refusal to deal in specific terms. Rabbi Wise stated emphatically that it was the duty of the Rabbi and the Synagogue to deal with specific problems. He sighted a case where he himself was able to intercede successfully in behalf of a group of exploited bakery workers in New York. In just a few years after this event the CCAR was well embarked upon its program of social justice.

By 1915, the Conference's Commission on Social Justice presented an elaborate report dealing with such definite and pressing issues as Child Labor and the rights of workers to organize. There was a minority report also at the time, and both reports were referred back to the Commission.[3] By 1918,

the CCAR adopted a "declaration of principles,"[4] which in the years following was emended and enlarged to make up the social justice platform of the CCAR. In every platform adopted by the Conference there was in evidence a deep concern for labor. In 1921 it was reported that steps were taken to publicize the Social Justice Platform by reprinting and distributing it and by placing it before the public in full-page advertisements in such national magazines as the The New Republic, The Survey and The American Hebrew (two years later in 1923 a page in the Atlantic Monthly was used for this purpose)[5] Indeed it can easily be observed that social justice (especially in its labor movement phase) became the dominant issue with which the CCAR concerned itself. It listened to papers on the subject and engaged in heated debates. It made laudable efforts to cooperate with Catholic and Protestant groups for united action. We shall discuss this activity in our next chapter. We are confining our study to religious groups but it should not be left unsaid that it was very often one or two dominant religious personalities whose penetrating thought and hard work prompted a religious group to take significant action. An example of such a personality was Rabbi Edward Israel of Baltimore. One need only glance through a file of the "Bulletin of the Commission on Social Justice of the CCAR," which was issued by Rabbi Israel to see the great diversity of activity into which he directed the CCAR's Social Justice Commission.

The Social Justice Commission is now merged with another commission and known as the Commission on Justice and Peace. It still speaks out forthrightly upon labor and other social questions, but the specific interest and enthusiastic activity of the late twenties and early thirties appears to be lacking. This may to some extent be attributed to lack of funds to set up a full-time office to carry out this activity. In the spring of 1947 not long after the Pittsburgh Conference on the Church and Economic Life, the CCAR convened in Chicago an Institute on Judaism, Management and Labor.[6] This followed largely the pattern of the Federal Council's Institute but its Jewish participants naturally approached the same problems from a Jewish point of view. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations cooperated in the conduct of this Institue. The Institute did pass a specific resolution opposing the Hartley Bill.

When we discuss the CCAR we are speaking only of the Reform Rabbis, we have yet to speak about the Rabbis of Conservative and Orthodox Judaism. But before we do this, we have an excellent opportunity to compare the attitude of the Jewish clergy and the Jewish laymen by following up our discussion of the CCAR with a discussion of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations - the laymen's branch of Reform Judaism.

It can definitely be stated that the laymen who compose the U.A.H.C. have resisted any significant social commitment.

In 1923 it was reported to the Central Conference that at a biennial meeting of the U.A.H.C. in New York, one of the Rabbis could not even get a resume of the Conference's social program reported out of committee.[7] Had it not been for the pressure exerted by the Rabbinical groups plus a meagre handful of laymen the Union might not even have a Social Justice Commission. Rabbi Israel states the matter succinctly for us. "The Reform Jewish lay group has not been conspicuous for its championship of socialized religion. However aided and abetted by a few rabbis, some outstanding lay leaders have fought the battle in the U.A.H.C. and we now have an official Social Justice body - albeit with extremely limited powers."[8] Thus again we must be cautious. Not only is it impossible to speak of present day Judaism's attitude toward modern labor, but when we speak of the comparatively small Reform Jewish group, we must be careful to state whether the Reform Rabbis or the Reform laymen are speaking.

In order to be completely fair to the Reform Jewish laymen we mention two events which occurred approximately twenty years apart. The first event took place in Cleveland Ohio on January 19, 1927.[9] A meeting at which, after much debate, the U.A.H.C. adopted a social justice platform. It did not adopt the proposed preamble to the presented platform - a preamble whose "striking feature....was its vigorous espousal of trade unionism."[10] It did not adopt point six of the seven-point program which was presented to it. Point six stated

that, "It was the duty of the synagogue to assure the working man of a welcome to its membership and administration."[11] As early as 1908, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ unanimously adopted a resolution stating that, "In its councils of direction, workingmen be welcomed and the wisdom of the poor be more freely recognized."[12] Over twenty years after the Cleveland Conference the problem of laymen activity in the social action field was again discussed. This time a joint commission of both the Rabbinical group and the laymen's group was formed, "Because the duty of building God's Kingdom of Justice and Peace on this earth is a responsibility both of the Jewish laity and rabbinate."[13] A ten-point program was adopted. It is too early to even predict whether or not any implementation will take place.

It was not until May of 1932 that the Rabbinical Assembly of America listened to the first report of its Social Justice Committee which stated that its appointment was "a welcome though belated recognition of the fact that it behooves an assembly of Rabbis to face and consider the social and economic problems of our time."[14] The committee's chairman, Rabbi Israel Goldstein honestly observed that "if this report conveys the impression that nothing substantial has been accomplished by the newly-appointed Committee on Social Justice, it is the impression which is intended."[15] But this late and slow start did not keep the R.A.A. from proceeding to the energetic pursuance of the pattern which had already been set by the social action groups of other religious

organizations. Almost as soon as it was organized the R.A.A.'s Social Justice Committee was invited by Mr. James Meyers of the Federal Council of Churches to attempt to forestall a strike in the ladies' garment industry. Many believe that the Rabbinical Assembly's programs and pronouncements are more forthright and to the point than any-other Jewish group.[15]

The Orthodox Jewish group until very recently did not officially concern itself with labor or other social problems. It is interesting to note that when the Rabbinical Council of America decided to deal with general social problems it did so in the same manner as the non-Orthodox groups which it usually so bitterly opposes. In April of 1947 it established a Social Justice Commission[16] and in September of the same year it issued during the Labor Day season a Jewish New Year Message on Social Justice with a strong emphasis on the "New forms of pressure (which) have been applied to the gains which laboring...painfully achieved after years of struggle."[17] Other Orthodox viewpoints have been difficult to trace. It is a fact that in 1933 the Union of Orthodox Congregations established a SOCIAL Justice Committee, but it does not appear to have been active or articulate.[18]

The social justice groups of the Conservative and Reform Rabbis have, on occasion, made determined efforts toward cooperation and united expression. In 1939 a plan was devised whereby four methods of cooperation were approved. (1) whenever contacted by a national organization for cooperation

the rabbinical group contacted shall communicate with the group which has not been contacted with the view to a choice of one representative to represent both groups, (2) joint pronouncements should be issued "as far as possible", (3) joint commissions of study should be set up "whenever possible" (4) Institutes for the study of social problems should be set up "wherever possible."[19] In 1940 a plan was worked out to set up a full-time social justice office with both groups sharing the expense ($5,000 from CCAR and $1,000 for the RAA) and decisions to be made equally by both groups.[20] In presenting this matter before the Rabbinical assembly in 1940, its Social Justice Committee pointedly observed that "for a long time we have also recognized an almost complete identity of object and method with the Social Justice Commission of the CCAR."[21] In 1941, however, Rabbi Edward Israel reported that "we have abandoned for the present the idea of the co-operative venture of a full-time Social Justice Secretary, because of the inability of the Rabbinical assembly to participate in the financial responsibility involved therein and our own limitation of funds due to the large expenditures by our conference in the field of refugee relief work."[22] Though to this day there is still a great deal of expressed Rabbinical desire for a full-time social justice office, nothing definite has been accomplished, and American Jewry is still guilty of the accusation, hurled against it in 1932 by Rabbi Israel "that American Jewry is today the only major religious group in this land which does not maintain a regularly

constituted full or even part-time department which devotes itself to the task of interpreting the social heritage of religion in terms of our modern age."[23]

From much that has been said in answer to the question: who expresses the Jewish attitude toward modern labor, it can easily be seen that whenever we have a Jewish expression it usually comes from the Rabbis and their respective Rabbinical organizations. It will therefore be interesting and in order to refer to an interesting study of the attitudes and beliefs of Rabbis as they refer to our subject. This survey was conducted and published by Rabbi Joseph Zeitlin who is at present the Chairman of the Rabbinical Assembly's Social Justice Committee.[24] Rabbi Zeitlin polled several hundred rabbis and theological students of the three wings of American Jewry. The data which these men furnished were scientifically studied by Rabbi Zeitlin. The value of Zeitlin's study is expressed in the preface by Professor F. Ernest Johnson who makes a point about pronouncements to which we have already alluded.

> The issuance of corporate pronouncements by religious bodies of which there have been many in recent years, is a fruitful method of influencing public opinion. But it happens not infrequently that such declarations represent quickly formed judgements by not very durable majorities. They need the corrective of considered private judgements formed without group pressure. It might be worth while for religious bodies - and secular groups as well - to make provision for periodic opinion studies among their members both for guidance in a group action and as a means of education with reference to emerging issues.25

What did Rabbi Zeitlin's study reveal about the Jewish attitude toward modern labor? Majorities of all

three groups believe that "in the issues between labor and capital the spirit of Judaism should impel one, generally, to identify himself with labor." Breaking this point down into the three groups, we find that a large majority of Conservative rabbis and a bare majority of Orthodox rabbis favor the above proposition - Reform seems to be between the other two.[26] The Conservative and Reform groups agree practically unanimously that trade unions do more good than harm in our industrial progress. 78% of the Orthodox group accept this point of view. Generally speaking, Zeitlin believes that the results of these studies show that Conservative rabbis are a little more pro-labor than Reform rabbis with the Orthodox group considerably behind both of them. According to the responses received, Zeitlin has set up his average percentages as follows.[27]

Pro-labor sympathies:

Reform 69% Conservative 75%

Orthodox 55% Total Group 69%

Anti-labor or no labor bias:

Reform 13% Conservative 10%

Orthodox 10% Total Group 12%

Mention should be made of the National Council of Jewish Women - which, while not exactly a religious group such as those we are studying, is an organization of over 65,000 women of the Jewish faith. It avowed purpose is to "offer its membership a program of education in social

legislation....."[28]

The National Council has a Committee on Education and Social Action which is quite active. This committee issues a well-edited action bulletin called "Spotlight," and speaks out on such issues as the closed shop which most religious groups seem carefully to avoid.[29]

Chapter IV.

