

RECORD COPY

LIMITED DISTRIBUTION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

1 November 1961

CAN THE WORLD CONGRESS FOR FREEDOM
AND DEMOCRACY REALLY WORK?

Suggested Questions for the Exploratory Meeting
(Paris, December 1961)

Two documents have been submitted to the participants of the Exploratory Meeting: A Proposal for Organization of a World Congress, and A Draft Declaration of Principles for Freedom and Democracy. The present paper is an attempt to anticipate and pose for detailed discussion some of the difficulties which would arise in developing the World Congress. The effort is in part one of a Devil's Advocate, to challenge the evidence adduced in support of the basic statements, and to discuss candidly the fears and misgivings which inevitably arise in the face of such a bold undertaking. But it is also, in part, an attempt to provide initial answers to the Doubting Thomases. In short, it is an agenda "think-piece."

This paper is divided into two sections, posing questions on organization and on the "Public Philosophy," i.e. the interaction of theory and practice contemplated for the Congress, and attempting to provide some answers to these questions.

I. Organization

A. Is it possible to achieve a world organization of the type proposed?

The proposal calls for a new type of organization, i.e. private in essence, but receptive to contributions of personnel and funds from governments, without strings. It may be questioned whether such private and quasi-official elements would be compatible, either in law or in fact. Foundations and other private institutions might legitimately be hesitant

- 1 -

JOB NO. 80-01445R

BOX NO. 1

FOLDER NO. 41

TOTAL DOCS HEREIN 1

DOCUMENT NO. 1
NO CHANGE IN CLASS.
LI DECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C
NEXT REVIEW DATE:
AUTH. HR 70 C
DATE: 11/10/87 BY REVIEWER: 103430

(17)

or unwilling to support an entity in which the impact of governments would tend to be strongly felt through their ability to increase, decrease or withhold necessary financial assistance. Even if there were a formal renunciation of control, there would remain the possibility of influence, especially where matters of great national interest were at stake. There would always remain the suspicion - certainly played upon by the Communists - that covert pressure was being exerted on the Congress. In any case, the weight and prestige of states, especially in the less developed and differentiated nations, would be felt as potentially greater than the sum of all participating private elements.

From the viewpoint of constituted government, it might be questioned whether contributions to the World Congress, locally or internationally, were not inconsistent with sovereignty or with the sound separation of public and private spheres. There might be fears that a state was being created within a state, or that the national components of the Congress might become in time formidable lobbies of foreign policy - in the US, a potential violator of the Logan Act. Nationalist or isolationist elements might denounce the cosmopolitanism, the "one world" tendency of the institution.

To these and other misgivings, there are no simple answers. Perhaps the most telling general reply would be the proposition that in a mixed effort lies the only effective means to counter the dualistic organization of the Communist challenge, the diplomacy and other forms of action of the Soviet State, interwoven with the non-judicial subversive actions of the Communist Party and its fronts. The Free World has proceeded on the assumption that the motions of governmental instruments and of spontaneous, pluralistic organizations of citizens will somehow be harmonious and effective. The reality of the situation casts doubt on this assumption.

Our proposal is for the creation of a sort of quintessence, an interpenetration of constituted, and free civic organization on a world scale without resort to that basic

element of Communist dynamics, the dictatorship of a revolutionary elite. In the history of human Freedom, this would, indeed, be a novum.

B. Would it in fact be possible to enlist all nations of the Free World in the Congress?

We have noted in the Proposal the possibility that neutral or unaligned nations would decline to join an organization which rejected the Communists. So long as the "three world" concept, the international troika, is accepted as an unchangeable reality, countries like India whose neutrality combines emotional anti-imperialist residues with opportunistic motifs, would probably hold back. Legally neutral nations, like Switzerland and Sweden, whose traditions are deeply rooted, interests clear, and sympathies unshakably on the side of the Free World, would probably tolerate, if not encourage, private association with the Congress.

