

DEDICATION AND LEADERSHIP TECHNIQUES

Douglas Hyde

www.GaryNorth.com

copyright, Gary North, 2006

Table of Contents

Foreword.	iv
Lecture 1: Need for Utter Dedication.. . . .	1
Lecture 2: Linking Theory and Practice.	12
Lecture 3: Use of Personnel in Leadership.	26
Lecture 4: Value of Techniques.	35
Lecture 5: Controlled Discussion Technique.	47
Lecture 6: Christian Leaders.	56

FOREWORD

Gary North
(December, 2006)

This document helps us to answer a question: “How did the Communists capture one-third of the world’s population by 1950, given the fact that Lenin had only a handful of followers in 1900?” This question raises others.

“How did the Communists mobilize the support of Western intellectuals, Russian terrorists, and peasants in Asia, Africa, and Latin America?”

“How did an explicitly atheistic movement gain the degree of emotional commitment of its members that had previously been associated only with religious movements?”

“How did a movement notoriously hierarchical and centralized enforce its discipline with minimal violence outside those nations in which it gained political power, where the Communist Party ruled only through terror and brutality on a historically unprecedented scale?”

Once we have accurate historical insights regarding the answers to these questions, there is another, highly practical question:

“What, if anything, can non-violent ideological movements legitimately adopt from the Communists’ program of mobilization?”

To begin to answer these questions, a five-day seminar was held by the Mission Secretariat of the American branch of the Roman Catholic Church. This seminar took place on September 17–21, 1962. It was attended by a small group of priests, nuns, and laymen. The main speaker was Douglas Hyde, the highest-level Western Communist ever to abandon the Communist Party and join the Catholic Church.

Hyde’s spiritual autobiography, *I Believed*, was published in England in 1950. This was two years before Whittaker Chambers’s larger but comparable testament, *Witness*. Hyde’s major book, *Dedication and Leadership*, was published by Notre Dame University Press in 1966. It remains in print, almost half a century later.

The seminar had an agenda: to discuss those aspects of Communist Party training that could be adapted by Catholic activists, especially missionaries. Hyde had been a leading trainer of British Communists in the 1930s and 1940s.

The seminar took place a month before the 13-day October missile crisis began: the showdown between the United States government and the Soviet Union’s hierarchy over Soviet missiles in Cuba. Three weeks after this seminar ended, Vatican II was opened by Pope John XXIII. It was closed by Paul VI in 1965. Vatican II launched a monumental transformation of the Roman Catholic Church.

This was surely a well-timed seminar.

This is a transcript of Hyde’s six lectures. A more complete edition of the entire

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

seminar was published by the Mission Secretariat in 1963. It is long out of print. It was barely known when it was in print. If you search its title on Google, you will find only a few footnote references. Yet this is a highly useful document for anyone who wants to understand the Communist Party's organizational techniques in the 1940s. Even more important, the document shows how some of these techniques can be applied by modern activist-ideological organizations.

By the time I got a copy of this transcript, sometime around 1985, the dedication of Communist Party members worldwide had been fading for three decades, dating from Nikita Khrushchev's so-called secret speech of 1956, which was highly critical of Stalin. By the 1980s, which would bring of the bankruptcy of the Soviet Union, there were few traces of either dedication or leadership inside the Communist Party.

I wrote to Hyde, asking permission to publish this document. He refused. He said that the Communist Party's dedication had faded, and that the manuscript would present a false picture of the state of the Communist movement. He could see that it was on its last legs. It was. The Soviet Union folded in a non-violent coup in August of 1991.

I have waited two decades to make this document public. Hyde is dead. The Soviet Union is dead. Communist China has the fastest growing free market economy on earth. The Communist movement is dead. It ran out of both dedication and leadership.

It is time to consider carefully how the Communists recruited, trained, and mobilized men and women in the West. It is also time to consider the level of dedication that the Communists maintained from 1917 to about 1960.

The Communists were messianic. They believed in salvation by revolution, as I explained in my 1968 book, *Marx's Religion of Revolution*. (The 1989 update is available free here: <http://bit.ly/gnmror>.) The Party called on its members in the West to devote the whole of their lives, to quote the title of Communist defector Benjamin Gitlow's autobiography, which appeared in 1948. No human institution can lawfully make such a claim—not church, state, or family. The Communist Party was therefore doomed from the beginning. But, in 1962, or even 1988, it was not clear when its day of reckoning would come, or how.

The transcript published by the Mission Secretariat was not well edited. I have edited it for clarity's sake. I have not changed Hyde's words or the book's original italics. I have added commas and semicolons in profusion.

I have not re-published the panel presentation from missionaries in the mission field, nor have I reprinted the two appendixes on Communist tactics for the nations targeted by the missionaries. These are of interest only to historians of the Communist movement, which is surely good news for modern man. Instead, I have stuck with Hyde's original agenda: to describe those Communist Party recruiting and training techniques that can be legitimately adapted and adopted by Christian activist organizations.

The following themes I regard as important.

First, Hyde argued, the appeal of communism was not its ideas. It was rather the moral fervor of the Communists, a fervor which appealed to people who were committed to a moral cause greater than themselves. Communists were idealists, Hyde said. This is a great irony, for Karl Marx dismissed all such appeals to morality as irrelevant at best and deceptive at worst. He saw all morality as class morality. He identified morality as the superstructure of the dominant class, a tool of class dominance. The substructure is fundamental, he said: the structure of economic production. He proclaimed scientific

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

socialism, and he dismissed all rival socialist systems as utopian.

I am convinced that this is equally true of all broad-based ideological movements. Few people join them because their founders developed philosophically persuasive systems of historical cause-and-effect. They join because the movements promise moral uplift personally and even moral reform culturally.

Second, Hyde told his listeners that a statistically abnormal number of communists he had met on several continents had this in common: They were lapsed Catholics. Why? Because of their idealism. The Church failed to appeal to this idealism, especially among youth. So, they departed into the camp of the enemy.

Third, Hyde argued that when organizations make minimal demands on their members, they get minimal commitment. When they make big demands, they get big commitment. This theme pervades this document.

Of course, the Communist movement was always a minority movement. This went back to Lenin's organizational decision to limit the Bolsheviks to an elite, although Hyde does not mention this. Hyde was speaking to missionaries: the Church's hardest of hard core members. The Roman Catholic Church has always allowed religious orders to form on the basis of extreme personal commitment. This degree of commitment is not expected to be widespread in the membership.

This tension between universal appeal—mass evangelism—and minority commitment affects every large organization. The standard rule of thumb is that 20% of the members will do 80% of the work. The top 4% (20% of 20%) will be the equivalent of the military's field-grade officers, and less than one percent will be the senior decision-makers and innovators (20% of 20% of 20%).

Fourth, he insisted that successful long-term leadership requires systematic training. The Communist Party was careful to provide such training at all levels. Everyone was trained to exercise leadership in his appropriate field.

Fifth, the communists understood that, in order to be an effective leader in the trade union movement, a person must be good at his job. If he is a slack worker, he will not be taken seriously by his peers, no matter how good a speaker he is. So, the communists pressured members to become the best workers on the shop floor.

Sixth, Communist leadership was for the sake of the Communist Party's cause. It was not leadership for its own sake.

All of these principles can be applied in every organization that is devoted to comprehensive social change.

When we understand the degree of dedication that once energized the Communist Party, we recognize a secular imitation of the motivation of the early church's evangelism, from the Apostle Paul to the first missionaries to pagan lands. There have been times when a handful of Christians have possessed this degree of dedication. The result was the rolling back of paganism's rival religions.

We have seen—or not seen, as the case may be—a comparable degree of dedication in underground churches in Communist societies. China is the best example. At the time that Hyde gave this seminar, the churches in Red China had been under assault since 1949. Four years after the seminar, Mao launched the Cultural Revolution/Red Guard movement. All of China was torn apart. Protestant churches disappeared from public view. Today, it is estimated that there are 50 million Christians in the nation formerly known as Red China, which has adopted capitalism with enormous enthusiasm. There

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

may be twice this number. Most of these underground church members are evangelical Protestants. This reversal has taken place in less than four decades.

In contrast, consider the state of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States in 2005. On the Catholicity.com website, John McCloskey, a priest, recorded these statistics in 2006.

In 1965, at the end of the Council [Vatican II], there were 58,000 priests. Now there are 41,000. By 2020, if present trends continue (and there is no sign of a dramatic upsurge in vocations), there will be only 31,000 priests, and half of those will be over 70. . . . In 1965, 1,575 new priests were ordained. In 2005, the number was 454, a decrease of more than two-thirds—and remember that the Catholic population in the US increased during these years from 45.6 million in 1965 to the 64.8 million of 2005, a rise of almost 50%.

The Venerable John Henry Newman said, “Growth is the only evidence of life.” By his definition, the Church in the United States has been and continues to be in sharp decline. Clearly, there has been a steep drop in the number of seminarians in these years. Between 1965 and 2005, the number of seminarians fell from 50,000 (some 42,000 of which were high school and college seminarians, while another 8000 or so were graduate seminarians) to today’s approximate 5000, a decline of 90%.¹

Hyde’s remarks in 1962 are even more relevant for Catholicism today than they were at the time.

As for Communism, it ran out of both dedication and leadership. For this, we should give thanks.

¹John McCloskey, “State of the US Catholic Church at the Beginning of 2006.” (<http://bit.ly/Church2006>)

Lecture One

NEED FOR UTTER DEDICATION

Reverend Fathers, Sisters, Lay-leaders:

There are two points I would like to make about this Seminar, right at the start, so that we can have its aim and purpose clear in our minds, and no confusion about the matter. Although the kits which Father Meehan has been talking to you about deal with communism as such, the seminar does not. *The seminar is a seminar on Christian leadership*—not on communism.

I think this is important because we do not want to take up the time and discussion with questions and answers on communism as such. That is not the purpose of the seminar.

The second point is that I shall be examining those methods which communists use in the training of their leaders which are capable of imitation or adaptation by ourselves, or which may spark off, I hope, some useful and constructive thought on our part. I am using communist methods in this way—in order to examine our own methods and in order that we may in humility look at our opponents and ask ourselves what they have to teach us.

In other words, I am not discussing with you communist methods, good and bad. I am not giving you an overall or accurate picture of communist methods in their entirety. That would certainly defeat the purpose of the seminar. I would hate to think a lot of nuns were going to use communist methods tomorrow, or *some* of the communist methods anyway.

We shall not be looking at those we cannot imitate; we shall not be looking at those which for moral or ethical reasons we abhor; we shall be looking at those methods which have something for us. We are going to be quite selective in this, and it is better to have no wrong ideas about it right at the start.

As some of you probably know by now, I was a communist for twenty years. I joined the Communist Party when I was seventeen years old in 1928, and I left it in 1948. I left it knowing that communism was evil. I had seen that in my own life. I had seen it in the lives of others. If you accept an evil creed, inevitably your actions become evil.

But I also left the Communist Party believing that in fact the communists were right in some respects. I still believe that they are right when, for example, they say that there is a great battle going on all over the world, that in the final analysis, regardless of all appearances to the contrary, that battle is one for men's hearts and minds and souls. I believe that they are right when they say that that battle is being fought in every country of the world and, therefore, it involves the whole of mankind. I believe they are right, too, when they say that the outcome of that battle is almost certainly going to be decided in the lifetime of people who are living now. *This is a turning point in our history.*

There have before been moments in man's history when the pattern of life for generations ahead was decided by what certain people did at that moment. The world in those days was generally conceived to be the known world, which was really only a small part of the surface of the globe, and involved only a relatively small section of the human race. Today as a result of improved methods of communication, ease of transport, etc., when we talk of the world, we mean *the* world—every country in it.

When the communists talk of building a communist world in this period in which we

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

live, *they mean the whole of the world*—not the whole of the world with the exception of the United States or the United Kingdom, or wherever you might happen to come from. I believe they are right in seeing the battle in these terms.

Their aim is a communist world—they have, in the past forty-five years or so, achieved one-third of that aim. Now, I do not want to give you a distorted picture:—to turn it around the other way, there is still two-thirds which they have not achieved. We are still living in a non-communist world—twice as much of mankind—twice as much of the land surface as they have. In other words, I would not for one moment want to spread some sort of defeatist idea amongst you. They have one-third; we have two-thirds.

But it is true to say, nonetheless, that never in man's history has a small group of people set out to win a world and achieved more in less time. It is also true to say that they have certainly brought far more people under their sway by their methods—not all of which we may copy—than anyone else has done in that period.

They have always worked through a minority—whether it has been in those territories where they have already come to power or in those territories where they have still to come to power.

You in America, and we in Britain, and certainly you people in the missions have to work with minorities, too. The communists have had the problem of having to spread their influence and make the maximum impact upon others through a minority, and they have arrived at certain conclusions and evolved certain methods which I think it is useful for us to examine.

At the moment, the Communist Party throughout the world has 36,000,000 members. Quite consciously and deliberately, they keep it small and keep it as an elite. Of those 36,000,000 members, much more than half are behind the Iron Curtain. Probably not more than 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 are in the free world. We have 400,000,000 and more Catholics, the majority of whom are in the free world, so we have immensely greater human resources at our disposal than they have. If they are more successful than we are, then it is not because they have more people—they have less. They are a far smaller minority than we are over those large areas of the world which are still free for us to operate in. Nonetheless, this group of people has influenced opinion profoundly throughout what we call the free world. It is almost impossible for you to pick up a newspaper or to switch on your radio or television to the news without hearing some reference to the communists. It is much less likely that you will hear a reference to Catholics. But the communists make us aware of their presence the whole of the time. They profoundly influence the thought of a whole generation; they never let us forget them. This isn't just an accident—there are reasons for it.

I do not believe that the strength of communism lies in the strength of its ideas. I am quite sure that you cannot either. We believe, and we must believe, that we have something infinitely better than what they have. We have something immensely better to sell, if you like to put it in that rather degraded terminology, than they have got. Yet they have been able to influence our generation much more profoundly than we have been able to do. The strength of communism, I repeat, does not lie in its teachings; it does not lie in its beliefs, important as those are to communism. Those are not what have attracted people to communism, as any of you who have studied communist textbooks will understand.

I don't know how many of you have, for example, tried to read *Das Kapital*. If you

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

have, you will understand what I mean when I tell you that Karl Marx suffered from carbuncles, and it is said in communist circles that you can tell just how bad the carbuncles were by how unreadable *Das Kapital* becomes. There is a good deal of internal evidence to suggest that he suffered from carbuncles non-stop. Reading Marx, reading Engels, reading Lenin and other Marxist writers is not easy. They do not have any natural appeal. The strength of communism lies in its people—the people who compose the communist movement throughout the world and the way in which they are used. That, I think, is vital to any understanding of communism.

I am not theorizing. I do not want to go into a lot of autobiographical detail, but it is the fact that I did spend twenty years with the communists. By the time I left the Communist Party, every friend I had in the world was a communist, which meant that I lost them all when I left the Party. Since then I have succeeded in taking the hurdle which is usually a rather difficult one to take for the ex-communist. Normally, he is cut off completely from communists, from the living communist movement. I have devised ways and means of taking that hurdle. My contact with the communists has been almost continuous. There has been a constant stream of communists in many parts of the world who got in touch with me. Why? In the first place, very much to my surprise, because they found that I was writing about communism fairly and without malice, writing about communists as though I loved them and not as though I hated them. So, communists with difficulties and with doubts tended to get in touch with me, and this has continued non-stop for the last fourteen years. It started as a trickle; it has become a stream. There is not a month—sometimes not a week—that passes without some communist getting in touch with me somewhere, wanting to discuss doubts, difficulties, with me. Sometimes they write to say they want to discuss their doubts; sometimes they write to say that, having read one of my books or attended a lecture, they followed through, and they want to tell me that they were received into the Catholic Church last night, or confirmed or started their instructions or something like that. They do not all travel the long, hard road from the Kremlin to the Vatican. I know how long and how hard that is, and it would be quite wrong to suggest that they all come all the way.

Some of you may know that in recent years, I have spent some time as an ordinary political prisoner in Oriental and other prisons where there are communist leaders who have been captured leading rebellions and civil wars. So, this time is spent in the closest possible companionship with communist leaders, sharing a small prison cell with them. This has often been successful.

When I am talking to you about the communists as people, I am not, therefore, theorizing. I am talking about people who were my good comrades. I am not talking to you about communists in one part of the world—a Western type of communist or British type of communist or American type of communist. I am talking to you of communists as I found them in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, as well as in the West. Overall, I would say that the strength of the communist party lies in the people it attracts to its cause, the means by which they are able to hold them to that cause, the training they give them, the use they make of them.

Again, let us get things brutally clear in our minds. The human material the communists are working with is not something different from the material you work with in your schools, your mission parishes, or wherever your work takes you. It is identical, in the sense that they are the same sort of human beings. But much more than that, it is

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

identical in the sense that a frighteningly high proportion of those who become the hard core of the communist party are baptized Catholics. This is an unpalatable fact, but we might as well swallow it at the start, making it quite clear in our own minds that we are not dealing with different material. Very often the communists are training and using the material that you once had.

Again, I am not theorizing. About one-third of the communist leaders of Britain are, I estimate, lapsed, fallen-away Catholics. Probably twenty-five percent of the Party membership in Britain are lapsed Catholics too.

Go to Australia and you will find that, while Catholics make up twenty-five percent of the population, the lapsed Catholics in the Communist Party are, perhaps, as much as forty percent of the leadership itself.

Here in America, the last president of the Communist Party in the United States was a fallen-away Catholic. When he died recently, the funeral oration was made from Lenin's tomb in the Red Square, Moscow, by another lapsed Catholic who has now become the president of the Communist Party of the United States.

It is just as typical in your Communist Party as any other. You find it in Canada; you find it in New Zealand. This is not just an Anglo-Saxon phenomenon, still less is it just an Irish plot. This happens everywhere.

You go to Kerala, in South India, which is the only State in the history of the world which voluntarily, freely elected a communist government. You will find a very high proportion of communist leaders there bear family names which are those of saints. These are the ones known as St. Thomas Christians, whose ancestors were, according to tradition, converted by St. Thomas the Apostle. They have a longer tradition of Catholicism than we have. You will find the fallen-away Catholic Indians leading the Communist Party there, just as elsewhere.

The reason is that your fallen-away Catholic is, perhaps, the most spiritually hungry of all spiritually hungry people. He has a gap in his life which he is trying to fill, and the Communist Party sets out to fill it and sometimes does seem to fill it for quite a long time.

I am making this point because I want you to understand we are not talking about some special human material. All too often we are talking about, if I may say so in all charity, *your failures*, not just some different brand of human being. I want us to look at these people, to see how the communists take them and use them and train them.

In discussing the question of Christian leadership in this way, it follows almost automatically I shall be dealing with the problem at the natural level. I think it is theologically sound to say that the supernatural is built on the natural anyway, so there is no reason why we should not consider it in this way. As we look at it, we shall try to see where their strength lies, not where their weakness lies. We are not discussing the weakness of communism. We are trying to discover where its strength lies and see if we cannot avail ourselves of some of that strength as well.

I would say, beyond any shadow of doubt, one of the things which Communist Party members have in common is their idealism—their willingness to sacrifice, their zeal, their dedication, their devotion to their cause.

This characterizes the communist all over the free world, and I could give you examples of this, non-stop, that would take the whole time of this seminar, because I have met so many communists, and so many would fit into this pattern.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

This is not just an accident. Later on I will try to show you how it is that communists are able to evoke this enormous degree of dedication. The communists do succeed in using idealism enormously effectively.

The majority of those who join the Communist Party are young. The average joining age used to be between seventeen and twenty-five, varying from country to country. Today—and it has been true for just the last few years—it is between fifteen and twenty-five. That is pretty young to go into politics, but it is nonetheless the joining age in most of the world today.

I joined the Communist Party at the age of seventeen, in 1928. I was a sort of boy wonder. People did not join the Communist Party at that age at that time. Today, it is perfectly normal for people to join it at the age of fifteen and upwards.

For example, the British Communist Party had a recruiting campaign recently. It brought in several thousand new members, and when the general secretary made his report to the executive committee a few weeks ago, he said that the majority of those who joined during the period of that campaign were between the ages of fifteen and nineteen. That is not in a country with a different culture. It is in Britain.

If you go to Singapore, or if you go to Caracas, Venezuela, you will find the same in both cities. The party is recruiting more people between the ages of fifteen and nineteen than in any other age group.

I make this point because youth is a period of idealism. The communists attract them by appealing to that idealism, and they have been very successful in this. Too often, I believe, we have failed to appeal to the idealism of youth, and we have failed to use it. And we are the losers.

I will be quite honest with you. I would say that I have met more cynicism in Catholic circles about the idealism of youth than anywhere else. I have spent more of my time in non-Catholic circles than in Catholic circles. In fact, that is the way life takes me, but I do not think that you will find anywhere more than in Catholic circles such a cynical approach to the so-called starry idealism of youth.

I have travelled in nearly every country of the world, and everywhere I have gone, I have found that young people are idealistic. I can only conclude that that is the way God wants them, and I do not believe that it is good sense, quite apart from charity or justice, to sneer at the idealism of youth. Young people will have their dreams; they will dream of a better world; they will want to change the world and if we have no patience with them or make them feel that this is some kind of infantile disease, they will still pursue their idealistic courses; they will do it outside the family instead of within it.

This is one reason why you find so many lapsed Catholics in the Communist Party and similar movements. We fail to use this idealism of youth at our peril. We do not simply lose these people; a portion of them go right over to the opposite camp and become part of the most formidable opponent the Church has ever had to face.

Certainly the communists have demonstrated that the idealism of youth is something which you can harness and use to tremendous effect. It is a dynamic thing. They use it dynamically, while we too often fail to do so. We know all about fallen man and all that sort of thing. We know we are never going to have a perfect world, so we take at the best a rather superciliously tolerant approach to the idealism of youth, if we do not ignore it altogether.

The communists use that idealism, and communism becomes the dominant thing in the

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

life of the communist. Just that. I do not know if you can say that of our Christians. I can say it of the communists I have known all over the world, beyond any shadow of doubt at all.

I will start with myself. Communism was my life; it meant everything to me. I lived for it from morning to night for twenty years. It was my wife's life. She joined the Communist Party during the Spanish civil war and was drawn into its activities.

The communists say if you make mean little demands on people, you will get a mean little response which is all you deserve. They say, if you make big demands on them, you will get a heroic response. They prove it over and over again. Call for a big initial sacrifice, and the relatively smaller ones will follow naturally. At any rate, that is the communist technique and the communists make it work.