Inter-Group Activity

A common criticizm of the attitude of a religious group toward modern labor is that it never leaves the pronouncement stage. It is the old story of too many words and not enough action. It would seem logical that when the three major groups would unite together and approach the field of modern labor the result would be a broad vague statement with which no one could disagree. Strangely enough, the record of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish unity in the field of labor is to a large extent, NOT one of vague pronouncement, but of energetic action. Let us cite some outstanding examples.

In 1926-27 the Federal Council, the Catholic Welfare Conference, and the CCAR Social Justice Commission conducted an investigation of a strike on the Western Maryland Railroad.[1] In reality, this seemed to be more of a lockout than a strike. The company was making what seems to be an obvious attempt to break the union and cut wages drastically. The company's superannuated employees were called back to work as strike-breakers under penalty of losing their pensions. Three capable men represented each of the three major faiths. They were Prof. F. Ernest Johnson, Father R.A. McGowan and Rabbi Edward L. Israel. The report was not the hurried slip-shod type such as that which might have been drawn up late at night in a smoke-filled hotel room in order that it might be presented the following morning. The three religionists conducted a scientific

investigation calling in experts to examine items in which the investigators did not consider themselves competent. The result of the report was in favor of labor - but it was an honest and an accurate decision. The Railroad Company went to work in an attempt to discredit the report which had been greeted by the Baltimore Sun with the opinion that "Scarcely less noteworthy than the conclusions of the report is the notable religious co-operation which helps to make its findings important and impressive".[2] The company used the old bromide that religion had no place in economic issues. It also made an attempt to have Rabbi Israel's congregational board halt his activities. The Company called the report a "post mortem" because the railroad was in full operation (enough strike-breakers had been found to run this small line). All of the Company's activity was to no avail. The powerful voice of religion was for once, heard loudly and clearly in a specific case of labor injustice. And let it be noted again that this voice was Protestant, Catholic and Jewish.

Another example. In the year 1919, before any religious organization had the necessary experience and technique in the field of labor unrest, the I.W.W. had been active in its effort to organize the lumber men in the states of Washington and Oregon. During the American Legion Armistice Day celebration in Centralia, Washington violence flared resulting in murder and even one lynching. It seems that the I.W.W.'s started the shooting but there also was considerable

conflict of testimony on "whether the I.W.W.'s started the shooting before or after the Legionaires rushed the hall."[3] The trial of the members of the I.W.W. was most peculiar. Armed members of the American Legion were paid spectators, and needless to say many of the I.W.W.'s were convicted and sentenced. It was not until several years later that religious groups began to take steps to protect this miscarriage of justice. In September of 1929, the Bulletin of the CCAR'S Social Justice Commission announced that Mr. Robert P. Scripp, head of the Scripps-Howard newspaper, had contributed $500.00 so that an investigation of the Centralia case could take place.[4] In January of 1930 it was announced that a trained investigator Mr. De Witt Wycoff of New York City, was engaged to conduct the investigation.[5] At the end of the year 1930, the Centralia Report[6] was issued jointly by the three representatives of the major religious groups - "after months of investigation and deliberation." The report called for the release of the imprisoned men and stated that the investigation showed that "the crime was not premeditated and was committed under decidely extenuating circumstances, in the light of which the sentences seem very severe." The report was greeted with favorable editorial comment by the Scripps-Howard newspapers and the New Republic and the Nation. And to show that religious groups must contend with the usual accusation of radicalism when they enter the field of labor and social justice, an interview with an American Legion commander in the Portland Oregonian produced

just such an accusation of radicalism hurled against a report in the formulation of which there was active and official Catholic participation. The imprisoned I.W.W.'s who had not died in prison, were eventually released.

Let us turn to the South for a third example. The South, of course, always provides us with additional problems and considerations. Our example concerns itself with the textile mills located primarily in North Carolina. It was the usual case of miserable pay and long hours of work in an area that was in the midst of an industrial revolution. It was almost impossible for the three national bodies to intervene directly. It was the general belief that the leadership in this situation had to come from within. "Sectional conditions" opined the CCAR'S Social Justice Bulletin "make it especially mandatory that the labor leadership of the South be Southern"[8] Nothing was done by the national religious groups for some time. As a matter of fact the Scripps-Howard newspapers (which at this time seems to have been very much in favor of religious intervention into social issues) even condemned the Churches for their inactivity in an editorial entitled "They Ask for Bread"[9] After several meetings a joint statement was issued by the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups. The statement called for a Federal investigation after describing the existing deplorable conditions. The following two paragraphs of the reports are especially to be noted for their support of organized labor and the direct comments about wages and hours.

"The unrest in the textile industry and the tragedies in some mill centers have arisen not only from the economic confusion in the industry as a whole, but also from faulty conditions in the relations between employers and employees. That the hours of labor are longer and the wages lower than in most industries and are below the standard which the pulbic conscience deems right, it is generally acknowledged.

Employers in the industry, with few exceptions have failed to recognize organizations of labor and to show a willingness to allow labor that freedom to organize for which the social programs of our three bodies stand. Manufacturers who organize associations of their own and act collectively, often through paid representatives, have no sound ethical basis for objecting to efforts of workers to organize for their own welfare and to act through representatives of their own choosing."10

We have cited three examples each of a different nature. There are a great many other cases of cooperation and activity which transcend the strict denominational line. These cases involve hosiery workers, pullman porters and coal miners, etc. Rabbi Israel speaks of a "large filing cabinet" which is full of the records of such cooperation.[11] To the best of the present writer's knowledge no complete record or evaluation of this activity has ever been made. Perhaps the most notable achievement of cooperative religious action was in the abolition of the twelve hour day in the steel industry. This action has been termed "One of the most striking achievements in the history of organized religion in America."[12] Discussion of this important struggle will be more in order when we come to a consideration of the general struggle for shorter hours in our next chapter.

Since the advent of the New Deal and the Wagner Act there has been little concrete activity on the part of the

three major religious groups. This may be largely attributed to the setting up of Federal machinery to deal with problems which in years past did not concern the government. If the Taft-Hartley Bill represents a trend in the opposite direction, the old procedures might once again become necessary. This is not to say that there are not yet large areas in the labor field (e.g. migrant workers)[13] which are almost as dependable as they have been for many years past. This point will also be enlarged upon in the pages that are to follow. There is still an occasional joint statement from the three large religious groups, but these seem to deal more in generalities and broad principles than with specific instances. The latest of such statements was released on October 16, 1946 and is called "Pattern for Economic Justice, A Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Declaration." It is interesting to note that this declaration seems to avoid the use of the term "union" and speaks of "free organizations of worker, farmers, employers and professional people" - all in the same connection. It is also to be noted that while the Federal Council is still the Protestant representative and the Catholic Welfare Conference, the Catholic representative, the Jewish representative is the Synagogue Council of America (a council of Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative Jewish Rabbinical and Congregational organizations).[14]

We now have to consider a religious organization which is concerned specifically with labor problems, but one that

is not a coalition of denominational agencies. The National Religion and Labor Foundation[15] was founded in 1932 by Jerome Davis who was at that time professor of social ethics at Yale Divinity School. The R.L.F., as it is commonly called is composed of union leaders, and for the most part, Protestant and Jewish clergymen and theological students. Catholics seem to be representated only by those union leaders who happen to be Catholic. The Executive Director of R.L.F. is Willard Uphaus who individually seems to inaugurate everything that the R.L.F. does or says. Jesse Caviller has written that "Willard Uphaus probably knows more local situations where ministers are active on labor questions and rudiments of Church-labor councils are established than anyone else in the United States, with the possible exception of James Myers, Industrial Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches. He and Mr. Myers also know more labor leaders who are themselves religious or interested in cooperating with the Churches than anyone else in America."[16]

The Religion and Labor Foundation operates through city Religion and Labor Councils which have been set up in various cities of the United States and Canada. It also has locals in various theological seminaries. It conducts seminars and conferences, urges political action, and issues a monthly bulletin called "Economic Justice." The R.L.F. recently held its Fifteenth Anniversary Conference in Pittsburgh (January 12-14, 1947).[17] This conference listed about 150 delegates - a

large number of which were residents of the city of Pittsburgh, and another large group consisted of the old stand-bys whose names constantly appear wherever Religion and Labor strives to meet and agree. The Conference issued an 8-point indictment of the Taft-Hartley Bill. Dr. Uphaus has kept the R.L.F. in the labor spotlight, but the organization seems to be quite confused as to what job religion has to perform in the labor movement and the basis of Church and Labor cooperation. The R.L.F. seems to have considerable financial difficulties. In the last few years a large portion of its income has come from organized labor. The Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith has also contributed to the R.L.F.

During the hectic presidential campaign of 1944, labor assumed a new role. This was largely attained through the vigorous activity of the C.I.O. Political Action. There was organized at that time an organization of citizens, not necessarily union members known as the National Citizens -P.A.C. This latter organization had an interesting adjunct known as the Religious Associates of the N.C.-P.A.C. For awhile it appeared that the Religious Associates, under the capable direction of Dwight J. Bradley, would become an important factor in moulding favorable attitudes with respect to Religion and Labor. About this time the C.I.O. issued its well-edited pamphlet "Labor and Religion" urging cooperation between the two and citing some of the record of religious groups' expressions toward the labor movement.[18] When the N.C.-P.A.C.

was merged into the Progressive Citizens of America, the Religious Associates of the N.C. - P.A.C. ceased to exist.

