

Where Is India Heading?

by V. B. Karnik

FREEDOM FIRST has been endeavouring since long to perform the unpleasant but necessary task of drawing attention to the totalitarian trends developing in the country. They have been developing rapidly during the last year or so and have manifested themselves noticeably both in the handling of our foreign affairs as well in the thinking over our economic problems.

Freedom First and a few other journals have from time to time invited public attention to the specific manifestations of the trend and urged a reconsideration of the policies underlying them. Theirs has, however, been to a large extent a lone voice which did not get the attention it deserved. It was ignored by many as the voice of Cassandra.

It appears, however, that the doubts and fears, which were expressed by *Freedom First* and a few other journals are also being felt in more influential quarters. The *Times of India* is one of the foremost organs of public opinion in the country. It is not an opposition paper whose views can be attributed to political partisanship. It is not also an anti-communist journal. As a matter of fact there was a feeling for some time that it was tending towards a pro-communist line. That journal has now thought it necessary to sound a note of warning.

In an editorial on February 14 entitled "Where Is India Heading?" the *Times of India*, commenting on the proceedings of the Amritsar session of the Congress, writes: "Apart from the linguistic issue a common thread of thought appeared to run consistently through the utterances and proceedings at Amritsar, giving the appearance of a monolithic party preparing to impose a monolithic society on the State."

After referring to Mr. Dhebar's advice to Congressmen to try to understand the methods adopted by the

communists for creating the tempo for stepping up production, the editorial says: "In their anxiety to follow what is supposedly good in communist methods while eschewing the bad, a time may come when such differentiation grows increasingly difficult and leads to a merging of one society with the other" and warns: "That is how Europe's Iron Curtain countries, the allegedly democratic republics, have come into being, and that is where India might find itself before its people and politicians know quite where they are going."

The editorial then comments on the effects of the Congress and Government policies on the private sector. One need not agree with that comment in order to share the apprehension expressed in the observation that follows. The observation is: "The point is whether under the cloak of an avowedly socialistic pattern of society the country is not being driven along totalitarian paths to totalitarian targets. Mr. Nehru has only to mutter a *mantra* for the Congress cohorts to echo it. That certainly is not the way of democracy."

The editorial then concludes with the following ominous warning: "Few of us would like to see India converted either into a communist or fascist State, but the paths we are treading today seem to lead inevitably to that goal."

These are weighty words which cannot be dismissed lightly. It is to be hoped that many who did not care to pay attention to *Freedom First* and similar other journals will now find it necessary to give a second thought to the doubts and fears that they expressed.

It is not necessary to agree with all that the *Times of India* has said. What is essential is a critical evaluation of all that is happening in the country and a readiness to raise the voice of protest whenever there is any actual or threatened departure from the values and standards of democracy and freedom. What is pernicious is the practice of blind hero worship and of uncritical acceptance of all that a few leaders may do.

How else can one explain the overnight transformation of "socialistic pattern" into "socialist structure"? It was only at Avadi a little over a year back

that the former was accepted as the goal of the economic policy of the Congress. The term "socialistic pattern" has a rather loose connotation. But it was deliberately adopted to escape being tied down to a dogma and to retain the freedom to adopt any measures that may suit the needs of the country. The term also indicated that India was going to follow her own way towards the goal of social and economic freedom.

Amritsar adopted the more rigid phrase "socialist structure." Why was it thought necessary to effect this change? Was there any discussion in the Congress ranks about the pros and cons of the two phrases and about the necessity of substituting one by the other? There is no record in the press about any such discussion. The Congress delegates assembled in Amritsar adopted the phrase "socialist structure" as unthinkingly as they had a year before adopted the phrase "socialistic pattern." The fact is that in both cases the Prime Minister asked them and they obeyed without a moment's thought.

Political democracy must necessarily develop into social democracy, if the political rights enjoyed by the people are to be translated in the real terms of social freedom and economic advancement. There can be no question that India must evolve in that direction. The utmost care will, however, have to be taken to see that in the impatience to effect socialisation we do not throw away democracy which alone prevents socialism from degenerating into a servile society of helpless men held in subjection by an omnipotent State.

Contemporary history is full of instances where democracy is abolished in the name of socialism and the people are subjected to the tyrannical rule of small coteries. Soviet Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe are glaring examples of this hideous transformation. The people who brought it about were not necessarily evil-minded. But they had no regard for democracy, they did not attach any importance to human personality, they held in contempt the essential rights of men and they followed

the philosophy of the end justifying the means. They began by imposing socialism through dictatorial methods and ended by establishing totalitarian regimes of oppression and exploitation.

To enable them to establish the socialism of their choice they built up monolithic parties. In a monolithic party no opposition is tolerated and the word of the leader or the leadership becomes the law. The country was then fashioned on the model of the party. A monolithic society was established in each country. The *Times of India* has warned that the Congress in our country is developing as a monolithic party and may end by establishing a monolithic society.

We in India are no doubt in a slightly better position as we have decided in favour of peaceful and democratic means. But who can be sure that there will be no departure from them as long as there is no effective public opinion insisting upon an unflinching adherence to those means? Democracy and freedom will not be secure as long as their existence depends upon the will of an individual or two, howsoever devoted and sincere he may be. An alert and informed public opinion which will react strongly against every slight deviation from the path of democracy and freedom can be the only sure guarantee against any such departure.

That alert and informed public opinion is yet to be created. It can grow only through a free and frank discussion of all public affairs, which should not be regarded as the monopoly of the Government or a few leaders. The wider the discussion of public affairs the greater will be the participation of the people in the making of decisions. Out of the discussions will grow a variety of institutions which will exercise democratic control over the actions and policies of the Government and political parties. The task of organs of public opinion is to aid that discussion so that in course of time there will not be a lone voice or two but a million voices to protest against and combat totalitarian trends.

Studies on the Plan Frame

Price Re 1

Papers on the Plan Frame by Dr. B. V. Krishnamurthy, Mr. Y. S. Pandit, Prof. Hannan Ezekiel, Mr. T. M. Desai, Mr. R. V. Murthy and Prof. G. D. Parikh.