"Nothing succeeds like success"! The Congress should extend a permanent welcome without excessive wooing. By its emphasis on positive measures to develop the Free World rather than negative measures to contain or roll back the "world socialist system," it should establish the advantages of association.

C. Can the broad spectrum of democratic action be held together in a single super-political organization?

We have indicated in our proposal that the Congress should embrace all elements of the polity which accept Democracy, and exclude only the anti-Democratic extremes. It may be argued that such a comprehensive venue is unrealistic. To put it in American terms, in what form of alliance could the followers of Barry Goldwater and Hubert Humphrey unite; in Italian terms, Malagodi and Nenni? The interests of political parties lie in preparing for and winning elections; at most times, these transcend national,

and a fortiori, international interests.

The answer is that the World Congress would bid for the participation of political parties on the same basis as that of states, i. e. individuals and funds contributed freely and without claim to control. The very existence of an international body which defended only one interest, that of Freedom and Democracy against tyranny of the right and the left, would evoke disinterested devotion, a spirit deeply rooted, but rarely provided with worthy objects of attachment.

D. Could the permanent staff of the Congress be recruited from sufficiently high caliber personnel?

It might be argued that the type of individual who would be required to staff such an organization would be found only in national foreign services or in the United Nations, and would not be readily available for a career as yet untested and unplanned.

As we have indicated, the success of this endeavor would depend on the ability of the Congress to combine universality of principle with particularity of action. It would have to create a new kind of international career service, a body of dedicated men, patterned, one might say, on the exemplar of Dag Hammarskjold, who are citizens both of their native countries and of the world. The permanent staff of the international executive Council would have to work out its own discipline, differing from that of the United Nations Staff in that it would operate solely through ability to influence the opinions and actions of others, and would have no executive arm. These would have to be men of courage, imagination and patience, recognizing the limitations of their career, but highly active within it. The proper balance of idealism and realism would be hard to strike. Special recruitment and training procedures would have to be developed, but efforts already made in this direction suggest that this is feasible.

We know that the power of the Communist apparatus, open and hidden, depends on unceasing indoctrination and training and on steeling in action. There is no reason to believe that we are incapable of making a comparable effort in this direction.

E. How will the Congress deal with highly controversial issues?

If the Congress is not to become a factory for pious platitudes, it will have to address itself squarely to burning, explosive issues, such as apartheid, expropriation or nationalization of property, and political self-determination. These not only will be controversial within and between governments; they will tear civic fabrics, as well. To many of these issues, there is no immediate solution. Criticism of governments which are seeking an evolutionary, rather than a revolutionary solution to such problems - for example, the United States with regard to Negroes - might exacerbate the forces working against orderly progress, and defeat rather than advance the good cause. Even on non-explosive issues, the intensity of internal dispute might be heightened if the position taken by the Congress appeared to constitute an external "intervention."

There is no ready-made procedure at hand for the Congress. It will have to cope with dissent in its own body as it arises. Ideally, it should be possible to achieve consensus, but failing this, majority and minority reports would appear to be the only means by which a democratic body could render its collective judgment. There might be "walk-outs," with corresponding pressure on the Congress to seek compromise formulas, diluting its impact to the insipidity of a debating society. The Congress cannot afford to become a "super-Arden House," producing an occasional splash in the press and then falling into oblivion.

Here, too, everything depends on the caliber of its permanent staff members, and their ability to prepare sound agendas, objective summaries of issues, and draft position papers or resolutions for consideration by the plenary bodies. By its close contact with all public and private entities significantly concerned with matters of Freedom and Democracy, the staff should perform the function of a catalyst. Without fear or subjection to pressure, it should seek to bring together opposing parties, lobbies, interest groups and even officials of State in constructive clash of views, and to create its own methods of synthesizing their dialectic.

II. The Public Philosophy

The problems raised in this section might be called ideological, but there may be some doubt whether the word "ideology" should figure prominently in the vocabulary of the Congress. Although it is widely accepted as a neutral term, being used by both the democratic and anti-democratic worlds, it does have a certain falseness of ring. On the one hand it tends to evoke the image of "ideologues" of the 18th century, with their accent on abstract theory. On the other hand it has modern activist connotations that are closer to Fascist and Communist totalitarianism than to classical Democracy. The word "ideology" has been avoided in the Proposal and the Declaration, with preference to "theory" or "doctrine," where these are in question, and such terms as Walter Lippmann's "Public Philosophy" where the amalgamation of thought and action is under discussion.

A. By what right does the Declaration claim that we possess Truth?

Modern science and historicism have generated the concept of the relativity of truth. Propaganda and counter-propaganda excesses have spread deep skepticism among the people, and the technique of the Big Lie, reinforced by

"brainwashing" and other forms of "thought control," has further sapped the integrity of belief. Stereotyping of political concepts and their reduction to shibboleths and "Fourth of July oratory" have made it almost impossible to vest them anew with living conviction.

We have stated that the test of our truth is in its fruits. There can be no Orwellian "newspeak" in the lexicon of the Congress. War cannot be transmuted into peace, degradation into dignity, slavery into freedom, by mere words. The application of the intellect to all the tasks undertaken by the Congress must be rigorously critical, and the language of persuasion must be honest. The utterances of the Congress must revive the eloquent rhetoric of the past in a modern medium of sincerity and directness, suited to a world audience of simple and sophisticated.

Mere affirmation is not enough. It will not do to say that our Democracy is true Democracy because our Freedom is true Freedom. We must establish absolute categories of judgment which can be applied to every concrete instance.

B. Is Man's dignity assured by Freedom and Democracy?

If Man is the "measure of all things," or, as Confucius said, the "measure of Man," why does he destroy his own dignity? Might it not better be said that "things are the measure of Man." Political Freedom, centered, as it must be, in the right to choose responsible leaders, tends to become an abstraction when the vital interests of a society are measured in material terms. The right of free vote can be won by, or conferred upon, a society in which most men are poor, but their dignity is not assured thereby. Rather the effect is to enhance their degradation.

We have sought to meet this problem squarely in affirming that education is pre-requisite to the attainment of true Freedom. A literate, and, as the Communists say, a

"conscious" electorate alone can exercise civic functions in the spirit of respect for the worth of the individual and resolve the dialectic of his personal conflict with the interests of the collective, the community and the state.

Education opens the gates to material progress, and permits the orderly construction of the fabric of economic well-being, without which, as the Greeks discovered, Man is not free but enslaved. The task of the World Congress and of its Commissions would be to study the inequalities which exist everywhere between men's status and their potential for education, and to expose the forces working deliberately or unintentionally to perpetuate these disproportions.

In answer to all critics, Democracy is the sine qua non, though it is not by itself the guarantor of human dignity.

C. Can the Free World provide an answer to the Communist claims of inevitable progress?

We have noted in the Declaration that confidence in the doctrine of progress has seriously declined, especially in Western Europe and America where it arose and flourished. The universality of conflict, threatening a Third World War, has destroyed the prevailing optimism of 18th and 19th century believers in the "perfectibility of man." It is difficult to project ourselves back into the spirit of an age which could speak of the "best of all possible worlds," of a natural harmony between public and private interest, of an unlimited horizon of human benefit.

And at the same time that the West has suffered a massive erosion of hope, Communism has reaffirmed it, and has provided an impulse, however irrational under its pseudo-science, which has put us everywhere on the defensive.

There can be only one answer, our own deeper re-affirmation. Certainly in the political field it is the Free World which is creative and responsive to change. The whole de-colonization process attests this. It has been accompanied by many efforts to find new relationships - constitutional, economic, and cultural - between peoples of different races and nationalities. Western Europe for 15 years has shown ingenuity in devising new forms and methods for a rapidly changing world. It is the Free World which has created the Colombo Plan, the Alliance for Progress, and the Decade of Development.

What has the Communist world contributed? Abusive debates over the corpse of Stalin and bullying attacks on long discredited domestic leaders and hapless junior partners of the Bloc. The new CPSU Program can suggest nothing but the "election" of more new people to Party organs and the future transfer of functions to public organizations, with the party still remaining in control.

We have sketched in the Declaration a concept of the "nature of the era, " dynamic in essence and optimistic in tone. There is abundant evidence that the Free World is reaching out for such a concept, and will grasp it if it is presented in credible terms. Leaders and led, intellectuals and simple workers, daily express in a thousand ways the craving for positive beliefs and programs of action. Only the deadly sin of Sloth, acedia, or in modern terminology, defeatism, can deliver the world of Freedom over to the Devil of inaction.

D. Can the theme of "Revolution" be woven into the program of the Congress?

We hear much talk of the "revolution of rising expectations, " the "technological revolution, " the "revolution against outworn dogmas and shibboleths. " But are these new slogans any better than the old, and do they convey an

effective will to counter the all-too-real drive of Communism toward World Revolution? The "right of Revolution" which John Locke bequeathed to the Anglo-Saxon world is almost forgotten. The United States presents the well-known paradox of the Daughters of the American Revolution standing for uncreative conservatism. The Jacobin tradition in France has bogged down in sterile anti-clericalism and socio-economic conflicts of interest. The phenomenon of the "revolution devouring its children" gives way to the grandchildren disavowing and even shaming their ancestry.

This paradox arises also in Communism, where the New Class emerges as a force of conservatism. It is, as the Communists say, "not accidental" that Stalin, replete with power in his later years, banished from orthodox dialectic, the "vzriv," the "leap" - or as we might say, the "quantum jump" - which resulted when the accumulation of quantitative change reached the critical point and generated a "qualitative change." Nor is Khrushchev in the least interested in "revolution" within his empire, only in those external revolutions making ruins of the empire of others, which he hopes to take over!

We must be very clear in our minds when we speak about the "revolution" in the world of Freedom, that what we are talking about is in fact a heightened tempo of "evolution," a new historic phase in which, as Rostow says, the powerful force of "compound interest" in the advanced stages of economic growth is further compounded and rendered explosive by "national liberation." We may claim heritage to the great revolutionary traditions of Europe and America, but we should not bemuse ourselves or the "emerging nations" with mere sloganistic invocations of the Founding Fathers. Our proclamations, like their Declaration of Independence, should be addressed against tyranny wherever it exists, but our acts, like theirs, must be anchored in order, as well as harnessed to change.

E. Can a world of a hundred nations achieve unity in Freedom?

Nationalism is rampant. It is difficult to present in a hopeful light the prospects for unity, peace, concord in a world where considerations of power, prestige, wealth, and territory are the measures of "national interest." Mature and stable countries have been unbalanced by the loss of empire and the confused promptings of historic grandeur. New, precarious nations are bursting forth in strident self-assertion. "Les vertus se perdent dans l'intérêt, comme les fleuves se perdent dans la mer." La Rochefoucauld was speaking of the individual, but his pessimism seems even more pertinent in a world order of atomistic nations. The distinction between morality and power bedevils statesmen and thinkers, and, to millions of ordinary men, it is lost altogether.

Here, too, the Communists have taken the initiative. They have proclaimed the existence of a "world system, " "nationalist in form, socialist in content;" this is to become a universal "commonwealth" of genuinely free peoples"- the new formula of the XXII CPSU Congress - in which national frontiers will eventually be absorbed in a higher unity. The events of October have exposed the cynicism of the Russian leaders and their discord with their Chinese rivals, but they have not basically weakened the fabric of International Communism as a movement, nor the appeal to the faithful of its formula for encompassing many nations in a revolutionary world unity.

We have suggested in the Proposal that the Congress cannot, at least at the outset, espouse existing federalist causes. It can, however, address itself promptly to the study of them, and to the encouragement of a rational effort to move forward into the age where regional groupings, far broader than existing territorial sovereignties, will inevitably take shape.

F. Can the Congress restore the initiative of the Free World in the cause of Peace?

Recent events have clearly demonstrated the hypocrisy of the Communists' claim to be the champions of Peace, and the Janus-face of their "peaceful coexistence" which is nothing more than the "highest form of class struggle." But is the championship thereby restored to the Free World? In his noble speech to the United Nations, President Kennedy has, for the first time, committed the United States to the cause of "general and complete disarmament." The fruits of this initiative, however, are not immediately apparent, nor could they reasonably be expected to become so. Stubborn conflicts of interest, wild surges of national excitement and frustration make any visions of the "lion lying down with the lamb" more than ever illusory. Hate, greed, cruelty, "nature red in tooth and claw," are still of the essence of relations among peoples, governments, tribes, clans and even families. The power to destroy grows with the power to create. The arms race follows its deadly syndrome.

What can the Congress do in the face of these bitter facts?

It is not proposed that the Congress become a super-agency of World Peace. This is the collective task of the United Nations, and of its hundred component members. The task of the Congress is to plant the sign manual of Freedom and Democracy on the world. But this means working for Peace, which means working for arms control and disarmament. We propose therefore, that the Commission for Peace be an articulate and fearless advocate of all who pursue these endeavors.

G. Can Democracy become universal?

Past and current practice do not indicate that democratic political systems are universally admirable. The history of political theory suggests that men have found

authoritarian and restricted systems to possess advantages of order, discipline and stability, whereas Democracy often deteriorates into demagoguery, mob rule or civil strife - "stasis." These tendencies may even be accentuated in modern times with the spread of mass media of communication, readily subverted to totalitarian purposes. Bonapartism in the nineteenth century and Fascism in the twentieth - not to mention Communism - have displayed repeated instances of mass endorsement of tyranny, 99% "plebiscites" for triumphant conquerors or charismatic Fuehrers and their Parties. Even where elections were technically "free," they often have been rigged and manipulated. In fact, it might be argued that only the Anglo-Saxon countries have displayed anything like a consistent ability to "make Democracy live." Among the newly "emerging nations," the pattern of leadership which is most successful often springs from the dedication of a military elite, brought into power in the wake of liberation from colonialism, or simply a drive to overcome corruption, or to fill a political vacuum. The concept of a "guided democracy" is not necessarily a mere facade for personal tyranny, but may correspond to the needs of political evolution in an intermediate stage.

The Congress must take full account of the various stages of development in Democracy. It must, so to speak, generate its own political theory, founded not in doctrinaire abstraction but in an analysis of living forms. It must encourage as well as admonish. But it must not compromise on the "spirit of the laws."

H. Is Economic Democracy possible?

The rise of Communism as a "world system" has resulted in large measure from the persuasiveness of the argument, first set forth by Karl Marx, that bourgeois capitalism is the "exploitation of man by man." It is widely recognized - even among Communists - that the specific abuses which Marx noted, for the most part in the early Industrial Revolution of England, have largely been remedied during the following

century. Yet the "class struggle" is a potent battle cry, especially when married to the "anti-imperialist struggle."

The real reason that the Communist indictment carries such rallying power lies in the negative fact that the Free World in its economic theory has failed to perfect a convincing analysis of its own practice. "Exploitation" in the crude, sweatshop sense, has largely been eliminated in the advanced economies, yet millions of European workers - edging into something like middle class status - still register a protest vote. Against what they are protesting is by no means clear, even to themselves; often it seems they are merely expressing the frustration of non-participation in certain vital management decisions, the ultimate effects of which are felt to be more political than economic.