Perhaps the most important attempt to influence religion's attitude toward labor through education is "The Institute on Industrial Relations for Church Leadership" sponsored every summer by the famous University of Wisconsin School for Workers. These institutes are held in cooperation with the National Religion and Labor Foundation. This institute has been held for the past five years for Church leaders and seminary students and has two objectives.

One is to more fully acquaint Church leaders with the problems and needs of workers through systematic study of typical industrial situations and through day to day living relations with workers where together they can learn from one another.

The other objective is to bring home to workers the fact that the Church and its aware leadership are allies in serving not only their physical but their spiritual needs.19

CHAPTER V

LABOR'S SPHERES OF INTEREST AND WHAT RELIGIOUS GROUPS SAY ABOUT THEM

Pronouncements do not usually lead to practical action. But whenever a religious group issues a pronouncement on some issue it reflects, to a large degree, the thinking of a great many members of that group. A pronouncement may also reflect the force of a dominant social issue upon a religious organization. Sometimes the religious group feels this force first or even anticipates it, but there are times when religious groups are among the last to feel the impact. Nevertheless, we are concerned with the attitudes of religious groups, and pronouncements provide us with the one tangible means of study and comparison. Any religious group, as soon as it attains even the rudiments of organization, issues some sort of a statement, explaining its point of view and its goals. The basis of this chapter will be therefore the many pronouncements which have been issued by a great variety of religious groups and which have been studied by the present writer.

In 1923, Dr. Abraham Cronbach delivered a paper before the Central Conference of American Rabbis entitled "The Social Creeds of the Churches -- A Comparative Study."[1] This paper was, in effect, a searching analysis of forty-two different statements of religious bodies and dealt with all the social problems which these statements discussed. Our topic was

discussed mainly under Theme No. 1 which had the general title of "Industry." It is not our present purpose to bring Dr. Cronbach's study up to date (though such a task would indeed be a worthy and beneficial one). We are at present attempting to portray an attitude and our purpose is not to study the pronouncements per se. What then will be the approach used in this chapter?

In our bibliography under the heading "Pronouncements" there will be a complete list of all the statements which we have studied and which we found to be pertinent in the preparation of this chapter. For the most part, the latest information available was used. Some information is as recent as 1947. Occasionally an older pronouncement is referred to -- usually to make some historical point. Our purpose is to use those spheres of interest with which the labor movement is mostly concerned, and to state under each sphere of interest examples of the religious attitudes toward it on the basis of the pronouncements studied. Wherever possible we shall point out what might be called a typical religious attitude toward a labor problem.

1. The Right to Organize

Labor's long hard fight to gain recognition of its own duly constituted organizations has been a long uphill battle. Only a few staunch conservatives may still deny the rights of the Unions to exist. Religious groups, not separately but together with everyone else, have been forced to take cognizance of labor's vigorous battle for recognition. It must be said, however, that by their very nature religious groups could speak out for the

organization of labor on the basis of eliminating what, in the eyes of their religious tradition, they considered grave injustices. That labor organizations did not receive this religious endorsement in their early difficult struggles is well known. It is now most safe to generalize and say that there is no religious group, regardless of who may control it, which would deliberately oppose the right of labor to organize. It might also be true, however, that some religious groups take the easy way out and merely affirm the right of labor to organize without stating the implications of the conclusions which organization brings with it.

At any rate, religious groups for a great many years have been affirming labor's right to organize and are still doing so in almost every statement issued. The Lutheran Church, through its Board of Social Missions, says that "while it is the duty of every man to work" it is also "the right of every man to organize for collective bargaining through representatives of his own free choice."[2] Many groups are careful to include employers' rights with the rights of employees. The sympathy undoubtedly usually rests with the workers, but it might well be felt that a reference to the employers may forestall a great deal of adverse criticism. Thus, for example, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church proclaims "the right of employees and employers alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action, the obligation of both to co-operate for the commonweal."[3] The Catholics can point with pride to Pope Leo who, in 1891, called for the multiplication of "working men's

associations."[4] The Jewish groups also, from the time that their interest in Social Justice began, have proclaimed the right of labor to organize. The Conservative Rabbis have expressed the belief that "the denial of the rights of workers to organize and form group associations so that they may be treated as economic equals with their employers is tantamount to a curtailment of human freedom. For that reason we favor the unionization of all who labor."[5]

2. How Should Labor's Needs and Desires Be Obtained?

The methods that labor prefers to use or that labor is sometimes forced to use are quite well-known. Collective bargaining has become the term that is applied to the most desirable type of labor-management negotiation. The strike is a more potent and voluble means by which a labor organization seeks to gain its goal. Most labor unions consider the closed shop as a desirable, and even necessary, prerequisite to fruitful labor-management relations. It can easily be seen that collective bargaining, and the peaceful relations which it implies, is most appealing to religious groups. Getting together, sitting down, and talking things over seems to be the tone of the procedure recommended in most religious pronouncements. The Protestant Episcopal Church calls upon employer and employee to take into collective bargaining the "Christian standard of the recognition of God's Fatherhood and the Christ attitude of fair play -- give and take -- patience and courage, all on the basis of loving thy neighbor as thyself."[6] Collective bargaining, as

we have seen from references above is usually associated with the right to organize. The Federal Council's Social Creed makes this association.[7] The Bishops of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in what was their "last major or full dress statement on the labor problem"[8] links the two matters very aptly. "To protect its (labor) rights," say the Bishops, "it must be free to bargain collectively through its own chosen representatives. If labor when unorganized is dissatisfied, the only alternative is to cease work and thus undergo the great hardships which follow unemployment."[9] Like the right to organize, religious groups urge the use of collective bargaining in almost all of their statements.

When it comes to outright sanctioning of the right of labor to strike, religious groups become cautious in their statements. Their words become a little vague and they either leave much to be inferred or else avoid the subject entirely. The Methodist Federation for Social Action (unofficial) is of course one of those groups which grant organized labor the right to strike. Says the M.F.S.A.: "Essential to the exercise of this right to organize at the present time, we believe is the right to strike, to picket peacefully and engage in political action."[10] The liberal Congregational Christian Churches recognize labor's right to strike, but caution, however, that "the economic power which management possesses must be recognized as qualified rights and should not be used to threaten the democratic process or the public safety and welfare."[11] The Unitarians speak specifically of labor's strike

weapon in their social action program. "The right to join organizations of their own choosing and to bargain collectively should in no instance be denied to any persons, nor should the responsibility that organized power implies be evaded by an organized group or so construed as to threaten democratic processes. This means recognizing the right to strike."[12]

The closed shop issue is one that religious groups avoid even more so than labor's right to strike. They don't condemn the closed shop, but they don't support or defend it either. Two Jewish groups have, however, approached the closed shop issue.. The C.C.A.R. says that it believes that "issues such as the closed shop and industry wide bargaining should be decided not by legislation but through collective bargaining between management and labor."[13] In a program publication the Council of Jewish Women has said that "the closed shop and industry wide bargaining are legitimate ends of collective bargaining."[14]

Another weapon which the Unions have employed in comparatively recent times is political action. Only recently the A.F. of L. has followed the lead of the C.I.O., and has established an energetic organization for political activity. Religious groups, too, have come to employ the methods of political agitation. The elaborate 1945 Labor Day message of the United Christian Council for Democracy contained a comprehensive resumé of the voting records of every member of Congress (compiled by the C.I.O.). This was accompanied by an "Action Bulletin" listing urgent legislation that demanded

immediate action.[15] Many other religious groups follow this type of procedure; we would not, therefore, expect them to criticize labor for a similar procedure.

3. Reduction Of Hours

Our plan in this chapter is to present the attitude of religious groups toward labor, as expressed in their various pronouncements and statements. In discussing what religious groups think about the number of hours a man should work, we must deviate from our plan to tell the story of a real contribution made by religious groups in this very important sphere of labor interest. The contribution was a combined Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish endeavor and it occurred in what is perhaps the most powerful of America's great industries.[16]

As early as 1911, a volume was published by John A. Fitch on the steel workers. This led Charles M. Cabot of Boston to ask for an investigation of labor conditions within the plants of the United States Steel Corporation of which he was a stockholder. A committee of stockholders reported back the following year that there would be "an eventual abolition of the twelve-hour day", and expressed the belief that this abolition would lead "toward increasing efficiency and resourcefulness of the working population, and for that reason bring benefit to both employer and employed."[17] Another year elapsed and the Finance Committee of U.S.S. reported that it would be unwise for United States Steel to abolish the twelve-hour day unless its competitors would also do so. There the matter stood when the 1919 steel strike occurred. This strike involved

three hundred thousand workers, and was characterized by James Myers as having "the familiar features of employment by the companies of labor spies and strike-breaking agencies, the suppression of civil liberties, charges and counter-charges, the bitterness, suffering, and violence which usually inhere in industrial warfare."[18] Among the principal demands of labor in this strike was the establishment of an eight-hour working day. We must add that, even though a committee of the U.S. Senate investigated the striking and characterized the working of men for long hours an "un-American policy", the strike was lost and the men went back to the old twelve-hour shift.