Published by

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM
148 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1

Free Economic Review

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF OPINION

FOR A FREE ECONOMY IN A
FREE SOCIETY

WITH LIMITED GOVERNMENT

Annual Subscription Rs. 3. Single Copy 4 annas

Managing Editor
Aryabhuvan
Sandhurst Road
Bombay - 4

Notes

A New Low

TO be attacked and smeared by the communists and their friends is a privilege that the lover of freedom and the opponent of totalitarianism in any part of the world enjoys. The Democratic Research Service has, ever since its inception, been the victim of numerous malicious and mendacious attacks by the journals of the Communist Party and the Bombay crypto-communist journal *Blitz*, and it has treated them with the contempt which they deserve.

What is surely a new low in such absurd stories is struck by *Blitz* in a recent issue. In an effort to cover up the obvious guilt of its communist friends in regard to the disgraceful disturbances in Bombay in January over the issue of linguistic States, this journal has had the effrontery to suggest that these riots were led by anti-communists and that the Democratic Research Service was among those who secretly instigated the "Bombay-for-Samyukta Maharashtra fight" and the disturbances in support of that cause.

The "Special Correspondent" who put out the story has concocted references to various meetings which are supposed to have taken place and which are in fact a figment of his own fertile imagination. The only concrete bit of evidence on which he has sought to base his statement that the D.R.S. was behind the "Bombay-for-Samyukta-Maharashtra fight" is an article written by "Vidura" in the *Times of India* who, according to him, is Mr. A. D. Gorwala, whom he describes as a member of the D.R.S. As it happens, however, Mr. A. D. Gorwala is not a member of the D.R.S. and has never been in any way connected with it.

The D.R.S. is, as is well known, concerned with the spread of information and enlightenment in regard to democratic values and the threats that face it in our country's life. While individual members of the organisation may hold differing views on the issue of linguistic States, the organisation as such has not taken any interest in it one way or the other. Perhaps the only expression of its views in regard to the happenings in Bombay and other parts of the country in January was an editorial note entitled "Obligations of Democracy" in the February 1956 issue of *Freedom First*, its monthly organ. In that article, the agitation for Samyukta Maharashtra was described as having "overstepped the bounds of democracy", to be "fast assuming the vicious character of a struggle against particular communities" and to be "shaking the very foundations of democracy." A plea was made to sober elements to regain a sense of proportion. Also, *Thought* of February 18 and *Mysindia* and *Radical Humanist* of February 19 carried an article by Mr. V. B. Karnik, Editor of *Freedom First*, pointing out the dangers to which the country had

been exposed by the activities of the communists and their allies in the Samyukta Maharashtra movement and in the disorders that they had promoted.

The "Special Correspondent" of *Blitz* has attempted to link up with this cock-and-bull story another unfounded allegation that the D.R.S. and others were engaged in creating an opposition party against the party today in power. Here again, there is naturally not the slightest basis in so far as the D.R.S. is concerned. While it would be perfectly legitimate in a democracy for those who so desire to form any number of opposition parties and to seek at the polls to displace the government of the day, the D.R.S., as an information and research group composed of members of the Congress Party, the P.S.P. and others, neither indulges, nor is competent to indulge, in activities of that nature.

Perhaps the best way to look at such utterly false and fabricated reports is to consider them a compliment for whatever sound work in behalf of democratic ideals a small group like this may be doing.

Copyright Bill

A NEW copyright Bill is before the Rajya Sabha and has been referred to a Joint Select Committee of both Houses. As a member of the British Commonwealth, India was a member of the European Union bound by the Berne-Berlin Convention. She also signed the Universal Copyright Convention at Geneva along with others in 1952. These Conventions provide for reciprocity as between their members in the matter of copyright. Copyright holders in one country automatically enjoy in member countries the rights they have in their own. This assumes a certain level of uniformity in the internal legislation of the participating States. So far, the requirements of uniformity have been in relation to the term of copyright and in regard to absence of formalities such as registration and prior Government approval of works before they could acquire copyright protection from the State. The universally accepted period of copyright protection in most countries of Europe has been 50 years from the death of the author. But the Indian Bill now on the anvil of the legislature reduces the period by half and makes it twentyfive years. In a democracy, there is an overwhelming tendency towards conformity and levelling down. All the more reason therefore for a democracy to be specially solicitous of creative ability and individuality, specially in matters of cultural achievement. It is to be hoped that the authorities would be persuaded by representations by the public and by discussion in the legislature to retain the original period of fifty years of copyright. The rights of the public are specially protected by the provision of compulsory licences to be given to applicants other than copyright holders to publish works if their owners are unable or unwilling to make them available to the public on reasonable terms. The provision to make translation rights co-extensive with those of authorship or production is an improvement which is to be welcomed.

Also the provision for a withdrawal of assignment by authors after 7 but before 10 years of such assignment if it appears that they had been unfairly dealt with in regard to the earning capacity of the work.

But another feature of the new Bill is of doubtful value, namely, the proposal to establish a Copyright Board with judicial powers with a Chairman, a Registrar, and three members. All copyright works will have to register with this Board if they are to enjoy legal protection, though copyright does not await such registration to accrue to the author or producer or artist. This is another matter which will automatically put our country outside the European Union governed by the Berne-Berlin Convention. The British Government withdrew their clause of registration from their Act of 1911. It is to be hoped that the Indian Government will also likewise be persuaded to withdraw the proposal to establish a full time office not only for registration but also for administration of a quasi-legal character with judicial powers. The general tendency of sound democratic administrations is towards leaving the ordinary courts of the land to deal with all matters. Specific laws relating to specific spheres of transactions are no doubt necessary but they should all be within the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts. The multiplication of special courts, though subject to appeal to higher regular courts, is contrary to the spirit of democracy.

It is necessary to get the sponsors of the Bill, viz, the Education Ministry to make it absolutely clear that India continues to be a member of the Berne Union without the need of negotiating new treaties with each individual member of the Berne-Berlin Union and of the Universal Copyright Convention of Geneva 1952. The relevant section 42 of the Bill speaks of Government regulating relations with foreign countries by orders. It is to be hoped that this does not mean orders in respect of individual applications of all foreign copyright holders for protection in India on a reciprocal basis. This is too cumbersome, time-consuming and vexatious. It would be useful to obtain clarification in regard to the way in which Government propose to retain reciprocity and maintain uniform world standards vis-a-vis foreign countries.

