THE
Commonweal
A Weekly Review of Public Affairs, Literature, and the Arts
THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

week by week

AFTER THE ELECTION

WITH AMERICANS across the country we salute John F. Kennedy on his election to the highest office in the land. We sincerely welcome him as the next President of the United States.

We regard the decision which has been made by the American people not only as a critical comment on the past, not merely as a desire for a change, but as a sign of their trust in the future —and in this man whose full measure this country and the world have yet to take.

It has become increasingly clear that with Senator Kennedy a new element has entered into our national political life. He is not to be a President like Dwight D. Eisenhower, nor Harry S. Truman, nor, for all the comparisons, like Franklin D. Roosevelt. Some measure of what he will be can be gauged by considering the formidable obstacles he faced, and overcame, before the people finally selected him to be their leader in the opening years of this decade.

Senator Kennedy first had to overcome strong and articulate opposition within his own party. Some of the sharpest thrusts at the Senator were delivered by other Democrats before his nomination. Yet after the nomination he enlisted those people in his vigorous campaign. Although he backed the most liberal Democratic platform yet produced, he gained support in the South. Although many were distressed at his choice for Vice President, he extended his strength in Northern liberal areas. And he convinced those committed people who initially felt they would rather lose with Stevenson than win with anyone else that his battle was worth fighting.

After his nomination he had to formulate and force those issues which were to be debated. He had at the same time to make himself known to many people who knew him little or not at all. And he had to overcome the unfavorable misconceptions of those who viewed him as an immature and inexperienced person. Further, he had at all times to cope with the always grave, always uncertain and frequently distorted issue concerning his religion.

THESE THINGS are not recalled at this moment of victory for fear that they will get swallowed up in history. They are recalled because they indicate the nature of the man we have elected. Throughout his campaign the Senator moved with authority, confidence and steadfastness of purpose, uniting people who were previously divided. He made manifest those qualities which were singled out by Walter Lippmann when he spoke in mid-October of "the precision of Mr. Kennedy's mind, his immense command of the facts, his singular lack of demagoguery and sloganeering, his intense concern and interest in the subject itself, the stability and steadfastness of his nerves and his coolness and his courage." Through all this, continued Mr. Lippmann, were revealed "the recognizable marks of the man who, besides being highly trained, is a natural leader, organizer and ruler of men." In a very real sense the electorate has ratified this view of Senator Kennedy.

After the grueling, wearing campaign and the momentous victory this is, then, a time for congratulations and celebration. Congratulations to the Senator because he has been elected and to the country because it has selected such a man.

But our congratulations are mingled with something approaching compassion for the President-elect and an anxious desire to see the forming outlines of the new Administration. For time runs swiftly. The tumult and the shouting dwindle down.

The last hurrah fades on the air. And a time of national testing is upon us.

It is no exaggeration to speak, before we are well into them, of the perilous sixties. We live at a time of crisis when hyperbole becomes the literal description of fact, when no heightened phrase is sufficient for the reality. As the strongest of the free nations of the world, the United States bears special burdens and responsibilities.

Even while we seek to extend the rights of democracy at home—where we fall noticeably short of the ideal—we must proclaim the ideals of democracy abroad. We must assert and teach that democracy is theoretically and practically superior to Communism and will survive. We must extend our help and influence to the new, revolutionary and untried countries without incurring charges of exploitation and colonialism. We must strengthen those ties which bind us to our Latin neighbors. We must work unceasingly for peace without relinquishing our strongest deterrent—the ability to wage war on at least equal terms.

There is no quarter of the globe that does not feel our influence. We must strive to see that such influence is beneficial and is regarded as beneficial. We must weigh and reexamine not only our position *vis à vis* Cuba or Quemoy and Matsu but our entire foreign policy.

We have no desire to turn a man into a legend before his time. Nevertheless, we think that Senator Kennedy promises to be the kind of leader who can accomplish many of these things. Not only has he the qualities enumerated by Mr. Lippmann, but he has that intangible quality of charisma. Even while the political commentators were decrying his intellectual, unemotional approach people responded to him with a kind of excitement and enthusiasm that has not been visited upon this country since the days of Roosevelt. In directing this country through the times ahead, this quality can be a factor of incalculable importance.

Having stated our belief that hope and trust in Senator Kennedy is well-founded, we also state that we look for no political miracles. In fact, we would distrust anyone who offered them. Nor do we anticipate that we will, in every instance, agree with Senator Kennedy's decisions as President. But we do expect a change of mood and direction in the management of this country's affairs. We do expect that he will bring large talents to the Presidency, and all the intelligence, imagination and dedication that he can summon, that he will speak hard truths too long unspoken, make hard decisions too long unmade.

RESULTS OF NEGLECT

SOURCES of raw materials and new markets for finished products have long been objectives of Europe's colonial empires. Colonial exploitation often meant shipping what had been extracted from the natural wealth of the colonial land to the "mother country" for processing and selling back to the colony in the form of more costly manufactured goods. This is colonialism in its economic aspect.

A similar pattern still exists in the operations of American foreign enterprise today. The resentment it causes in the underdeveloped lands does much to blur our image as the champion of anti-colonialism in the world. It seems to more than offset the American record in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, our intervention at Suez and our general anti-colonialist attitude at the U.N.

The feeling of resentment runs particularly strong in Latin America, where peoples with great natural wealth continue to be beset by desperate poverty. For one thing they are now demanding that their resources be developed for their own national well-being rather than for foreign companies and foreign investors.

When the United States reduces its import quotas of oil or cuts the prices it pays for tin or copper for its own business reasons—regardless of the substantial havoc that causes in the producing country—Latin Americans perceive the similarity to an outright colony's being run for the benefit of its mother country. The results are often devastating, as so many of these countries are primarily dependent on exports of a single crop or commodity. This colonialist impression is confirmed when Cuban expropriation of American business properties leads to economic or diplomatic reprisals.

Resentment of this form of colonialism is therefore natural enough among Latin America's hungry and restive peoples. But the Communists are also on hand to make the most of very real evils: high infant mortality and low life expectancy, abysmal rural poverty and city slums, widespread illiteracy and disease, the great gulf in living standards between the populace and a small and powerful wealthy minority. Moreover, the Communists are solidly entrenched in university circles and in the labor unions.

This is the true framework in which to evaluate the impact of the Castro revolution. Other aspects of the Cuban situation are of distinctly lesser general importance. The exiles do not count for much. The trading of insults, the charges of preparation

for an "invasion" and the increasing characteristics of a police state all tend to obscure the real meaning of this revolution for the United States.

Regardless of the success of Castro's agents in other lands, Cuba by its very course threatens to set the pattern for other Latin American revolutions. What American companies do now may have much influence as to what is to ensue. If they succeed in transferring at least part of their assets now on comparatively favorable terms, and if they seriously undertake to set up local processing and manufacturing plants, they may be able to forestall trouble that otherwise appears inevitable. Much will depend on a willingness to recognize that the country in which they operate has henceforth to be the element of their prime concern.

United States companies do pay better than the low prevailing wages and often provide useful community facilities as well. But they will have to do far more if they are to play their part in building up a new and far happier international relationship in the Americas—and contribute to the achievement there of humanly adequate living standards. Without real progress of this sort the present Cuban pattern can confidently be expected to recur in a number of countries in this Western hemisphere.

"PEACE" AT G.E.

THE COLLAPSE of the strike at General Electric was highly significant. Pre-strike negotiations were carried on in a painfully strained atmosphere; the company took a very firm position from the first, and it stuck to it. At the same time, there was considerable reluctance to strike on the part of union members, many of whom were already concerned about mounting unemployment in the industry and the possibility of further layoffs. In these circumstances, the back-to-work decision of one key local spelled finish to whatever hope for success the strikers ever had. The plain fact is that the walk-out was a failure, and the agreement that marked its finish simply spelled out the terms of the surrender.

In other industries, both labor and management are likely to see in the events at G.E. a reliable guide to industrial relations in the near future. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell recently reported that there were fewer strikes, and fewer men on strike, during the first nine months of 1960 than in any previous comparable period since 1945. This fact will be taken by some to indicate improved labor-management feelings, but this is not the case; indeed, relations between the two groups have deteriorated sharply in recent months. But what the fall-off in strikes does reflect is the harsh reality of the current economic situation.

From management's point of view, competition is coming back on the American scene, and companies are not as prepared as they once were to pass on increased labor costs to the consumer. And from labor's point of view, unemployment is high enough to make unions dubious that they can get what they want by striking at this time. When both factors are put together, the result is likely to be a period of labor "peace"—with a considerable amount of bad feeling not too far under the surface.

ANGLICAN PRIMATE AND ROME

IT IS HAPPY news indeed that the Archbishop of Canterbury will soon pay a courtesy visit to Pope John. When the Archbishop, the Most Rev. Geoffrey F. Fisher, Primate of the Church of England, makes his call upon the Pope, it will be the first time since the beginning of the Reformation that an Archbishop of Canterbury has met with a Roman Pontiff.

Dr. Fisher's generosity and courage in requesting this meeting can hardly be overpraised. Nor can the similar qualities shown in Pope John's swift and gracious response to the Anglican Primate's inquiry. For on both sides there is painful awareness of the delicacy of the situation and of the possibility of new misunderstanding and resentment. There are those within the Roman Catholic Church who look with suspicion and dismay on any tendency toward what they describe as "compromise" of the exclusive claims of the Church of Rome. If the errant sons wish to come home again, their attitude seems to be, they know the way to Rome. Similarly, there are those in the Anglican Church and among British Nonconformists who are distressed by what they see as "knuckling under" to the rigidity and arrogance of Rome.

Non-Christian reaction to the proposed meeting underlines the danger of misunderstanding. The *Manchester Guardian,* for instance, seemed to give a qualified approval to the forthcoming visit but indicated a great impatience with all the intra-Christian squabbling about "technicalities" such as the validity of orders and Holy Communion. Granting the good will of its author, the *Guardian's* article is likely to wound the members of all churches and could easily do harm to the ecumenical movement.

Not least, there is the danger of expecting too much and rejoicing too soon over the effects of this meeting between Archbishop Fisher and Pope John. If all the current ecumenical activity, and the scheduled Vatican Council, should fail to lead to any spectacular steps in the cause of unity—which might well be the case—the resultant disappointment could be a serious deterrent to continued perseverance in ecumenical work.

Having taken due note of the difficulties attending next month's meeting, however, it is heartening to turn to the more positive—and, we think, more important—implications of the Archbishop's visit to Rome. Whatever happens in consequence of it, or if nothing happens, this simple exchange of courtesy is a seal and a ratification of the profound change in the relations between Christians.

As Dr. Fisher himself observed after last summer's World Council of Churches meeting, "The pace is quickening." One of Pope John's first acts was to call for the Ecumenical Council which is now being organized and his plea for Christian unity was warmly received in all quarters of the world; recently he set up a Secretariat for Christian Unity, under Cardinal Bea; for the first time, an official Roman Catholic observer was present at a World Council meeting; in innumerable small but significant actions and statements, the Pope has indicated his fervent desire for conciliation between the divided servants of Christ; and almost daily, in theological and religious journals and even in the secular press, one sees evidence of the new growth of sympathy and fellowship among churchmen who once were rivals and disputants.

The developments in the direction of unity among non-Roman Catholics have been no less marked. From the World Council of Churches and from individual churchmen, officially and unofficially, have come countless expressions of openness and fraternal warmth. Now, in this personal act of the Primate of England, and in his words, there is a peculiarly significant portent for the coming together of Christians. Even if the proceedings of ecumenical meetings are cruelly slow, or seemingly meager, we have come so far that things can never be what they were. The expressions of hope and love which have been made and received on all sides have created new ties which can never be severed completely, come what may. The steps toward unity which have been taken, and Dr. Fisher's visit to Rome high among them, are historic acts and will weigh in the scales of time as surely as the acts which led to the scandal of separation.

Dr. Fisher put it well when he said that many were praying that "this tiny and altogether unspectacular and yet novel incident of a visit of courtesy offered and welcomed on both sides may bear fruit. . . . It is true, as has been said, that in one sense what may pass between the Pope and myself may be trivialities. In another sense, the fact of talking trivialities is itself a portent of great significance . . . the pleasantries which we exchange may, as one church leader said, be pleasantries about profundities."

Finally, the Archbishop said he hoped his visit to the Pope may make it possible for Catholics and Anglicans to talk "freely and openly in a spirit of Christian friendship and fellowship, not seeking victory or advantage over one another, but as fellow disciples in the service of the one Lord—learning as Christians always must learn, first by talking with one another and speaking the truth as they see it in love."

THIS MEANS YOU, SIR OR MADAM

THE CULTURE-CRITICS seem to have eased up considerably of late in their worriment over the shifting roles of the sexes in this country. For a while back there, every other sociologist who could put together a magazine article was demanding to know What Happened To American Men? And the ones who weren't asking that were wondering What Happened To American Women? We don't recall that there were any definitive answers to the questions, but the excitement petered out after a while, and we figured that whatever it was that had happened to them it wasn't too serious.

Maybe we were wrong. We've just seen an ad in the paper for "The Ladyfingers Compact," which is an elegant little tool kit—that's right, tool kit—designed "for the lady of the house." The plastic case (in coral, sand, yellow or black) is fitted with chromium-plated steel tools with "sleek black plastic handles," including "a glamour hammer," screw driver, pliers, awl and assorted other mechanics' and carpenters' trinkets.

It was easy to shrug off the theorizing of the experts in these matters, but this is something else again. This is business, after all, and now we're really worried. What frightens us most are the inevitable next steps. Next week, for instance, it may be a saddle-leather sewing kit for the man of the house, featuring stainless steel needles, perhaps, and maybe a he-man, pistol-grip needle-threader, or maybe. . . . But it doesn't do to think about it.