Before the close of the year 1919, the Interchurch World Movement conducted a thorough investigation of the strike, and in a thorough and carefully-worded three hundred-page report, pointed out that the strike was justified because the demands of the workers were just. A five hundred-page answer entitled "An Analysis of the Interchurch World Movement Report" was issued, stamping (as might be expected) the report as radical propaganda.[19] This fallacious answer was widely distributed by Judge Gary, the acknowledged leader of the steel industry at that time. We cannot go into all the details of the situation. After many studies and requests, including one from President Harding, all stating the desirability of the eight-hour day and the three-shift system, the American Iron and Steel Institute reported in vague terms on May 25, 1923. This report contained no substantial recommendation for

immediate action. On June 6, 1923, the united voice of religion spoke out firmly and clearly. It was the same team that we have met before in this study -- The Central Conference of American Rabbis, The Federal Council of Churches, and The National Catholic Welfare Conference. The report was written in answer to the American Iron and Steel Institute. Its vigorous tone can be ascertained from the following quotation:

> The Steel Institute's Committee contends that the workmen themselves prefer the long hours. Undoubtedly there are those who will voluntarily work long hours to their own hurt, but the Committee's contention is chiefly significant as showing that workmen whose only choice is between abnormally long hours of labor and earnings that are insufficient to maintain a family on a level of health and decency, naturally adopt the more arduous alternative. . . . . The public expects the initiative to be taken by the United States Steel Corporation. It is a task that presents admitted difficulties, but none that a powerful corporation which has accumulated an enormous surplus should find insurmountable. The forces of organized religion in America are now warranted in declaring that this morally indefensible régime of the twelve-hour day must come to an end. A further report is due from the Iron and Steel Institute -- a report of a very different tenor.[20]

The report made front page news. The religious and labor press took up the battle. Public resentment was definitely aroused. Reluctantly, the United States Steel Corporation could delay no longer and announced a general curtailment of working hours in all its subsidiaries. The twelve-hour day in steel became a thing of the past, and the united action of religious groups was largely responsible for bringing this about.

Present-day pronouncements still advocate reduction of hours, mostly on the basis of the need of man for adequate leisure time for the development of a wholesome family life. Present-day pronouncements have advanced beyond the advocacy of one-day rest in seven, and many now look forward to the five-day week for all workers. The Evangelical and Reformed Church calls for "a reduction in the hours of labor as the general productivity of industry increases; release from labor at least one day in seven; and the acceptance, as quickly as possible, of a five-day working week."[21] The Unitarian Fellowship sees in the "shortening of the week" increased opportunities for "adult education."[22] The C.C.A.R. in 1920 asked that all workers be "assured the right of observing their Sabbath in accordance with their religious convictions."[23] And the Conservative Rabbis in 1933 looked forward to "the thirty-hour week."[24]

4. Additional Social Welfare of Workers

By the above topic we mean everything that enhances the welfare of the worker in addition to wages and hours. This includes abolition of child labor, improving the working woman's status and conditions of labor, and all types of social insurance against accidents, sickness, old age, and unemployment.

Child labor and exploitation of women workers are not the problems they used to be. Most States have laws prohibiting child labor, and women are also protected by law in many States. Nevertheless, a great majority of the present-day pronouncements still call for the abolition of child labor and protection of

the woman laborer. The Catholic Bishops refer to the States which refuse to adopt such legislation as the "stagnant ones."[25] The Reform Rabbis have this to say with respect to women who work: "We advocate special regard for the health and safety of women in industry and for their equal pay with men for equal work."[26]

It is sufficient to state that religious groups in their pronouncements are in favor of the protection of the worker by the various types of social insurance. They urge the continuance and extension of all types of social insurance. The "Social Ideals" of the Federal Council express the matter typically when the Council calls for the "safeguarding of all workers, urban and rural, against harmful conditions of labor and occupational injury and disease. Social insurance against sickness, accident, want, old age, and unemployment."[27] The supplement to the Catholic Encyclopedia suggests that the contingencies and liabilities of social insurance "should be met by industry since industry is at once the beneficiary of the wage-earner's life work and the only source of provision for his life's needs."[28]

5. Religious Groups Speak Out For The Improvement Of The Labor Movement

There was a time when a labor organization had to struggle just to keep itself in existence -- when its right to organize was threatened. At that time religious groups could merely proclaim the right of laboring men to form and join organizations of their own choosing. Now, almost following an

"American pattern", we have a great many labor organizations securely organized and with every intention of existing as separate entities. Two large labor organizations, the A.F. of L., and the C.I.O., have been at odds ever since the founding of the latter. They have not even been able to work together on matters in which there is between them basic agreement, e.g. political action. Religious groups, taking advantage of the fact that they don't have to take sides, have urged the opposing factions to get together for their own common good. This call for unity within the labor movement has been expressed in various ways. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church says that "As believers in the worth of labor organizations and rejoicing in what has been accomplished by them on behalf of workers, we deeply regret that the labor movement is weakened by division and strife, and we urge the responsible heads of labor organizations to reconcile their differences in the spirit of love." The Presbyterians then continue to sermonize a bit. "The question before the Church, before labor, and before management is this: What shall be the guiding principle of the industrial life of America, the principles of Jesus Christ or the principles of materialism?"[29] The Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1940 urged the belligerent factions of labor to unite for their common good. The Conference even suggested that religious groups might play a part in bringing about this unity. "...while the complicated problem (of unity) has not yet been solved," said the C.C.A.R., "the religious groups are more intimately in

the picture, and may be able to be of effective service at any moment that a rapprochement seems possible."[30]

Perhaps organized labor, especially the C.I.O., has gone further than any other group in society to recognize the members of a minority and to accord them equal rights and privileges. Nevertheless, there are unions which have erected barriers, especially against the negro. The existence of unions which practice segregation has led many of the church groups to express themselves on this matter. The expression usually takes the form of a statement calling for the abolition of such a condition. Typical of many is the call of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, looking forward to the achievement of "unsegregated unions in which minorities will be accepted into full membership and accorded equal privileges."[31]

6. Religious Groups Urge Churches To Practice What They Preach

We don't usually consider the agencies of religion as regular businesses, and yet in many phases of their activities they are just that. Religious groups are employers and consumers. Religious publishers can engage union or non-union printers to prepare the huge amount of literature which they issue. In addition to the practical side of this situation, there is the legitimate expectation that religious groups should set an example for others. This has come to be of great concern to religious groups. In a very real sense, religious groups have begun to tell their constituents to "practice what they preach." The recognition of this situation is not

completely new. Over twenty years ago, Professor F. Ernest Johnson wrote that "The importance of the employing function of the Church has not been generally recognized, but when the number of its employees in office buildings, parish houses, and printing establishments is considered, it becomes evident that the contact of the Church with industry is by no means wholly secondhand."[32]

In 1931, the Social Justice Commission of the Central Conference of American Rabbis recommended "that the Conference enjoin its membership, wherever possible, to carry on congregational work with those business houses and employers who are fair to organized labor; that, in the printing of our bulletins, in congregational construction work, and in all matters appertaining to congregational life, personally or as part of an organization, we strive to deal with those business firms which recognize those principles of our social justice program relative to collective bargaining, hours of labor, and minimum living wages."[33] Let us now cite some of the recent examples. The Methodist Federation for Social Action (unofficial) calls for fair labor practices "within the institutions of the Church including those local churches which are employers of labor, the Methodist Publishing House, hospitals and homes, and all the boards and agencies of the Church."[34] The Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, when speaking of the right of workers to organize into unions "of their own choosing", immediately follows up this statement with the words "Churches

and institutions related to the Church especially should recognize this right."[35] The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice pleads for "Democracy in the Church", and asks for "the examining and improving the practices of churches as consumers and employers, especially with respect to the wages, hours, and social security of their employees."[36]

In the previous section we mentioned that some church groups felt called upon to criticize those unions which practice segregation. It is interesting to note, by way of contrast and because we are dealing with those matters concerning which the churches are asked to submit to self-examination, that the Federal Council used the medium of its 23rd Annual Labor Day message to criticize those churches which practice segregation and deny equal rights to all. The Federal Council statement forms a good summary for what we have been reporting in this particular section.

> The beginning must surely be made in the Church itself. There must be a vigorous effort to see that no congregation is a class church or a racial church. That is not easy, for churches are usually neighborhood organizations, and people live in neighborhoods of similar economic status. But a true visitation and evangelism by the laymen of the churches will make possible a congregation that crosses economic and racial and class lines. A local church-family is the place to lay a foundation of sure and sympathetic understanding of other people and of why they act as they do."[37]

7. The Taft-Hartley Law

Dr. Alva W. Taylor, an old-timer in the field of religion and labor, commented as follows on the Taft-Hartley Bill after it became law: "It puts a ball and chain on labor

unionism."[38] This statement may have been phrased for dramatic effect, but it presents a most accurate picture of the status of present-day trade unionism. Whatever the end result may be, the Taft-Hartley Law was designed to check the great upward surge of power which labor had gained during the early years of this decade. The Taft-Hartley Law is ample evidence of the fact that the fight for all the logical benefits to be derived from healthy labor organization is far from over. Thus, while in the previous sections of this chapter we dealt with concepts, we now turn to the consideration of specific and crucial items.

How did religious groups react to the Taft-Hartley Law? Is there an attitude of the religious groups about it? Let us answer these questions first, and then proceed to substantiate our answers.

There was a decided reaction on the part of religious groups against the Taft-Hartley Law. And it is fairly safe to state that the general religious attitude toward it is one of opposition.