Exploitation Of Students

STUDENT indiscipline in India has been a matter of serious concern for the past few years. It is said that this is partly a hangover of the days of the British Raj, when students with the rest of the citizens were expected to be as vocal as possible against foreign domination. But immediately the Union Jack was hauled down a new situation arose and it was expected that our leaders and the students themselves would assess their responsibilities afresh and realise that their duty was to imbibe knowledge and not participate in current debates. It is as important for the students to remain detached, as it is for the military and the police not to question the decisions of Government.

It was therefore unfortunate that students were dragooned into receptions which were organised for the Soviet dictators when they visited our country. In some cases schools were opened earlier than usual after the holidays to enable children to join in the organised welcome to the Russian rulers. From this it was but another step to see, during the last linguistic disturbances in Bombay, processions of students, shouting slogans and stoning buses and cars in protest against the S.R.C. Report.

Our Government now seems to have realised that students can shout both for and against the Government—and the latter is not so pleasant as the former. Speaking at Shaheed Nagar on February 10 at the All India Youth Congress, Pandit Nehru asked students to shun agitational politics like taking out processions and shouting slogans. The Bombay State Education Department has been more specific and in a circular to the heads of secondary schools it has asked them to ensure that children in their schools are not used for political purposes by any party. The circular says: "Use of secondary school children by various political parties for their own purpose is detrimental to the best interests of the nation and creates difficulties of discipline." This is elementary commonsense. Unfortunately our Government and political leaders have taken a long time to learn it.

Austria And The W.F.T.U.

THE World Federation of Trade Unions, one of the most important front organisations of international communism, has been at last compelled to quit Vienna. The Austrian Government was never happy with the presence of this communist organisation in their capital. But they were helpless so long, as its office was located in the Russian-occupied zone of the city.

The W.F.T.U. had shifted to Vienna after it was driven out of Paris owing to its blatant communist activities. In Vienna it continued the same type of activities and indulged moreover in many acts which were a gross violation of the sovereignty and independence of Austria.

With the signing of the peace treaty Austria regained her sovereign independence and Soviet Russia was no longer in a position to force her to give shelter to the unwanted W.F.T.U. The Government tried in the first instance to persuade the W.F.T.U. to respect Austria's neutrality and to act according to law. Having failed in that attempt there was no alternative before them except to ask the organisation to quit.

The W.F.T.U. is now in search of another place in the free countries of Europe. It can easily find a place in countries behind the Iron Curtain. With over ninety per cent of its membership in those countries, Moscow, Warsaw, Prague or Bucharest would be the proper place for its office. The Federation is not, however, willing to adopt that natural course as it would expose its real character as a communist front organisation.

New Soviet Leaders

by Bertram D. Wolfe

Too much is likely to be read into the criticisms of Stalin on certain minor issues to which expression was permitted during the proceedings of the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which have just concluded. Mr. Bertram Wolfe places the matter in proper perspective. Indeed, this article, which was written in January before the Congress commenced, displays a remarkable capacity to anticipate the strategy which the Soviet dictators adopted during the Congress.

JOSEPH Stalin had been dead six hours and ten minutes before the Kremlin announced his passing. The broadcasts were not a cry of grief for irreparable loss, but a call to "monolithic unity. . . . high political vigilance, intolerance in the struggle against the inner and outer foe. . . . to insure uninterrupted leadership. . . . and the prevention of disorder and panic."

"Disorder and panic"! These words bring us close to the heart of the mystery of the totalist state.

A system which has ruptured the fabric of legitimacy first in its traditional monarchist, then in its democratic form; a system which seeks to continue the revolution from above and the remaking of man according to a new and arrogant, not to say a blasphemous, "blueprint"; a system in which the Leader and his lieutenants try to intervene in every local quarrel, break up every local "nest" of solidarity, make their power felt at every level high and low and in every private spirit; a system which seeks even to prevent the development of a stable bureaucracy operating according to rules that are impersonal and not readily subject to change; a system which issues commands and "allocates functions" without granting control over either the decisions or the resources which those functions require; a system which has "a vested interest in confusion" and unsettlement and lives by the uncertainty and unending strain of all its subjects; a system which has chosen to pulverize all non-state organizations and recognizes no autonomy either of public organization or of private purpose or feeling; in short, a system which describes itself as a dictatorship in permanence and is what it describes itself to be — such a system has not developed a legitimacy in a third of a century of existence nor can it develop a legitimacy.

Because it thus wages unending war on its own people and on the world, the reverse side of its inordinate power is its inordinate fear. The thermometer measuring opposition having been deliberately broken, the quicksilver of opposition is instinctively felt to be everywhere. The words "confusion and panic" escaping from the lips of the "orphaned" rulers of the world's most powerful government betray the fear that is in their hearts. They fear the prostrate and atomized people over whom they rule and to whom they give no peace. They fear the outside world which they plan to conquer and to which, even in their peace-mongering campaigns, they give no peace. And they fear each other.

The whole dynamics of dictatorship cries out for a dictator; autocracy for an autocrat; militarized life for a supreme commander; authoritarianism for an

authority; absolute, centralized, ubiquitous power for an absolute ruler; infallible government for an infallible leader; totalitarianism for a charismatic or synthetically manufactured charismatic leader, a *Duce*, *Fuehrer*, *Vozhd*.

Because this type of Leader dwarfs and deprives of personality even his closest associates, it was not hard to foresee that their first step would be the proclamation of a "collective leadership." But the whole dynamics of their system makes that but the first step in a muted or open struggle for the succession.

There is in the Soviet system no machinery to provide a peaceful, legal and legitimate succession. The Soviet Government has long ceased to be a government by soviets. The one-party state has long ceased to possess a living party, for parties are parts and need each other to maintain party life as the sexes need each other to maintain sex life. When there is only one party, every controversy within it must reflect the hopes of some part of the population outside of it. Hence Lenin forbade factions and party discussions in 1921.

Now there is no party to decide anything or to select its servants, officials, leaders. The Party is anything but a party in the normal sense of the word. It is a pretorian guard, a recruiting of activists to carry out the Leader's plans, the eyes and ears of an espionage system, a "transmission belt" to convey the Leader's will to a will-less nation and to members and sympathizers in other lands. There is not even a provision in the Soviet Constitution or in the Party Statutes for a dictator, much less a provision for a legal succession to the post which grew out of the real dynamics of the totalitarian regime. Hence the funeral orations of the ostensible triumvirate spoke of a "collective leadership." The Big Three in that "collective" leadership were Malenkov, Beria and Molotov.