I am a non-smoker today. I used to smoke forty cigarettes a day and a pipe at night. I am a writer, and I live on my nerves. Then on Christmas Eve, 1939, a member of the political bureau of the Communist Party asked me if I would join the staff of the *Daily Worker*, the Party's daily paper and become its news editor. They asked me if I would join and start work on January 1, 1940, eight days later.

I was proud to take on that work. I did not hesitate and felt it was the greatest honor the Party could pay me as a communist writer. But in taking on that work, I accepted a two-thirds cut in my salary. The salary the Communist Party offered me was just one-third of what I had been earning for years and was, in fact, smaller than my expense account had been for years as well. Which meant that I had to take more than a two-thirds drop in my standard of life. It goes without saying that I was not smoking two-thirds of my income, so I had to give up smoking and a good deal more besides. Later on, when I was converted to something better than communism, I saw no reason why I should be re-converted to lung cancer, so I continued as a non-smoker. That sort of sacrifice which the Party demanded of me was perfectly normal, and it seemed perfectly normal of me to accept it.

I will admit that when I went to the *Daily Worker* office on January 1, 1940, I felt a little bit virtuous at the size of the sacrifice I had made until I met my staff. Then I found that most of them were older men than I was at that time; they had gone further in their careers. They had been earning more; they had made bigger sacrifices in order to work there. Literally, we did not know at that time whether we would get our small salaries at the end of the week. We used to read all the nonsense about Moscow gold. We read it rather wistfully, wishing some of it would come our way. There were plenty of occasions when I sent the office boy around the office, from room to room taking paper clips off letters which had been thrown away because we could not afford to buy more. It was much more significant that we were keeping our organization going on the basis of our sacrifices, than that we were having life blood pumped into our movement by some foreign power. Oh yes, the communists do subsidize communist movements, where they think that will serve the communist cause, but they prefer that the movement should be based on sacrifice, and that is psychologically sound. We asked our staff members to make these sacrifices when they came to the paper and the sacrifices did not end there. We continued to make the same demands upon them as the Party makes upon all of its members.

There was a point at which the *Daily Worker* was banned early in the war by the British government because it was opposing the war effort. Our offices were raided. Our

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

machines were sealed by police, and I was told that if I produced another copy of the paper, I would be sent to jail for seven years. Of course, the Party told me I must have a copy of the paper on sale on the streets of London the next morning, which I did, as an act of defiance and as a gesture.

Shortly afterwards, the plant which we had was bombed, so we did not have much left of the *Daily Worker* by that time. We were banned and bombed. Then, twenty months later, the ban was raised. We were given a matter of ten days by the Party to put the paper into production again, find a new plant, a new staff, train the staff as quickly as we could.

As soon as the paper got going and we got some sort of rhythm into our organization, as it were, the members of the staff began to wonder if they could do something more for communism than just produce its daily paper, although that seemed a vital job in itself. They wanted to be able to work in the area in which our factory was situated, making communists and spreading communism. So, they checked on all the factories in the area and they found, that there was a communist group already established in each one of them. They felt rather frustrated. They wanted to spread their communism. They wanted to build communist organizations, but the communists were already established in the factories all around.

So, as leader of the Communist Party inside the *Daily Worker* building, I called a meeting of members to discuss this problem. Someone said "well, you know, there is a big hospital just around the corner, and there are no communists there. We have already checked. We have no contacts with anyone inside. Here is a job for us to do." So, the question was how could we start working inside the large hospital where we had no contact of any sort. I called for suggestions, and at our next meeting someone came up with a good one.

He said, "London is being bombed every day; thousands of people are being injured, every hospital is crying out for blood. No one checks very carefully to see how often people give their blood because the demand is so great. Why shouldn't we volunteer to give our blood? This would give us an excuse to go back to the hospital time after time. We could get to know the domestic, nursing, and medical staff. We could discover where they eat, where they play tennis, or where they spend their spare time, and we could in due course make friendships, and out of the friendships, make communists."

I called for volunteers, communists who would give their blood, for the cause of communism.

There were 200 members of our staff, and I got 200 volunteers. They used to line up outside the hospital day after day to give their blood. It reached rather absurd proportions because there were times when I urgently needed a reporter to go out on an assignment, and I would have to send the messenger to bring one back from the blood line. I stopped the operation in the end because the production of the paper was threatened when on one occasion the chief sub-editor, just as the paper was going to press, collapsed on the job. I got the staff doctor to check him over, and he said: "This man has been so anxious to give blood for communism, he has nearly drained himself white." That was the response of my staff to that situation.

Perhaps I should add that, as a result of that operation, we did make our first contacts with the staff, we made our first converts, and twenty-two years later there is still a communist group functioning inside that hospital. That paid off very well indeed. Here you see the sort of sacrifices the communist workers are prepared to make.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

I mentioned to you communists who have gotten in touch with me and whom I have been able to help out of the communist party. I told you I have been able to assist some along the road to the Church. There have been many who have not come all that way. Of course, when people who have such a burning faith in communism, whose whole life has been given to communism, lose their communism, they have nothing else. They are often rather pathetic figures. They remind me of a squeezed-out lemon. Just everything has been squeezed out of them,

I was talking to one such man on one occasion. I shall always remember the conversation. He had left the Party, and he had only his disillusionment, his cynicism left. We were talking together in my home. He said: "Do you remember what it was like when we were together in the Party?" I should add that he is a man with a background of considerable education and from a very well-known family. He said: "Do you remember what life was like in the Communist Party?" He said: "You got up in the morning and, as you shaved, you were thinking of the jobs you would do for communism; you went down to breakfast, you read the *Daily Worker*, to see what the Party line was, to get the shot and shell for a fight in which you were already involved. You read every item in the paper wondering how you might be able to use it."

Then you read the *Times* to see what the enemy was doing, and you set off to work. On the bus or train you read the *Daily Worker* as ostentatiously as you could, holding it up, so that others might read the headlines and, perhaps, be influenced by them. You took two copies of the paper with you; the second one you left on the seat in the hope that someone would sit on it, read it, and be influenced by it."

He went on: "When you got to work, you kept the *Daily Worker* circulating, you would give it to a worker, who would take it outside, read it for a few minutes and bring it in again. At lunch time, in the canteen or the restaurant, where you took your meal, you would try to start conversations, sitting with different people on different days, not thrusting communism down their throats, but using conversations which would be brought round to policies in campaigns in which the Party was interested. Before you left your place of work at night, there was a quick meeting of the factory group or cell. There you discussed in a few minutes the successes and failures of the day; you discussed what you hoped to do the next day. You dashed home and had a quick meal and then you went out, maybe to attend classes, maybe to be a tutor, maybe to join in some communist campaign, going from door to door, standing at the side of the road selling the communist paper, doing something for communism. You went home at night and you dreamed of the jobs you were going to do for communism the next day."

He said very wistfully, very sadly: "You know life had some meaning and some purpose. Life was good in the Communist Party."

He was right. Of course, it was. It is quite wrong to suppose that it is only the saints who are not sad; sinners can get quite a lot out of life, too. This is a day in the life of a dedicated man. This is a normal day in the life of an ordinary, hard core Communist Party member.

Well, if you think of Communist Party members in those terms, then if you know they have 36,000,000 of these dedicated people, you begin to understand how it is possible for them to make the sort of impact they do.

Any communist leader running a leadership course of the sort that I am running here would insist right at the start that the beginning of leadership is dedication. You are not

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

going to get the sort of leaders you want if they are not dedicated. You may turn out some sort of leaders, but not the sort you want—not leaders for a cause. They may be leaders for themselves. You can learn techniques and become a leader for yourself. The first requirement, if you are going to produce a leader for a cause, is that he should be dedicated, so you have to find ways of making him dedicated.

Now, I told you this human material which the Communist Party uses is not special human material. It is not a particular sort of person who goes to communism. That is true of types, true of classes, too. The Communist Party draws its members from every class. It is quite wrong to suppose that it simply appeals to the have-nots, that it simply appeals to the working class. Communism has, in fact, probably been more successful with the educated and middle class than with the very poor, bearing in mind the difference in the sizes of the classes.

It is true to say that communism draws its people from every class. So, it is that no particular race has a special tendency to become communist. When I think of the dedicated people I have known who were hard core communist members, I think of just as many people drawn from races in the mission countries as in the mission-sending countries.

I came quite literally from the communist world to the Catholic world with no gap in between. As soon as I began to meet Catholics and mix with them as friends (I had never known a Catholic as a friend in my life until I went to a Jesuit and asked to be instructed—I had already taken all my hurdles by then), as soon as I began to move in Catholic circles, I came across a certain sort of corny joke concerning the alleged fact that if you are a Catholic, you are always having collections taken, you are always being asked to give to this and that. I tell you quite honestly I watched the plate going around the church on Sunday with a sense of embarrassment —when I saw the size of the contributions that were made by the people in my suburb and compared these with the sort of communist collections which I was used to.

The communists make much bigger demands on their people than we make on ours, and they do it for good reasons. They believe, as I told you earlier, that if you make big demands upon people, you will get a big response, and so this is a deliberate policy on their part. They will never make the small demand if they can make the big one. It is not done with a gun at your head. You have to find ways and means of doing it. But it is good psychology to ask for a lot.

This is one of many, many, many paradoxes which we shall see in the course of this seminar, in this whole question of communism. They show a faith in their people which we often are not prepared to show. They ask an enormous amount, and they expect to get a big response.

At the same time they are hard-headed enough to know that it is not enough to have an organization of enthusiasts. It is not enough to have sacrifice, dedication, and zeal. These are important; they are, as I said, the starting point. They are what helps to ensure that when you make a man a leader, he will continue to lead for the cause and not for himself. But you have got to have training; you have got to have preparation; you have got to have instruction as well if you are going to achieve this.

And so the communists set about trying to use this enthusiasm, this dedication, this human material which is at their disposal just as effectively as they can. They have worked out their ways of using that material effectively. They have a slogan inside the

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

Communist Party: *every communist a leader—every factory a fortress.*

I will explain what they mean by that: every communist a leader will be clear to you. They set out to make every hard core member into a trained leader. Later I shall be telling you the sort of mechanics of the thing, how they do it. That is their aim, and so, when you have thousands of dedicated people—people trained to lead—naturally they make an impact. The communist is expected to lead—to offer a lead to others wherever he goes, no matter in what situation he may find himself.

When they say “every factory a fortress,” they mean that wherever you have any sort of communist organization at all (which means three or more communists, because three or more communists form a unit of the Communist Party), in any place of work, they should set out to make that place a fortress for communism.

In other words, they should so spread their influence and establish themselves as leaders of the working people there that they cannot be touched by anyone.

This is the communist approach to leaders. First, you should believe in the human material you have at your disposal. You should not be afraid to make big demands upon it, and you should try intelligently and skillfully to call for sacrifices, making them big and following through with other sacrifices.

Then you should also use your people well. The communists believe that it is necessary for their recruits to understand their communism, to learn it. They believe that they should learn it in order to use it, to use what they learn. You know Frederick Engels, Marx’s collaborator, finished one of his books with some really very wonderful words: “*The philosophers have only tried to explain the world, the job, however, is to change it.*”² He rated himself as a philosopher and this was the closing sentence, of a book on Marxist philosophy: “The philosophers have only tried to explain the world; the job, however, is to change it.”

That slogan, “change the world,” has proven to be one of the most dynamic slogans of our times. Years after Frederick Engels was dead, the Communist Party throughout the world adopted it as its slogan. There used to be a slightly high-brow sort of literary communist publication before the War here in America—some of you will remember it—called *New Masses*. In *New Masses*, there was a man who wrote a regular column which was called “change the world.” That was a period when the Communist Party in the United States was more successful than it is today.

Communists all over the world have this slogan. They believe that they can change the world. They believe that they can change it in our lifetime. This is not just a dream on their part. They believe that they have a whole technique, a whole science, as it were, to make this possible.

Marx finished his *Communist Manifesto* with the words: “*You have a world to win.*” These words are in the mind of every communist all the time. He is out to change the world but has a world to win. He has a clear goal, knows what he is trying to work toward, something to which he aspires, something which he feels to be a goal, capable of realization.

²Here, Hyde made an error. The phrase is Marx’s. It comes from his brief essay, *Theses on Feuerbach*. This is the eleventh and final thesis. It was written in 1845. Engels published it in 1888. Engels did modify it slightly.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

But you see the sheer tragedy of it—see the tragedy of the sort of people I have been talking to you about, giving all this dedication, giving all this zeal, giving all this energy, giving all this sacrifice to the worst thing that men ever had, while we who have got so much, so often give so little to it. Or we are afraid to ask others to give anything to it?

The communists have the worst creed on earth, and they shout it from the housetops. Too often those of us who have got the best creed speak with a muted voice if we speak at all. If anyone is going to change the world, it ought to be us. If we started applying our Christianity to the society in which we live, then it would be we who would change the world. It is tragic to realize that the communists are thinking in terms of a world to win; this ought to be our slogan. There is no reason at all why we should not adopt it. There is no reason why the communists should have some sort of monopoly on it.

I think we will have to come to something of the approach that communists themselves have.

TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION

The question which I want to put to you as a basis for your discussion is this:

If you make mean little demands upon the people, you will get a mean little response, which is all you deserve. If you make big demands upon them, you will get a heroic response.

The communists say this. They prove it to be true in their own experience. I want you to discuss this in relation to your own work. Is it true for us, too? Could we adopt this? Do we use this as a method and, if we do not, might we do so?

Lecture Two

LINKING THEORY AND PRACTICE

I spoke to you of the dedication of the communist. I want to carry on from there to the actual techniques which the Communist Party uses in order to make the most of the people it has at its disposal. I would like to remind you that we are looking at communist methods, not with the idea of studying communist methods as such, but to see what we can learn from them, being selective in our approach to them, looking only at those which we may either imitate or apply to our work, or which may help us in some way.

The Communist Party everywhere is a minority—usually a small minority. We are very often preoccupied with the fact that we are a minority. As I told you, I joined the Communist Party when I was seventeen, so I spent all my late adolescence and early manhood with the communists, my formative years. I had always been conscious of the fact that the membership of the Communist Party was small, but we had always taken it for granted that we had a world to win and we were going to win it.

I was astounded when I joined the Catholic Church, for very soon I began to hear people talking of what they describe as a minority complex, which British Catholics are supposed to suffer from. I do not know if you have a minority complex here. But here were British Catholics—nearly 5,000,000 of them out of a population of 50,000,000—in other words, ten percent, talking about a minority complex, whereas in the days when we communists had 15,000 people out of 50,000,000, we believed that we were going to make Britain communist.

To me it was just astounding that people who had such numbers at their disposal—had the truth at their disposal—who had everything that the communists lack, should be going around conscious of the fact that they were a minority and that they were having a very hard fight against a big majority.

The communists do not think in those terms at all. They set out, as I told you, to make every member of the Party a hard core member, into a leader. So, we had 15,000 trained leaders operating in every walk of British life. We were effective, and we knew we were effective in spreading our ideas. Supposing we had immensely more Christian leaders than we have, imagine the impact that we might make.

I want to show you the sheer mechanics, as it were, of leading people to a state of mind where they are anxious to become leaders, and then tell you how they are made into leaders. As I describe the communist method, I want you to relate what I say to the lay apostolate, and in your minds ask yourselves how far could this apply to our own work—how far might it be used.

I talked to you of the tremendous dedication of the majority of the communists. Often people say to me, how can they be so dedicated? It does not just happen. There is a whole technique, if you like, a whole approach which is aimed at making them dedicated, which helps to explain why they are dedicated.

The average person who joins the Communist Party does so knowing very little about communism. This goes as much for the intellectuals as it does for the workers who join the Party. It is quite wrong to think the intellectual is always guided by his intellect. He can be guided by his emotions just as much as anyone else.

People who come in to the Communist Party have usually seen—and this is important to the whole thing—usually seen the Communist Party in action, in some way. Someone

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

they know is associated with it, or someone where they work is active, collecting signatures for peace petitions or working to try to improve the coalitions at the place of work, or to get higher salaries. Or maybe they see the Party in action in the shape of a campaign run by communists to prevent a widow from being evicted from her slum dwelling. They see the Party in action, and they admire what the Party is doing. They are attracted by a particular campaign. They then become aware of other campaigns which the Party is running and they find that these correspond to what they feel is useful and desirable as well.

In other words, it is the Party in action and the Party as people which provide the normal first approach to communism.

I only had one man in twenty years come to me by what I would call the purely intellectual route to communism. He turned up at my office one day and he said: "I have read the whole of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Plekhanov. I have discovered that I am a dialectical materialist and I ought to be organized. Please, may I join the Communist Party?" That is really the intellectual way of coming.

Most of them do not come like that at all. As I say, they see the Party in action. They are drawn into action by people and by campaigns which they feel meet a real need and so begin to associate with communists. Now, this business of associating with communists in action is important.

I believe that it is profoundly true to say that the more materialistic our society becomes, the more the dedicated man stands out by way of contrast, and the greater, therefore, is his appeal. The dedicated man has an appeal, and the communist is a dedicated man. So, your person who comes under the influence of communism in the shape of communist activity begins to meet dedicated people. He has not met very many—may never have met any. He may have moved exclusively in Catholic circles, and he still may not have met a dedicated person. You know that as well as I do.

Most certainly if he is living with an ordinary cross-section of your public or mine or overseas in the missions, he will not have been living with a group of dedicated people. Now he is suddenly plunged into an exhilarating experience of associating with people for whom life has a real meaning, who have a single aim, a singleness of purpose, the whole of the time and who are giving everything they have got. So, his first impressions of communists and communism are these.

If you ask me how it was possible for me as a boy from a deeply religious family, a deeply religious background, to go to atheistic communism, I would say: "Oh yes, I read books on communism—a great many of them before I joined the Party. But more important, I met communists. I was impressed by them because of their dedication. I have been impressed by them as people. Therefore, I was conditioned to be sympathetic to what I read. I was responsive to what they stood for, and I would say that that probably is the key to the explanation of how it is possible for someone to go from a deeply religious background to the Communist Party, knowing it is atheistic. This is typical of the experience of a person who begins to associate with communism. It is an exhilarating experience. Having associated with the communists for some time, they ask him if he will join the Party.

What does joining the Party mean to him? Now, you can become a Catholic, make the first approach to the Church because you want to marry a girl, or, alternatively, you want to marry a boy, who is a Catholic. You can go to your instruction, and you receive the

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

instruction all right, but you do not necessarily get the impression of your becoming a Catholic, meaning that the whole of your life will be changed, from early morning till late at night, that you are now going to become part of a group of dedicated people.

But when someone is approached by a communist, asked to join the Communist Party, having seen communism in action, he will know that communists are dedicated. Therefore, if he makes the decision to join the Party, he knows that is a big decision. It is not to be taken lightheartedly. It will involve his becoming dedicated, too. On our side, if we have a low general level on the part of the mass of our people, then we have people coming in as our converts, who also come at that same low level, as a norm, which is all wrong. There is a different norm in the Communist Party.

The norm in the Communist Party is one of total dedication for the people who come in. They expect to have to be dedicated right from the very start when they make the decision to join the Party.

This is tremendously important, I think, because you get off on the right foot, as it were, right at the very start. Then it is up to the Party to maintain it. So, they come in expecting to have to sacrifice—sacrifice their time, their energy, themselves. They do not have any illusions. It does not matter if someone is joining the P.K.I., the Communist Party of Indonesia, who sees Indonesian leaders living in the Kampongs with the people, living simple lives, although they are leading one of the largest parties in the world, or whether they are joining the Communist Party of the United States, where they see the leaders of the Party going in and out of jail. They know that sacrifice is going to be demanded of them.

They know also that they will have to go into action.

If you become a Catholic, the whole of your leisure hours might remain pretty much the same as before, except that you get up a little bit earlier on Sunday morning to go to Mass. But no one would suppose, joining the Communist Party, that life is going to be the same, because they have seen the communists in action. That is the way they have come. And they know that the people they have been attracted to are out night after night, busy with their communism, busy at work pushing their communism there, communists all of the time, so they come expecting to go into action.

This holds them back for some time. They have to make a decision. It is going to be a big decision. When they make it, they feel it is a most important decision and it is drawing on something noble within themselves. I do not think we should have any doubts about that at all.

I have had plenty of communists I have helped out of the Communist Party say to me: “When I joined the Communist Party, even though you have now demonstrated that communism is evil, I still believe it was the biggest and best decision I made in my life. It was the most unselfish decision I ever made.” I have had plenty of people say this to me. They are conscious of the size of the decision they make.

So, they come, expecting to have to sacrifice and they come expecting to have to go into action. They are conditioned right from the start for these things. You can see, therefore, that this business of getting as much as possible from them is, as it were, a follow-up operation. It is not something that has to be created after a period of being a communist and doing nothing. Right from the very start, the Party expects the recruit to be dedicated and active.

How does the Party follow through? In this way: There is a sort of chronological order

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

of things which is quite important. Any communist who has been trained in this sort of work would tell you that you cannot miss one single step on the way. The whole thing follows in a sort of logical sequence.

They are not instructed straight away. They are instructed very soon, but not straight away. You do not need me to tell you there are a great many differences between becoming a Catholic and becoming a communist. One is that if you join the Communist Party, you are received first and instructed afterwards. There are reasons for this. When recruits join the Communist Party, that is a significant act in itself; it commits them. Then they are further committed.

Quite consciously and deliberately, before they are instructed, they are sent into some sort of activity which will commit them publicly to communism. Just how publicly would depend upon the nature of their work, etc. Obviously, if a man is a nuclear physicist and he comes to join the Communist Party, he is not going to be publicly exposed as a communist.

The ordinary person who has no particular security reason for not being brought out in public is deliberately involved in some very public form of activity as quickly as possible. Most probably they are sent out to sell communist papers.

You may say that is a very simple thing, a low form of activity. I want to suggest to you it is of profound psychological significance. I sold communist papers' at the side of the road when I was a communist, and I have sold Catholic papers at the side of the road since I have been a Catholic. I hated it either way. Only someone who has done it will understand what I mean. Perhaps you have got to be an inhibited Englishman to really suffer. You start out with a pile of papers. You unwrap them, feeling very self-conscious. The public is going by wondering what you are going to produce from your parcel. You hold up your paper, you try to bring yourself to shout *Daily Worker*, and the first time it sounds like a squeak and not like your voice at all. I think it is true of anyone who is newly come to communism.