Long before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Bill, the Presbyterian Church recommended "that the General Assembly urge people to be alert in opposing any legislation or industrial practice that would undermine the legitimate and salutary gains made by labor. . ."[39] But there was also specific action when the Bill was brought into the public eye. There was organized a National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley Bill. A delegation of this committee presented

a statement to President Truman urging him to veto the Bill. The statement was signed by 642 prominent Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders. The statement stated that the Bill "substitutes government regimentation for sound collective bargaining and wise attention to the fundamental economic and psychological causes of industrial strife."[40] It should be noted, however, that these clergymen acted as individuals, and not as representatives of religious groups.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, at its most recent meeting, recognized what appeared to be a reactionary trend in the air. Said the Reform Rabbis "The second post-war year has witnessed a continuing deterioration in human relationships. On the industrial front, the forces of reaction are determined to destroy the gains of labor through repressive legislation. . . ." The Rabbis then continue to state that "We reaffirm our conviction that the Wagner Labor Relations Act and the Norris-La Guardia Act have resulted in assuring labor many well-merited gains, and urge the President to veto <u>any legislation</u> which might destroy these gains."[41] The Orthodox Rabbis of the Rabbinical Council of America, which only recently began to concern itself with current social questions, spoke out against the new anti-labor trend. "New forms of pressure have been applied to diminish the gains which laboring people had painfully achieved after years of struggle. Ambiguous legislation has been approved," complains the R.C.A., "which actually seeks to reverse the course of

progress in labor-management relations. As religious leaders, it is our profound hope that in the administration of the new law there will be a reasoned approach which will avoid aggravating a tense situation."[42]

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., was on the spot and could actively oppose the Taft-Hartley Bill. The statement issued by the Social Action Department of the N.C.W.C. on June 13, 1947, was a pointed one. "The Taft-Hartley Bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management co-operation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem of industrial relations from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view. It runs the risk of disorganizing and disrupting industrial relations by hastily and completely recasting the whole range of Federal labor legislation just at the time when industrial stability is most desperately needed and, ironically enough, just at the time when collective bargaining shows definite signs of moving toward collective co-operation for the common good."[43] On the Labor Day after the Bill had become an official Act, the same official Catholic opinion was still opposed to this newly-enacted law of the land. "More mature consideration as well as recent experience", observed the Catholic Bishops, "have brought out expressions of dissatisfaction" with the Taft-Hartley Act. We have declared our own judgment that the Act is awkward and unworkable in many respects, and is an inadequate and short-sighted approach to the very complicated problem of industrial relations."[44]

8. A Note On Religion, Labor, and The Economic Order

In all that we have been saying there would seem to be one glaring omission. We haven't said a word about what religious groups believe to be labor's just share of the profits and products of the economic system. Many religious groups are concerned with this matter -- some mildly and others quite strongly. Some speak in the tone of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, which asks that workers be given a "just share of the product which their genius and energy have made."[45] The Methodist Federation for Social Action takes the extreme point of view and describes itself as "an organization which rejects the method of struggle for profit as the economic base for society, which seeks to replace it with social-economic planning in order to develop a society without distinctions and privileges."[46]

The above paragraph is our way of saying that it is impossible to discuss labor's full role in the economic order according to the religious groups without first analyzing the attitude of the religious groups toward the entire economic order. This would, of course, have to be a separate, though related, study. Suffice it to say in this short note that, from most of the statements which we read, religious groups think that the laboring man is entitled to a much greater share of the profit of the product which cannot be produced without his work and effort.

Chapter VI.

Bringing Religion to the Laborer.

We have seen in the preceding chapters that religious groups have engaged in labor activities and expressed themselves on labor questions without mentioning religion - except that their specific religious traditions sanction and even compel them to act in this direction. Religious groups have quite naturally been concerned with the religion of the laborer - or perhaps, more correctly, what it is considered his lack of religion or his indifference to it. In this chapter it is our aim to present, from statement and from deed, what religious groups have said or done in their attempt to bring religion to the laborer.

Many of the statements which we studied contain some reference to this activity. The Methodist Federation for Social Service (unofficial) calls upon its members to "Support a training program among Churchmen in the field of religion and labor."[1] The Presbyterian Church urges its ministers to seek a first hand contact with employers and employees, to bring to them the fraternal greetings of the Church as ministers of Christ." The Presbyterian statement continues to ask, "What shall be the guiding principles of the industrial life in America, the principles of Jesus Christ or the principles of materialism?" The Disciples of Christ also speak forth on this matter (like the Presbyterians they too are careful to mention management along with labor). "We

urge that increased attention be given by our ministers and churches to the spiritual needs of management and labor," say the Disciples, "in order that the ministry of the Gospel may be brought to both groups and a bond of Christian fellowship be created which will enable both employer and employee to meet in the spirit of justice and brotherhood."[3]

The means of implementing the aims of statements such as those quoted above usually find expression in the advocacy of some form of labor temple. The pioneer in this field is the famous New York Labor Temple founded in 1910 by Charles Stelzle. This important project of the Presbyterian Church demands treatment in any evaluation of religion's attitude toward labor.

In 1910, the New York Presbytery was considering the disposal of a church on the East Side, because most of the people who were moving into this section were Catholics and Jews from Southern and Eastern Europe. Rev. Stelzle, who was also a member of the A.F.L. Machinists Union, secured the use of the building for his labor temple project. Labor Temple was organized specifically to be a specialized labor church. Rev. Stelzle set up a program designed to appeal to the people who lived in the neighborhood. James Myers talks about the "Jews, Catholics, Protestants, atheists, anarchists, socialists, proletarians, I.W.W.'s men and women of all races and nations" who participated in every phase of Labor Temple's activity. One of its most interesting activities was its Open

Forum to which famous speakers were invited and then beseiged with questions from the floor.

The old church which housed Labor Temple soon grew inadequate for its need. About fifteen years after its origin, a new seven-story building became the new home of Labor Temple. This building was equipped with meeting rooms and auditorium, chapel, gymnasium and extensive living quarters. An elaborate adult school was organized by Labor Temple largely under the direction of Will Durant. It seems that when other organizations with more adequate funds began to do educational work along the same lines that Labor Temple School operated, the latter curtailed its program. The literature available on Labor Temple seems to lead to the following conclusion. Labor Temple, [redacted] sponsored and supported by the Presbyterian Church, can boast of doing a good job in aiding the working man and in providing for his education and leisure. To its credit Labor Temple welcomed everybody, (in 1929, James Myers wrote that "two thirds of the constituency of Labor Temple is Jewish"),[5] but did no active proselytizing. It was usually an extremely busy place. Strike meetings, classes, lectures and even sleeping quarters at times made Labor Temple a twenty-four hour per day operation. But in all this there is little of what is usually meant by a church-labor relationship. In other words, religious observances does not seem to have been one of Labor Temple's important activities. This is the tone of Jesse Cavileer's evaluation of the Labor Temple School when he

comments that "most of its teachers were secularists, uninterested in or opposed to the church." [6]

The function, purpose, and personnel of Labor Temple have changed considerably during the years. In 1944, by action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, a program for the training of church workers and theological students in the church and labor field was inaugurated. This program found expression in the Presbyterian Institute of Industrial Relations which was set up in January of 1945. Labor Temple was "taken over" by this Institute whose purpose is "to prepare Protestant leadership for an understanding of the urban-industrial community of this generation and to relate the eternal truths of Christianity to the particular needs of the people of these communities..." [7] Rev. Scott, the dean of the Institute, thinks that a new emphasis on religion is being worked out under this new administration. "In the year and a half that it has been conducted by the Institute," comments Dean Scott, "it (Labor Temple) has built up a new staff and is again adapting its program - which is not very different from much that it has had in the past. The changes are more in emphasis and attitude than in program. During the thirties much of the program was supported by public-funds in an attempt to meet the tragedies of unemployment and insecurity. Naturally this support meant a secular emphasis. Under the Institute, the emphasis has shifted back to religion and the need for the church to participate in the lives of the workers." [8]

All of the above is, of course, written from available printed literature. An "on-the-spot" study would of course be necessary for a complete evaluation.

The labor temple idea has held some fascination for Jewish groups. In 1938, the organ of the Jewish Reconstructionist Movement printed an extensive article by Harry Esrig advocating a Jewish Labor Temple.[9] Essrig emphasized the fact that the synagogue was far removed from the actual life of the Jewish worker. He made reference to the searching paper on "The Spiritual Situation Among Jewish Working People in America" by Israel Mufson.[10] Essrig felt that the creation of a Jewish Labor Temple could be a great aid to the Jewish laborer and attract him to the benefits of Judaism. He described his proposed project as an organization which would "maintain a firm contact with all Jewish movements that function amongst the masses of our people." It would further find "no group foreign to itself that aims to advance the majority of mankind along the road of justice and righteousness."[11] The movement for a Jewish Labor Temple received a semi-official impetus in the report of the Director at the 1946 bienniel meeting of the Union of American Hebrew Congregation. The Director of the Union, Dr. Maurice Eisendrath reported that, "Already we have had preliminary discussion with labor leaders and with spokesmen for at least a portion of our Yiddish-speaking brethren. They are not as antagonistic to our movement as we have supposed, nor

as a matter of fact, as some of us have been to them"[12]. Dr. Eisendrath called for the establishment of "one, two or even a score or more Labor Synagogues throughout the thronging Jewish districts of our land."[13] At the time of this writing nothing concrete has come from the proposals.

The Mullenbach Industrial Institute sponsored mainly by the Congregational Christian Churches was established in 1940 and must be mentioned now because, in a sense, it employs the opposite of the Labor Temple approach. The Mullenbach Institute "decided not to develop a special church or worship service believing that the local churches needed to minister more adequately to the workers within their membership and to draw in new ones. The local churches needed an approach to labor which would be neither patronizing nor uninformed, but rather a natural part of their religious life."[14] The technique of this Institute seems to be largely in the holding of conferences to which are called church, labor, business and government leaders. It also strives to orient ministers and theological students to a working knowledge of labor problems.