Malenkov was deprived of his post of First Party Secretary by Khrushchev two weeks after Stalin's death. On February 8, 1955, he was deprived of his Premiership and forced to confess "my guilt and responsibility for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in agriculture. . . . my insufficient experience in local work. . . . and in direct guidance of individual branches of the national economy."

In December 1953, the second Triumvir, Lavrenti Beria, ended with a bullet in the base of his brain, became a retroactive traitor from the beginning of time, then an unperson.

In the September *Kommunist* of this year, Molotov confessed that six months earlier he had been guilty of an ideological error "theoretically erroneous and

politically harmful introducing confusion into ideological questions contradicting Party decisions and casting doubt upon the existence in our country of a socialist society that has in the main already been built."

This leaves Nikita Khrushchev as Number 1, with the main power lever, the Party machine, in his hands. With him in an enigmatic duumvirate is the secretive Bulganin. Supporting them, yet anxiously checking on them, are other Stalin lieutenants, maintaining as best they can a "collective leadership," out of which Khrushchev increasingly emerges as "more equal than the others."

Supported by "the Army" — more precisely, by Bulganin's Special Section, the secret police machine and the Party machine in the Army — Khrushchev was able to depose Malenkov, dispose of Beria, and compel Molotov to put himself out of the running by a confession that he didn't know socialism when he saw it. Khrushchev's platitude are beginning to be quoted solemnly in black type as an *ipse dixit*.

Around Khrushchev and Bulganin, supporting them yet anxiously seeking to restrain them are other lieutenants of Joseph Stalin. Trained in the same hard school, with the same blood of comrades on their hands, they know enough to make many moves in their heads before they touch a single piece on the chessboard of power. They have reason to combine against any man who moves too fast, yet to desert each other if they think they know who will win, and can swing aboard his juggernaut in place of being crushed by it.

It is well to remember — historians at least should have a memory — that Stalin ruled as modest party wheelhorse in a "collective leadership" from 1923 to 1929, that he denounced Zinoviev for "wanting Trotsky's blood," then denounced the Left Opposition for wanting "to run the Party without Bukharin," and did not himself shed the blood of his comrades until he had been thirteen years in effective power and seven years the sole and absolute ruler.

"Collective leadership", hard enough in a democracy, runs against the very nature of dictatorship. Yet it is the natural, if incurably transitory, form of interregnum in a system of totalitarian dictatorship.

Having thus briefly examined the nature and dynamics of the totalitarian system, let us look at the "new" measures of the post-Stalin era.

The men may be styled *epigoni*. Lenin's Marxism was so different from that of Marx that Charles Rapoport, an admirer, styled it *Marxisme a la tartare*. Stalin's Leninism differed from Lenin's too, but the differences are not so radical and the continuities are greater. Stalin's personality set its stamp upon his era, as Lenin's did on his, and the differences in their personalities were enormous. But the direction of change was determined in large measure by the dynamics of the developing totalitarian system for which Lenin had laid the foundations — by his party organization, by his theory of elite dictatorship, by his seizure of power, and by his power-oriented rather than welfare-oriented use of it.

Being accustomed to use the pistol to guide the his-

torian's pen in enlarging and glorifying Stalin's name, they immediately began fresh rewriting of history to cut him down to size — not to actual size, but to their own size. For the Stalin cult had so dwarfed them that who could claim to be big enough to rule after the sole repository of greatness and author of everything was no more? On the other hand, they cannot altogether extinguish his name, for what other claim do they have to rule except association with Stalin and discipleship to Lenin in an unbroken "apostolic succession"? Nor do they wish to abandon his policies, for in large measure they flow from the nature of the regime, and, more than we are prone to realize, they are their policies no less than his. . . .

Stalin's declining years were marked by more than a touch of paranoia and increasing rigidity. But we would do wrong to exaggerate these. The same Stalinist "paranoiac" account of the Second World War has just been retailed by Khrushchev and Bulganin in India.

Because the death of a tyrant in Russia has always been accompanied by a general expectation of change, because the war-weary free world was longing to yield to new illusions, because his lieutenants were freer to manoeuvre with fresh imagination after the "Old Man's" death and because their power position was more uncertain, they carried out his suggested manoeuvre with unexpected verve. But not one thing they did went outside the formula he had there laid down for them or went as far toward "relaxation of tensions" as had Lenin's New Economic Policy and concessions, or Stalin's Collective Security, Disarmament and Popular Front, or his Grand Alliance manoeuvres. Each chess game is played a little differently, but the same basic manual of "book-moves" is being followed.

In Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism* (1952) are to be found literally the whole stock of formulae on which Khrushchev, Bulganin and Company have been proceeding. For a while they were forced to put more emphasis on the satisfaction of the need for consumers' goods, but always on the basis of "the primacy of production of the means of production." This slight shift was due to their weaker power position and their need to meet and play in the expectation of change. The "primacy" was never sacrificed, and now they have enlarged it to a more than Stalinist priority.

The drive for a fresh revolution from above in agriculture is also outlined in algebraic formulae in Stalin's pamphlet. Khrushchev was even then the man charged with giving "arithmetical values" to those algebraic formulae.

Deluded by the Stalin cult and our own propensity to personalize, we have forgotten that even while Stalin lived these men were co-makers of his policies: Khrushchev in agriculture, Bulganin in the armed forces; Malenkov in industry; Molotov in foreign affairs; Zhdanov and then Malenkov in literature. If Beria is gone, to direct the KGB there is still Serov (famed for his order to put on the political suspect list in Lithuania even philatelists and Esperantists),

(Continued on page 7)

Come To Sunny Russia

by Alex Atkinson

WANT something different? Why not a Russian jaunt this year? Farther than Madrid, larger than Majorca, not so cold as Marie Byrd Land, nearer than Montevideo, the U.S.S.R. offers plenty of scope for a really chic, up-to-the-minute holiday.

When you think of it, Russia is in the news quite a lot these days: hardly a week goes by without some reference to it in the newspapers, however brief. Yes, Russia is certainly here to stay, and the time is not far distant when you will be pointed out as something of a freak in your favourite Espresso bar if you have not had *solyanka* soup in Leningrad or sailed along the Don to Rostov. You can get there by air in next

(Continued from page 6)

and Kruglov (of forced-labour construction fame) to head the MVD. However, neither of these is in the Presidium, a sign of the reduction of power of the Secret Police in favour of Bulganin's Secret Special Section of the Army.