We may believe that the vast amount of economic research and analysis now being conducted in the United States and the European community contains the answers to the indictment of Communists, and to its echo among confused masses - and leaders - in the underdeveloped countries. The problem is how to synthesize this analysis and derive statements which can influence the formation of new economic institutions and procedures.

We have indicated in the Proposal and the Declaration a number of the basic problems. Among the heads of the Devil's Advocate's indictment we might set forth the following:

"The rich get richer, the poor get poorer."

"Affluence corrupts, absolute affluence corrupts absolutely."

Imperialism and colonialism have in fact been "exploitation," and the removal of their grosser abuses does not obliterate their taint. There must be some measure of general restitution. As the Foreign Minister of Nigeria said recently, if all the wealth which has been removed

from Africa were returned to the countries from which it was taken, they, too, could be affluent. (UNESCO Conference, Boston, October 1961).

"Power without property" has not eliminated "exploitation" but has merely shifted it from a paternalistic to a technocratic ruling class, and has de-personalized without mitigating the harshness of competition. The "conscience" which apologists of the modern giant corporations call for and seem to hear is but a "still, small voice."

In sum, what the Congress must reckon with is the great confusion existing between Free World economic theory and practice, the ambivalent attitude toward planning, the persistence of myths of "private enterprise" derived from the age of "rugged individualism," the dialectic between incentive and the enervating effects of prosperity, between inflation and "sound" fiscal practice, restrictive concepts of cartels in tension with the expansive forces of the new economic communities, and above all uncertainty as to the goals and aims of the "welfare state." All this tangle calls for a massive effort of clarification.

I. How can the strong be persuaded to succor the weak?

We have tried to state in the Declaration the case for placing the development of backward nations on a basis of prudent investment. We have also pointed out that in part this would be overdue restitution. But will the "affluent societies," caught in the Circean charms of gadgetry and abundant leisure, respond to these progressive motions? Many enlightened individuals and groups - most recently among them COMISCO - have called for the contribution by the advanced countries of at least one percent of their Gross National Product to the general program of economic aid - President Kennedy has felicitously labelled it the Decade of Development. Surely this is a minimum, and in fact, some countries can claim that they are already contributing on

such a scale. The Congress should untiringly press to double and treble this amount. But there are voices of interest or of sheer negation which protest against even the most modest deduction from the sum of goods and services domestically available. At worst, they may grudgingly grant some "hush money" to the importunate. At best they may heed the argument that economic aid programs are necessary to contain Communism, but this leads them to the dilemma, faced during the '50s whether to concentrate on those who join or profess to join them in this aim, or on those whose need is greatest and potential most apparent, even though they insist upon "non-alignment."

The combination of inertia and short-sightedness is stubborn in men. It will only yield to the most convincing demonstration, presented primarily in terms of self-interest. There is a major task for the Congress to show what will happen to the sources of essential raw material and to the markets of the advanced economies, if there is no positive effort of development. Economic interdependence is a fact, but its full implications are lost on many. To cite but two examples, how many Americans are aware what readjustments will be necessary to our mighty economy if sources of iron ore outside our own boundaries are not assured for the future? Or what would happen to our petroleumized economy if, over a prolonged period, major supplies of foreign oil were cut off? Similar hard realities confront Europe if its dissolving empires and colonial systems fail to reconstitute themselves as harmonious, interdependent economic communities.

These realities are, of course, not absent from the calculations and plans of Western leaders. What is absent in all too many cases, is the willingness to pay the necessary price now in order to cope with them in the future.

J. Can the "population explosion" be checked in time to realize the "fullness of the Earth?"

We have proceeded in the Declaration from the proposition that the earth can nurture and sustain far more people than now inhabit it. Over a period of time, this proposition is certainly true, but not necessarily in the short run. Steps must be taken now to match the life-prolonging achievements of public health with a prudent curtailment of man's fertility.

The direct sponsorship of movements to propagate knowledge of contraception and the desirability of planned parenthood would probably be disruptive of the fabric of the Congress. Such a task belongs to governments which face the need, and to private organizations which are not hampered by religious or ethical inhibitions.

What the Congress can do is to build up the image of Freedom based on the worth of the individual which can only be attained through a proper balancing of aspirations and means. It must remind or teach men that the act of committing a life to this planet is a social responsibility, not to be lightly undertaken.

K. Has the Free World the moral strength to meet the challenge of Communism?

This is our deepest concern. We behold in the United States a model of economic productivity which Europe is fast equaling and may soon outstrip. We see in America a stable polity which has evolved from the constitution created by its Founding Fathers, surviving the cruelest Civil War of modern history, in unity and general civic harmony that only the countries of the British Commonwealth can match.

But there is a deep malaise, indeed malady. Our great productive capacity is under-used, and its cyclical fluctuations are like an undulant fever. The desire to follow the middle-of-the-road seems to foster complacency and favor the courses of conservatism. At the same time, as though by a fatal reaction, the "American Way of Life" becomes

mired in excesses; "Freedom of Choice" and the "Good Life" are identified with billboard advertising. The four F's (Freedoms) give way to the four T's - television, tranquilizers, tailfins, and togetherness! The freeing of sex from taboo has been accompanied by a wave of legal pornography flooding the newsstands and by controversy over censorship. A cascade of early marriages has occurred, animated by the virtuous intent of launching substantial families but leading into the frustrations which are the price of emotional immaturity and concluding all too often in divorce or worse. Leisure has become a problem rather than a blessing. The universalizing of entertainment, available without cost and even without motion, has created an "opium for the people," far more insidious than that which Communism saw in religion. The capacity for active attention is eroded by "chewing gum for the eyes." Artificial excitement strives against pervasive boredom. Crime, juvenile delinquency, gambling, the flourishing of underworld empires on the fringe of legitimate business, all these side effects of affluence and permissiveness, have led thoughtful men to query whether a society such as ours can survive. Not all of the American model is followed abroad, but much of it is, and the result is sorry.

This is the case of the Devil's Advocate, and its plausibility cannot be denied. But against this harsh indictment there is the evidence of moral health. For every abuse of economic power, there is the certainty of exposure at the hand of a free press, and a remedy in the laws and administration, of which the investigations of Congressional Committees are a final guarantee. None are more critical of the American way of life than the Americans. Sooner or later, all evils are pilloried, some trivial, as the absurdities of packaging, others more serious, as the trafficking in matters of health. Vulgarity, the demoralizing licentiousness of Hollywood, the tasteless excesses of styling, are subjected to criticism and to salutary corrective competition. The Old World, itself not immune to the same

malady, helps by the depth of its tradition to redress the balance of the New in taste, style, culture.

Through its dedicated opposition to all the forces which work against the dignity of man the Congress could become an arbiter in matters of public morality. It could lead the crusade for a society of excellence.

Conclusion - Practical Problems confronting the Congress.

We have suggested in the Proposal that the success of the Congress would depend on its ability to promote concrete and practical measures in support of Freedom and Democracy. It lies beyond the scope of these preliminary papers to outline the tasks to be carried out; this would be the work of the permanent Commissions, working with and through the national sections of the Congress. The function, as we have suggested, would be catalytic, to set in motion and intensify the effectiveness of private and public agencies. Only time and experience would determine to what extent the Commissions would actually conduct substantive research through their own staffs, as opposed to stimulating the work of others. There is clear need for a vast labor of coordination. Every week throughout the world there are national and international meetings of scholars, technicians, experts, citizens' groups, many of which receive public notice, while others seem to be speaking only to themselves. Simply to maintain contact with this shifting array of associations and to be aware of what they are trying to do, is an overwhelming task. To distill from them an essence of general value, to blend one idea with another, to give publicity and encouragement to constructive thoughts and proposals, in short, to create a universal lobby for Freedom and Democracy, - that is the challenge to the Congress.