There are a number of Protestant Christian Churches with a large trade union constituency. Probably the two most outstanding ones are the Salem Evangelical Church of Buffalo (which calls itself "the Working Man's Church") and Rev. Fred Shorter's Church of the People in Seattle, Wash. The majority of the members of Salem Evangelical are members

of the Socialist Party. Their minister, Rev. Herman J. Hahn, is often referred to as "the Socialist minister", and has often run for political office on the Socialist Party ticket. The membership of this congregation has remained small in number.[15]

We have already mentioned that when dealing with a subject such as ours it is often one individual behind a certain religious group, who is responsible for most of the group's action. Such a personality is the dynamic Claude Williams. Regardless of what activity he interests himself in, it is marked by real concern for the underprivileged and exploited and it is carried on upon the basis of complete interracialism. This tone has marked Williams' work in the south with negroes and poor white preachers and in his work in Detroit's People's Institute of Applied Religion which concerned itself mostly with war-workers of World War II. Rev. Williams is now back in the South residing in Birmingham, Alabama. His work has been plagued by what Williams himself has called, "oblique red-baiting".[16]

So we have seen that in this field of bringing religion to the laborer, attempts have been made to go beyond what F. Ernest Johnson has called the "pronouncement-stage." The Catholics seem to believe that the A.C.T.U. (of Chapter I) will accomplish this purpose. The Protestant and Jewish groups have not established their techniques and procedures. Those Protestant and Jewish groups which are most anxious to do something concrete in this field seem to be hindered by the old

obstacle of lack of funds. The call for labor churches continues to be issued. In June of 1947, Dr. Witherspoon Dodge wrote in the R.L.F.'s Economic Justice, "Only a Labor Church, served by a minister at once free in spirit, informed in mind, and sympathetic in heart and soul, is likely to declare this message showing the close relationship between real religion and labor. Persistent preaching of it from a Labor Church pulpit would have the further beneficial effect of spreading it over a period of time to other churches and throughout the community."[17]

Chapter VII

Some Tentative Conclusions

One conclusion seems very obvious from the study which now is drawing to a close. Any religious group, which concerns itself with the problems of this world, is favorably inclined to the laboring man and his organizations. We did not find one religious group which said it was opposed to the modern labor movement. The attitude of Jewish and non-Jewish religious groups is quite favorable to the modern labor movement. But attitude can also be expressed by method and action. We want to conclude by suggesting what we believe to be the most effective means of bringing religious groups and labor organizations closer together. What we say from now on is personal opinion, and since we desire the privilege of accepting valid criticism and of changing our mind we were careful to label our conclusions with the adjective "tentative."

First of all, we should like to come to the rescue of the pronouncement. One of the easiest conclusions to reach after a study of this kind is to say that religious groups have done a lot of talking which has not been implemented. The accusation may be justified, but there is a certain value in a clear statement of one's views. This appears to be especially true for religious groups. The words of the Prophets were also pronouncements on the issues of their day. More is certainly needed, but a valiant effort to have religious groups express themselves

openly and clearly is certainly necessary. Every utterance will not be prophetic, but the more forthright the statement is, the more likely it is to gain notice and have effect.

The chapter we devoted to inter-group cooperation, however incomplete it may have been, told a thrilling story. Such activity is worth reviving. Certainly there will be obstacles, but if the three major groups could unite, for example, on a vigorous campaign to aid the migrant worker or increase teacher's salaries, they would accomomplish infinitely more than getting together on a platform every February and extolling each other's virtues. Of course, we mean a campaign active enough to inspire a few newspapers to term it the result of communistic infiltration. Such cooperation need not be based on any theological point of view, the three groups could simply unite for aggressive social action as they have done in the past.

What about the religion of the laborer? The Catholics, as we have seen, are quite concerned about this. That is why we have organizations of Catholic laboring men. We have seen the great number of Protestant groups so it is impossible for us to generalize on what the Protestants should do. For the Jews, however, we feel that our study warrants a repetition of the old suggestion of a Jewish Labor Temple. But it must be a Labor Temple without the patronizing attitude of "saving souls." Laboring men do not need their souls saved nearly so much as they need someone to help them fight the battles of securing a sufficient livelihood in the uncertain future. The very existence of a Jewish Labor Temple in a neighborhood inhabited by Jewish

working people would be a wholesome influence. Perhaps a Jewish house of worship and assembly for a large group of Jewish working people would more closely deserve the title of a "House of Living Judaism" than the proposed office building of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

One more conclusion seems necessary. The labor movement is a definite operation that is easily studied and interpreted. Modern religion cannot make this claim. When we say a man needs religion, we involve ourselves in a host of complicated definitions and conflicting programs. Thus it seems justifiable to suggest that professional religionists who want to aid the labor movement must first of all know and understand it. Even if it is a one way street and labor does not immediately seek to study and learn about religion, professionals in the field of religion must know and understand the man who works by "the sweat of his brow."

We end on the same note with which we began. The modern labor movement needs help and encouragement now. It may be needed even more in the future. The forces of religion could perform no more beneficial task than translating favorable attitudes into constructive aid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Ryan and Husslein "The Church and Labor", New York 1920, p.V.

2. Ibid, p.VII

3. cf. The Catholic Encyclopedia, Article on "Laity", Vol. VIII, p. 751

4. The World Almanac 1947, p.48 (This is a good outline of the organizational set-up of the National Catholic Welfare Conference).

5. The 1947 Labor Day message issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 5, D.C.

6. This description is that of Irene M. Naughton in a personal communication to the author from the Headquarters of the Catholic Worker Movement, 115 Mott Street, New York 13, N.Y.

7. "What is the A,C.T.U.?" -- a statement of purpose in "The Labor Leader", Vol. XI, No.3, February 18, 1948. "The Labor Leader" is the national paper of the A.C.T.U.

8. Cavilleer, Jesse: "Church and Labor Relation", Social Action, Vol. X, No. 8, October 15, 1944, p. 23f

9. Ibid.

10. "What does A.C.T.U. stand for?" - Brochure issued by the A.C.T.U. National Headquarters, 226 Lafayette Street, New York 12, N.Y.

11. Cavilleer, Jesse. op.cit. p. 21

12. For many interesting details of its ten years of publication, see The Labor Leader's Tenth Anniversary issue, January 31, 1948. Vol. XI, No. 2.

13. The Wage Earner is published by the A.C.T.U. Publishing Company, 58 West Adams Street, Detroit 26, Mich.

14. "What does A.C.T.U. stand for?" op.cit.

15. "Story of the Catholic Labor Alliance" - A series of three articles tracing the growth of the Alliance in Vol. IV, No. 12, and Vol. V, Nos. 1 and 2 of "Work", the monthly publication of the Catholic Labor Alliance, 3 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago 11, Illinois.

16. "A Statement of Aims", by the Catholic Labor Alliance (mimeographed).

17. "Story of the Catholic Labor Alliance", op.cit.

***

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. "The Social Creed of the Methodist Church", published by the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.

2. Cavert, Samuel McCrea: "The Federal Council and the Church", published in the 1946 Biennial Report of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, p. 8.

3. Ibid, p. 9

4. Ibid, p. 12

5. Ibid, p. 41

6. "Report of the National Study Conference on The Church and Economic Life," p. 4.

7. Pope, Liston: "The Pittsburgh Conference", Social Action, Vol. XIII, No. 6, June 15, 1947, p. 3.

8. McPeek, Francis W: "The Church and Economic Life -- Pittsburgh Conference Impressions", Social Action, Vol. XIII, No. 6, June 15, 1947, p.6.

9. "Report of the National Study Conference on The Church and Economic Life", p. 10f.

10. Ibid, p. 14

11. Jack, Horner A: "Protestanism Looks at Capitalism", p. 1.

12. McPeek, Francis W: op. cit. p. 14.

13. Jack, Horner A: op. cit.

14. McPeek, Francis W: op.cit. (The author is indebted to Mr. McPeek for his comprehensive survey of press reaction to the Pittsburgh Conference).

15. "Understanding" -- A quarterly published by the National Association of Manufacturers, Vol. II, No. 1, March, 1947, p.2.

16. Thomas, D.E: "Reaction of Delegates", Social Action, Vol. XIII, No. 6, p. 25 ff.

17. Ibid, p. 26

18. "Report of the National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life", p. 2.

19. The latest available address for the United Christian Council for Democracy is 200 West 107th Street, New York 25, N.Y.

20. Landis, Judson T: "A Study of Protestant Social Action." Information Service, Vol. XXVI, No. 23, June 7, 1947.

21. Ibid

22. Ibid

***

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Reprinted in C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. I.

2. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. XIX, 1909.

3. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. XXV, 1915.

4. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. XXVIII, 1918.

5. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vols. XXXI and XXXIII, 1921 and 1923.

6. For a complete report of this Institute, see Liberal Judaism, Vol. XV, No. 2, June-July, 1947, pp. 51 ff.

7. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. XXXIII, 1923.

8. Israel, Edward L: "Glimpses of Social Justice History", Hebrew Union College Monthly, January, 1932, Vol. 19, No. 3, p. 14.

9. Cronbach, Abraham: "Social Justice at Cleveland -- by One Who Was Not There", Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. XIV, No. 4, March, 1927. (This article contains a complete summary of the 1927 Cleveland Conference).

10. Ibid

11. Ibid

12. Ibid

13. Liberal Judaism, Vol. XV, No. 8, February, 1948, "Liberals Gird for Social Action." (Contains the full text of the adopted program).

14. Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, Vol. IV, 1930-32.

15. The usual caution must however be remembered. In the comprehensive "Pronouncement of the Rabbinical Assembly of America on Social Justice", published in Vol. V, of the R.A.A. proceedings, it is carefully noted that even though this pronouncement was passed on a majority vote on July 5, 1934, "not all the members of the Assembly subscribe to all the positions taken in the pronouncements." It is stated, however, that this statement represents the Assembly's "preponderant and authoritative attitude."

16. R.C.A. Bulletin, Vol. I, No. 3-4, May-June, 1947

17. National Jewish Post, September 12, 1947

18. Zeitlin, Joseph: "Disciples of the Wise", p. 37

19. Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, Vol. VI, 1939, p. 76.

20. Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, Vol. VII, 1940.