To sum up: "New" men who have succeeded to Stalin's power are not so new as they look to the un-inquisitive eye. The power structure is the same and drives in the same direction. The unending war on their own people, to speed up, to remake, and to reduce them to animate instruments of the power of the State, will continue. The war to win the world will take ever new forms, as it has done in the preceding three decades, but will continue undiminished, too. The "collective leadership" is unstable; the whole dynamics of the totalitarian dictatorship drives toward a continued, muted struggle for a single successor.

More than Stalin would admit or they dared to claim while he was alive, these men worked out the Stalinist policies with him. Now that he is dead, they are able to cut the losses of some minor errors with which his stubbornness or prestige had become involved. But all their major policies — from "peaceful coexistence" and "anti-colonialism" to "partyness in literature," "primacy of production of the means of production" and "increase in labour productivity" in industry to continuation of the agrarian revolution from above — are envisaged in Stalin's last work and political testament. They can bring a fresh frankness to their drive in agriculture; separate the drive for partyness in culture from Lysenkoism and the non-sensical refusal to learn technology openly from abroad which characterized Stalin's last but not his earlier years; show new tactical imagination disciplined by the same inflexibility in strategic aims in their international drives. But they have no intention of diminishing the "revolution from above," the war on their own people, the drive to win the world, that represent the continuity of Lenin, Stalin, and Comrade X in a continuing totalitarian system.

Abridged from the *New Leader*.

to no time, and a little bird tells me that you will soon be able to buy your fur hat at London Airport *before you board the plane*.

Once in Moscow you will be struck by the many points of similarity between their way of life and ours — always a good start to a holiday. Muscovites, like Londoners, use their elbows on the Underground, scowl at strangers, love children, give parties but never ask you to them, distrust bureaucracy, leave fish-bones on the side on the plate, and take a lively interest in politics. (Russian politics, by the way, are different from ours. The most popular system of government is called Communism, and everybody is divided up into soviets. The arrangement is not easy to follow, but it certainly seems to be catching on. Almost everywhere you go you will bump into at least one communist, and it is ten to one that the best-dressed, most nicely-spoken man in any gathering will turn out not to be a Conservative after all. This can be confusing at first. In fact, as in Ireland, it is best not to delve too deeply into politics: Russians seem to learn about it at school, and the things they know about English history can be most embarrassing — especially on holiday.)

An interesting city, Moscow, with its wide streets, sky-scrapers, plain-clothes secret police, and nail-varnish openly on sale in the shops. Tourists are made very welcome. Cars, guides and interpreters are placed at their disposal, and at any of the Intourist hotels (there are three) you will feel immediately at home, especially if you are over seventy. Potted plants, anti-macassars and red plush sofas abound. There is a night-club (if it hasn't already been raided), and its old-world charm has considerable appeal. The floor-show includes a fat woman doing the shimmy in a woollen vest, while for admirers of Ted Lewis and early Victor Sylvester the band is a *must*. Apart from this, night-life in Moscow is refreshingly sombre. The nearest thing to the Folies Bergere is the Bolshoi Theatre, and that's always full. At eleven p.m. you might think you were in Cowdenbeath.

Another diverting feature of Moscow life is the absence of bars. Unless you are staying at the Moskva or Sovetskaya Hotels, you may drink only with meals. (Incidentally, you can get a very simple meal for two for ten pounds, with any luck.) I don't know how you can overcome the drinks question, but I shouldn't lose too much sleep over it if I were you, because a glass of beer works out at about twelve shillings.

There are always exciting queues to join in Moscow — for cinema seats, bread, bathroom fittings, tinned fruit, lectures: the list is endless. Another way to pass the time if you feel lonely is to stand stock still in the middle of Gorky Street (just off Red Square — you can't miss it), take your camera from its case and call out "Me English! . . . Me friend!"

You will at once be surrounded by milling throngs of Muscovites—artisans, civil servants, minor poets, students, admirers of Paul Scofield doctors, deviationists, farmers, soldiers, etc.—who will punch and jostle one another in a struggle to be the first to prod you with a fore-finger and say “Churchill,” “Good Show!” or “Prince Charles!” (Most people in Moscow learn a smattering of English, probably at night school; but like most foreigners they tend to have rather laughable accents. However, if you are any good at making signs you will usually manage to get some sort of sense out of them.) Among the remarks made to English visitors surrounded in the streets of Moscow the following are the most frequent:

“When did you last attend a lynching, please?”

“We are your friends.”

“How much was that watch?”

“Why did you not open a second front sooner?”

“Come and see us again.”

“You live in a hut in Knightsbridge, without drains.”

“Where did you get that hat?”

“I require a photograph of Stanley Mathews.”

“Why do you prepare for war while your peasants have to eat berries?”

“I like you.”

“An old man has just run off with your walking-stick.”

“Russia wants peace.”

As you will realize, many fascinating conversations may be built on these simple openings. Do not be shy. Gain their confidence. Give them sweets. In this way you will get to know the *real* Russia; and if you can persuade a particularly frumpish teen-ager to pose for a photo, with the pink walls of the Kremlin in the background, you'll be sure of a few guineas from one of the Sunday papers when you get home.

Many people tend to think that the USSR consists merely of Moscow and Leningrad, but this is a misconception. Russia's unique attraction as a camper's paradise is the fact that it measures eight million

five hundred thousand square miles, with a population of only two hundred million—many of whom are quite amusing people, such as Uzbeks, Turkmenians, Kazakhs, Khazars, Yakuts and Tatars. The Tadzhiks speak Persian, for some reason or other, while the Mordvinians and Udmurts, in north-west Siberia, Finnish. Most religions are catered for, including Roman Catholic, Buddhist, Moslem, Protestant, Jewish, Lamaist and Greek Orthodox. For times of services it is advisable to consult a local paper.