Here is an act of tremendous significance. He is making a public witness for the new thing which he has accepted. He may feel a fool as he does it, but he begins to see the significance of it when he has been there for a little while. People pass by for a while. He begins to get some dirty looks and someone comes along and starts abusing him. It can happen to someone selling Catholic papers, too. It may be a crank, it may be a bigot, but whoever it may be, someone will come along and start abusing him. This will make him draw upon his resources quite a lot. This is an act of moral courage. It is good to start a career with an act of moral courage.

Sooner or later, too, someone who is not just an abusive critic but an intelligent critic comes along and starts to ask questions: Why did you join the Communist Party? How can you join the Communist Party when you know what Russia did in Hungary? Or, how Joe Stalin concluded a pact with Hitler? Someone else comes along and says: How can you be an atheist? And starts to argue atheism with him. This is tremendously important because he has not got the answers. He is not supposed to have answers at that stage. This is all part of the operation.

He discovers his own inadequacy. He thought he knew quite a lot about communism. He had been mixing with communists, reading the *Daily Worker*. Perhaps he discovers that he does not really know as much about communism as he thought. When he has been doing this for two or three weeks, someone described as the education secretary comes to

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

him at a Communist Party local meeting, and says: “Don’t you think you ought to learn more about the communism which you have accepted? Wouldn’t you like to attend some classes? We are organizing some classes for beginners now. We won’t make enormous demands upon you. They will be pretty simple, geared to the state that you have reached, but we’d like for you to attend.”

He heaves a sigh of relief, and says: “Thank God or whatever gods there may be. Here is a chance of getting the answers to the questions I have been asked. Here is a possibility of getting ammunition, shot and shell, for the battle in which I am already involved.”

In other words, he already feels the need for this—and so it meets a need.

This means in turn that he goes to the classes in a receptive frame of mind. It means that he feels the tutor has something which he needs, urgently needs, desperately needs, and, therefore, he is going to pay attention to what he is given, he is going to put in whatever work is required. Incidentally, no very great demands will be made on him at the start in the way of reading. All this is a sort of psychological preparation for future training.

This business of sending them out to make a public witness is something which is tremendously important. It is important in the preparation for leadership, in making them into active members. It is important, too, even in holding them to their cause.

I remember last year when I was travelling in Central Africa, an Irish Jesuit was driving me through the bush to Lusaka, the capital of Northern Rhodesia.

As we drove into Lusaka, there were Africans spaced out about 100 yards apart on either side of the road for a very long way. They were selling something and I looked to see what it was. It was *Watch Tower*. They were Jehovah Witnesses. Those of you who know Southern Africa will know that the Jehovah Witnesses are spreading more rapidly than we are in many parts of Africa today.

I said, “Who are these people?”

He said, “They are Jehovah Witnesses.”

I said, “Yes, I know that, but what were they before they became Jehovah Witnesses?”

He said, “You really want to know?”

I said, “I wouldn’t ask you otherwise.”

He said, “A very high proportion of them were your people, they are baptized Catholics. They are now Jehovah Witnesses.”

I said, “Well, Father, when they were ours, did we give them anything to do? Did we ever send them out to line the road, selling papers?”

He said, “I am afraid we did not. That is probably one reason why they are there now.”

It was not a question of whether they were going to sell many copies of *Watch Tower*, they probably did not, but they were making a public witness—they were being made to feel that they were doing something. They had never been asked to do anything before which would bring them out in that way. I believe that this thing is significant in many ways. I do not mean that you have to send every convert you get straight out selling a Catholic paper. But to commit people publicly, make them right away start to do something which involves an act of moral courage, which bring them before others, brings them under attack, is a good thing, not a bad.

Then comes the instruction. I am trying to show you step by step the mechanics of the thing. You are a recruit to communism. You have been asked to attend classes. Here you

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

will learn elementary communism. You will begin right at the very beginning. What form does the instruction take? The actual form of the instruction, the whole approach, is just as important as anything else I have described to you.

You will be made to feel right at the very start that instruction is not an end in itself, that acquiring knowledge is not an end in itself. To acquire knowledge in a world involved in a great battle is to be given as ammunition for a fight, something to be used; not just something to be absorbed.

It is a fact that people who attend communist courses generally see those courses through. It is normal for the vast majority to finish the course. Those who drop out usually have very good reasons for doing so. Now, those of you who organize courses in the Church's social teachings—I wonder if you can say the same of your courses—that the majority of those who start off with great enthusiasm are still there at the last class.

When I first became a Catholic, and it has continued since, people came to me and asked me if I would launch classes. Their approach was usually this: they would ask me to give a talk, and the expectation was that a large number of people would come to hear me. At the end of my talk, the chairman would say that this was really the beginning of a series of classes; the classes would begin next week with such and such a tutor. They would try to get as many from the audience as possible to attend those classes. I was the bait, as it were.

One day when I had been doing this, a woman came to me and said, "You know, Mr. Hyde, I do not know how many times I have heard you talk. I think I have been to every lecture you have given in the greater London area."

I said "Well, you have been very active in following me around."

She said, "I am a very active member of the Catholic Social Guild. I have been, I think, to every series of classes they have organized within reach of my home since it was founded. I have been to all their summer schools at Oxford, every year and I have been doing this since it started."

I said, "You must know a great deal about Catholic social teaching by now." She said, "I do, Mr. Hyde."

I said, "What have you done about applying it to the society in which you live?"

She said, "Good heavens, Mr. Hyde, I have been much too busy going to classes to be able to do anything like that." She is an extreme case, but you know the type.

We are not achieving very much if that is all we are doing. The Communist Party would not bother to run classes if that is all it added up to. They want to instruct people in order to involve them in battle, and so they have given a lot of attention to the methods which they use in the whole approach of the tutor.

The approach of the tutor is important. You cannot convey to your pupils what you have not got. The way in which the whole thing is presented is very important indeed. You may have all your facts right, you may know everything which you want to convey to the others, but it will not be meaningful and dynamic in their lives unless you present it in the right way.

I will tell you how the communists do it; you can judge for yourselves whether it is capable of application, whether it is meaningful to you.

The communists will say that it does not matter how dull the subject may be, *it has to be presented in an inspirational way*. That calls for thought; it calls for ingenuity. I will tell you how it works in practice.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

The man who has joined the Communist Party, whose case we have been tracing, goes to a class. It is a beginners class. Here is the syllabus which he will take; it is in red type appropriately called “A course for new members.” It is a four-lesson course in elementary, scientific socialism. It is not simple stuff, although it is made as simple as possible. It is not naturally easy; here are the titles given to the four classes:

1. The kind of world we live in
2. How that world can be changed
3. The force that can change it
4. The party of the working class.

That is the four-lesson course which a beginner does. Right at the start, he begins to learn communist theory. He believes that this is something which is related to changing the world, that the Communist Party is going to change it, and he is taught how to be one of those who will be in on the operation.

After that he gets a straight course in Scientific Socialism in simple terms, but nonetheless into the very roots of Marxism. That is the inspirational approach. For myself, I feel it has something for us.

Next, it is presented in *global terms*. If the Communist Party member goes to classes or if he goes to a meeting of his local Communist Party, what is presented to him will be presented against a background of the *world as it is*. He will be made to feel there is a great battle going on all over the world, that this applies to his own country, his own locality, his own neighborhood, to him. He will be made to feel that the period of history in which he lives is a decisive period and he has a decisive role to play in it. He is made to feel that he is a part of a *great world-wide movement*.

There is something tragic about this, of course. We talk about the Mystical Body of Christ. A communist joins the Communist Party and is given a great sense of oneness with suffering humanity all over the world as soon as he starts attending his first classes.

If you ask me what sense of deprivation I had when I left the Communist Party and became a Catholic—and every convert has that sense of deprivation in some form or another—I think I would say it would be the loss of *that sense of oneness* which we had in the Communist Party. That is crazy, of course; it is we who talk about the Mystical Body of Christ. But this is a hard reality; it is a hard fact of life.

The communist is made to feel this sense of oneness right at the start. We know that men do respond tremendously to this feeling of being united with others throughout the world, and it has never been more true than of our generation. No generation has ever had the means of being one with men throughout the world as our generation has. Then what is taught is linked with action. This is tremendously important. You know as well as I do, if we are honest with ourselves, that we have classes in Catholic social teaching running for year after year, where we have people talking about man’s inalienable human rights. They rattle this off; it is almost meaningless; they can still be talking about and learning about man’s inalienable human rights even while still continuing their own racial prejudices, color prejudices, class prejudices, snobbery, and all the rest of it.

It does not connect up with life. Something fails to click. They learn it, but it does not influence their lives.

If the instruction is linked with action from the start, this is meaningful to their lives. It

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

is not just something which goes in to their head and stops there. The way the Party tries to insure that this should be so is as follows.

Any tutor worth his salt in the Communist Party finishes each class with these words: “What are the comrades going to do about what they have learned tonight? How are you going to apply what you have learned to the hospital where you are nursing? You to the school where you are teaching? You to the factory where you are employed? You as a housewife to the neighborhood where you are living?”

The first item on the agenda next week will be “How did the comrades apply what they learned last week?” It does not matter whether it is dialectical materialism or trade union history or scientific socialism or what the course may be. The course will be related to life and action in that way.

Next, in addition to being linked with action, the tutor sets out to make the individual feel that he has a role in this activity, that *he* has to go into action, and that he has an important part to play.

Finally, it is presented in such a way as to make him feel that he is engaged in a fight which is against evil things and for the good. You may say that that is an extraordinary inversion. You see communism as evil; we see ourselves as standing for the good. But do not have any illusions about this. He sees *us* as evil; he sees the things we hold as evil; he believes that the communism he has got is the best thing that any man could ever have. He sees himself as involved in a fight against evil things: an evil capitalist system, an evil system which condemns millions of people to death through preventable social diseases, which kills off millions of children all over the world through chronic malnutrition, which keeps people in ignorance and subjection. He is on the side of righteousness—or believes he is.

Here is an extraordinary thing: you can have an atheist tutor appealing to people in this way, making them feel they are on the side of righteousness, and yet often we are inhibited about doing it. This is quite an extraordinary thing, but it is real and, of course, in doing this, they are working on something very profound indeed. They do draw out something good in their people, and they use what is good for an evil cause.

They are able to get people to respond because they make them feel that they are part of a crusade, that they are fighting evil things, that they are on the side of righteousness. I believe that that response can be gotten by others.

I recently did a survey of *Marxism Today*, one of the communists’ learned journals, for the past two years, and I estimated that slightly more than fifty percent of its space had been devoted, not to economic condemnation of our society, but to a *moral condemnation* of our society—to discussion of moral aspects of life in a decadent society.

The communists know that communism has both an economic appeal and an ethical appeal, and that the ethical appeal will be the greater one. Any man who has ever led a strike knows perfectly well that when the strike is going badly and the fight is getting hard and tough, if you really want to maintain the morale of your people, you stop talking about so many cents an hour extra pay or whatever it may be. You get off of the economic issue and you say that there is a tremendous principle at stake. If you do them in that way, you will get their support; you will get a degree of sacrifice which you otherwise would not have.

The communists know this, and they use it for their own purposes. Often I feel that some of our people look almost with suspicion on moral indignation. It is a healthy thing;

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

it is not unhealthy. The communists are able to build up this moral indignation against the evils of our times and use it for their own purposes. The recruit to communism goes through a course in this way, and all the time shown the wider issues and how what is being taught is related to these broader issues.

The study group is where the leaders are formed, and not just by leadership techniques as such. A great deal depends on the attitude of the tutor, the way in which the tutor approaches his or her particular job.

Let me give you the story of one man who came to the Communist Party and how we made a leader of him. You will note the stages in his development and the steps which the communists believe are required in the formation of a leader through instruction.

I had been giving a leadership course. I was the tutor. When I came to the last session, I ended it by saying what the communists the world over say: "The Communist Party is able to take anyone who is willing to be trained in leadership and turn him into a leader." I will repeat that because the communists believe it. *The Communist Party is able to take anyone who is willing to be trained in leadership and turn him into a leader.*

You note the one qualification—if he is willing to be trained. That presupposes an attitude of mind which communist parties have to try to create.

I closed my series with those words; I got down from the platform. A new recruit who was doing the course came to me and said that he wanted to be made into a leader. He did not say it like that. It was not as simple as that. As I looked at him, I thought I had never seen anyone look less like a leader in my life. He was short, grotesquely fat, with a great, flabby, wide, uninteresting face, as unprepossessing a man as you will find anywhere. He had a cast in one eye, and the poor man had a most distressing stutter too, and so quite literally he said to me—I am not making fun of the man—"C-c-comrade, I w-w-want you t-t-to -t-take me and t-t-train me and t-t-to t-t-t-tum me i-i-into a l-l-leader of m-men." I wondered how I was going to do it. I wondered why we had made that big claim of being able to take anyone who was willing.

Here was Jim, pathetically willing, but how were we going to do it? I thought, this is a challenge, and so I told him: "If you come to our classes, Jim, you will have to study. You will learn dialectical and historical materialism. From that you will learn that the very laws of the universe are on the side of communism. The law of change, progress coming through conflict, is something which we use, which helps us, which guarantees our ultimate victory, provided that we understand our communism sufficiently well."

"You will see that there has been a pattern in history—running through history over the years, building up to the ultimate triumph of communism. We shall only succeed in our aim if a sufficient number of people are trained in leadership, understand the moment of opportunity and seize it when it comes."

I gave him a hope; I gave him a goal. I gave him something to work towards, and I set out to give him confidence in himself. That is the first step on the way to making a man a leader. You must give him self-confidence.

That in itself is not enough. The world is full of people who are bursting with self-confidence and have nothing to back it up. They are not leaders. They are just nuisances. So, the next thing was, of course, to give him something to be confident about. In other words, we gave him his instruction; we gave him something which others had not got. When he had been going to classes some eight or nine months, I went to him one night and I said, "You know, Jim, you ought to be a tutor."

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

He was absolutely terrified.

I said, "You have been in the Party now for some time. You have been attending classes for eight or nine months. Have you learned anything?"

He said, "Yes, I have learned a lot."

I said, "Well, you know, the majority of people who join the Communist Party know as little as you did when you joined. In other words, they know practically nothing about our theories. Now if you have already learned a lot, this means that you know more than the people who have just joined."

He said, "Yes."

I said, "The whole art of teaching is to know just a little bit more than the people you are teaching—if you do, you can get away with it. If people ask you questions, and you do not know the answers, all right, go to your textbook. Say, 'I do not know the answer, but I will give it to you next week.' Go to the textbook. Find it there. In that way you will learn. If you cannot find it there, I will give it to you."

And so I made him feel that he was adequate to the task. And he was.

I did not send him as a building worker with a minimum of education to teach dialectical materialism to nuclear physicists. I taught him to take a beginners' class for building workers, like himself. This was a tremendous thing in his training as a leader, because here was a new relationship between himself and his fellow workers. They were sitting at his feet at night. He was teaching them what he knew. This was good for his confidence. And in order to do it, he had to think out what we had taught him. He had to get some order into his thinking, some discipline into his thought, which the average man does not have to do. He had to learn to get the ideas, which we put into his head, out of his head and into the head of the other person. In other words, he had to become articulate. You cannot be a leader if you are not, and so we made him articulate. We gave him a clear goal towards which to work. We made him see his role in the wider fight, and, of course, we sent him into action.

Those were important steps in his formation as a leader; ones worth noting and trying to follow, I think. At any rate in due course, I asked him if he would go through a public speaking course. He went. It is a course pretty much the same as the course which Frank Sheed would give to members of the Catholic Evidence Guild.

Then we put him up at the street corner, in the market place. We did not turn him into a great orator. We did not even cure him of his stutter, which became modified as he gained confidence in himself. But he was still agitating for communism and propagandizing twenty years later.

Having given him—and this is an essential part in training a leader—the broader training in leadership, we told him that he must lead in a specialized field, and this is important too. We did not throw him to the wolves and say: "All right, you go into your labor union and start leading them." We gave him six months preparation. We taught him trade union history, trade union procedure, how to chair a meeting, how to move a resolution, how to move an addendum. We taught him the vocabulary of the labor movement, so when he got up, he would not sound like some sort of alien. The average Catholic in the labor union only gets up and speaks when the question of birth control, or Catholic schools, or something like that comes up. We equipped him to talk the ordinary language of the ordinary trade unionist, to know his interests, to be able to speak about those interests, not to appear to be grinding a communist axe, but be a good trade

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

unionist.

Until recently, Britain had just one communist-dominated union, the Electrical Trades Union, and Jim was one of its leaders. I assure you, you are never likely to have a more unpromising pupil than Jim. The Communist Party turned him into a leader. He is still doing an effective job of leadership for it now.

It is an extraordinary paradox that we say that communism is opposed to the individual, and that we are the great defenders of the individual. In practice, the Communist Party does certainly bring out the potentialities of its people where often we neglect them. I think we ought to have greater faith in the human material that God puts in our hands.

TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION

You will now go into your discussion groups, and consider this: Lenin said, “*Theory without practice is sterile. Practice without theory is blind.*”

It is not a bad slogan to remember—you could usefully put it up over your classroom.

Are there evidences of this sort of sterility, this sort of blindness in our own Catholic community? What steps can we take to prevent it?

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Mr. Hyde: I wonder if you would mind mentioning your name and community when you speak so we know who you are. Remember that the seminar is on Christian leadership—not just on communism, so we do not want questions on every aspect of communism. Does any group have a question?

Fr. Finbar Shanley, O. Carm: We were discussing the fact that American Catholics are not outgoing, are not leaders, because we have not trained them. I would like to ask since you have seen the Catholics in our country and Catholics in England and in many other countries, does it appear to you that we do have this ghetto mentality of herding our own people into heaven, and letting the rest go to hell?

Mr. Hyde: I think there is some truth in that. You are in a better position in some respects than I am to answer it, although I have been coming to the United States for six or eight weeks, most years for the past ten years. I think I have travelled in every state of the Union and have seen a good many Catholics in action. If I try to compare it, say, with the British, I would say that you are probably producing fewer, but not very much fewer, lay leaders than we are. But, you see, the British Catholic community also suffers from the same ghetto mentality. Historically it probably has the same origin.

There seems to be some validity for the existence of such a mentality years ago but, honestly, seeing your Catholic community, size, and all the educational institutions and everything else that you have, I just cannot comprehend how any one can be a Catholic with a ghetto mentality in America today. I would say that one of the purposes of this course is to try to help you out of the ghetto mentality, if you are there, and certainly help

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

you to help others out of the ghetto. I do not think the Catholics of this country are making anything like the impact they might make, and you know it perfectly well too.

Sister M. Cuthbert, S.C.M.M.: We think that one of our problems is that we are too secure; that a communist outside of the Iron Curtain is insecure, that he is actually undergoing persecution. Do you know anything of the situation behind the Iron Curtain—how we could learn from it. In other words, there the Party is established, and it would be liable to the same kind of bourgeois and managerial mentality to which we in the Church are liable here in America and elsewhere in the western world. Have they discovered anything that we could use to keep a revolutionary outlook in an established situation?

Mr. Hyde: Communists have been conscious of this as a danger to themselves. Of course, the Communist Party in the free world is a minority, and they see themselves as an elite. It is much more difficult to maintain that feeling in country where communism has come to power. They meet it in their own ways. Some of those ways I think are meaningful to us and some are not.

For example, one thing which they have done, which we cannot do, is to deliberately limit the size of the Communist Party in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. The communists deliberately keep it small. It is the highest honor to be a member of the Communist Party. You have the greatest difficulty to get into it, and once you are there you are liable to be purged unless you maintain the high standards which are demanded of you. This is the way they set about trying to solve this problem of keeping it as a minority and an elite, making it difficult to be in. Clearly that does not have any particular message for us. We cannot take that view of the Church.

A Calvinist once wrote a hymn which said, “We are the choice, selected few—let all the rest be damned—there’s room enough in hell for them, we won’t have heaven crammed.” We cannot take that attitude, but we can still make the individual feel subjectively that coming into the Church is the highest honor. The Communist Party makes life difficult for its members. How? By making them feel they are absolutely on demand, as it were. Big demands are made of them: they are made to sacrifice. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union can say to its Party member, “Leave the place where you have been living; go work inside the arctic circle, the far eastern territories, in Siberia, in some backward republic with an unpronounceable name, somewhere on the borders of the Soviet Union.” And the Party member is expected to go. He is expected to be a one-hundred percenter, and this is really the means by which the morale is maintained, the revolutionary spirit is maintained.

Part of what I have been trying to get over to you is this: That if you make mean little demands upon people, you will get a mean little response. If you make big demands upon them, you will get an heroic response. They use that behind the Iron Curtain with their communists just as they use it here. There, I think, they do have something for us. We do not make the demands we might make on people. We are more likely to maintain the sort of mentality we want, the sort of approach we want, if it is not only felt to be a high honor to be a Catholic but if we demand something which does involve total commitment, singleness of purpose, sacrifice of time and energy and everything else.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

Mr. James Lamb, A.Z.D.: In terms of revolutionary changes which we find it necessary to make, do you think we might possibly consider something like this in the Catholic Church, which requires that we go to Mass on Sunday? I wonder what you might think of the idea of no longer requiring Catholics to go to Mass on Sunday and the implications of this?

Mr. Hyde: I imagine he means this is a sort of minimal demand and that many people make it the only thing. What would I think of the idea that we should not require them to go to Mass on Sunday? I do not think that would be the beginning and the end of the solution of the problem at any rate. It might solve some problems, but it would create others. It is true, of course, in the sense that a false impression is created by the fact that some Catholics do genuinely seem to feel that they have done their duty to their Church and to their God by going to Mass on Sunday. It does not occur to them that the whole thing becomes almost meaningless unless they take the values of the Mass on Sunday on to the stock exchange, or to the labor union, or factory or wherever they go the next day. This I think is the nub of the question, really.

How can we make people who feel that going to Mass on Sunday is the beginning and the end of their duty, realize this is wrong and that Sunday Mass is something which should influence every moment of their lives? I think this has got to come in the home, in the school—very much in the school—and from the pulpit. I think it sounds rather trite for me to say this, but I know you want me to talk quite frankly to you. In fact, I do not hear many sermons preached which relate the Mass to everyday life—not only the life of the man in the factory, necessarily, the stock exchange, the problems of the Catholic who has been sent into politics. I would feel that the answer really lies not so much in the question of must they or must they not be compelled to go to Sunday Mass, but how can we make the Mass meaningful to every moment of their lives? When we do that, we provide the answer.

Father John Newell, S.J.: You talked about frustrated men being drawn into communism. That is true in Honduras. Propaganda used in Latin America today says that communism in Russia today is a dictatorship of new privileged classes. Where is the note of dedication here? It has been lost. It looks to me that they can now be labelled as ambitious and avaricious men.

Mr. Hyde: I would like to say this is not a question we want to take. This is not a seminar on communism as such. We will take this one, but this will be the last that I will take of this sort.

The question is that I said that frustrated men go to communism. In Latin America, people are saying that in communist Russia there is dictatorship, and that something has been lost in Russia as a consequence. Where is the dedication if you have got a dictatorship?

I will not go into this deeply at all. First, the dictatorship is not an afterthought on the part of avaricious men. It is an essential part of communist teaching. They would not be true to their communism if they did not introduce a dictatorship after the revolution. Dictatorship is regarded as a necessary evil to destroy the last remnants of the old ruling class, destroy the economic basis of their power, destroy, too, what the

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

communists would call the ideological superstructure—all the ideology and beliefs which grew out of a bourgeois society. It is only when those are destroyed that the dictatorship is supposed to end, and they should then go on, allegedly, to the greater freedom of communism. This is in accord with fundamental communist teaching. It is not a trick or plot by avaricious men.

Secondly, are the leaders of that dictatorship corrupted by the dictatorship? Of course, some of the leaders in the dictatorship get their motives mixed. That does not mean that they stop believing in communism. That does not mean that they might not be prepared to die for communism tomorrow. In my view, they would. We all know perfectly well that at the time of the reformation, there were some men who died for the faith whose lives had been dreadful before. Suddenly challenged, they became the Church's martyrs. There were priests with concubines who are recognized as martyrs because they were prepared to die for the faith. Because a communist leader gets his motives mixed, it does not follow that he must therefore cease to believe in his communism. To them, I would say, communism still provides the answer to the universe, to the world, to the society in which they live.

But their motives get mixed. I do not see how we can demand a higher degree of fidelity from communist atheists—more fidelity to their beliefs than we demand of our own people. We know that we send Catholic laymen into public life, and before very long their motives are mixed, too. They like the power which they get; they like the tributes; they like position. It is the same with Catholic politicians anywhere. This does not mean that they cease to be Catholics. It is what happens to ordinary human beings. It has happened to the communist leaders in some cases in Russia, but those are not our problems.

The people who really challenge us are the totally dedicated communists who make the communist movement what it is in the world; it is from them that we have to learn. We may draw some comfort from the thought that they have the same problems as ourselves when it comes to dealing with people in prominent positions. But they are not the people upon whom the communist movement in the world really depend.

Lecture Three

USE OF PERSONNEL IN LEADERSHIP

I have particular reason to remember an Easter Mass at which an old Indian priest was preaching to a congregation of very poor people, Indians and Chinese. He told them that the women on the first Easter Sunday went looking for the Risen Lord. They looked in the Tomb, and they did not find Him there, and they looked around the Garden for Him. Again, they could not find Him. But, he said, you do not have to look in the Tomb, you do not have to look around the garden to find the Risen Lord. He is in your hands. When you go out to work tomorrow, whether you are pulling a rikisha or whether you are digging a drain, whatever you may be doing, you are cooperating in God's work of creation, God is in your hands.

Sitting in front of me was an old Indian with gnarled bare legs, with varicose veins—those of you who work in the Orient know the type. As the Indian preacher said that God is in your hands, I saw this old man look at his toil worn hands with their broken nails almost in awe. And it is my guess that work will never be the same for that man again. God is in his hands.

Suddenly, whatever degraded form of work that he was doing became meaningful. It was related to things in which he believed, so that God and religion would not belong just to the Mass on Sunday. It could be related to cleaning the drains the next day or wherever his work might take him.

That, of course, is how we ought to see it. It is not necessarily how our people do see it. The communists see it like that. *Work is the most wonderful opportunity to spread communism.* His work gives the communist his biggest opportunity of all. It is in the nature of capitalist society to bring ever increasingly large numbers of people into every large building to produce for profit for the capitalist class. The capitalist class digs its own grave; it brings a ready-made audience together every day among whom the communists can work. If you call a public meeting and have 5,000 people, you think you have done very well. Society presents the communist with, it may be, scores of thousands of people every day—at the expense of the enemy, ready there for him to treat as an audience, as a group among whom he can work for communism.

The most important part of the communist's day is really his time at work. He sees work as a wonderful opportunity to work for his cause. I do not think we have really got that conception over to our people. More often than not, they feel that if they are going to do any job for the church at all, it begins when they leave the factory, or the office, or the hospital—wherever they work. Communists believe that that is the biggest opportunity of all.

I think that is something that we can definitely learn from them.

They go further than this. They say not only can your work, your work place, your fellow workers, be used for your cause. This is a ready-made audience and opportunity presented to you, and this is typical of the communist approach. You have to make yourself as effective as you can *in that place, with that group*. You leave nothing to chance; you think the thing out.

“How am I going to be most effective?” The communists think correctly that you will be most effective if you are respected. You will be respected if you are good at your job, not because you can talk, not because you are always talking about communism and

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

always trying to sell communist papers. You will have an authority on all sorts of subjects, almost any subject you care to talk about, if you are good at your job. This may not be logical, but we know it is true.

Take the industrial worker: There is still sufficient pride of craft left for craftsmen to have a great respect for the good craftsman, and in business, the business world is the same. A man is dismissed contemptuously if he is inefficient. If he is no good, they say he is a bum. They do not listen to him. If he is good at his job, they listen to him.

Therefore, if you are going to be effective in your place of work, you must be the best man at your job. A rule of the Communist Party is that each member should aim to be the best man at his job. It is a splendid rule and, as I say, gives him authority which he otherwise would not have. He is listened to in a different way.

The communists, of course, test their methods by “Does it work?” In this case, it does work, it is effective, and they have proven it over and over again. They are trying to sell to their public something which is difficult to sell. They are trying to sell something which is naturally unacceptable. But they give some thought to this question. And this is one of the means by which they manage to get their unpopular ideas over: an *unpopular minority to an apathetic majority*.

The communists are active among students. Many of you know that from the areas in which you work. They are more active among students in Asia, and in Latin America today than they have ever been. This is going to grow—this increasing emphasis on students—particularly in Latin America.

Of course, you will get your odd communist student who will get so carried away by his communism that he fails all his exams. That is not viewed with approval by the Party. He is put on the spot for it. He is told, “You work very hard and we are very grateful to you for what you have done. But you would have done a better job for communism, if you had passed your exams. You will be more effective later on. You are not going to be only a student. Student life is a preparation for what follows. We hope you will be a communist always and so your first job as a student is to pass your exams. The better you do, the better it will be for your cause.”

This makes study meaningful. It is given, as it were, a communist purpose a communist meaning, and this means that the student can go to his studies with more enthusiasm. This is a preparation for being more effective for the thing in which he believes. Working hard for his exams is working hard for communism.

The same is true of the people working in industry.

This is a particular approach to work—a particular approach to life and the world that I am trying to get over to you. This is the approach the communists have. It is sound. It is good. We have no quarrel with this. The tragedy is that it is used for an evil purpose.

I believe it is right for us to try to convey this approach to our students, and to our own lives and our own work. It is those who are good at the job who make the greatest impact. Of course, it would be wrong for me to suggest that we do not have people with the same approach. We do, but I think you will agree that we do not have enough of them. This is not the norm, it is the exception. I can think of those exceptions.

I was in Calcutta at the beginning of 1962, staying with the Jesuits. There were two Belgian Jesuits. One was taking the trouble to become recognized as one of the foremost Bengalese scholars in East Bengal. The other is known as one of the outstanding Sanskrit authorities — again, a Belgian, not an Indian. The one who has become the great Sanskrit

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

man is also an authority on Indian music, and he is invited to Hindu marriages, weddings and funerals, to sing hymns in Sanskrit, hymns which he has written, to the Holy Ghost, to the Blessed Trinity, etc.

These men have made an impact because they have mastered the subject which is theirs. They have done it, knowing what they were doing, for a purpose. If they make converts, these are not going to be second-class people. Now, we are not going to divide our converts into first and second-class converts in the sense of first and second-class souls. But it is true that they will attract people of their type—like does attract like—and they are going to make an impact where that impact can be tremendously important.

The Communist Party believes as I say, that work can be used for communism, that it is the greatest opportunity of all. Of course, you are not at work all the time. You have another period of your day when you are free to work for communism in a different way. So, the Party again does not leave it to chance. It asks itself “What are the best forms of activity and how do we organize that activity?”

The communists have a slogan—the Party lives by its campaigns—which is true to a very great extent. The recruits to the Party, as I pointed out earlier, come in through the campaigns which the Party runs. The campaigns keep the Party members active the whole time. A lot of thought has to be given to starting one campaign after another which will keep their people in action. They want that action to be as purposeful and as meaningful as possible.

We know quite well that, in fact, people can see action as an end in itself.

I knew a man who devoted every moment of his spare time, seven days a week, 365 days a year, to raising homing pigeons. You have known people like that. There are those who spend every minute playing bridge. Others who spend every minute organizing other people.

Action can become an end in itself. In appealing to people to be active, we are not going against the grain, as it were. They will get satisfaction from activity. If it is made meaningful, they will get even greater satisfaction. The communists recognize this and they try to make it meaningful. They are determined to keep their people active all the time.

So, they plan their campaigns. The basis is this: If they are going to be successful, they must be related to the real needs, the real desires of the people. This may sound odd to you on the part of communists because you will feel that what the communists do are against the needs of the people, against their best interests. Communist *propaganda* is usually in tune with the needs of the people. It may not be closely related, from the outsider's point of view, to the long-term aims of communism, but always the communist tries to keep his ear to the ground to see what the public is saying, what they are thinking, what the people really need and he tries to gear campaigns to these real needs.

Mao Tse-tung, in volume four of his *Selected Works*, has one essay on what he calls “*From the people to the people*.” The idea is that you send your communists out among the people; you try to discover what they want most, what are the things which are occupying their minds, what are the things which are nearest to their hearts. You then report back to your Communist Party cell or group what you have discovered. The Party then tailors its campaign to the things the people already want.

You take it from the people, give it a communist content, and give it back to the people. Since it originated with the people, they will naturally respond to it. Of course,

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

Mao Tse-tung approached this thing in an unprincipled way. I do not say that we can use Mao Tse-tung's method, but the idea behind it of trying to discover what are the needs of the people, and seeing what we have to say on them, is worthy of consideration.

The communists say that their aim is a communist world. That means *every country* of the world. That aim is firmly in the communist mind, each individual's mind, the whole of the time. What he does is related to his attempt to attain a communist world. But it is also true that if you are campaigning, you cannot campaign for a communist world all the time. That is the long-term objective.

As you read communist books, books by Lenin or Stalin, for example, you see the terminology is the terminology of a military textbook. They think in terms of strategy and tactics, campaigning, and so on. Now, the whole art of campaigning is to be able to maintain the morale of your troops.

Any military man, any top military man, has to think in terms of these things. They know perfectly well that if you take a big defeat, your men may become demoralized, but there are ways of avoiding this. There is a little fact of human psychology that you can take a big defeat, if you throw your people quickly into action again in some sector of the front where they can get even a small victory. You can still maintain the morale of your troops.

Leave them inactive, and before long they are demoralized. For this reason you need your long term objectives, but you need intermediate and short-term objectives as well. The long term objective of a communist world may not be achieved for some time; although communists believe it will be achieved in our lifetime. But communists are given goals which are capable of realization here and now.

I suppose if we think in terms of our long-term objectives, we will say that ours is *the world for Christ*, the extension of Christ's kingdom all over the world. It is a fair equation, but it seems far ahead to our Christians, too, understandably. It is something that should be there as a goal. But human beings want something they see immediately; so, there have to be intermediate objectives as well.

The communist says that his intermediate one is to win his country for communism—to devise ways and means for doing this. A communist United States, a communist Britain, a communist Indonesia, Africa—wherever it is you come from. That is the intermediate goal. So, his activity will be geared to trying to find ways and means of making his country communist.

For the Christian, as I see it, the equivalent aim would be to *Christianize the society in which he lives*, all the institutions and organizations which go to make up the modern state. To Christianize the public opinion in which he has to operate, to try to change the climate of opinion, so that you have an atmosphere which is conducive to making new converts and to the spread of Catholic ideas.

At any rate, the communists keep their intermediate objective constantly in mind. But he does not see the Party's campaigns as ends in themselves; they are geared to these two objectives. There must also be the *immediate* objectives. This is like the little skirmish into which you send people, knowing in advance that they are likely to achieve a victory. It is terribly important psychologically to maintain their morale. It is important that they do not lose heart after a time.

The immediate objective may be anything. You run a campaign on some local issue, a campaign which is likely to bring results. If they can see results from time to time, then

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

they get the human satisfaction of something attempted, something done. There is a great satisfaction that is to be got from that.

Another immediate objective, of course, which the communist is encouraged to bear in mind all the time is the making of converts.

One would suppose that since the Church was a missionary church from the very first day, that this thought of making converts should be in the mind of all our people. It is not. It does not even occur to many of them—just literally that.

The communists never forget it. I am not saying that we have to send all our people out to proselytize, forcing their beliefs down people's throats, but it is a question of trying to create situations where it is possible to make converts, or at any rate, to gain the attitude of mind, where people think in terms of making converts. The communists are conversions-minded. Any communist worth his salt, moving into a new group of people, will instinctively look around to see who are the probables, the ones who may be made into converts most easily. He will work upon them and he will try to devise ways and means of making converts. Later on when we are discussing techniques, I will discuss with you the question of convert-making.

What I am discussing with you now, really, is an attitude of mind. You will see that this is what it is all about, *an attitude of mind*.

An attitude of mind on the part of yourselves—an attitude of mind which you should convey to others—which too often is absent in our circles.

You can learn leadership techniques. I am trying to put some over to you. You can learn leadership techniques: you may learn them from lectures; you may learn them from a textbook, but you will never become a leader unless you get a certain attitude of mind for it. That attitude of mind may be summed up like this: You have created a leader when you have created an attitude of mind, where a *person thinks in terms of leadership*. It is as simple as that, in a way.

In other words, when some new situation arises, the average person says: "Why doesn't someone do something? Who is going to give us a lead?" The person who has been made to think as a leader instinctively, without stopping to ask himself the question, says: "What do I do in this situation? What we ought to do is so-and-so." He proposes a course of action, and since he has established himself with his group in a way that they have confidence in him, they listen to what he says and when he says, "I think we ought to do so-and-so," they respond to this suggestion. It is, as I say, an attitude of mind.

The fact is that people are hungry for leadership today. Do not think it is a big up-hill struggle trying to get people to respond to a lead. For, if a lead is given effectively, people will follow. If you doubt that, see the sort of people who are leading today. See how the Jehovah Witnesses, Moral Rearmament, anyone can get a following today. If you have dedicated people, as you have in the movements I have named, who have given some thought to this question, they get a following all right.

Almost any sort of quack can get a following today, if he comes before the people to offer them a lead. Men have never been as leaderless as they are today. Never were there so many bewildered, leaderless men in the world as we have now. We can sit down and weep about it or we can rejoice and say: "Here is a heaven-sent opportunity." The communists see it as an opportunity. I think that we should see it in the same way.

Really, one learns to lead by getting that attitude of mind. One says instinctively, "What do I do in this situation?" and suggests a course of action. You learn to lead by

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

leading. You gain confidence as you go along.

The communists send their people into action. Again, I want to talk very frankly to you, without even trying to be polite. They send their people into action, and they believe in them. They expect that they will make mistakes, and they do make mistakes. They teach them to learn from their mistakes, but those who are sent into action know that their leaders have confidence in them.

Now, if we are going to be perfectly honest about the lay apostolate, a good many laymen go into action, and they do not feel that people believe in them. They do not feel that they have the confidence of the priest when they go into action. There are reasons for this, and you know the reasons as well as I do. I am not taking an unsympathetic approach. I know the problems of priests too. I have had priests say to me, when I have perhaps gone and talked with trade unionists in their parish: "Well, you have got my people all wanting to go into action now, but my hair is going to stand on end. I do not know what they are going to say in the factory tomorrow. I do not know what sort of heresies they are going to be guilty of."

Of course, if you never say a word on behalf of Catholicism, if you never do anything, you are never going to be guilty of heresy—except that that seems to me to almost constitute a heresy in itself. Perhaps it is one of the great heresies of our time.

There is a calculated risk involved in sending a man into action. But if we can be honest with ourselves, do we never make mistakes? I know perfectly well from travelling in almost every mission area of the world, that lay missionaries go in, and they make mistakes. You get all sorts of emotional crises in the first months among some Papal Volunteers and others. You have a percentage of failures. You in the mission societies know that you have your percentage of failures too, despite the seminary training and your religious training. Of course, you have. Human beings make mistakes. You have to be prepared to see the laymen make mistakes, just as your superior must be prepared to see you make mistakes.

The important thing is, though, that if the man you send into action is going to make mistakes, he has got to be taught how to learn from his mistakes. Mistakes may be deadly or they may be helpful. Everything depends upon his attitude toward them.

Communists all over the world take the view that mistakes are something you learn from. They are used by them. Mr. Khrushchev makes mistakes, but he does not usually repeat them. Our Western statesmen make mistakes and go on making the same mistakes for years on end. That is part of the problem.

It is not by coincidence that this happens. We paper over our mistakes. It's courtesy and all that sort of thing. It is a form of dishonesty, too—a form of hypocrisy. The communists are ruthlessly critical of themselves and of each other because they do not have to bother about matters like Christian charity. They can be really ruthless in their criticism of each other.

But, nevertheless, there is something in the idea of coming with this self-critical approach. It is a good one. It is a wonderful antidote to complacency. The communists have something they describe as Bolshevik self-criticism. This is a very, very meaningful thing to the communists, and it is one of the healthiest and best institutions they have.

I will tell you how it works. You run a campaign, you engage in some form of activity, and in the end, you have what is called the inquest. In that inquest, you are not polite to each other. You do not say: "Sister so-and-so, I think you were wonderful." Oh no! You

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

first of all criticize yourself and say: “Where I went wrong is in such-and-such a way.” You are not there to discuss your successes. They can be taken for granted. You say: “I slipped down completely on this, on that, and on the other.” Then having criticized yourself, honestly and frankly, you feel entitled to do the same with the other people present. You feel you have a right to do it.

You say: “*You* went wrong *there*, and *you* went wrong *there*. Do you agree?” You discuss the mistakes you all have made. That is good. It is true they do not have to practice Christian charity and so their language is perhaps more severe and sharp—sometimes more blasphemous, too, than we could use. But the idea is a good one, and it certainly helps to make their leaders feel that when they send their people into action, they need not be too worried about their mistakes because they know that they will set about and try to learn from them.

I will give you an example of the way this thing works. At the beginning of the last war, I was living in an industrial suburb in London. The population of the town had doubled in, I think it was, the previous six years. This meant that there were two families in almost every house. The accommodations which were provided by the builders for coal (every British home is heated by coal as a domestic fuel) was intended for one family, not two. That would create a problem in itself. But the problem became immensely greater at the beginning of the war when we were changing from a peacetime economy to a war economy. Everything was diverted to the war factories, including coal. In many parts of Britain there was a fuel crisis. No domestic coal got to the domestic consumer; it went to the factories instead.

I was working in London on the *Daily Worker*. I became aware in time that this place where I was living was experiencing such a crisis. No fuel had come into the place for weeks. People had too small a storage capacity. They had used up all their fuel, and the winter of 1939–40 was a bitterly cold one. Literally, people were living in unheated homes.

I became aware of this, when I had no coal myself, I called the leaders of the local communist party and said: “There is a fuel crisis hitting the working class of this town really hard. People are suffering. What have you done about it? Nothing at all. The question is what are we going to do? Here is a situation which is just waiting for us to do something.” So, I write a leaflet. The leaflet said that the people refused to shiver in silence. I said that old people were sitting by empty grates and stoves, sick people were dying in unheated homes—which was true—and that the mass of the people were suffering as a result of this diversion to war industries of the coal which should have gone to the homes of the people. We were, of course, opposing the war effort in our own way. I told the local party’s leaders to get the leaflet printed, get it distributed. The leaflet ended by calling on the housewives of that town to demonstrate on Thursday afternoon at three o’clock, to go to the town hall and make their anger known. We had no housewives in the party and so no idea what response there would be. But I said they should have 10,000 copies of the leaflet printed, have them distributed, and we would see who turned up.

The most we could hope for was that we might have a typical communist delegation to the mayor—five good, genuine working-class housewives—and Douglas Hyde to keep them on the party line. We went on Thursday afternoon at three o’clock to see who was there. There was no question of getting a delegation. Ten thousand angry housewives

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

were there. I have been in wars, I had been in revolutions, but I had never seen anything so frightening. They stormed the town hall. They chased the mayor from his parlor; they went to the fuel office; and they did the same to the fuel officer. They broke some windows, and they went back home.

On Sunday morning, I was trying to get a little bit of extra sleep, when I was awakened by the sound of heavy trucks going up and down the street on which I was living and all the neighboring streets. I pulled back my blackout curtain, and I saw that even the men who go around emptying garbage cans were going around delivering coal. The local authority had mobilized every truck in the whole place to deliver coal.

When we had our big demonstration of housewives on Thursday, naturally we played it up on the front page of the *Daily Worker*, where it deserved to be a great communist campaign. And you can imagine that in Monday's *Daily Worker*, we had an even bigger story, with bigger headlines, the great victory for which the Communist Party was responsible. The people of that industrial suburb were no longer shivering because they had refused to shiver in silence.

Then came the inquest, when we met as a Party branch to discuss the campaign. In our propaganda we had said it was a great success. What was our verdict *at the inquest*?

It was a failure. Why? We had demonstrated that the housewives were angry at the situation, that was true. We had ten thousand angry housewives together in fighting mood, and then victory had come too easily. Now, we had ten thousand complacent housewives sitting smugly by their firesides, preening themselves and complimenting themselves on what they had achieved. We should have built up class anger; we should have given it a revolutionary content; we should have made some converts to the Communist Party; some new readers for the *Daily Worker*. We had not done it; so, we wrote it off as a failure.

This is Bolshevik self-criticism being absolutely honest with yourself. Saying, "What is this *really* about? Have we really achieved our goal?" It is not just complimenting each other on our little successes. As I say, I think there is a lot to be said for some sort of Christian application of that idea of Bolshevik self-criticism. You might even have a Bolshevik self-criticism session about this seminar when you go home.

The Party believes it is important that you use the human material which is at your disposal just as well as you can. For this reason, the Party established a "cadres department" in every country all over the world in, I think it was 1934—it was after Stalin had made a speech to the Supreme Soviet saying that "Cadres decide everything." The Party set up a cadres department at every level of the party. So, from the National Executive down to the smallest local cell, you have someone who is called the cadres secretary. His job is to watch closely over the development of each individual in the group. It does not matter what level of the organization it may be. He has an over-riding responsibility and authority over the person who is the leader of that group. He is watching over each individual asking: "How are we combining theory and practice? Are we getting that balance that we want? Are these two opposites being united (this is a sort of dialectical approach) in the life of the individual? Or is Comrade X spending too much time in study and is he becoming some sort of arm-chair philosopher? If so, how are we going to make him more active? Is so-and-so just becoming an activist and does not really know what it is all about? Is he forgetting what is the real motivation? If so, he must be persuaded to go to classes." The cadres secretary is responsible for the development of

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

each other member in his group.

They are working with small numbers of people, but they think it worthwhile to allocate one person to this full-time job. Of course, it is a worthwhile operation. If during the course of the year, he can develop each member of that group in leadership and make him more effective, then it is not a waste of personnel. It is good use of personnel.

Each communist is brought to a position, as a result of this training, where instinctively he says—without thinking a thing out before he goes into any form of action—“What do I do as a communist?” Not, “What do I do?” but, “*What do I do as a communist?*” “Is the course I am pursuing a distinctively communist one? Is a distinctively communist approach possible on this occasion? If so, what is it?”

He always thinks as a communist. When we have reached the point where we have our lay people asking themselves each time, before they go into any sort of action: “What do I do as a Christian? Is my approach a distinctively Christian approach to this question?” we shall be well on the way to making a vastly greater impact than we are making at the moment.

TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION

Now the next question which I think we might discuss is a very obvious one. “Is Catholic action, even for many of our apostolic Catholics, often seen only as a spare-time occupation? To what extent can the apostolate be carried into our daily work? What are we doing to make that so?”

VALUE OF TECHNIQUES

I want to talk to you now about the techniques of communism, particularly with reference to the communist propaganda. You do not need me to tell you that the communists are all too successful as propagandists. Again, that does not just happen. It is a result of attention to detail. It reflects the attitude of mind of a person who believes that he has what the world needs, he is going to pass it on. It seems to him to be reasonable; so, he wants to pass it on as effectively and as efficiently as he can.

One of the things which communists have had to combat is the public reaction which comes to anyone who is going to make a noise, as it were, in modern society. That reaction is one whereby people say: "Well, of course, they talk all right, but do they do anything?" The communists set out to demonstrate to people that they not only talk but they act.

Too often, I think, we give the impression that we talk, that we have all the right answers, but we do not follow them through into action. They in fact have all the wrong answers, but they follow them through into action. So, people are influenced by the fact that they are active, they are doing something, they are accomplishing something.

Communists are out to try to prove to people that they care about them as people. Obviously, anti-communist propaganda has been directed to the idea that the communists do not care—that communists only care about power and things of that sort. Those of you who work in mission areas where the communists' ideas are already circulating will know that a consequence has been that the communists have been able in many areas to establish the idea that *only* the communists care. That is quite a considerable achievement.

It has not been simply on the basis of pouring out words. They have tried to think of various means of convincing the public that this is so. For example, in various parts of Asia recently, when Communist Party congresses have been called—the annual congresses at which all the topmost leaders and the local leaders meet—they have followed the technique of aiming to prove to the people that they care.

The congress is called, not at some big city which provides accommodations like this, but quite deliberately they call it to meet in some remote place. Those of you who work in mission areas or even those of you who know your history will know that roads break down isolation, link up communities with other communities, and pave the way to development. The Romans knew this, and if any of you work in areas where there are no roads, you know how isolated you can be. And so some of the Asian Communist Parties have called their congresses to be held in some area which is quite cut off from all development because it has no road to link with the main highways. The Indonesian Communist Party did that. They called their congress (this is a powerful party with 2,000,000 members) to meet in a place where there was no road to link it up with civilization. They called their delegates together a week before the congress was due to begin. Then they spent the week—top leaders and all the other leaders—working together to build a road from that village to the nearest highway. So the people would never forget that the communists came there and opened up the way to development.

Now, this is an indication of how serious they are—to convey this idea that the communists care—that the communists do not just talk; they act. It works from their point

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

of view. You cannot start condemning them for doing it. It shows imagination. I am not saying that we have to imitate this but we have to imitate their attitude, to imitate that sort of approach.

When they use propaganda, they try to avail themselves of all the modern means of propaganda and use them as effectively as they can. I think that the man who is dedicated to a cause—and comes to it in all humility—is likely to make modern techniques work more effectively than the man who comes with a different approach. Let me tell you what I mean.

I was news editor of the *Daily Worker*, the London communist paper. When we had been both banned and bombed, at the beginning of the War, my staff was dispersed, and suddenly I had to get together a new staff. I just had to get anyone I could as long as they were politically sound, that is, as long as they were good communists—and intelligent enough to be trained, and trained very quickly.

I got together a staff of furriers, engineers, and housewives, anyone but journalists. I trained them as quickly as possible in journalism to bring out a paper which was going to be competitive with the best that the capitalist press could produce. When I was briefing them, trying to teach them their journalism, not only journalism but communist journalism, the point I made to them was the point which Lenin laid down for people who in my position were teaching it to others. Lenin said the whole art of communist journalism is to *get profound ideas across in simple language*. That need not be exclusive to Lenin and communism, but the communists prove that it works.

As I have said on many occasions already, what they are trying to sell is not naturally attractive; it is not naturally easy. If I were to give you a half hour lecture on dialectical materialism, you would know that this is so. They are trying to get profound ideas across. They have to learn to do it in simple language, and they test themselves as journalists, or publicists, whatever they may be, by asking themselves whether they are able to reduce their ideas to simple terms to themselves, as simple as possible, at any rate, and then get these across to others, choosing the short word rather than the long word, writing for ordinary people, being as lucid as they can.

This is an important thing. And again, it works. They do get profound ideas across to ordinary people. They get ideas over in simple language. Often their ideas are not necessarily easily acceptable, yet they get their communism across to their followers pretty successfully. They get dialectical and historical materialism over to housewives and unskilled laborers, and that is quite a task in itself. All over the mission areas, they have been able to get certain basic ideas over which have spread in such a way that very often it is impossible to trace them to the communists, because they are not traceable directly to communism. Communists have spread them to others who have spread them and spread them. They turn up, many moves removed from the party itself.

For example, when I was touring Northern and Southern Rhodesia last year, speaking mainly to exclusively African audiences—audiences which consisted of groups of Africans in places of work, inside big copper mines and in African reserves—I found something which people were not aware of before. It was proven absolutely, as I went around, that the Africans there had universally, and I use that word meaning it, *universally* accepted two simple propositions: that Russia is the big brother who helps poor straggling colonial peoples to achieve their freedom, and secondly, when they have achieved their freedom, Russia and the other communist countries provide aid without

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

strings. That was universally accepted in Central Africa, in our seminaries, everywhere.

The Communist Party did not even exist in Northern Rhodesia at that time. The first group has in fact come into existence in early 1962. It is still only at the study circle level, which is how the Communist Party will normally begin in a mission area of that type. It is not yet a formal, organized Communist Party at all. Yet already those ideas had been accepted in Northern Rhodesia. They had come through all sorts of people, all sorts of different channels. People who were not themselves communists got these ideas from others who were started by the communists.

If we are going to combat communism, if we are going to try to get our own ideas over, we will be wise if we reduce them to the simplest terms, particularly if we are trying to deal with simple people. It is not easy, but it is worth making the attempt, and generally if the attempt is made with sufficient seriousness, it can be done. The communists, of course, have demonstrated that you have to adapt what you are trying to teach people to the type of people you are trying to teach—pretty obvious, of course. But what may seem something very elementary to you may seem something tremendous to somebody else with less education.

I remember a story told by the American journalist, John Reed, a liberal, who was in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik revolution. It was at the time when the counter-revolution was just beginning, and there was absolute chaos everywhere. No one knew where the front was; it might be here today and somewhere else tomorrow. He was trying to find the front in order to report on it for his newspaper here in the States. He saw a truck full of peasants, heading off, and he said to them, "Where are you going?" They said, "To the front." He said, "May I come too?" and they said "Yes." He said, "Do you know where the front is?" They said, "No, we are trying to find it, we are following the noises of the guns."

They set off across the frozen, plowed field. It was in mid-winter, November, 1917. They were bumping along over the frozen field, and meantime, he found the truck was carrying a load of hand grenades. They were sitting on top of the hand grenades, bumping along over the frozen plowed fields, trying to find the front. He said to them, "Do you realize that most of you will not come back from this journey?" They said, "Yes." He said, "That means that you are going out to die?" They said, "Yes." He asked, "What are you going to die for?" These were illiterate peasants. He saw all of them groping in their minds, trying to find the words. They had the idea but they could not find the words. Then one man rather haltingly said: "Well, you see, Comrade, it is like this. Throughout history there have always been two classes, the rich and the poor, the oppressors and the oppressed, and in the past the poor have always been trodden down, and it is the rich who have trodden them down. Now the poor are coming to their own and we are going to be the ones who will rule the world in the future."

That was a simple proposition, but here was a truckload of men ready to die for it. You may say, "Well, I would not die for it." But they were prepared to die for it, which is what matters. A great many of the people who made the revolution may not have understood very much dialectical materialism, although this was the very nub of what this revolution was all about, really. Here was the Marxist interpretation of history, put into very simple language. The Bolsheviks had got that idea across in the short period in which they had been a legal party. They had got this simple proposition over. Here were profound ideas, conveyed in simple language, and men were prepared to go and die for

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

them, and did die for this cause in scores and hundreds of thousands.

The communists would say that if propaganda is to be successful, you have got to be close to the people. You have got to understand the people's language, the people's needs—not live in your own little sealed-off world.

The burden is on you. You have to find a way to get your ideas to them. If they are not receptive, it is because you have not found a way to make them receptive. You will only make them receptive if you understand how their minds work, if you understand things which are meaningful to them, make them meaningful to you and identify yourself with them.

So, the communists are expected to keep as close to people as they can, knowing what are their deepest wishes, what is nearest to their hearts and to their minds. Stalin edited a dry as dust book, *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. (It could not be drier, although it has been a dynamic book which communists all over the world have studied). Stalin ends this book with a parable, as it were, about keeping close to the people. If you do not keep close to the people, he says, your roots are cut off from the soil, and then you must wither and die.

I think he had something there. Your communists will say that if you are going to get close to the people, you have to talk the language of the people. I know that Western journalists very often think they are talking the language of the people when they invent a degraded form of English, which can only be described as journalese. That is not the language of the people. That is not getting close to the people. It shows contempt of the people, in fact, molding their minds in the wrong way. But the communists would feel that it is worth going to a lot of trouble to try and perfect themselves in the task of getting profound ideas over in simple language.

On one occasion I was discussing with a Catholic editor how to make his paper more successful. I said, "Well, I would like to suggest that you might make your own editorial leads a little more readable. For example, at the first sentence in this week's editorial leader has five semi-colons, one hundred and four words. You have to read it four or five times to know what it is about." I said: "I agree with the communist journalists who believe that you have got to get profound ideas over in simple language." He replied. "I could not disagree more. I deliberately write like that. It is good that they have to read it four or five times to understand it. They then know what it is all about and remember it."

I feel that was an alibi. Certainly, I would say that is not the way to get your ideas over. Of course, it is difficult to get some ideas across in simple language. Every specialized branch of human knowledge has its own jargon. We have ours, the communists have theirs. That is within the family.

When you are trying to reach out to others, then, you have got to break out of that jargon and use simple language if you can. If you are not able to reduce it to simple ideas in your own mind, this may be, and it quite possibly is, that you do not really understand it yourself, and you are shielding behind the big words and behind the jargon. Which means that you might as well start on yourself. I remember when I was in Korea at the end of the Korean war, I was staying with the Columbian Fathers there, getting material for my book, *One Front Across the World*. I was discussing this with the priest who was the Superior there at that time. He was telling me they had a great problem. It is one that I believe is still substantially the same. It is this: Although in the past the Church was a church of the poor and the illiterate, these are the beginnings of an interest in the church,

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

in the faith, on the part of the educated.

But there was no literature for them. No literature in their own language. There were, I think, about twenty-two books and pamphlets at that time, mainly rather sugary pamphlets, about sugary little saints or saints who were made to appear sugary, although they probably were not. But nothing to appeal to the intellectual. Even the Scriptures were not translated; there was nothing to offer the intellectual who was groping around, looking for the Faith.

I said, "Well, you have got people, after all is said and done, who can do it. Have you no Korean who could do this?" He told me the problem which would be known to any of you who have worked or work in Korea. He said, "If you are a Korean writer, it is big face to sprinkle what you write with a lot of quotations from the classical Chinese. It is approximately like putting in a lot of quotations from Latin and Greek if you are writing in English. This is big face. It proves your erudition. We have an enormous problem, but this is what our Korean writers all insist upon doing."

"We just cannot get them to write in the simple language of the people." I said, "Would you say that this is characteristic of all Koreans?" He said, "I would have said so until the communists came in from North Korea. They flooded the country with pamphlets and leaflets which were written in the language of the people. There were no quotations from classical Chinese in *them*. They found a means of getting their ideas across in simple language, but our own people were still preoccupied with what was big face. The communists were not concerned about big face. They were concerned about communism, getting it across.

The communists would say if you are operating in the field of journalism, if you are trying to get ideas over through the written word, then just as it is important that you should be the best man at your job, you should make the best job possible of that. Of course, this is immensely true. In their publications intended for the non-communist public, they try to achieve the highest possible level of journalism.

The *Daily Worker* in London is, of course, openly a communist paper. It also sees itself in competition with the ordinary, national press, owned by millionaires, with all the resources they have at their command. The British newspaper industry collectively offers a prize each year to some paper which is the best in some particular field. One year it will be the best edited paper, next year the best news edited, next year the one with the best typography, next year, the one with the best design, etc. Over and over again, the prize goes to the *Daily Worker*.

On one occasion, the editors of the *Times* and *Daily Worker* tied, and they marched together to receive their diplomas, shoulder to shoulder. This is not a coincidence, of course. It is not that they had people on their staff who were already most skilled in journalism when they came to the paper. It is that they have got this idea over to them that they can be the most successful if they are good at their work.

Technique counts for a tremendous amount in this whole field of propaganda. You can see it so often.

If there is anyone here who is interested in color printing, he will know that some of the best color printing in the world today comes from communist East Germany.

We are always hearing that East Germany is a total 100 per cent failure. This is not true in every respect. On the cultural level, East Germany is ahead of most European countries at this moment. In color printing, it leads absolutely. The same holds for China.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

Some of the publications coming from China today are amongst the best in modern color printing.

Here the same principle is being applied. If you are going into propaganda, you use every technical means at your disposal, use every modern means—the latest color printing, whatever it may be—but you also *master* the whole technique. You recognize that this is the way to be more effective. It is not only true of publications; it is true of their pamphlets and books and papers, it is true of poster designs, too. This is tremendously important.

Those of you who were familiar with Italy in 1948 at the time of those elections, which practically decided the fate of Italy, Italy might have gone communist. You know how the communists plastered the walls of Rome and every Italian city with their posters—wonderful, ingenious posters. I have a big collection of them at home, some of the best posters that were ever produced.

But, fortunately, Catholics saw this as a challenge. An organization which was an off-shoot of Catholic Action, the Civic Committees, produced posters too. They used the same technique. They found the very best Catholics in that field of poster design, typography, etc. to design the posters. The communists would go to a city and plaster every wall in that city during the elections with wonderful posters. Within a few hours, the Civic Committee members (Catholics) would be going around putting up other posters which were the reply, directly related to the posters which had been put up only a few hours before, as good in design, as imaginative, as amusing, as devastating.

That was described, as you know, in the world's press as the Battle of the Posters. It played a very profound part in winning that election and keeping communism at bay. Too often a reply like that does not come from us. Too often the communists do the first part of the operation, but the Catholics do not respond with the second part.

The same goes for the making of films. Too many of us—and this is particularly true, if I may say so of mission congregations—feel it is a tremendous achievement to produce a film. You have to have a film of the congregation because another congregation has a film of theirs. So, a film has to be made. It is an achievement to make the film. Not always is it true to say that the quality is very high. More often than not the thing is on the level of the 16 mm films of thirty years ago. Obviously if you are restricted financially and every other way, it may be the best you can do. I have known a communist film, which was a pretty poor type, a 16 mm film, achieve quite a lot. But whenever possible they try to do something better than that.

At any rate, they will make sure that someone has really been trained to produce the very best possible film. Again, you can see the technique operating.

The best example I can give you is a film I saw a few years ago. One of our cinemas was persuaded in Britain to show the *Diary Of A Country Priest*. The management, to balance things up so that no one would think it was suddenly going Catholic, had a supporting film in color, which had originated in Hungary and been given a Stalin prize—a typically English compromise.

I went to the premiere. I was interested to see what this Stalin film was like. It was a nature film—you could not have anything more innocent—anything more non-political than a nature film. Those who made it resisted the temptation to put any politics into it at all. Quite simply it was probably the best nature film that has ever been made. The camera work was absolutely tremendous. First, you went hunting with a polecat. The

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

scene was the swamps, not far from Budapest, which are known for their animals and birds and fish.

You went hunting with a polecat and, truly you went down into rabbit holes with the polecat. You saw the polecat kill baby rabbits, its mother trying to defend them; you saw a wonderful fight underground, terrific photography. Do not ask me how it was done. It was genuine. You saw the polecat sucking bird's eggs. You saw it killing one creature after another in the course of its day.

You went hunting with an eagle in the sky. Again, more superb photography. Pictorially, in every way it was good. You saw the eagle hover over some other bird, drop on it and kill it, or hover over a rabbit and kill it; and then you went under water in the big lakes which exist in that area, hunting with the fishes. You went hunting with big fish, saw them swallow small fish, you saw others swallowing smaller ones. There was nothing else; that was it.

This film got the Stalin prize. It was about the best communist propaganda film I have ever seen. It was produced in Hungary, and it was taken around every village hall in Hungary. Everyone would go to see it. Here was something which was in touch with their life: the life of the people who work on the soil, who know the birds, who know the fish, who know the animals. This was their language, their world. They would go to see it and they would marvel at what they were shown. The next day when they were working on the collective farm, or on the cooperative, the communist amongst them would say, "Did you go to the village hall last night to see the film?" "Yes." "What did you think of it?" "I thought it was perfectly wonderful." "So did I. I will tell you what worried me afterwards. Did you notice that the polecat lived by killing and the eagle lived by killing and the fish lived by killing, and in fact, this ran through the whole thing. Of course, that is what the world is like, is it not? Now you are a Catholic. Tell me how you can explain a God of love in a world like that? Tell me how you can prove God from nature."

Maybe you can find the answers, but the Hungarian Catholic peasant may have great difficulty in finding the answers. So would a great many other people besides them. It was all that was needed—it was superbly done—a good technical job, close to the lives of the people and a follow through coming *afterwards* from someone else. That is good propaganda.

It does not have to be used for evil things, but this one succeeded because the people concerned had mastered the techniques involved.

I am always travelling about the world, and my family is left at home, and they get the rough end of the stick. But by way of compensation, and also for my own rather nostalgic reasons, I try to bring back what you call phonograph discs—we call them gramophone records. I try to bring back authentic folk music of the country—the real music. Then when I think of those countries, I can play them on my gramophone.

I was in Saigon on one occasion, and I had to leave in a hurry. I was occupied to the last moment. I wanted to get a record and I had been unable to get it. Shortly afterwards, I was in Paris, and instead of staying at a hotel, I stayed with a Vietnamese family. I mentioned to them that I regretted that I had not been able to bring anything back from Saigon. They said, "You can get plenty of Vietnamese records in Paris. A great many French soldiers fought in Indo-China and brought back records, and there is a demand in Paris for them." There are not less than 5,000 Vietnamese students in Paris at any moment. They said they would take me to a music shop and tell me what to get.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

We went and the assistant produced a pile of records. My host said, “Not that one, not that one, not that one,” “You do want the authentic thing, don’t you?” “Yes.” “Well, not that one.” There was just one out of a dozen that was authentic. The instruments were right; the music was right; the voices were right; this was the real thing. All the others had been degraded by being jazzed up, set to American tempo, etc. This was the one authentic record, the only thing that any Vietnamese student would want to listen to.

I bought it, and when I got outside they said to me: “We will tell you now, there is only one thing wrong with the record; the words are not authentic. They are communist revolutionary words.” That record comes from North Vietnam. In other words, in the South, they have been turning out the degraded stuff, jazzed up and Westernized. In the North, they knew that that was not acceptable to the Vietnamese people, and so they produced the authentic thing. And they saw that it got to Paris. So, when Vietnamese students in Paris sit around on Saturday night, after a hard week of study, to relax, and play their discs and dream of home, in a nostalgic receptive mood, they listen to this record because this is the only authentic one, and the rest of the week they go round singing the revolutionary words to themselves. That is good propaganda, superb propaganda.

Again, this is an approach; it is an attitude. Oh yes, many of these things you may not be able to copy exactly, but you see the idea, you see the approach, the attention which is given to it. I believe it is this sort of approach that we have to have for our propaganda, if we are going to make it succeed.

The communists operating in this field and in every field have one of many slogans which are meaningful to them and which I think should give us cause to think. I have said this hundreds of thousands of times in my life as a communist; I have heard it in every country of the world: “*Nothing is too good for the party.*” Imagine the tragedy of this!

Nothing is too good for Our Lord. How often do we apply that to the ordinary details of our work? But that is the approach of the communists. Nothing is too good for the Party. So they give everything they have got to it, particularly in attention to detail.

Oh yes, the communists use subterfuge; they use every sort of deceit and a lot of our Western cold war propaganda is based on that. But do not lose sight of the fact that they get far more success from their *mastery of technique* than they get from all their subterfuge, from all their deceit. Sooner or later, their subterfuges come back on them. Their deceits boomerang on them, but their good techniques do not.