21. Ibid

22. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. II, 1941

23. Israel, Edward L: op. cit.

24. Zeitlin, Joseph: op. cit.

25. Ibid, p. V.

26. Ibid, p. 108.

27. Ibid, p. 119.

28. American Jewish Yearbook, 1945-46, p. 592

29. cf. Chapter V of this study.

***

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Israel, Edward L: "Glimpses of Social Justice History", Hebrew Union College Monthly, January, 1932, Vol. 19, No. 3 (and a number of other places).

2. Ibid

3. Ibid

4. Bulletin of the Commission on Social Justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, No. 5, September, 1929.

5. Ibid, No. 6, January, 1930.

6. "The Centralia Case" -- A Joint Report on the Armistice Day tragedy at Centralia, Washington, November 11,1919.

7. Israel, Edward L: op. cit.

8. Bulletin of the Commission on Social Justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, No. 5, September, 1929.

9. Ibid, No. 6, January, 1930.

10. Ibid

11. Israel, Edward L: op. cit.

12. Cronbach, Abraham: "Judaism and Modern Social-Economic Problems". Published in Modern Trends in World Religions. Edited by A. Eustace Haydon, p. 89.

13. In re: Migrant Workers. Rev. David Williams, a former missionary in Africa and now a welfare worker among the migrants of New York State said: "I thought I had left poverty behind in Africa. But here I find families living in stables, and subsisting on corn bread. People do not live and eat like that even in Africa." (Life and Labor Bulletin, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.).

14. The Synagogue Council of America, 91 Washington Avenue, New York, N.Y. The joint declaration referred to may be obtained from this office.

15. National Religion and Labor Foundation, 106 Carmel Street, New Haven, Conn. (Executive Secretary: Willard Uphaus).

16. Cavileer, Jesse: "Church and Labor Relations", Social Action, Vol. X, No. 8, October 15, 1944, p. 34.

17. Economic Justice, Vol. XVI, No. 4, December, 1947, contains a complete report of the 15th Anniversary Conference.

18. "Labor and Religion", issued by the Department of Research and Education of the C.I.O.

19. From the literature about the Institute released by Ernest E. Schwarztrauber, Director, University of Wisconsin School for Workers, 1214 West Johnson Street, Madison, Wisc.

***

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. XXXIII, 1923, pp. 200-281.

2. "The Church Speaks on Labor", published and distributed by the Board of Social Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America.

3. Deliverances of the General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1910-1945, on the issues of Social and Moral Welfare.

4. Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum by Pope Leo XIII, reprinted in "The Church and Labor", by Ryan and Husslein.

5. Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, Vol. V, 1934, p. 157f.

6. "Christian Social Relations at General Convention 1946", The Protestant Episcopal Church.

7. "The Ideals of the Churches". This much-publicized statement of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is reprinted in many places. Perhaps it is most readily available in the pamphlet called "Excerpts from Statements on Religion and Economic Life" (cf. p. 5) issued by the Federal Council.

8. The description is Father George G. Higgins's in a letter to the author on February 12, 1948.

9. "The Church and Social Order." A statement of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, issued from Washington, D.C. on February 7, 1940.

10. "Recommendations of the M.F.S.A. Commission on Church and Labor." Reprinted in "Social Questions", the organ of the M.F.S.A., in the February, 1947, number.

11. "Our Response to the World's Needs". Programs of action adopted by the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches in Grinnell, Iowa, June 18-25, 1946.

12. "A Program for Social Action", issued by the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice", adopted in May, 1946.

13. Report of Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1947 (mimeographed). It is not yet known to the author whether or not this phrase was officially adopted by the C.C.A.R.

14. A program publication of the National Council of Jewish Women's Committee on Education and Social Action (mimeographed).

15. Labor Day Message -- 1945, issued by the United Christian Council for Democracy.

16. The author acknowledges that, for the most part, the account of the abolition of the twelve-hour-day in the steel industry is taken from Chapter IX of James Myers' "Religion Lends a Hand."

17. Ibid, quoted on p. 96.

18. Ibid, p. 97f.

19. An excellent example of this is an article by Gilman Parker which appeared in the New York Tribune of January 8, 1923, and was inserted in the Congressional Record by Senator William M. Calder of New York. This article termed the report a "product of radicalism."

20. op. cit. James Myers, quoted on pp. 106ff.

21. "Objectives for Christian Social Action". "Adopted by the General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church at Cincinnati, Ohio, June 24 to July 1, 1942).

22. "A Program for Social Action", issued by the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice. Adopted in May, 1946.

23. Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. XXX, 1920, p. 89.

24. "Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America", Vol. V, 1933.

25. Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. cf. section on "Child Labor", p. 25.

26. Point XII of the Central Conference's 1928 Social Justice Program. C.C.A.R. Yearbook, Vol. XXXVIII.

27. Points 4 and 5 of "The Social Ideals of the Churches." Excerpts from Statements on Religion and Economic Life, p. 5.

28. The Catholic Encyclopedia (Supplement 1920) Article: "Labor and Labor Legislation", p. 444 ff.

29. Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1910 - 1945, p. 40.

30. Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. 50, 1940, p. 100.

31. "A Statement on Labor-Management Relations." Issued by the Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church and published in its bulletin of January 1, 1947.

32. Johnson, F. Ernest: "The Church and Industry", an article in "Christianity and Social Adventuring", edited by Jerome Davis, p. 305.

33. Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. 41, 1931, p. 90.

34. "Recommendations of the M.F.S.A.Commission on the Church and Labor", Social Questions Bulletin, Vol. 37, No. 2, February, 1947, p. 25.

35. "A Statement on Labor-Management Relations", issued by the Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, and published in its bulletin of January 1, 1947.

36. A Program for Social Action issued by the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

37. Labor Sunday Message of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, 1947

38. Taylor, Alva W: "Putting a Ball and Chain on Labor Unions." Economic Justice, Vol. XVI, No. 2, October, 1947.

39. Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1910- 1945, p. 45.

40. cf. "Information Service", Saturday, June, 28, 1947 edition. Issued by Federal Council of Churches of Christ, p. 4.

41. 1947 Report of the Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (mimeographed).

42. 1947 Jewish New Year Social Justice Message of the Rabbinical Council of America (Orthodox), reprinted in the National Jewish Post, September 12, 1947.

43. "Official Statements on Legal Protection of Right of Labor to Organize", p. 3, issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference (mimeographed).

44. "1947 Labor Day Statement", issued by the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

45. "Objective for Christian Social Action", issued by the Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

46. This purpose is printed on the first page of every issue of Social Questions, the bulletin of the Methodist Federation for Social Action.

***

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Social Action Handbook of the Methodist Federation for Social Service (Unofficial), p. 8.

2. Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1910-1945.

3. Resolution adopted by the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ, in Columbus, August 6-11, 1947.

4. Myers, James: "Religion Lends a Hand", p. 119.

5. Ibid, p. 123

6. Cavileer, Jesse: "Church and Labor Relations", Social Action, Vol. X, No. 8, October 15, 1944, p. 28.

7. Scott, Marshall L: "The Labor Temple", Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. 34, No. 1, p. 9f.

8. Ibid, p. 10. (This is the most recent account of the present-day activities of Labor Temple available to the author. His request for information, addressed directly to Labor Temple, was not answered).

9. Essrig, Harry: "A Jewish Labor Temple". The Reconstructionist, Vol. IV, No. 5.

10. Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. XXXVIII, 1928, pp. 295-311.

11. Essrig, Harry: op. cit.

12. Eisendrath, Maurice N: "The State of Our Union." Report of the Director, U.A.H.C. 39th Council, March 3, 1946.

13. Ibid

14. Cavileer, Jesse: op. cit.

15. cf. Social Action, Vol. X, No. 8, p. 27, for a list of "Churches with a Large Labor or Trade Union Constituency."

16. There are two biographies of Claude Williams: Cedric Belfrage's "South of God", New York, 1941; and "A Faith to Free the People", New York, 1944.

17. Dodge, Witherspoon: "It's Time for Labor Churches." Economic Justice, Vol. XV, No. 9, June, 1947.

***

Pronouncements and Statements

N. B. We have not been too concerned with the definition of creed, pronouncement, statement, declaration, etc. We are concerned with every item which helps to form an attitude. Only those statements are listed which were found to express some concern with the labor movement.

Jewish

1. Yearbooks of the Central Conference of American Rabbis Vols. I - LVI

2. "Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America" Vols. I - VII. Also mimeographed statements which supplement publication of these procedings.

3. "R. C. A. Bulletin" Official organ of the Rabbinical Council of America. Especially Vol. 1, No. 3-4, May - June 1947

4. "Liberals Gird for Social Action" A ten-point program of the Joint Commission on Social Action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Liberal Judaism Vol. XV No. 8 February 1948

5. Jewish New Year Social Justice for 1947 issued by the Rabbinical Council of America. Printed in National Jewish Post, September 12, 1947.

6. Social statements of the National Council of Jewish Women. Found in the publication "Spotlight" and in the program publications of this organization.

Catholic

1. For all important and official Catholic statements to the year 1920 see "The Church and Labor" by Ryan and Husslein, New York, 1920.

2. "The Church and Social Order" A Statement of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Ave. N. W. Washington 5, D. C.

3. "Secularism" Statement issued November 14, 1947 by the

Bishops of the United States and signed in their names by the members of the Administrative Board, N. C. W. C.

4. "Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction" 20th Anniversary Edition, N. C. W. C.

5. "Labor Day Statements" issued by The Social Action Department of the N. C. W. C.

6. "Official Statements on Legal Protection of Right of Labor to Organize" issued by the Social Action Department of the N. C. W. C. July 18, 1947. (mimeographed)

Protestant

1. "Objectives for Christian Social Action" adopted by the General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church at Cincinnati, Ohio, June 24 to July 1, 1942. Issued by the Commission on Christian Social Action, Evangelical and Reformed Church, 2969 West 25th Street, Cleveland 13, Ohio. Also the "Christian Social Action Bulletin" issued by the above organization.