In the town the women are roughly square in shape, and don't stand any nonsense. They wear their hair in plaits, which they wind around their heads to make them look picturesque. Alternately they smooth it all down with bear grease and drag it back behind their ears. Fashion models have forty-inch hips and curious legs. Some arrangements have been made about promiscuity but no tourist has yet fathomed what they are. Schoolboys learn to play chess blind-fold. Russian jokes are about collective farmers scoring off civil servants, officials wangling jobs for their nephews, factory managers stealing sacks of sugar, and blocks of flats collapsing on account of bureaucracy in the foundations. Apples cost five shillings each. It is advisable to wear a muffler. Architecture was recently abolished. The Russians are a warm, friendly people, and have been building up a warm, friendly empire by gunpowder, infiltration, blarney and bloody murder with hardly a pause ever since the invasion of Siberia in 1581. A small slab of chocolate costs thirty shillings. If you enter a works canteen at lunch-time and see men and women, wearing brown serge clothes and clogs, shuffling about in pairs like traglodytes in a haunted sewer, it is workers' playtime and they are dancing the two-step.

Yes, many and varied are the sights that await you in this land of rolling plain, freezing steppe, piercing wind and crowded bus. And don't forget to take a good fat notebook; you'll have to pay for the trip somehow.

—Reproduced from *Punch*, London.

ENCOUNTER

Literature • Arts • Politics

THE USES OF THE DEAD

A WAKE IN WARSAW

by Laurie Lee

THE REAL MICKIEWICZ

by Czeslaw Milosoz

ELEGY:

A PREVIOUSLY UNPUBLISHED POEM

by Dylan Thomas

PISH-TUSH

by Wyndham Lewis

FEBRUARY 1956

29

ANNUAL Rs. 12/-

For members of the Indian Committee
for Cultural Freedom Rs. 10/-.

QUEST

a bi-monthly of arts & ideas

Sponsored by

the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom

EDITOR: NISSIM EZEKIEL.

“I was much impressed both by the get-up and by the contents of QUEST. It seems to be up to the highest standards, and is certainly far and above the best magazine I have ever seen produced in India.”

—Mrs. R. Prawer Jhabwala, Author, *To Whom She Will*.

Poems, Articles, Short Stories, Book Reviews,
Notes on Theatre, Cinema & Dance.

Annual subscription Rs. 6/-

Single Copy Re. 1/-

Army & Navy Building,
148, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay 1.

A P.E.N. Centre In Soviet Russia?

THERE has been a proposal for forming a P.E.N. Centre in Soviet Russia. The International Secretary of the P.E.N. wrote to Mr. Simonov, Secretary of the Executive of the Association of Soviet Writers that any proposal to form a Russian P.E.N. Centre would be considered with interest "in the context of the Charter."

Members of the P.E.N. are primarily writers and not directly concerned with politics. But this is an issue that leaves them no option but to take a definite attitude to fundamental matters, questions of freedom and slavery, of life and death to culture as such, to the essence of man and his unique destiny.

The international and non-party character of the world P.E.N. comes increasingly into conflict with its nature, (no less important,) as an association of free writers, bound in our honour and our pledged word to resist all attacks upon the liberties upheld by our Charter.

In his Presidential Address at Vienna delivered in June 12th 1955 at the 27th International Congress, Mr. Charles Morgan raised these profound issues in trenchant fashion and put a few crucial questions for the consideration of members arising out of the proposal to open a P.E.N. Centre in Soviet Russia:

"1. In view of the unquestionable fact that in all totalitarian countries, organisations and societies cannot openly exist without Government approval, is it possible that a P.E.N. Centre formed under such a regime can be genuinely independent and free?

2. Will its membership be open to critics of the regime?

3. Will any of its members who deviate from the party orthodoxy be free to say so in speech and writing? Will they be able freely to attend our Congress outside their own country?

4. Is there reasonable hope that the delegates from such a Centre will enter into genuinely free discussions with us and will not use their place among us for the purpose of propaganda, penetration and ultimately of domination?

Further if a totalitarian country decides to let a P.E.N. Centre be formed within its territory, it may happen that members may be instructed to subscribe to the Charter.

In that case, members will have to ask themselves whether the subject of totalitarian countries can subscribe to our Charter in the right spirit or whether they do so as a temporary means to an extraneous end. In a country subject to a secret police, rigid censorship, where men accused of deviation have no appeal to independent courts of law, is it possible that the Charter could have the same meaning as in free countries? What will be the ultimate outcome of this in regard to the quality of the World P.E.N. and to its basic ideals?"

Finally, the President declared: "Tolerance is a great virtue and it is true that such words as liberty and freedom may within certain limits be variously interpreted in different circumstances and at different

periods of history. Nevertheless, moral courage is a virtue at least equal to the virtue of tolerance.

"There are limits to tolerance. If our country is invaded and our homes are threatened and our liberties endangered, and if a man then collaborates with the enemy within our gates, we do not praise him for his tolerance. We regard him as a traitor and a coward. So in the moral sphere, there comes a time at which we must stand firm, and I think the time may come when P.E.N. will have to choose between the ordinary and reasonable interpretation of our Charter and the surrender of it I know for my own part that as long as I am President of P.E.N. I will do nothing which will endanger what I regard as its basic principles. Among the most important of these principles are these: That writers who are the instruments of tyranny are not entitled to be received by us. In this spirit, I ask you to consider the questions I have put before you consider them in your hearts and be prepared to answer them, as I shall be if ever the time should come."

A glance at clause 4 of the PEN Charter will show at once the sharp difference between the countries behind the Iron Curtain and the free world in regard to cultural freedom. The PEN stands for "the principle of unhampered transmission of thought within each nation and between all nations, and members pledge themselves to oppose any form of suppression of freedom of expression in the country and community to which they belong." Even the exponents of Soviet principles do not claim that freedom of this kind exists in the lands over which they rule. The State according to them should control the major lines of thought in every field of culture: literature, philosophy, science, art, and any deviation from the rules authoritatively laid down by the party agencies will have serious consequences for the writer or scientist. The case of Lysenko is well-known. Many novelists have lost their means of livelihood and have been punished in other ways including liquidation for departing from the principle of "Socialist Realism." The Charter further declares "for a free press and opposes arbitrary censorship in time of peace." But Soviet Russia has never relaxed its iron system of censorship that seeks to control the entire substance of thought and feeling to which her subjects are to have access. No foreign books and periodicals can be imported by Soviet citizens on their own individual initiative. The proposal of many nations of the free world to open Information Centres in Soviet Russia has always been steadily negated by the Soviet Government. It is clear that there is no cultural freedom whatever in communist countries. It is therefore difficult to understand how Soviet writers can form a PEN Centre in their country and run it in the spirit of the Charter. It is only all too clear that the Soviet Government and party seek to take full advantage of this proposal and make of it another cultural front under cover of which to infiltrate and control the cultural circles of free countries.

M.A.V.

Review

Sister Cecilia

Longmans, Green and Co. Price 12 Shillings.

IT is a moving story told by Sister Cecilia herself to William Brinkley. It is the story of Communist tyranny over even simple innocent nuns, whose interest was not political but only the service of the sick and the stricken.

Sister Cecilia was at the hospital, nursing, when the Czechoslovakian Communist Police came to arrest her. She would not submit to the arrest; she decided to escape and to go under-ground. What did she do on the spur of the moment? She herself describes: "I stop thinking and I do it. I lift off my veil. I unhook my collar. I untie my bonnet. I untie my forehead cover. I unhook my cloak. I take off my belt with its rosary and cross. I take off my dress. And disappear."

For full one year she becomes a hunted fugitive before getting across the Morava River into Austria, thence into Germany and eventually to America.

Sister Cecilia had begun her life in a happy family in Slovakia before the First World War. She took her final vows in 1932 and became a teacher. When Czechoslovakia fell a victim to communist domination, all the nuns were ordered to stop teaching. But Sister Cecilia loved the young and hence went to nurse sick children in a hospital in Bratislava. It was not long before the communists came to arrest her only to find that she had escaped. Had she not escaped, she would have been arrested and probably tortured like other nuns. She came to be more and more involved in the underground movement till the day she narrowly escaped from communist tyranny. Her account arouses sympathy for her and for so many of her compatriots who have been so brutally uprooted. The book reveals the nature of the treatment that the communists mete out to religious bodies and persons. A. A.

The Ambassador

A Views magazine devoted to international problems. Edited by Sudhir Hendre, Bombay 26. Price annas four.

THE first two numbers of the new fortnightly magazine called significantly *The Ambassador* augur well for its future as an independent journal of opinion dealing specifically with international affairs and foreign policy. There is far too little of informed discussion on this subject in the country. And a general tendency to conform to official or fashionable views is preventing free and open expression of opinion from finding outlet in recognised media of public discussion. Also, the claim that the present policies in force on foreign affairs represent the almost unanimous judgment of vocal sections of the population is not as much of a truth as it may appear to be from the headlines of leading papers. In such a climate of thought and feeling, the venture of Mr. Hendre in launching on this enterprise in outspoken journalism is all the more creditable and is to be welcomed. M.A.V.

Books To Read

The Public Philosophy

by Walter Lippmann Published by Hamish Hamilton London 1955 Pages 168. Price Sh. 12/6.

FEW reviews have done justice to the weighty views broached in this small book by Mr. Walter Lippmann. His thesis is that in the first half of this century of world wars, democracy has failed to rise to the occasion and justify the hopes entertained of it in the era of reforms and revolutions since the English civil war. The main reason is that total wars have necessitated appeal to the masses for support and the governing classes have found it necessary to defer to the passions and ideas of the masses and have become increasingly unwilling and unable to act for the peoples entrusted to their care in the light of the best knowledge available to them and in a spirit of independent devotion to the public good, even if it should on occasion conflict with the views and desires of the masses. Western States have had periods of good government when the rulers had the courage and the insight to rule in the light of what Mr. Lippmann calls the *public philosophy*. Western civilisation from the days of Pericles and Socrates has developed a political tradition which places the good of the country and society above the private sectional interest of the rulers. They have been guided by public spirit to put the common good above the sectional good of classes.

Modern democracy since the days of the American Revolution has sought to incorporate this tradition into the methods of governance adopted by democratic constitutions. Now it is Mr. Lippmann's thesis that this tradition of public spirit or public philosophy has suffered a catastrophic eclipse since the war of 1914. Several currents of thought prevailing in these eventful years have weakened the public philosophy. One is the general scepticism of the time, which saps the foundation not merely of religious belief but of any conviction of objective values and objective realities whatever. "There is nothing good or bad but thinking makes it so—" is a dogma that is prevalent all over the world today. The public philosophy of the past had a strong faith in natural law, buttressed among the religious by belief in a God of Nature who wills and sustains its activities. Today the public interest is lost in the clash of sectional interests and pressure groups. The very question—is there a national or social good apart from the good of classes and individuals within the society—is becoming unintelligible to modern citizens nowadays.

The only way back to civilisation in political affairs is to recover the old sense of the absolute value of social or universal good over-riding in case of conflict in the short period the interests of individuals and groups.

This needs a new sense of the objectivity of reality, natural and social and of the universality of good. This demands a radical rethinking on the implications of ethics, individual and social.

(Continued on page 11)

I. C. C. F. NEWS

Quest, the bi-monthly of arts and ideas sponsored by the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, organised two meetings in February to further its policy of promoting discussion on political and cultural subjects. The first of these was on Tuesday February 14 in the form of a Seminar on Martha Graham. *Quest* is preparing an assessment of this noted American dancer's impact on Indian audiences. The Seminar was a part of the effort to elicit informed opinion on the subject. A selection of excellent photographs of Martha Graham was on view by kind courtesy of the U.S.I.S. The Theatre Unit lent some books on Martha Graham which were also displayed. These exhibits appeared to be greatly appreciated and were kept on view for a week.

On Friday February 17, Mr. S. Natarajan, former editor of the *Free Press Journal*, led a discussion on "The Question of Linguistic Provinces." A large number of those present participated in the debate that followed Mr. Natarajan's speech.

A reception was accorded to Shrimati Rukminidevi Arundale, M.P., a member of the Executive Committee of the I.C.C.F., on February 11 when she was in Calcutta for presenting a couple of dance dramas composed by her. The reception was jointly organised by the Calcutta Group of the Committee and the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture. Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.P. presided over the function. Shrimati Arundale spoke on the occasion on the "Spiritual Significance of Art." Over 400 persons were present at the reception.

Prof. W. S. Woytinsky, the well-known American economist, delivered a lecture at the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture on February 12 when he was passing through Calcutta on his way to New Delhi. The subject of Prof. Woytinsky's lecture was "Outlook of the World Economy." Prof. Nirmal Bhattacharya of the Calcutta University presided.

Mr. V. B. Karnik, Hon. Secretary of the Indian Committee, visited Bangalore on February 12. He delivered a lecture on the "Second Five Year Plan" under the auspices of the Society for the Defence of Democracy. Mr. Karnik was in Madras on February 15, 16 and 17 to meet the members of the Committee in Madras and to discuss with them plans for reorganising the Committee's activities in the city. It is expected that as a result of his visit the local committee will be shortly reconstituted and a number of new activities will be undertaken.

Four prominent Japanese women writers Mesdames Tsuyako Abe, Yoshiko Shibaki, Shigeko Yuki and Ayako Sono, were on a short visit to India. The Asian Office accorded a reception to them when they went to New Delhi. The writers were in Bombay on February 24 and 25. The Indian Committee accorded a reception to them on February 24. A number of Marathi, Hindi, Gujarati and English writers attended the reception. The Japanese writers answered a num-

ber of questions put to them regarding the state of literature in Japan. A special display of Manipuri dance given by the Jhaveri sisters was also arranged for them.

*

Dr. Max Yergan and Mrs. Yergan of New York paid a visit to the office of the Committee in Bombay on February 21. They met in the office members of the Administrative Board and some other active members and discussed with them a number of issues pertaining to the relations between India and the free world.

(Continued from page 10)

The implication for democracy is that elected persons have to take to their function as a vocation with its own obligations. They are responsible not to the passing vagaries and passions of the masses but to the discovery and realisation of common good or public interest in the day-to-day issues that emerge in the course of administration and statecraft, domestic and international. Statesmen should make up their minds and find the best solutions in the light of the public interest and persuade the masses to accept their advice. They should *lead* and not *follow*. There is an element of legitimate aristocracy in government which must be boldly accepted. It is not contrary to the spirit of democracy but is on the contrary necessary to fulfil the democratic hope.

To Indian readers, the book should have a singular appeal. If the West has to recover its sense of public philosophy or the ethical tradition of governance, we too have to recover or discover the spirit behind democratic institutions and cease to identify it with the rule of majorities. Democratic conventions are only external devices to enable the best minds of the society to come forward to accept the responsibilities of government. The central business of government is to govern, not to enrich one's self and satisfy one's lust for power but to find the public good through the clamant passions of the hour and to give administrative effect to it. Democratic statesmen should educate public opinion, accept the lead of the people where it is right but modify it where it is wrong—with disinterested courage. In India this tradition of governance is called *raja dharma*. Now we may call it *rajya dharma*. This is our public philosophy. The values of a good society and of a sane ethical society are laid down in *raja dharma* and in story and legend in our ancient books.

The task of theory in India is to relate the principles of democracy and constitutional government to the precepts of *dharma*, individual, social and universal. The high metaphysical institutions of the Upanishads and the lofty ideas of the spiritual absolute in the Vedanta have to be mediated to throw light on social and political values. Both the West and the East is now engaged in such a renovation of ethical thought as would give meaning to and support the framework of public order and the substance of public spirit. The work suggests the line of creative reconstruction to thinkers in East and West which could make the idea of *One World* come alive to the imagination of the present generation.

M.A.V.

With Many Voices

“The deep
Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
’Tis not too late to seek a newer world.”

—Tennyson.

The Communists are not Left but East.

—Mr. Mollet quoted in *New York Times*,
February 2.

The trouble is that the West uses the word and idea
of peace as a shield, while the East uses it as a
projectile. —Don Salvador de Madariaga, *Thought*,
February 11.

There is a terrorism of words not so very different
from the physical terrorism associated with totalita-
rian regimes.

—Mr. Hugh Gaitskell,
The Times, January 24.

There is a distant relative we have to cope with,
and that is the influence of stale slogans which affect
our minds and which leave us content to accept con-
clusions which, if we really thought them, we would
realize are not applicable.

—Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, *The Times*,
January 24.

✓ In the present situation, Mr. Nehru is something of
an asset from our point of view, despite the fact that
he has weaknesses and seldom speaks without attack-
ing us.

—Mr. Ajoy Ghosh quoted in *The Observer*,
January 15.

The trends he (Mr. Nehru) dictates will live after
he dies.

—Mr. Ajoy Ghosh quoted in *The Observer*,
January 15.

To the Editor,
FREEDOM FIRST,
C/o Democratic Research Service,
127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Bombay 1.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to FREEDOM FIRST.
I remit the annual subscription of Rs. 3|Rs. 2 for
members of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.

Name:

Address:

.....

.....

Signature

The Soviet Union is to have no use for the man who
sits in an office compiling minutes and directives does
not know the front end of a tractor from the rear end
of a horse.

—*Pravda*, quoted in *The Observer*, January 15.

“Their (E. German writers) subjects should deal
with the true heroes and creators of the new life in
east Germany, such as the State and party officials
holding responsible positions.”

—Quoted in *The Times*, January 12.

One of the economic follies of the Peronista dicta-
torship was to regard foreign loans as contrary to
Argentine sovereignty, and ex-President Peron said
he would sooner cut off his right hand than accept a
foreign loan.

—*The Times*, January 21.

Mr. Chou en-lai is lately reported to have said that
he would welcome discussion with General Chiang
Kai-Shek himself.

—As quoted in *The Times*, January 21.

....Tolerance is a great virtue.....Nevertheless,
moral courage is a virtue at least equal to the virtue
of tolerance.

—Charles Morgan as quoted in the *Indian P.E.N.*,
February 1956

Successful democratic politicians are insecure and
intimidated men. They advance politically only as
they placate, appease, bribe, seduce, bamboozle, or
otherwise manage to manipulate the demanding and
threatening elements in their constituencies.

—Walter Lippmann in *The Public Philosophy*.

✓ A real internationalist is one who brings his sym-
pathy and recognition up to the point of practical and
maximum help in support and defence of the U.S.S.R.
by every means and in every possible form.

—Vishinsky as quoted in the *Times of India*,
February 28.

✓ Legal work must be combined with illegal work.
The party which does not carry out systematic, all-
sided, illegal work, in spite of the laws of the bour-
geoisie and of bourgeois parliaments, is a party of
traitors and scoundrels.

—Lenin, as quoted in the *Times of India*,
February 28.

✓ Moscow is sure it has history's timetables in its
pocket. Hitler once thought so too.

—George Meany, Presidential Address to the
AFL-CIO, December 13.