

tried to sit—hour after hour, day after day, week after week? What makes baby sitters so sought after? Undoubtedly it is the difficulty of the employment and the paucity of consummate sedatorial skill. Surely sitting is the most arduous, the most exacting task of life. It is an art, for one must not just sit—he must sit right. It tasks every fibre of our being. Sitting is the real business of life. Descartes said, "Cogito, ergo sum" (I think, therefore I am), but surely it is more true to say, "Sedeo, ergo sum" (I sit, therefore I am).

—M. R. M. '51

A SOLUTION: DISTRIBUTISM

Two very real inclinations in modern society are the over-emphasis of specialization and the centralization of industry. Those prevailing trends are especially apparent in the United States and Canada. Industrial centralization more than anything is responsible for untamed regions of both countries remaining undeveloped. There is a constantly increasing migration to central Canada from the Maritimes and the Western provinces. Although central Canada is expanding prodigiously, this situation has a detrimental effect on the less populous provinces. Since it is an unhealthy tendency, it should be corrected. Distributists advocate decentralization of industry; and we find in distributism a reasonable means to bring about a dispersal of wealth and power.

Concentration of power, and immensity chokes the individual. Masters of industry rule society but the common man's opinion is rarely taken into consideration. Small businesses encounter great obstacles. Many of these smaller enterprises are forced to sell to industrial corporations to avoid economic ruin. This is one of the principal reasons for our national industry becoming over-centralized. Even in agriculture, there is a leaning towards collectivism. Small farms are being incorporated and virtual manorial farming has resulted. In agriculture and industry, lesser individuals are becoming increasingly dependent, while land-owners and industrial magnates are amassing wealth and power. Because of this situation, the great men of industry participate more in governmental affairs. Eventually, we shall find them dictating to governments. Thus, there will be as a consequence an aristocracy of opulent capitalists.

Distribution calls for a diffusion of wealth and industry as a means to secure man's freedom. Possession of

freedom varies, being almost non-existent under totalitarianism and at its zenith in democratic states. But man's freedom is also restricted in the monopolistic capitalism of modern democracies. Industry has a major voice in state matters in democracies. If industry were decentralized, more individuals would have a voice in the affairs of government.

Ideal distribution would involve extensive apportionment of industry and widely dispersed ownership of productive wealth. Giant factories would be made smaller, and many new plants established in other sections of the country, where little manufacturing was done previously. Factory methods and assembly-line techniques would be improved and varied to prevent humans from becoming mere robots. Everyone would be paid a decent living wage. Standards of living would be changed; but distributists have their own definition of living standards. They do not regard the possession of a large stock of gadgets and luxuries to be a man's earthly goal. Rather, a man's greatest needs are freedom, independence, and security. The price of acquiring luxuries endangers basic inalienable freedoms, so distributists think we should accept a lower living standard. A free man who has adequate comfort is a greater asset to society than a pampered and wealthy automaton.

Distributists would sponsor a return to the land for many who are now employed in manufacturing. As small farms would not support the entire population, and because the burdens of rural living would be unsuitable for many, a policy involving land ownership for more citizens would be promoted. Education and medical care for all would be a necessary part of the program. Thus, many proletarians could secure real independence and security on farms. Instead of mammoth factories and stores, there would be smaller ones. This program may be realized through discriminatory taxation. The proportionate amount of tax would be predetermined by property valuation. Today, most small firms need no special help but a chance to compete fairly in business. Many giant modern factories are considered inefficient by some economists; and they continue to exist not because of magnitude, but rather because of grand scale finance and monopoly.

The first step towards decentralization should be taken by the government. Although diffusion of authority is the ultimate aim, the immediate ends can best be realized by governmental intervention. Thus, big corporations and enterprise would be broken up by taxation. Investors and owners would lose, but a new pattern of economic develop-

ment would eventually be established. A consequent stimulation of small businesses would logically lead to industrial decentralization. Other methods to be used are the disintegration of large cities into relatively independent suburban communities, reduction of the cost of housing, and programs of education about distributism. All these approaches would modify and stimulate existing institutions rather than abruptly revolutionize society. A rapid transition is scarcely practicable in the social order.

Already, distributists have done much for modern society by merely pointing to dangerous trends and serious social evils. Dorothy Day, Hilaire Belloc, and the late G. K. Chesterton have come forth in favour of distributism. Father J. F. Cronin points out in his book **Catholic Social Principles** that some addresses by Pope Pius XII display a definite distributist tendency. Like papal programs, the distributist program is a careful one. If the Church seeks a change in society, her method is gradual. An evolutionary transformation of the existing order is approved rather than a sudden change imposed by the state. Transitions made gradually result in a more permanent system.

No less an authority than Pope Pius XI approved and supported a program of improved distribution. In **QUADRAGESIMO ANNO** he says: "If these principles (of social justice) be observed by all, everywhere and at all times, not merely the acquisition and production of goods, but also the use of wealth, now so often uncontrolled, will within a short time be brought back again to the standards of equity and just DISTRIBUTION". In the same encyclical he dogmatically states: "Wealth, which is constantly being augmented by economic and social progress, must be so DISTRIBUTED among the various individuals and classes of society that the common good of all be thereby promoted".

Canada would provide a testing ground for these principles. In an article in a recent issue of 'Saturday Night', a prominent Canadian economist states flatly that a major portion of our national industry is located in the metropolitan and suburban areas of two cities—Montreal and Toronto. That this is a serious setup scarcely needs reiteration. Why should a program of decentralization be undertaken in Canada? A very practical answer is that a half-dozen Canadian citizens present a very imposing target in the event of future atomic warfare. But we find the basic answers in the arguments for distributism. How, and to what extent should this program be carried out? Those in authority can best judge this; and a

deciding factor would be the relative amount of co-operation received from the state for its inception.

Certainly the time is ripe for a dispersal of industry in Ontario and Quebec. It is high time the Maritimes and the Western provinces received their share of national manufacturing and contracting. According to 'Saturday Night', there is a scarcity of primary agricultural goods and a surplus of manufactured goods in Canada. This indicates an overemphasis on industry. To relieve and correct this situation, a program of distributism seems to be a most reasonable solution.

—PETER BEATON '52.

THE EXODUS

Drowned in the drabby din of hacks and horns;
Lost in the labyrinth of madding mobs;
They heed the crowded city's hum-drum heart
And tinsel throbs.

No more they calmly gaze on setting suns,
Or feel the silence of some lonely lane;
Nor can they sense the soothing solace of
A summer rain.

The thirst for leisure tames the lave of toil,
And vices stain the virtue-verdant soil.

—LEONARD O'HANLEY '51

MIDLAND AND THE MARTYRS

It was a delightful motor drive from Camp Borden along a tree-bordered highway and quiet countryside direct to Midland on the 301st anniversary of the destruction of Fort Ste. Marie. Five of us had decided the evening before to leave for early Sunday morning Mass at the famous Martyrs' shrine, which was built in 1926 in honor of the heroic sacrifice of the early Jesuit missionaries, and about which we had heard so many people talking on this occasion.

At Barrie, eighteen miles from camp, we entered the historic district of Huronia which, over 300 (Three hundred) years ago, was the birthplace of civilization and Christianity in Ontario. We had entered the beautiful districts of Northern Ontario, which were once the home of the Huron Indians, and were first visited in 1615 by