2. "The Social Creed of the Methodist Church" adopted by The General Conference of the Methodist Church, Kansas City, Mo., May 5, 1944. Commission on World Peace of The Methodist Church, 740 Rush St., Chicago 11, Illinois.

3. "Our Response to the World's Needs" Programs of Action Adopted by the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches, Grinnell, Iowa, June 18-25, 1946.

4. "Recommendations of the MFSA Commission on the Church and Labor" Social Questions, Vol. 37, No. 2, p. 24, Bulletin of The Methodist Federation for Social Action (unofficial), 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Also "Social Action Handbook" issued by above organization.

5. "The Church Speaks on Labor," published and distributed by The Board os Social Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America, 231 Madison Avenue, New York, 16, N. Y.

6. "Christian Social Relations at General Convention 1946," The National Council, The Protestant Episcopal Church, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, 10, N. Y.

7. "Report of the Standing Committee on Social Education & Action," The 159th General Assembly, Presbyterian Church in the U. S.A., Grand Rapids, Mich., May 27, 1947. Also, "Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1910-1945" Office of the General Assembly, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

8. "Biennial Report - 1946" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. Also "The Social Creed of the Churches" issued by the above organization; the bulletin, "Information Service," issued by this organization's Department of Research and Education; and the Federal Council's Labor Sunday Messages.

9. "The Time of Healing" 32nd Annual Report, The Board of Evangelism and Social Service, the United Church of Canada, Wesley Building, Toronto 2B, Canada.

10. "Resolutions" Adopted by the International Convention of Disciples of Christ in Annual session at Columbus, Ohio, August 6-11. (typewritten)

11. "A Program for Social Action" Unitarian Fellowship for Social Action, 7 E. 6th St., Dunkirk, N. Y.

12. "Annual Conference Resolutions" Church of the Brethren, June 8-15, 1847. (typewritten)

13. "Labor Day Message - 1945" Issued by United Christian Council for Democracy, 457 West 123rd Street, New York 27, N. Y.

14. "The Malvern Conference Report - Official Version" Published in "Information Service" - Saturday, May 31, 1941.

15. "Council of Church Women Meets in Biennial Assembly" National Council of Church Women, Third Biennial Assembly, Nov. 11-15, Grand Rapids, Mich. Reported in Federal Council Bulletin, December, 1946.

16. "Social Pronouncements by Religious Bodies Affiliated With and Related to the International Council of Religious Education, 1930 - 1934" The International Council of Religious Education, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

17. "Social Creeds of the Churches" A study of forty-two religious social creeds - mostly Protestant by Abraham Cronbach in the CCAR Yearbook, Vol. XXXIII, 1923.

Bibliography

Bradley, Dwight J. " The Effect of Religion on Organized Labor As a Power Agency in Western Culture." A paper published in Conflicts of Power in Modern Culture." New York, Harpers, 1947

Calder, William M. "Church Steel Strike Declared of Radical Bias ....." Article inserted in Congressional Record January 8, 1923

Cavileer, Jesse "Church and Labor Relations" Social Action, Vol. 10, No. 8, October 15, 1944

Cohen, Jules Henry "Law and Order in Industry" New York, Macmillan, 1916

Cronbach, Abraham "Judaism and Modern Social-Economis Problems." Published in "Modern Trends in World Religions" Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Cronbach, Abraham, "Religion and Its Social Setting" Cincinnati, The Social Press, 1933

Cronbach, Abraham "Social Creeds of the Churches" CCAR Yearbook, Vol. XXXIII, 1923

Cronbach, Abraham "Social Justice at Cleveland - By One Who Was Not There" Hebrew Union College Monthly, March, 1927

Cronbach, Abraham, "The Social Outlook of Modern Judaism" Cincinnati, Ohio, The Commission on Information About Judaism

Davis, Jerome, "Christianity and Social Adventuring" New York, The Century Co., 1927

Day, Dorothy "A Letter to Our Readers at the Beginning of our Fifteenth Year" New York, The Catholic Worker

Dexter, Robert Cloutman, "The Social Obligation of Liberal Religion" American Unitarian Association, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Eisendrath, Maurice N. "The State of our Union" Report of the Director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, March 3, 1946

Essrig, Harry "A Jewish Labor Temple" The Reconstructionist, Vol. IV, No. 5, Apr. 22, 1938

Foster, Solomon, "The Working Man and the Synagogue" CCAR Yearbook, Vol XIX, 1909

Hall, Cameron P. "Economic Life: A Christian Responsibility" New, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ

Israel, Edward L. "Religion and the Social Order" Reprinted from "Religion in Life" 1932

Israel, Edward L. "Some Social Implications of the Machine Age" Reprinted from Religious Education, March, 1930

Israel Edward L. "Strike Situation on Western Maryland and the Principles Involved as Seen by an Interchurch Investigator" Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen's Magazine, May, 1927

Jack, Homer A. "Protestantism Looks at Capitalism" Reprinted by American Unitarian Association, 25 Beacon St., Boston 8, Mass.

Johnson, F. Ernest "The Social Work of the Churches - A Handbook of Information" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, New York, 1930

Landis, Judson T. "Social Action in American Protestant Churches" American Journal of Sociology, May, 1947 (Reprinted in "Information Service" Vol. XXVI, No. 23)

Lawrence, David "Relationship of the Catholic Church to a Recent Controversy over a **Labor** Management Law" National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, 1947

Mufson, Israel "The Spiritual Situation Among Jewish Working People" CCAR Yearbook, 1928

Myers, James "How Labor and Church Can Work Together" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, New York, March, 1945

Myers, James "Labor Today - and Tomorrow" New York, Fellowship Publications, 1943

Myers, James "Notes From the Diary of A Modern Circuit Rider" New York, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, October, 1937

Myers, James "Religion Lends a **Hand**" New York, Harper and Brothers, 1929

Myers, James "Representative Government in Industry" New York, George H. Doran Company, 1924

Ryan and Husslein "The Church and Labor New York, Macmillan, 1920

Ryan, John A. "Labor and Labor Legislation" Supplement to the Catholic Encyclopedia (1920) pp. 444ff

Ryan, John A. "Labour Unions" article in "Catholic Encyclopedia" Vol. VIII, pp. 724-728

Scott, Marshall L. "The Labor Temple" Cincinnati, Ohio, Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. XXXIV, No. 1, 1946

Uphaus, Willard "Judgement Must Begin in the House of the Lord" New Haven, National Religion and Labor Foundation

Ward, Harry F. "The New Social Order" New York, Macmillan, 1922

Ward, Harry F. "The Social Creed of the Churches" New York, The Abingdon Press, 1914

Waife, Mitchell M. "For Social and Economic Justice" Liberal Judaism, Vol. XV, No. 2, June-July, 1947

Zeitlin, Joseph "Disciples of the Wise" Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1945

Pamphlets (without listed authors)

"Excerpts from Statements on Religion and Economic Life" The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York

"Ministers of Tomorrow Relate Religion and Labor for the Common Welfare" National Religion and Labor Foundation, New Haven, Conn. 1943-44

"The Guild's Hearst Strike - Against the Chicago Evening American and Herald & Examiner" Churchmen's Fact Finding Committee, Chicago, March 17, 1939

"What the Church Thinks of Labor" American Federation of Teachers, 506 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

"Labor and Religion" CIO, Washington, D. C. 1944

"The Centralia Case" A Joint Report on the Armistice Day Tragedy at Centralia, Washington, November 11, 1919, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, New York, 1930

"Report of the National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life" Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, New York

"The Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems" Washington, D. C. The National Catholic Welfare Conference

"They Had Unions In Those Days Too" New Haven, National Religion and Labor Foundation.

"What Does ACTU Stand For" ACTU, 226 Lafayette Street, New York 12, N. Y.

"A Statement of Aims" Catholic Labor Alliance, 3 E. Chicago Ave, Chicago 11, Ill.

"Twenty-first Year of Educational Service to Labor 1925-1945" University of Wisconsin School for Workers, 1214 W. Johnson St., Madison 5, Wisconsin

"Industrial Relations in a Hosiery Mill" A joint study made by the CCAR and the Federal Council. Published in Information Service, Vol. VII, No. 20, May 19, 1928

"Pattern for Economic Justice - A Catholic, Jewish and Protestant Declaration" Obtainable through Synagogue Council of America, 91 Ft. Washington Ave., New York, N. Y.

"Some Aspects of Industrial Relations" Proceedings of a seminar held in Cincinnati under the joint auspices of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, May, 1931

Periodicals

"Bulletin of the Commission on Social Justice" Central Conference of American Rabbis, Nos. 1-10, 1928-1932

"Economic Justice - Bulletin of the National Religion and Labor Foundation" 106 Carmel St., New Haven(11), Conn.

"Information Service" New York, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, Dept. of Research and Education

"Social Action" Published by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y. See especially Vol. VIII, No. 7; Vol. X, No. 8; Vol. XI, No. 10; Vol. XIII, No. 6.

"Spotlight" Published by the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, New York

"The Catholic Worker" 115 Mott St., New York 13, N. Y.

"The Labor Leader" National organ of ACTU, 226 Lafayette Street, New York 12, N. Y.

"The News Letter" University of Wisconsin School for Workers, 1214 W. Johnson St., Madison 5, Wisconsin

"The Wage Earner" Paper of Detroit ACTU, 58 W. Adams Street, Detroit 26, Mich.

"Understanding - A Quarterly Devoted to Cooperation Between Clergymen and Businessmen" National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West 49th Street, New York 20, N. Y.

"Work" Paper of the Catholic Labor Alliance, 3 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill.