priesthood is permitted to peddle real estate in heaven and provided no obstacles are placed in its way in the pleasant duty of gathering shekels from its dupes? Organized Religion is above all thoroughly opportunistic. It has all through history supported class rule, no matter how cruel and blood-thirsty a regime. It trims its sail to suit the wind. Dollars to doughnuts the R. C. hierarchy of the Dominican Republic sees the handwriting on the wall for the Trujillo regime, believes that it is tottering. These quick-change artists in the black vestments no doubt perceive the need for an about face, and they waste no time in repudiating Trujillo and in announcing to the world their own nobility and high character.

Were the church interested in the defense of civil rights and humanity, why does it render unqualified support to the Franco dictatorship? The prisons in Spain are filled to bursting, a brutal dictatorship is in the saddle and riding hard, with the blessing of the R. C. church. That not all are fooled by the church's hypocrisy can be seen by the anger let loose upon the priesthood during the Spanish Civil War of the 1930s. But we can predict that the unqualified support given Franco by the R. C. hierarchy will continue only until a large opposition develops, when we will witness another hypocritical gesture toward democracy and liberty of expression — provided any such opposition guarantees the safety of the church property.

In the second paragraph of the Times editorial the statement is made that "the church does not intervene in political affairs unless religious rights are attacked or until political oppression impinges on moral rights." To one who pays even the slightest interest in politics, this is laughable. One needs but a slight acquaintance with Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York City, Chicago, Milwaukee, for example, to quickly grasp the mighty political power the church exercises and wields for its benefit. There is no question of the meddling in mundane affairs despite any protestations to the contrary. There are excellent reasons why many New Yorkers refer to the cardinal's home on Madison Ave. as "the power house." And how murderous must a dictatorship be before the church considers that its politics impinge on moral rights? How many must be imprisoned and murdered? This is the 64 thousand dollar question.

On the other hand, where has the New York Times and the rest of the "free," "truthful" press been during all the blood-letting by Trujillo? The existence of such a brutal police state in America's back yard has not caused too much open editorial outcry by these guardians of liberty. Not enough to cause Trujillo uneasiness till now. And we are still patiently awaiting some genuine clamor in our "democratic" press against Franco. Our memories are not too short to remember the period before World War II, after the seizure of power by Mussolini and by Hitler. We recall vividly how the American press for the most part supported these dictatorships because the trains were made to run on time and because of the suppression of the Communists.

If there were the slightest chance that those seeking the overthrow of Trujillo were aiming at setting up a socialist society, the R. C. hierarchy as well as the capitalist press would not hesitate to give the dictator their unqualified support, no matter how beastly his regime might be. They will oppose no government that is needed to support capitalism and which permits the church a clear road in spreading the gospel of ignorance. They will even support professedly Communist and avowedly atheist regimes such as is the case in Poland, the government of which cooperates with the Roman Catholics and in Russia where there is peace between the Bolsheviks and the Orthodox church for the glory of Polish and Russian state capitalism. The church throughout history has supported class rule. It will, in all of its varied species, continue to do so until socialism abolishes class society and replaces ghost worship with scientific knowledge.

S. O.

MONEY AND BRAINS

Some time ago the Saturday Review of Literature dedicated itself to reconciling the "gigantic" differences that exist between business men and professors in modern society. They considered it to be a graceless war which has waged for more than 100 years between the two. In one issue of the Review three articles were presented by heads of corporations and scholars to prove the divergence and achieve a solution, so that the hurling of such endearing expletives as "Babbitt" and "egghead" would cease, and the complementary functions of our "healthy middle class society" would survive and prosper.

Looking over the evidence adduced in the case, we were struck by the wealth of words that can be poured over a nonexistent issue. Our contention is that there is no line of demarcation between the roles of scholars and business executives in capitalist society. They are both in harmony with the prevailing social order and determined to perpetuate it at all costs. There are of course deviations from the norm in both cases. The satirist and cartoonist conceptions have emphasized these departures and made it appear that the exceptions have become the rule. We have known business men who were as paunchy as a pig, and as mentally alert as a mule. We have known starry eyed professors, beset by cosmic problems and oblivious to their immediate surroundings. Both are exceptions.

The average executive in a modern industrial enterprise is a graduate, possessing a diploma, of some seat of learning. Those who work under his supervision are in most cases releases from Universities who specialized in some department of business. The tendency of the times is to have all those who function even on the lower levels of finance and industry equipped with a college education. We can surmise that in the foreseeable future even the fellow who gets up in the morning to push the button for the robots to go to work will have a string of capital letters, interspersed with periods, following his name or number.

So, too, in the case of the professors. While some of them devote their energies to art, literature, and other cultural subjects, more and more of them are being channeled into the departments of production and management, where they examine and teach the various aspects of distribution, the financial connections to business, the informational aids to analysis and control, taking of inventories, transportation arrangements, and other operational problems of big business. Just as the modern business man is not altogether an ambulant stock certificate, the up to date professor is not a dreamy recluse with a somnambulistic fixation.

A big change in the subject matter and methods of teaching has taken place in the Universities during the last fifty years. The University of Pennsylvania made the start. The dependence of this educational center on the steel trust might account for the switch from culture to business.

A prominent section of the University was reserved for the study of advertising, accounting, marketing, insurance and industrial relations. The change was a success from the initial stage. It proved the utility of education to the business community. It trained the minds of young Americans to concentrate on the characteristics, circumstances, and problems of the various phases of industrial activity rather than allowing them to stagnate pondering over what Homer wrote, what Bizet composed, or what Titian painted.

Harvard, or the textile trust, was next to initiate a new departure. Sensing the fact that big business had to acquaint itself with more than a mere knowledge of how to buy and sell goods, the Harvard School of Business Administration riveted its attention on processes of management, how to make decisions of a