The same goes for public speaking. When the communist is trained in public speaking, he is told to always try and keep close to the people. Every example he uses should be drawn from life; every time he is trying to make a theoretical point, he should illustrate it with a story from life; again, Mao Tse-tung explains this in all of the communist parties the world over.

Then they spread their ideas. The communist propaganda is to try and find a point of contact in the mind of the other man—not where do we disagree, but where do we agree?—and then try to extend that area of sympathetic interest wider and wider.

This is a good technique. There is nothing immoral in it, nothing that we cannot copy in it. The communists find it works.

You know as well as I do that it is the element of truth which makes communist propaganda get across. It is because they will find something which is true in it even though there is a lot of falsehood. Now, think of the implication: It is the element of truth

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

which makes propaganda acceptable. We have *THE Truth*; it ought to be *more* acceptable.

We sneer at the communists because they have to use a little bit of truth, while we have the whole of it. I believe it is up to us to find ways and means of getting the truth over. They are trying to sell false goods and having to use the truth which belongs to us in order to sell them. It is we who ought to be able to sell all truth, really.

The communist believes, too, that in addition to good propaganda he has to back it up with good organization. I will deal with this briefly because time is short but organization is tremendously important, when we consider the effect of communist activity.

You will know that the communist organization is based upon cells. The cell is the basic unit of the Communist Party. All sorts of anti-communist propagandists write about communist cells, and I often feel that they do not really know what it is all about—just how it works.

I would like to describe it to you because it explains a lot. You may say to me, “Does every communist belong to a cell?” The answer is that most communists belong to a *lot* of cells, which is often overlooked. You see, a communist is a communist the whole of the time.

We will take an individual communist. He, shall we say, works in a factory; he is a member of a labor union; he is interested in gardening; and he is interested in music. All right.

He works in a factory, so if there are two or three or more communists in that factory, two others besides himself, they will constitute a cell. Wherever three or more communists are gathered together, there you have a communist cell. That is the rule of the Party.

And so if he goes to a factory with only two, he will have a real driving urge to make a third one so they can start organized activity. If there are three in his own department in that factory, there will be a departmental cell. If there are three in his particular workshop, there will be a workshop cell. He will always act as an organized communist. At the end of every day, that cell will quickly meet to discuss the successes and failures of the day, always working as an organized group.

He belongs to a labor union, so he goes to his local, and there, if there are three or more communists, two more besides himself, he will be a member of the cell inside that local. They will plan their work in that labor union branch. If he is elected to a higher level, to an area committee, and there are three communists there, he will be a member of the area cell; to a higher level, to a district or to a national level. Still, he will be a member of the cell.

He is organized at every level of his activity. Always he is working in an organized way, pooling his ideas, sharing his experience with others.

He is interested in gardening, so he joins a gardening society or association. If there are three or more communists there, he will still be a member of an organized cell; they will probably have that Hungarian nature film shown officially by the society.

If he is interested in music, and belongs to a music society, he will do the same. He will not insist only on Soviet music being played, but he will see that it is played sometimes, and he may try to get a discussion about Soviet composers, e.g., the role of music in the Soviet Union.

This is a form of organization, but it also helps to keep a sense of purpose the whole of

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

the time very clear in the mind of the individual communist. Once more I want to underline the fact that it is the *attitude of mind which they set out to create, which they do create, which we are trying to create here.*

General Booth, who founded the Salvation Army years ago, on one occasion was asked: "Why is it that you always set your hymns to the most popular current tunes?" He said, "I see no reason why the devil should have all the best tunes." I do not see any reason why the devil should have all the best techniques either.

TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION

Now we take the question which relates to something which was put to me, on one occasion, in Holland. I finished my lecture about techniques, and a professor, who should have known better, got up and said, "I don't agree with you. I don't think that techniques and the Holy Ghost go together at all."

I replied, "I could not disagree with you more. I believe if we pay some attention to techniques, we will give the Holy Ghost a chance."

What do *you* think of the statement that techniques and the Holy Ghost do not go together? Do we make as much use of modern techniques as we might? and which of them would be particularly helpful to us in our endeavor to make the maximum possible impact upon the thought and life of our generation?

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Bishop Van Bekkum, S.V.D., has given me a couple of questions which I think can start the questions going.

"How far will the actual idea and practice of the Church about Catholic action hinder a profitable leadership among the Catholic laity?"

It is true, of course, that all sorts of people have set ideas about what Catholic organizations should be like. In a sense, I suppose, a sort of innate conservatism which one finds in people may make them rather reluctant to break with old methods and adopt new. I would not like to suggest that we ought to scrap all of the old-time organizations and create a lot of brand new ones. But what I do know from experience is this: first, clearly inside the Church, we are not dealing with a very small group of people as the communists are, but with 400,000,000 or more people, and *there is room for a lot of different types of organization.*

That is one thing. Within those organizations, I think there ought to be some which are modeled in a way or organized in a way that is *just for business*. I mean these are the ones that are going to get down to business in the most practical, modern way they can.

The old type Catholic organization does not always necessarily lend itself to that. At times it may be useful and profitable, and I do not want to urge the point any more than that. It may be useful and profitable to reorganize.

For example, the Sodalites of Our Lady are the oldest organizations of their sort in England. They had, therefore, most of the old approaches, mainly for people whom we call the pious Catholic type and no more. They were not generally remarkable for sending

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

people into action and had no tradition of that sort.

Sometime ago, an attempt was made to reorganize the Sodalites for younger people, leaving the old ones to the old form of organization. To reorganize them on a sound basis rather like the one I described to you just now, *with the idea of producing as many leaders as possible*, using the sort of cell techniques I explained to you. The last Holy Father said that this came nearer to his mind of what was required today than anything he knew.

So, if we reorganize in this way, we are not being over-adventurous; we are not exploring some new territory. This has been done, and it is being found effective. As I say, no attempt was made to change all the Sodalites of Our Lady over to some new basis. The older people wanted to keep the old type, the old approach. They were allowed to keep it. But Sodalites were reorganized for the younger ones.

Student Catholic Action of the Philippines has gradually, over the years, been reorganized on the cell basis and has a reputation for leadership in its own field. It might not be ideally suited to students here, but for the students in the Philippines, it has proven itself to be extraordinarily successful.

The Catholic Action of Italy—after all is said and done, this is as close to Rome as it can be and as close to the mind of Rome as possible—while it has remained Catholic Action of the old patterns to some extent, *when it was confronted with the communist problem*, the danger of Italy being overrun by communism, *quickly produced another organization*, an offshoot of itself still under the guidance of Professor Gedda, who was the spokesman for Catholic Action at that time. It was tailored for the immediate needs of fighting communism and was put on a group and cell basis, with modern approaches and techniques.

One does not necessarily have to say that the old form of Catholic Action organization stands in the way, but here and there, it is useful to supplement or even bypass it with other forms of organization which are more closely attuned to a particular need, to a particular job, to a particular situation.

Bishop Van Bekkum's second question: "What do you hope for from the Council about Communism?"

Well, I would hope first, thinking in positive terms, that there may be something positive come from the Council by way of reply to communism in terms of the attempt to tailor our own activities to the modern needs. *Sign* magazine some time ago asked a number of people who are described, I believe, as Catholic intellectuals, to give their views in a couple of paragraphs on what they hoped from the Council. They asked me, so I gave mine. One of the two things which I suggested in the two-hundred words allotted to me was that there might be leadership training centers established, on each of the three continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where we might have leadership training for people to go into a modern apostolate. I would hope that something like that will come.

I would expect also that somewhere or another in the immense amount of material which is likely to come from the council that there will be some attempt to assess communism in modern terms with particular reference to the mission territories and some discussion of how to combat it as a falsehood and how also to combat it in positive ways as well.

Now I will take the first spoken question:

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

Fr. Claude Buchanan, O.F.M.: Mr. Hyde, we have placed a lot of emphasis today on the communist activity, the commitment of their men, the zeal they have, and we want to stir the same zeal amongst ourselves, and we are looking at techniques. I was wondering if it is not so much our not using the proper techniques, as that we are very superficial in our interior life. There must be an interior renovation in ourselves, a more or less agonizing re-appraisal of our own interior life, to stir up this zeal and the proper use of techniques and clarify our own position.

Mr. Hyde: Yes, I would agree with that absolutely, in the sense that I believe the basis of it all must be as you say a reappraisal of ourselves, a deeper zeal and dedication on our own part, a spiritual renewal. That is why, although I am using this technique, of looking at communism and trying to learn from it, I started off with the dedication of the communists.

Even the communists in their own way acknowledge that all the leadership techniques in the world would be useless to them—they may produce leaders or make a fortune for themselves but all the leadership techniques will fail unless the starting point is *dedication to the cause*, that they are doing it for the cause and not for themselves. This is not leadership for the sake of leadership, still less for the sake of the leaders, but for the cause. In terms of our own Christianity, and the job we have to do, quite obviously, you have to begin by getting yourself straight. I do not think this has to follow in chronological order, wait and perfect ourselves first and then begin to get concerned about techniques afterwards, or we will all be on the other side of the grave before we start. The two things can go together.

I think that technique and the Holy Ghost do go together. I feel that, in a sense, our voice has been muted, our effectiveness has been reduced because too often some of our very best people have felt they did not have to bother about techniques and all that sort of thing. The consequence is that good as they have been, the influence which they have exerted has been a very limited one. It is very real, I am not questioning this at all but their influence is a very limited one, whereas, remaining just as good, they might have had a greater influence, made a greater impact, in a period of urgency such as we are living in now, had they paid more attention to techniques as well.

But techniques most certainly are not an alternative to spirituality. They should go together.

CONTROLLED DISCUSSION TECHNIQUE

I hope you are not getting too tired after so many lectures or that you have not reached saturation point. I propose that this last one should be on the method which the communists use when they are teaching communism to their members.

Throughout this seminar I have, of course, been selective. In other words, I have been quoting to you the best examples that I can find, the most effective ones. I will discuss with you the methods which communists have found most effective and which they use whenever and wherever they can. They are not necessarily universally used and a great deal depends upon the tutor concerned.

Again, in discussing the method with you, the important thing is to convey to you the *attitude the communists have* on this question of *passing on ideas or actions to their own members*.

The communists, of course, have lecture series like these we have, where you have somebody giving a lecture, and members of the public get up and ask questions afterwards. That is a form of public education which they use in common with others. When that form of education or activity is embarked upon by communists, they have to follow the traditional pattern, the only thing being the lecturer is expected to have been trained in his method and to follow the lines which I mentioned to you earlier when we were discussing communist propaganda methods. But when the communists want to convey their ideas to a. group of *their own members*, they use different methods.

They would not feel that they could teach people communist beliefs most easily through an ordinary lecture series. They would say that a much smaller group is required than one would have in a normal lecture series and a different method is needed too. When they have their study groups, they intend to achieve three things:

- 1) to teach the people who attend them;
- 2) to equip them for action;
- 3) in the process of teaching them, to help to train them as leaders, too.

The man who is a communist tutor (I am not talking about a professional communist teacher; I am talking about the tutor teaching the equivalent of our instruction classes or catechism classes or anything you care to call them), the man who is engaged in trying to teach people communism is told he must ask himself a question over and over again, which the sensible Catholic educator asks himself or herself: *Education for what?*

We know perfectly well that the goal is easily lost sight of. Those of you who teach school know how easily one can lose sight of what it is all about. Education for the maximum number of people to pass exams, education for academic honors—what is it all about anyway? What is it all for?

The communist is told that human beings tend to lose sight of the main goal unless they remind themselves constantly what it is all about. So, the communist tutor, before he starts a class, is supposed to remind himself and say, *education for what?*

Not to prove how clever he is, not to turn out a lot of very well informed communists: it is more than that. It is to send people into action, to take part in the most thrilling battle of all times, to develop them as people, as leaders. He is supposed to have a clear idea of

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

what he is trying to achieve in a particular series and within that series, and at each session of that series. He is supposed to ask himself in advance, “What am I going to try to do tonight? What am I going to try to get out of this?”

This is a good approach. Certainly, I still find it useful. If I am giving a public address or writing an article, or taking a seminar, I like to go in to it with a clear idea of what I hope we shall get out of it and to keep my eye on that goal as constantly as I can.

What can we expect from the people we are going to teach? The communist tutor is expected to have a pretty clear idea about that. What one can expect from any group will depend upon the composition of that group, quite clearly. The broad aims will be the same but they will have to be conditioned by the type of people he is teaching. He must generally suppose that the people he is teaching are *already busy* people. This, of course, is something which does not apply in quite the same way if you are teaching school, although your children will have a full life anyway these days.

But if you are teaching adults, some of you will be, then I think this is very relevant indeed. The people you are teaching are busy people. The probability is they come to their tuition, we would say night school, when they are already tired. In mission countries in particular, they are likely to be physically tired. When you are physically tired, you do not learn as easily. You reach the saturation point more quickly. Therefore, he is told to remind himself that these people are already tired when they come, and it is up to him to make it as easy as possible for them to understand; the burden is on him. It does no good blaming them if they start yawning or if they nod off to sleep—that is his fault, not theirs. They have done a hard day’s work already.

He must understand them, and it is up to him to devise ways to make the matter so significant, so interesting to them that they will be on the alert.

It will be necessary for them to do a certain amount of reading. But they are busy people. If they are not, they ought to be. They have done a full day’s work, tried to be apostles for communism on the job, and have taken on all sorts of responsibility for the Communist Party at night as well. They will have a limited time to read, and so it is up to him, with the cooperation of the appropriate department of the Communist Party, to discover what reading will be most helpful to them and reduce it to a minimum.

In a very few minutes, I will show you a whole lot of recent syllabi which the British Communist Party has issued to its tutors within the last few months, and discuss them with you. It is normal for a syllabus to include a list of necessary reading. People who attend the classes will be expected to do a certain amount of reading. That will be reduced, as I say, to a minimum. So, the inside cover of the syllabus is likely to say that those taking this course should read Chapter I of the *Communist Manifesto*, pages 1 to 27 of such and such a pamphlet, or the first half of chapter 3 of such and such a book, all reducing it to an absolute minimum.

Some of your students would be very grateful if you would do it for them. This is not just sort of pampering, or anything like that. These are busy people, people who have been expected to be busy for communism during their working day, so it has got to be made as easy as possible for them.

A good deal of thought is put into this; but the thought and time given to it is well spent. You can get people to do a minimum of reading where they will not do a lot of reading. If you give working adults a lot of reading to do, they start to do it. They get stuck half way, and they go to sleep at night before they have finished it; and so they

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

come to the class unprepared. If *you* take the trouble to reduce the reading to a minimum, and they can see that you have done so, they are much more likely to see it through.

Lenin had a slogan which he repeated over and over again, and anyone who has read either the *Selected* or the *Collected Works* of Lenin will have read it many times because it runs like a signature through all his writings: "Patiently explain." Every communist is taught that if he is going to get communism over to people, he must *patiently explain* and explain and explain. Applying this to the question of reading, the tutor will be told that, if necessary, he must help people with their reading—not only reduce the reading to a minimum, he should make himself available to them. Say to them: "Now, if you are having difficulties with your reading, come to me and discuss it with me."

It is all right to hand out Frank Sheed's *Theology and Sanity* and say, "It is a fine book, you ought to read it." But how many of us check afterwards to make sure that he has really understood it? You, with your greater knowledge of theology, might help him here and there, make the book more interesting, stop him from giving up half way through, because it has become meaningless. This is a good technique.

A Communist Party group or unit which has sufficient people available will use one person simply for that. They do not have large numbers available, but they will have one person who will be a guide to reading. This can be very necessary in the case of someone who has little in the way of education but is still capable of grasping the ideas. The guide will sit down at the side of such a man and help him with his reading; reading the same book with him, discussing as they go along. By such means, they get quite difficult ideas, quite profound ideas, over to unlettered men, and do it successfully.

I told you earlier that the communist tutor, like the ordinary Communist Party member, is expected to combine theory with practice. Those of you who know anything about dialectical materialism will know that the communist believes there is a unity in opposites. Here are two opposites: theory and practice—and the communist in his own life, as an individual and as a tutor, is supposed to bring theory and practice together and achieve a sort of unity.

So, when the communist tutor is taught tutorial methods, he is taught also how to teach a particular subject. He learns the method and the contents together. That is how I used to teach it. When I was teaching it in that way to tutors, I was also expected one night a week to teach a beginners' course myself with some raw recruits. Then I would know the problems of the people I was teaching, the sort of questions they would be likely to come up against, the sort of human material they were dealing with. If we did not do that, then I was likely to get further and further away from the real problems, and I would become more and more academic as a consequence.

This is their normal approach to combining theory with practice.

As I pointed out earlier, a tutor must always impress those who are taking any course that they are studying, not to acquire knowledge in order to become little wiseacres, not in order to be some sort of armchair philosophers, but to get ammunition for a fight. Their study is for action. So, each class which the communists run—if they run it well—will end by the tutor saying, "What are the comrades going to do about applying what they have teamed tonight to their work? to their life?"

The first item before they get down to the study session next time will be: "How did the comrades apply what they learned last week to their life, to their work during the past week?"

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

The communists use three methods:

- 1) The ordinary, straight, normal, tutorial method of lecture, followed by questions and answers. This, as I told you, is not to form the leaders; this is for reaching out to non-communists or to get over something which can be gotten to a larger group.
- 2) The question-and-answer method, which is based entirely on the tutor putting questions and getting answers back from the group. This is employed only on special occasions but is one which they find most useful.
- 3) Controlled discussion method. This is used for training leaders while they are teaching people things.

I would like to discuss this with you in some detail. Actually, in your pack is a reprint on it from *Christ to the World*. You will find that I outlined this method there, so that you will be able to follow through on this later on. I would like to describe it to you because, as I say, it is a method which is most frequently, most successfully used.

It is controlled discussion.

It is relatively easy to prepare a lecture and take questions afterwards. It requires more thought to be a tutor using the controlled discussion method. The tutor will ask himself, "What am I going to get across to my students tonight?" He will try to reduce it to two or three simple but fundamental points, for which he is going to gain acceptance.

You may or may not have noticed I have been trying to use the techniques I have described, in action with you. You have been my guinea pigs, as it were. In each lecture, I try to get over certain simple basic ideas. A communist tutor will have to tell himself, "I am going to try to get across, say three points"—very rarely will he attempt more than three in this method—"and I am going to get acceptance by all those in the group of these three points which I want them to accept."

He will have a group of as small a number as three. Five is a very good size. Fifteen or sixteen is absolutely the top limit. A group of five would be quite the easiest to handle, three is too small; it begins to get more difficult when it is more than five.

He will give what is called the opening statement in five minutes, in which he will try to start lines of thought going in the direction of the three points at which he wants his people to arrive. He presumes that his pupils have already done some necessary reading, so they have some background, for they had been told that they must do the necessary reading before the course begins. Then he will ask questions of the group. At least that is how he will begin. In fact, he will set out to get all the group talking. (It has been demonstrated here that it is not difficult to get you to talk. All your little groups seem to go straight into action and to talk steadily until you are told to stop. You are a special group; you are an elite anyway.)

In the average small group, you have some people who are talkative and some who are not. Some find it easy to talk; some find it difficult to stop talking; and some find it just as difficult to start. The communist tutor has to learn how to deal with these different types and he wants *them all* there. *He wants these different types*. Even their seating is important to the success of the method. He wants the maximum informality; so, he will have them grouped around him, not as so many disciples at his feet but rather a group of

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

which he is a part.

Having closed his introduction, he will say to the person who is obviously the talkative type, serving a useful purpose at this moment, to get the discussion going, but who later on is going to be a dreadful nuisance: "Well now, comrade, I think you have got something you want to say about one of these points I made. Would you care to tell us what you think?"

The talkative man starts talking. When he has made a point—not necessarily the point the tutor wants to arrive at—when the talkative man has made a point which is worth following through, the tutor says: "All right, all right, comrade, I think we have got the point now. That is fine."

Someone else is already straining at the leash and wanting to come into the discussion, so the tutor asks, "What do you think of what he has said?" He brings the second one in and tries to build it up in such a way that before long they are all wanting to get in. It is his job to control that discussion in such a way that *the others are not conscious of the degree of control which is being exercised.*

I am not saying this is a method which we can copy absolutely, but it is one which suggests certain possibilities. The tutor will get as many as possible coming in gradually, steering them towards the point he wants to arrive at. He gets them to that point. There is probably still someone there that has not come in. A shy person. So, the tutor will say: "We all seem to be arriving at such and such a point. We have had a long discussion. Things seem to be jelling, but so-and-so here has not come into the discussion. Comrade, is it because you disagree with us or is it that you find it difficult to come into a discussion of this sort?" Maybe the man is shy and he says, "Yes, I do agree, but I do find it difficult to come into conversation." That is good enough.

Maybe the man has some doubts, and the tutor will say, "It seems to me that this comrade here has some doubt. All of us seem to be threshing out ideas and getting to some real point, and perhaps we can help this comrade. He is obviously having difficulties." Presented in terms of "We are going to help this man," it becomes more acceptable.

He is up against difficulties, and we are going to help him. It is a sympathetic approach, and the man concerned begins to think, "Perhaps I am particularly dumb or there is something the matter with me." It puts him in a more receptive frame of mind. So, the others are all eager to help because they have arrived at the point of view themselves. They have arrived at it collectively; each individual has helped in it; this is their idea; they have arrived at this conclusion; and they are now anxious to gain its acceptance by someone else. Here is their opportunity. They all work, then, to bring the other man into acceptance of the idea, too.

It is only when he has them all going along with the first idea that the tutor will move on the second. He will not attempt to arrive at the third if he cannot get acceptance of the second. They can try again next week. The aims are quite limited; they are fundamental, and the people who have been through a discussion of that sort go away feeling that they have collectively arrived at a point of view each—has contributed to it—it is their idea, not the tutor's.

They do not feel that this is something which has been imposed upon them. This is something at which they have arrived. For that reason, they feel a greater attachment for that idea, a greater willingness and desire to defend it than would otherwise be the case.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

The Party knows that this is not an easy method, although you learn it as you go along, of course. It becomes easier with practice.

Perhaps I should say that the British Communist Party, in common with communist parties all over the world, is making this next twelve months what they describe as an “education year,” during the course of which they are going to try to deepen the understanding of communism of all their members everywhere. Each party is expected to organize more classes than before; persuade more people to attend them.

The way in which they decide to take these classes is interesting; the reason for it was given in *World News*, which is a publication for the Communist Party members, of September 8, 1962. It says: “The coming autumn and winter, therefore, will be a time of mounting struggle, but in order to be effective, it must also be a time of study. Study of the theoretical principles which guide our day-to-day work in the class struggle and the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.”

They believe that there are greater possibilities than there have been in the past for doing this sort of work. This particular article on education year ends: “Many people, especially young people, are questioning the old ideas, looking for a political philosophy that makes sense, that can help mold a better future for mankind. That philosophy is and can only be Marxism and Leninism.”

So, they are sending their tutors into action.

I showed you the course for new members in an earlier lecture—the course, which starts off on the inspirational and global note: what kind of world we live in, how that world can be changed, the force that can change it, the Communist Party, the party of the working class.

At quite a different level, a few months ago, the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, produced a book which anyone who takes Marxism seriously needs to have in his library—that is to say, if you can get the necessary dispensations. It brings together just about everything that Marxists have written over the years, and it is right up to date. As I said in an earlier lecture, there is a *development of Marxist doctrine*. This book brings it right up to the middle of this year. It is called *Fundamental Principles of Marxism-Leninism*. It is a large book, nearly 1,000 pages, superbly well bound and printed, morocco leather binding, and trying to equate English money with dollars, it is around \$2.00—that is all.

In other words, it is *subsidized* from Moscow, put out cheaply, and every communist party can have it put out in twenty-two different languages. It is intended to form the basis of study for people who are working as tutors and others in the education year. But it brings together really just about all you want to know about communist theory and practice. So, the communists are buying it, and side by side with it they get a six months personal study program on *Fundamental Principles of Marxism-Leninism*. This is a guide for people who are reading the book, so that they can understand it chapter by chapter by making it as simple as possible, bringing out the main points in each chapter, posing certain questions for the person reading the book to ask himself.

This is good organization in assisting people to understand what otherwise would be a very difficult book.

Then they run classes on this book, and every communist party is at this moment throughout the world expected to organize such classes. So, going into all sorts of different languages, you have the tutors guide for the syllabus of *Fundamental Principles*

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

of *Marxism-Leninism*. This is for the tutor not for the people taking it—it discusses how the syllabus based upon the book can be taught, session by session: the method to be used, the questions they are to ask if they cannot think of better ones themselves, a list of questions which they can put before their people when they are taking classes in the controlled discussion method.

Then you have the syllabus itself: the syllabus on the *Fundamental Principles of Marxism-Leninism*. This is what the person taking the class reads. It is cyclostyled (mimeographed) and is inexpensively produced. This is produced by the national communist party concerned, on the basis of a translation of something which originated in Moscow. It is not easy going. The first session is historical materialism; second, capitalism; third, the development of capitalism to the stage of imperialism; fourth, socialism and communism; fifth, the transition to socialism. communism; fifth, the transition to socialism. That is what the people attending the classes are expected to read by way of preparation.

At the end of the section for each class concerned, you get the “necessary reading.” I am just opening at random here—“readings:” Emile Burns, *Introduction to Marxism*, Chapter 6; Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*, especially the discussion of quotation 3; N. S. Khrushchev, *Report of the 21st Congress, CPSU*, pages 39 to 45, 71 to 85.

For deeper study, *Fundamental Principles of Marxism-Leninism*, Chapters 26, 27, pages 788 to 977.

But that is the sort of preparation which is put into the running of a communist class. *They get the results*. They do not get them because communism is diabolical. They do not get them just because they are a lot of enthusiasts. They get results because *they put a lot of hard work into it*. Someone put a lot of hard work into the preparation of those syllabuses—I happen to know it was just one man. That was time very well spent on the part of one man.

Here is another booklet for a typical run-of-the-mill class which would be going at any time in any communist party: the syllabus on the class struggle. Again, you have the questions which are going to be discussed and the background on those questions.

There is an important point to be noted here: If you persuade someone to attend the class, and you say to him, “Now if the class is going to mean anything to you, you had better read this syllabus on the class struggle,” and you give it to him, but he may not read it. He comes to a controlled discussion for the first class, and he is caught out completely. The others have read it, and he has not. The tutor asks questions. The questions begin to go backward and forward. The ball passes from one to another. If he has not done the reading, the others can soon see that he has not done it. The tutor can tell he has not done the reading. He is less likely to come up with the right answer than anyone else. So he tells himself, “I have got to take time to do the reading before the next class or I am going to look a darn fool.” So there is an incentive to do the reading—pressure upon him.

Incidentally, the same method is used behind the Iron Curtain. It is used in China. It is used in Russia. And behind the Iron Curtain or behind the Bamboo Curtain, it can have very sinister implications.

But this side of the Iron Curtain, it does not in normal circumstances have those consequences for the member at all. On the contrary, it is a very effective way of getting

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

ideas which might otherwise be unacceptable, or difficult to accept, over to people. I have a whole lot of syllabi here: “On Imperialism,” a syllabus “on Marxism versus Reformism,” and so on.

I also have a document, which I quoted in *Christ to the World*, which is in your pack, “*Some hints for party tutors.*” This is written by the head of the education department, and they are very down-to-earth, simple, homey, practical sort of hints for the tutors.

Some of the hints for tutors, I think, are ones which we could very well take to heart. For example, one of the practical points is this: “on the use of quotations: Some tutors like to acquire prestige by looking up rare quotations from books out of print or not yet translated. It may be good for the tutors prestige, but it does not help the students. My advice when quoting, wherever possible, use the well-known quotation which the student himself can find. You will get deserved prestige if you help people to understand things not through the display of your own erudition but by helping them.” This is not a bad approach.

St. Ignatius might have thought of it too.

There is a very practical one which I think the nuns will appreciate: “Confirmed knitters put some tutors off at first, but they should be treated with sympathy.”

My own experience is that the kindly and decent attitude to students is one of the first demands of the tutor. Many comrades find things difficult. Many are diffident and nervous at first in the field of study. I am for the most cooperative comradely atmosphere. I endeavor to listen patiently to what comrades have to say, even if you feel it is wrong. Make an effort to pick out from the contributions what is good as well as what is bad—to explain mistakes in the most comradely and helpful manner—in general, there is a very strong case for modesty and humility on the side of tutors who often have less experience than those they are helping to study.

“Rough treatment”—and this is delightful, I think—“Rough treatment should be reserved for those who are arrogant and intolerant to others in the course of the class or discussion.” In other words, rough treatment is reserved for the Scribes, Pharisees, the Levites, and not for the Samaritans.

Well, that is the way the communists attempt to get their ideas over to people. This is the way their instruction classes are run. Some of you run instruction classes, too. I do not know how they compare with yours. I hope that it suggests some ideas to you. I feel personally, as I said earlier, there is no reason why the devil should have all the best techniques.

While this method cannot be taken over lock, stock, and barrel by us, it is capable, I think, of adaptation. In fact, attempts have been made to adapt it to our needs, often with considerable success.

QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION

How far do you think it is possible to use these ideas in your work?

CHRISTIAN LEADERS

I suppose the fight for what is good must always tend to take two forms: the fight for truth and against falsehood. I have been concentrating on the positive side of the fight.

I do not see it, quite honestly, just as a fight against communism. *It is a fight for Christ and His Kingdom.* Quite obviously, if we are successful in that, that is far and away the best way of combating communism—almost as it were, as a by-product of our activities.

Nonetheless, it is true to say that communists are active. They are active in your mission fields, active wherever you work. *There is no part of the world where they are not active.* We find ourselves having to spend a lot of time and energy in what might seem a very unrewarding fight, not a fight of our choice at all.

I would like to discuss some of the aspects of that with you now. But I want to make it plain right at the very start that, first, we are not dealing with a simple question. It is a very complex one. It is very complicated. It does no good for someone to say, “Well, is not the answer to communism prayer?” Of course, it is *part* of the answer, but God gave us intellects as well; we are supposed to use those too. Prayer is not supposed to be some sort of a substitute for the use of our intellect. It is necessary for us to try to *understand communism—to understand its falsehoods*, trying to oppose those falsehoods.

You may say, “Well, is not the answer to it at the level of social reform, the improvement of social conditions?” You would have to be mad to deny that social reform is important in the fight against communism. It is tremendously important. If you want to put that to a test, try and spread communism in a wealthy country or try and spread it in a poor one. Go and talk to people who know no social injustice or go and talk as a communist to those who suffer from social injustice, and see what sort of response you get.

I have done both. I know from experience.

Of course, it is easier to spread communist propaganda in a country where you have bad social conditions, and quite obviously, *one way* of opposing communism is by trying to bring social justice, trying to combat injustice of any sort wherever we find it, *trying to involve people in an activity which will improve their own standards of life*—these things are absolutely essential in the fight against communism. But they would be essential if there were no communism in the world; if communism had never been heard of, it would still be our duty to do these things.

In other words, in being Christians, if we try to apply our Christianity to twentieth-century conditions, we do help raise effective barriers against communism. It would, however, *be quite wrong to say that you can reply to communism in that way.*

After all is said and done, the standard of life has risen very rapidly in the last few years in North Italy, but the communist vote has not gone down. In affluent West Germany, affluent Britain, and in a good many other Western countries at this moment, there is a beginning of a trend among intellectuals back towards communism, *even though the standard of life is rising.* It is quite clear it is not simply a question of raising the standard of life, although that is important.

I think we have to see that this is a *many-sided thing*. Positive action is essential. It is essential that we should constantly remind ourselves, no matter what form of activity we are engaged in, which has any connection with communism, we have to constantly ask

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

ourselves, *what it is all about? what are we doing this for?* We have not gone into politics; we have not suddenly decided that the main fight against communism is a political fight. *We are doing this as Christians. We are doing this because communism is evil. It is immoral in its approach to God and man and the world.*

If the communists had never persecuted missionaries, it would still be evil. If communism were not opposed to us as Catholics, it would still be evil and as Christians we would be obliged to find ourselves in conflict with it at the level of ideas.

It seems to me that one has to try and find the answers, too. I cannot produce easy answers to every problem that communism raises in mission areas or anywhere else. If there were a single, simple answer, I would have given it to someone long ago. We would have cleared up the problem of communism and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

It is not as simple as that. Many people do look for very simple answers to communism. They just are not there. I have been trying to emphasize that if you are going to try and find answers to communism, *you have to do it the hard way. You have to start with yourself, start with other people, paying attention to detail, paying attention to organization.* These are the things which make communism successful in its work. It is not that communists have the truth, and we have not; we have the truth, and they have not. *They pay attention to detail, to techniques, and to organization.*

They put a great deal of thought and activity into their fight for communism; this is the hard way which we have got to take too. *We cannot find some simpler, easier way than the communists themselves use.*

If we get involved in conflict with communists, there is always the temptation to begin to use the same sort of tactics as the communists use. We cannot use the subterfuges that they use; we cannot use the deceptions they use. If we even attempt this—I know you will not be so stupid as to try to—they would beat you every time because they can lie as they please. There are no depths of duplicity to which they cannot sink; they can use every deceit and subterfuge. And they would do it with a clear conscience. They have only one test of their behavior; does it serve the cause of communism? If it does, it is right; if they go against that, they can have a bad conscience.

Communism not only moulds minds, it twists consciences, and the communist will feel himself impelled by his communism to do the evil thing. He would do it believing that it was right, believing that it was the proper thing to do under the circumstances. You can only use his bad methods against your conscience. So, of course, he will do it better. He will beat you at lying, deceit, and subterfuge every time, and you might as well face up to that.

It is not a question of trying to answer them at that level. We have to find other answers instead. That does not mean to say that we should not understand their techniques, that we should not understand their subterfuges, that we should not try to find answers which are permissible to us. Again, I want to remind you that the communists are not using subterfuges all the time. They would be fools if that were so.

They use deceit and subterfuge only when they think that it will achieve their purpose better than using the more legitimate course. They know there are dangers involved, that sooner or later, you are caught out in your deceit, and it boomerangs on you. This has been demonstrated to them. This is one of the hard facts of life. Over and over again, these things come back on them so that today even if Mr. Khrushchev privately wants disarmament, for his own purposes, no one is going to believe him; if he wants to get an

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

agreement, no one is going to believe in that agreement. They say, oh yes, we know the communists always use deceit and subterfuge; you cannot rely upon their word.

This is a self-defeating method which they use. In the long run, it comes back on them, and certainly would come back on us much harder if we tried to use it.

I mention this because, over and over again, I have seen Catholics who have been drawn into the fight against communism use the same sort of uncharitable language, the same sort of tactics, the same sort of methods as the communists themselves. When Catholics do that, *we are hurt by it*, not the communists. It is the best way of helping communism and the worst way of helping our cause.

I tried to list the other day those conditions which communists try to operate in and which they find most helpful to their work. You have got to expect in the mission areas that the communists will be active in the cities; after all is said and done, revolutions are made in cities, by and large. You must expect that the communists will always try and work amongst city people.

At this moment, there is a greater concentration upon students than at any time since the communist parties were formed throughout the world. I have been associated with or watching communism very closely since 1928. The Soviet Union was only ten years old when I joined the Communist Party. Beyond any shadow of doubt, there is a greater concentration on students now than there has been at any time since the Bolshevik revolution of 1917.

In a way, this is only the beginning. It is going to build up much more. They are going for a lower age group than they used to go for. In the past, they would go for students, generally at the undergraduate level of 18 to 22; now they have discovered, particularly in newly developing countries, that a younger age group of 15 to 18 or 19 is a particularly profitable group to work amongst.

Those of you who know Southeast Asia will know of the succession of strikes by school boys and girls of that age which have occurred in Singapore, parts of Malaya, and elsewhere in Southeast Asia. Some of you from Central Africa will know that the school boys and school girls strike has been used there as well. Those of you who come from Venezuela will know the work that the communists have put in the last three-and-a-half years amongst the high school children in Venezuela.

They have found, in fact, that you will make a convert more quickly at that level. After all, they are politically immature; they have no experience of life. All youngsters in that age group *will go into action or they will study, they will do whatever is required with greater enthusiasm* than at a slightly greater age.

They are working particularly amongst that very young group, and if they are not doing it in your mission at this moment, it is *quite likely that they will be doing it before very long*. The world communist movement is *exchanging its experiences*. If it has a success on one side of the world, the communists are teaming from that success in every other part of the world in a very short time. This was why some of us felt that this publication, *Christ to the World*, was necessary for us, where we could have an exchange of experiences of our successes and our failures in the same way. The communists are doing this all the time. They discovered in Southeast Asia, first, that they could get better results from an age group of high school age students; then they switched to Latin America, then to Africa, and you are likely to see it turn up in any mission area today. They have always gone for the undergraduates. They will continue to go for them. You

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

must expect it. They try to get in at the level of the professors. If you are trying to win a society to your point of view, clearly you want the professors in your universities as your allies and friends, if you can get them.

Often, among teachers in the mission areas, it is easy to get a following. This will clearly vary from country to country, but if you take India as an example, very often your teacher is a grossly underpaid person, has no standing in society at all today. Such a man can have a very real grievance indeed. You find frustration there, and it is easy for the communists to recruit where you have frustration. The communists know this. They go for it. You must expect them to try to get into teacher organizations and they will establish themselves on the basis of real grievance.

I would say that wherever it is possible (it is not always possible) for us to lead the way in terms of giving a square deal, a just deal to teachers in our schools, we should do it, where we employ ordinary secular teachers.

The communists will, of course, go for the workers in industry. Their best way to get the workers in industry in the newly developing countries is through the new trade union movement, which is growing in every new developing country. You know how it goes. It may be a most backward country. Then you get a power project started, a hydro-electric scheme. Somebody dams a river. It may be with American money. It may be with Russian money. And before very long, factories are growing up around that project. You have a new industrial working class suddenly emerging in a nation which had no industrial working class before.

The people working in factories are brought together in large numbers, the whole pattern of their former life destroyed, and this is a situation in which communists can easily work. Very quickly trade unions are established, and quite properly so. It may be very difficult to capture a big trade union—it may take years to do it. If you have an infant, immature trade union, you can go into that labor union very easily and capture positions.

Very often, even the Europeans and Americans and others say, “Well, that is not an important organization; in any case, it has got only a few hundred members.”

So it will have at the start. Ten years later, it may have tens of thousands of members. The communists who got in when it had a few hundred members will still be there, in the saddle, when it has got tens of thousands of members, too. So, you must expect the communists will try to get into labor unions when they are first established or wherever they exist.

This does not mean to say that we have got to accept it, but we should know that they can do it. They are preparing for this. They prepare their people for it. Unless I grossly misunderstand our Catholic social teaching, *our people should be going into this sort of activity*. They ought to be leading unions, too. If communists have got the good sense to see it is easy to get into a movement when it is just beginning, get a leading influence there, *surely we can see that too*. We ought to be training people who are able to go into these various movements.

I cannot tell you just how you ought to train trade union leaders. When I told you my story of Jim, I tried to outline to you the methods which the communists use: general training in leadership first, then the specialized training afterwards, for a particular field of activity. It is not enough to train a person as a leader and say: “Right now, you must go into a labor union or a political party or whatever it may be.” They need some special

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

guidance, some special preparation. I think that very often we could use our people who are already active in these spheres more than we do. They often have a feeling of being isolated. We encourage a man to go into a labor union. He works there. All his time is taken up. We do not see as much of him as we would have done, and he feels very often that he is left on his own. He would regard it as a complement if you asked him to try and help train some others in his own field of activity. He would probably willingly cooperate.

We do need these specialized forms of preparation for leadership as well as a general one. Here and there this sort of work is being done.

For example, in Tanganyika. Here and there you will find it in Latin America, in Asia and there are places, too in Europe and in this country for training people of this sort. This is a tremendously important field of activity.

The point of entry for the communist movement in many a newly developing country (and very true of Latin America) is through the trade union movement. It is particularly true of those unions which are affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Those trade unions which are affiliated to WFTU and have a living link with the communist movement. The leaders of WFTU are top communists, men of enormous experience. A great many Latin American unions, the majority of whose members are nominal Catholics, are affiliated to WFTU, so you have a living link with communism the whole of the time. People looking for the link with Moscow, ask how do the communists get control? How do they get their directives? Very often it is coming straight through the ordinary trade unions affiliated to WFTU.

There are many practical problems raised all along the line. I said this is not a simple thing. If the unions in your country are WFTU unions, linked with Moscow, what do you do? In those circumstances, I would say you *have just got to train your people all the better*. You cannot say we have nothing to do with it. You have to train them *well enough and make them firm enough in their faith* so the communists do not win them, and *send them into those unions to work*. The majority of the members will not be communists, but they will have communist affiliations. There is no alternative to this.

In many mission countries today, we are up against a real problem. I was talking to a group of executives of a great industrial concern with interests in every part of the world, whose publicity budget in one year is greater than the bill for the whole of education of some African countries, a huge industrial concern. One of their top men from Africa said:

“Our problem is we have WFTU—Communist-led unions, and we have non-communist unions to deal with. Both are represented at the table when we are carrying on negotiations and *we know that the communists will keep their word*. When they say, ‘We will do this’ or ‘We will do that,’ they will do it. We know that they are speaking for their members, and they have the membership they claim. When we speak to the leaders of the non-communist union, who have been trained by American or British union leaders, we know often their membership is fictitious. They have no control over their membership, and they are not likely to honor their agreements. We find ourselves against all our interests having to conclude agreements with the communist-led union as opposed to the other.”

That is a crazy situation, but it exists in quite a lot of countries. Those non-communist unions are wide-open for our people to go into and lead, but ours have not gone. Instead, you have had all sorts of pagans who have gone in—often very corrupt and, regrettably,

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

people have gone from your country and mine—believing that every man is worth his price and can be bought, and they have gone around buying trade union leaders. The whole movement begins with corruption, so we must not be surprised if that corruption spreads.

These are difficulties. I am not making it seem simple for you, because it is not. Again, I say we could get, *we should get our people into such movements*. The labor union is a point of entry over and over again for the communists in a newly developing country where you have industries spreading quickly.

You must expect the communists will always try to capture unions if they can, and we have got to produce people willing to go into this fight. It is a fascinating one. They are not necessarily going to be doing penance for the whole of the time they are engaged in trade union activity, but we have got to have people who are prepared to be heroic.

On one occasion, I was speaking to a meeting of trade unionists in Coventry, which is the heart of our motor industry in Britain. I told them they ought to go into their labor unions, accept responsibility whenever it was doing, take on responsibility (because if they did not, the communists would), and then set out to try to do the job well. Ten years later, when I had long ago forgotten that I had ever been there, I got a letter from a man one day, a most tremendous letter. I have been talking about the heroism of the communists but here was a different sort of heroism. This man who wrote said:

You will not remember that tremendously crowded meeting of engineers which you addressed in Coventry ten years ago. I was the man who was standing nearest to you—the room was packed with standing men. You told us if ever a position is going for grabs in a union, the communists will always jump in and take it. And they will do the job well, and as a consequence, they will go from one level of the organization to another and have a great deal of influence.

I had never paid much attention to my union—I was just a nominal member, no more. On the basis of what you told us, I went to the next union local meeting, and it happened to be the annual general meeting. One position after another came up for election, they all went automatically, the communists taking one after the other. Each time they asked for volunteers for a position, a communist would come forward and say, ‘I’ll do that.’ He would get it because he was willing. It was exactly as you described. There was only one job left, that was the treasurer’s job, the man who looks after the money—and he said, ‘I was beginning to feel that I ought to do something’.

I have always hated having to do anything with money at all—I am no good looking after my own money or other people’s, either. I was not even good at arithmetic at school, but this was the only job that was going. I suddenly heard my voice say, ‘I’ll do it—and, he said, ‘I took it’.

Previously the only sort of work I had done as a Christian was through the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Suddenly, I was in a new sort of work. It was all exactly as you described. For ten years now, I have been sitting up until midnight every night trying to balance the books, trying to do my arithmetic. I do not like it any better

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

now than I did at the start. I am still no better at looking after other people's money or my own; I just had to train myself in it. I try to comfort myself with the thought that, as I balance the books, I am doing it for our Blessed Lord.

That is a wonderful approach that is terrific heroism. A man will take on a job that is uncongenial to him and feel that this is something important and meaningful and he will do it conscientiously for Our Blessed Lord. We can produce people who will do the necessary hard work, if we make them see that the dulllest sort of job is all *part of the battle of our time*. This puts them in the front line and makes them play a meaningful role in it.

You must expect, if you are working in Latin America or, for that matter, in Asia or Africa, you must expect that those slums around the big cities are going to continue to grow. The appalling trend is well under way of people flooding in from the countryside into the cities, arriving with not the slightest idea of whether they can work or where they are going to live or anything else. These appalling slums are growing up. These are not the sort of workers from whom the Communist Party usually recruits its actual Party members. There are good reasons for this. These people do not know where their next meal is coming from. They do not know how they are going to survive and that is their main preoccupation.

Oh yes, if you have some fighting in the middle-of-Caracas, or Santiago, Chile or Lima, Peru, they will come out in the streets; they will put up the barricades or break the windows; steal the stuff from the shops, etc. These are not natural revolutionaries in terms of being organized consistently over a period of years for communism. That is how the communists see them. But the communists believe that they can be used for communism. They are the people who might carry the day in the event of a revolution from sheer numbers.

The communists believe that these people are easily led and they can be whipped up at any moment; forgotten for some time maybe, and you can go back to them and whip them tip again. This in one sense is true. You can see it happen. But it is also true that these people are perhaps more responsive than any others, as those of you who work amongst them know, to real Christian charity. They are the most needy of people in our cities in mission areas, and they are the people who are the most responsive.

Very often they are very simple people, they will follow a lead. They will follow a Christian lead much more readily than they will follow a communist one. Whether they do go in and loot the shops and burn and kill when the communists want them to may depend upon the work of a very few people, either communist or otherwise. A few of our own people living amongst them, giving a real lead, can transform the whole situation.

Communists all over the newly developing areas today pay more attention to peasants, to rural workers, than they have ever done. I went into the reasons for this more deeply in my second lecture to the earlier group. It is a fact that all over the newly developing areas today, communists are creating peasant unions, as they call them. Generally the tactic is this: not to make them openly communist, but to have a few communists in the leadership yet to claim that they are non-communist.

It is quite likely that genuinely non-communist peasant unions will come into existence. Some people will see communists organizing these groups and say, "Why should not we do it too?" I would not want you to conclude immediately that every

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

peasant union in your mission must be communist-led. A peasant union coming into existence at this moment or which came into existence in the last couple of years, is quite likely communist-led or communist-inspired.

This is the beginning of one of the latest lines of international communism. Work among the peasants; create peasant unions; and demand land reform. But when land reform comes, decry it as being just reformism and not a revolutionary solution to their problems. Then call upon peasants to seize land, a big estate here, a big estate there, to demonstrate to them that you can get land by revolutionary action. This is the pattern in which this sort of peasant union works.

They are working that way in various parts of Latin America; they are doing it in Indonesia at this moment; they are doing it in South India. It is likely to spread to every other mission area where the Communist Party is established. In the past, you could feel if you were working in a rural area that you were one of the fortunate missionaries. Your people were simple, and communism was not a problem there. That was something which the more sophisticated city dwellers. You cannot go on thinking that today.

Quite suddenly, you may find your own rural mission is right in the front line of the battle, the communists doing everything they can to mislead your people. This means that you have got to produce lay Christians who understand their Christianity better—amongst other things. They are in the front line too; if you are, they are there as well. They also need to be equipped. If possible, they have got to have some sort of preparation and knowledge of communism.

It does not mean that you have got to switch them all on to becoming anti-communist crusaders. But people do need to have knowledge of communism today and it needs to be reduced to the simplest terms possible in areas such as those.

Whenever you see the beginnings of activity of this sort, of course, in the back of your mind you have got to have the thought, “Is this communist-led?” You have to be looking out for the communists, in case they are beginning to get established in your area.

But I would like to repeat what I said in the earlier sessions, that one of the best ways of helping the communists is to attach the communist label too quickly to people before you know that they are communists. Do not start labelling everyone you do not like, every anti-American or anti-British, everyone who is supposed to be a trouble-maker, every nationalist who talks in extravagant language. These are not necessarily communists at all

and one of the ways in which communism has been brought to some mission territories has been by missionaries too quickly labelling nationalists and others as communists.

I could give you actual examples of that in various mission areas I know. *We need here to restrain ourselves*—obviously, the demands of charity and justice are such that we should not start attaching the communist label too quickly. *Conversely, we have to be intelligent enough to have our eyes open and try to recognize the communist when we see him.*

As I say, there is not a single, simple answer to any of this. It has got to be on the basis of finding answers through producing better Christians, more well-informed Christians, by using the laity more, getting them into action, and by trying to produce as many leaders as we can. I have tried to give you what I hope are some helpful suggestions and hints on the

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

making of leaders. We need an immensely greater number of lay leaders than we have at the moment. The mere fact of bringing people into action helps assure that they will not go over to the communists.

Above all, we should try to create leaders, or try to create that attitude of mind that I have been trying to get over to you, of people who feel themselves involved in struggle, men who will give everything they have to it, be the very best that they can at it, pay attention to every detail, every technique which is likely to assist the fight.

And in producing leaders, you simply have to hammer this home time after time: very quickly people can start leading for themselves, leading for the power and the privilege and the excitement which can come from this sort of work. That means that you have got to see that the spiritual foundations are right as well as keep on hammering it home that the Catholic lay leader is *leading for Christ, not leading for himself*. His job is to Christianize the society in which he lives. His job is to ask himself over and over again, “*What do I do as a Christian?*” “*Is the course I am pursuing a Christian course?*”

Any of us who engage in this fight against communism need to ask ourselves those questions over and over.

I would say, when we are talking or trying to create the right attitude of mind, that it has got to begin in the school. It is not good enough to start later when they get out in the world. It has got to start in school. Those who go to our schools ought to be made to feel, long before they leave, that they are in a world which is going to make big demands upon them; it is their *privilege to be Christians who can play a leading role later on* in the great struggle of our times.

Quite obviously, too, it begins in the seminary. If one is going to try and produce leaders, one has got to produce them in the seminary. I think it is quite wrong to suppose that it follows automatically that when a man has completed his training in the seminary and been ordained, that he is, therefore, trained in leadership, is articulate, able to get his ideas over to other people, has already got his qualities of leadership developed.

It seems to me that every thing possible has got to be done to try to insure that we are turning out people who are already leaders from our seminaries, so that they, in turn, can teach others to be leaders.

One or two people here have raised the question of which organization is best when it comes to Christian leadership is it the Young Christian Workers? Is it the Legion of Mary? Frankly, I am not much concerned which organization you think is best. *It is a question of how you use that organization*. I have seen some wonderful Young Christian Worker Groups, and I have seen some pretty unsuccessful ones, too. I have seen organizations which were expected to be little more than ones which would provide social occasions for well-to-do Catholics turn into extremely apostolic and effective organizations. *It depends upon the members*—and what you make of them. I am not too concerned about which organization you may think is best.

What I want to see is that *they are activated and that they are used to try to produce people who are equipped for the fight in which they ought to be involved*.

Other people have said to me: “Well, what are the communists’ weak points?” “How do we crack the communist beliefs?”

Of course, there is no simple answer. If there were a simple answer which was immediately acceptable to the communists, we would have given someone the answer long ago. We would have got away from this problem of communism. There is no single

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

answer which you can produce like a trump card which is bound to convince the communist that he is wrong.

Yet, you can provide certain answers to communists, which may or may not satisfy your communist. They will only satisfy your communist if he is already beginning to get doubts in his mind—otherwise, he will not consider them. Have no doubt about that at all.

If any of you have ever argued with a communist, you will know this is true. His mind is closed normally as your mind is closed to communism. If you start arguing with a communist, and he puts forth forceful arguments, you do not start opening your mind to them. You close your mind because you believe that you are right. The communist does exactly the same. Put yourself in his shoes, and you will understand why he does it. He puts down such thoughts as being bad thoughts unworthy of a communist, he will not accept them. You must expect him to do that.

If he begins to respond to the arguments which you aim to put forward, the rot has already set in. He already has doubts about his communism. Generally speaking, one does not, therefore, achieve very much with the actual Communist Party members, the hard core members, by pointing out the weaknesses in their communism.

There are weaknesses. I think we ought to be aware of these, so that we can prevent people from being drawn into communism, and this may often be successfully used with people who are not Communist Party members, but are communist sympathizers. Their minds are still open. You see, it is always difficult to provide an easy definition of a communist. I would say that for normal working purposes, a communist is someone who consciously accepts the discipline of the Communist Party.

That means there are some people in the Communist Parties of Italy, Indonesia, France, who may be in the Party but do not accept the discipline. They are not the sort of communist we are talking about.

There are other fellow travellers who, although they do not hold a Party job, do consciously accept the discipline of the Party. There are certainly large numbers of people who are around the communist movement who are likely dubbed as communists, but who do not accept the discipline of the Party—will not, and refuse to—and that is why they are not in it. Their number is much greater than the number of the communists. Those people's minds are not closed.

It is the difference between the Catholic, if you like, and the Protestant, who is somewhere near the top step of the church, but has not quite come in. These people are in a different position, are much more open to influence. It is not difficult to show these that, say, in Marx's dialectical materialism, he chose his facts. He selected them to suit his own case. I do not say Marx did it with conscious dishonesty. Marx thought he was on to

something wonderful, and he was looking for every fact that he could find which would support his case. This is even more easy to demonstrate in the case of historical materialism. The communists present this, and will present it, to ordinary simple people in mission areas as the tide of the future, the wave of the future, the whole of his story is such that it must lead up to communism.

In their case for historical materialism, the communists select little areas in Europe and the West and certain periods of man's history, the feudal period in particular, to show that this is the way the dialectic works in history. They leave out of account the great mass of

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

mankind, the great mass of human history and they build up their case for historical materialism by narrow selection. It would require a series of lectures to give you the adequate answers to this, but there are answers—that is the real point, and they can be found.

Your communist sympathizer may be influenced by this. The man who is moving towards communism or is attracted by it may be stopped from moving nearer to it by being shown that there is an intellectual answer *at his level*—not at our level, accepting our first premises, but at his level, there is the answer—to the claims which communists make. In mission areas often, you are not up against the problem of having to meet communism at

the level of the intellectual. You may have to do that with your students and others. But often you are up against the problem of having to combat communist ideas which have filtered through, but not necessarily originated with some local communist at all. They have stated, for example, in the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization's Office in Cairo, which is not communist but has communists there, then filtered down through the local nationalist

movement to your people.

In your seminary, you will have seminarians who may say that Russia is the big brother who helps poor struggling people, and when they have got independence, gives them aid without strings. You will find this repeated over and over again all over the world.

One has to find simple answers to that sort of propaganda—the communists have succeeded in getting the simple ideas over.

I think it would not be a bad idea for mission societies who are in education to buy up all the old maps of Russia they can lay their hands on and just hang them in their schools side by side with the modern map of Russia and let the children see that the old Imperial Russian Empire and the USSR are the same. It's a perfectly simple visual thing.

Africans said to me over and over again, "We have nothing to lose." I tried to find a simple answer, and the one I found worked best was this: wherever communists come to power, they must take over the land. They may give people land reform first of all, but they must as communists in time bring the land into the possession of the government. It is no good talking about the state—the people of the type I am describing do not know what the state is—but they do know the government. They know the government through the tax collector, if no one else. So, I would say that it is a basic principle of communism that all property which produces must be in the hands of the government. Land is the great producer and, therefore, all land would go to the government. No African in a communist Africa would own any land. Moreover, cattle are productive property too, so cattle would go to the communist government, too.

In fact, when Russia tried to compel the Kulaks, the class which had a little bit of land and some cattle, to give its land and cattle to the government, in the early 1930s, they refused to do it. The Kulaks killed their cattle, and four million Kulaks were killed because they refused to hand their cattle over to the government. Now, those of you who work in Africa will know that probably eight cattle represent the bride price. A man's social position depends entirely on the number of cattle he has. Often your African will have an immensely larger herd than his land can support. They are staggering around half-starved, but he has social status as a result of the number of cattle he owns.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

This really hit them between the eyes. If communism came, they would have no land, no cattle. The government would take both.

It seems to me that we have got to find simple answers at the level of the people; the closer we are to the lives of the people, the better our answers will be.

We have to remind ourselves that in all our propaganda, whether it is to that sort of public or to a most sophisticated public, we must ask ourselves, not what would convince us, *but what is required to convince them? What is meaningful to them?*

Often we live in our own little world. We think in our own terms. We never bother to try to think in terms of the other man.

I am not going to say that the communists never make mistakes. Of course, they do. I have been giving you the best examples these last few days.

I think we have to try to think as the other man thinks. See how things look to him.

There is a very real problem in trying to work with the actual Communist Party members. But your communist is a person who has doubts from time to time. If there is someone who has some sort of personal contact with him, those doubts can be discussed in charity.

You need to have people who are strong in their faith, if they are going to associate with communists. Very often your communist is cut off completely from all Christian influences, yet we wonder why it is that lie does not come over to us.

You must realize you do not make converts by arguing with people, defeating them in argument. Oh yes, you get a great satisfaction from that. It is good for your pride. It is bad for your humility, but you do not make converts by defeating people. As a Christian, you must have some respect for the individual and for his dignity as a person. Argue with the communist, and it drives him back to the fundamentals of his beliefs. It strengthens him in his communism, just as it is the best possible thing for our people to come under attack as well.

Over and over again, the communist is strengthened in his beliefs when anti-communists start trying to argue with him.

The first step in my experience—and I am only talking from my own experience—is to establish a sympathetic relationship with him by finding the points at which our minds can meet—establishing an area of agreement and then trying to extend that area of agreement. That can be done.

No, there can be no agreement at the deeper level of the fundamentals of our belief. They are directly opposed to each other. There can be no question of any compromise on that level. On the ordinary human level, there is plenty of room. Your communist is almost certainly in good faith. He has almost certainly gone to communism because of his idealism, what is good and generous in his nature. He went to communism with the idea of trying to change the world and produce a better world. He was, and probably still is, tremendously against injustice, precisely those injustices which we denounce or should denounce. You can go along with your communist at that level a very long way indeed. Go just as far as you can; very often you can go further than him when it comes to condemnation of injustices. Point out injustices that he has not even noticed. Talk his language for as long as possible until you have found an area of agreement. Then move on from there.

At some point, then, I would aim to get him to look at his own communism to make

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

sure, to convince himself that communism really means as much to him as it did originally, or that it means the same thing. That he is not being held by group pressures or by loyalty either to himself and to his past, or to others, and not really to the set of beliefs which he originally accepted.

Generally his communist beliefs will begin to crumble. Once his mind is opened up to the possibility of doubt, to the possibility of error, then things begin to crumble. Either Marxism holds together as a whole or the thing just collapses. You either have got to accept it in its entirety or you must reject it in its entirety.

I have tried to show you some aspects of the work against communism. As I say. I can not give you single, simple answers but if you ask me questions, I will answer them in the time available.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

(*Name not recorded*): If you were confronted with a volunteer with desire to lead and a volunteer with knowledge and had to make a choice, who would make the best lay leader?

Mr. Hyde: I would use them both. I do not think you have to make the choice. I am not being smart, Father. I do not think normally we have to make that choice. My real point is that they can both be used effectively.

Jim at his level, the educator at his level—it is impossible for me or anyone else to say which is the more important level of the two. The one will work among the intellectuals; the other amongst building workers. Both are important groups. I do not know of any unimportant group.

In other words, *we have to take the human material which is available to us and use it*, which is what the communists do.

In other words, then, if someone approached you, say on the missions, and showed he had good will, you would use him immediately, before looking around for someone who seemed to have more qualifications as a leader.

The *degree of dedication*, I would say, is one of the first tests. If they have not got that dedication, then, in fact, they may become great leaders, but at some point, they are much more likely to go off the rail. So, dedication has to be the starting point. If I had to choose between one and the other, I would certainly make that the beginning of my choice.

Then, one has got to take into account what the man has in the way of intelligence. That does not seem to be decisive—the question is *whom he will lead*. Your man of relatively little intelligence can lead other people of relatively little intelligence perhaps more effectively than an intellectual could do. *It is a question of finding the right group for your man to work with.*

Mrs. Maria Callas: Mr. Hyde, after a country has turned out to be communist, after the commies have invaded the country, what is the best way to get them out?

Mr. Hyde: What is the best way to get them out when they have already taken over a country? I said earlier the answers to communism are not simple answers, and this is

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

particularly true of those countries which have gone communist. I do not think we have to fool ourselves here. In a sense, the worst has happened when the communists arrive. In other words, it is much easier to get a country go communist than to bring it back from communism. That is true of individuals, too. That is why my emphasis is very much upon preventing people from becoming communists. It is an immensely easier task than to get them back afterwards.

There is no precedent yet to indicate what is the way to bring back a country which is already communist. . . .

In terms of military tactics, it might be exactly what the communists want. . . .

If you ask how can one influence people in a country that is already communist, there are problems there. As you know, the attempt has been made over many years now to get propaganda into Russia and the other communist countries. Now, we know, and I have done some of this work myself, that some of it gets through—there has been convincing evidence that some of the propaganda which has been done through radio and various organizations does filter in and influence people inside.

The communists of late, in organizing great world occasions like youth festivals, etc., have in fact provided us with a large public gathering which *we could also use for our purposes*. Today people are beginning to use some of these occasions for anti-communist activities, or non-communist activities, as well. The recent Helsinki Youth Festival is a case in point. The same was true of the Vienna Festival. A certain amount can be done, but by and large, the answer has got to come from inside the country. Inside a communist country, generally speaking, the only organized ideological opposition which exists is that of the religious groups. Therefore, the level of ideas and beliefs, the ultimate disintegration of communism is most likely to come from those with religious beliefs. It is almost impossible for others to create organizations and groups which are in ideological opposition to communism and are known as such.

I do not think, in a way, the problem of Cuba is quite the same as the problem of the other communist countries, it is easier to get propaganda and other ideas into Cuba, than it is into the countries which are behind the Iron Curtain in eastern Europe and in Asia.

Mr. Reinhold Kissener, A.I.D.: I would like to ask your opinion regarding the formal teaching of courses in dialectical materialism in our Catholic universities. As far as I know, there is only one course that is taught in any of our Catholic universities. If we are to cope with the problem, why is it that our Catholic universities, or our State universities, or private institutions do not have courses?

Mr. Hyde: Why isn't communism taught in our Catholic universities? I cannot answer that. I am not in charge of even one of them. I am not even an American. I see a strong case for having Marxism and Leninism taught by the right people. For heavens sake, make sure it is the right people.

It can serve a very useful purpose indeed. I know that some Catholic universities have toyed with this idea here. I was not aware that there is only one doing it. It has got to be done, but not as anti-communist propaganda. The university or the school is not the place for propaganda of any sort, least of all anti-communist propaganda. It has to be taught straight.

Oh yes, *the answers have got to be presented straight, too*. We have got the answers.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

It must not be put over in the spirit of propaganda. It has got to be put over as much at the intellectual, academic level as possible. I know it can be done and it can be done successfully.

You ask why it isn't taught in the State universities? Again, I have no responsibility for that. But I would want a very close check on those who taught in the State university. Without knowing a good deal more about your educational system, I would not care to suggest that it would be a good idea to campaign for communism to be taught in State universities. I would feel a good deal safer if it were being taught in Catholic ones. Certainly, communism can be taught within the framework of the educational system, where you have Catholic schools.

I do what is described as a *Red Week* for the Columban Fathers every year. I teach all their young divines who have just been ordained and their men home on leave, usually 60 men a year, for a full week. The first half of the week is entirely on Marxism, Leninism, dialectical historical materialism, etc., from notes which I used when I was a communist tutor. I talk to them as though I were still a communist and as though they were communists, too, putting it across to them as persuasively as I can, appealing to their intellect and to their emotions. The second half of the week we discuss answers at the intellectual level *and positive answers as well*.

That has worked, I know the Society believes that that is so, as I am asked to go back, year after year, to do the same.

Fr. R. F. Sheridan, M.M.: Many of us will in the next few weeks be back in the missions. What, in your opinion, would be the dangers for us as Americans when we try to set up these leadership courses in the mission fields of Latin America, Africa and the Orient? In other words, what would be the charges we should expect from the communists when we try to set up this counteraction?

Mr. Hyde: I think the first charge, which is bound to come in Latin America, is that this is simply Americans bringing the cold war into Latin America, and that the Church is identified with American imperialism and is taking part in the cold war—the necessity for which not all Latin Americans by any means would accept. This can be a damaging charge.

Those of you who work among Latin Americans know the pride of the Latin American in his culture and his history. The independence which goes with that pride is something valuable, something to be preserved. He does not want to feel that he is being bullied by his northern neighbor. He wants to be able to think and feel that he is helping to solve his own problems. You have to pay some regard to those feelings.

Therefore, I would try and work as hard as possible *through the people of Latin America themselves where it can be done*.

You may find it necessary to establish some things which are openly and directly Catholic, but if you were running leadership courses and it is possible to do it *through laymen* rather than through priests, I think it would be better. I do not say that you can begin that way.

I do not think that should deter you from trying to train your own people as much as possible, the men and women in your own societies, getting as much out to them as you can. I would give them as much as you can. You have to begin with your own members.

Dedication and Leadership Techniques

They have to be made conscious of the need. Equip them for it, and then try and select one or two within any group who can specialize on training leaders—not training leaders just against communism, but training them *as leaders generally*. Then, if you will equip them to lead in the modern world, of course, they have to be able to lead the light against communism, too. The reason they are taught communism and the answers to communism will be that they are being trained as leaders generally.

And as soon as possible, have people trained whom you can have sufficient confidence in to do the work which you have started. In other words, get it out of your hands into the hands of others as soon as it is possible. I do not see any other immediate answers to that charge you are bound to face. I think that is certainly the most damaging one from which you can be sure to expect.

Mr. Hyde: Father Meehan tells me it is time to bring the questions to a close. Thank you for listening for so many, many hours to this voice droning on; it is tremendous of you; you have suffered such a long time. I can only feel that you must have a great sense of relief now, Rather like a little boy who was banging his head on the wall, about whom you have heard. His mother said, “Why do you do it?” With tears running down his face, he said, “I do it, because it feels so nice, when I stop.”

Fr. Meehan, S.J.: All of us are certainly grateful for this experience. There is not much more to say. We will always be grateful and will always thank Mr. Hyde from the bottom of our hearts. Our best thanks will take the form of a determination to put into practice some of the principles of the leadership that has been demonstrated here. In the next period we are going to find some practical possibilities for everybody.