

Humanitarian snaps at sycamore

I almost laughed at Sycamore's recent "Forum" editorial, but the thought that others—perhaps many others—might share his opinions sobered me, and I thought how hard it would be to correct all these minds and to bring them back to reality. But, since I am a humanitarian, I resolved to try it.

What, I might ask Sycamore, is the point of outlawing the Communist Party? Outlawing the Communist Party is not a major issue of our Age, nor even of Canadian politics. If the Canadian Communist Party is engaged in subversive activities, outlawry, instead of stopping it, might make it more ruthless. At any rate espionage is against the law, and I feel confident that spies and the like will be ferreted out by the authorities. Despite the possible contrary opinion of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Communist Party is not a significant social force in Canada. In fact Canadians have the tendency to scoff at the very idea of a Canadian Communist Party. And rightly too, for it seems unlikely that the Canadian proletariat (if there is a Canadian proletariat) is about to rise up against the bourgeoisie. Finally, outlawing the Communist party would be as futile as outlawing the USSR itself, and I think that this ostrich-like act would not erase what we like to call the "communist threat."

We encounter the communist threat in the Cold War, and surely all intelligent Canadians know that communism is the enemy. Yet, if we are to believe Sycamore, Canadians are so dull that they must be alerted by the act of outlawing the Communist Party, and this at the risk of infringing upon our

fundamental freedoms. Perhaps what is most ludicrous about Sycamore's document is his naive identification of "democracy" and "capitalism." Need I point out that this is not a necessary association, that capitalism is not necessarily the best of all possible social structures, and that it is slightly smug, if not reactionary, for us to think so? If there is anything in this conflicting world to which we must cling, it is the idea that we can and will change, if change is for the good.

ACCEPT THE COLD WAR

This resiliency is needed to keep communism from becoming an internal problem, to keep it "out there," as an international issue. And this is to accept the Cold War as a fact. We must accordingly grapple with this and understand its implications. And one of its overwhelming implications is involved in the question, how can a Cold War be won? If there were any clearcut answer to this, the Cold War might be over. Yet, there is a clear-cut answer in Sycamore's quotation from Lenin to which Sycamore tacitly gives his consent. The Cold War will be won when "a funeral dirge will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over capitalism." But the fact is, and it is a wonder that Sycamore did not consider this when he so blandly accepted Lenin's challenge, that if a funeral dirge is to be sung, there will be nobody left to sing it.

So, Sycamore, in seeking the causes of the hellishness of this Age, let us not blame only the communist, for surely the international antagonism involves both sides mutually as "deadly and dedicated enemies." And, readers, remember this, that when the buttons are pushed, and when the missiles hiss, and when the sirens moan, and when the bombs burst, the guilt is upon us all, every single one.

Yours truly,
B.G.S.

Socialist rises to the bait

Dear Mr. Brandon:

In FORUM, Nov. 17, you expressed the hope someone would reply to your arguments and perhaps refute them. As a member of the New Democratic Party and CUCND, both of which you said would fail in the attainment of their goal of nuclear disarmament, I wish to try not only to refute your argument, but to replace it with a constructive alternative. I should point out, however, that I do not speak for the two organizations concerned, but merely am expressing an individual belief.

You said in your article we cannot ban the bomb, and the reason for this is that we do not really want to. Because our dull lives have to be kept interesting, we need the bomb, and with it the threat of annihilation, as much as we need arguments, difference of opinion, debates, fisticuffs, music, song and sex. And because even ban-the-bombers want this excitement, you conclude, they are beaten before they start.

FISTICUFFS FINE

Before attempting to dis-

prove your assertion, let me first agree that life is made more exciting and interesting by differences. Debates and arguments are productive, they aid us in the attainment of truth and are thus useful. It is true we need them. Music contributes to happiness—it is the food of love—and even fisticuffs are good, being an entertaining test of skill, and in no way concerning hatred. Because these are all conducive to human happiness, you are quite right in saying we cannot abolish them. But then you morbidly add that for this same desire for diversion, we cannot abolish the threat of war either. Why not?

War is man's worst, most destructive enemy. It solves nothing; it merely destroys. And nuclear war is the worst of all possible wars, ultimate in killing power and criminal content.

Surely no thinking human can want the atomic holocaust which threatens. And surely by simple common sense no one can condone the fiery sword of Damocles which now hangs over our head. Do you

want the bomb? Of course not.

You say the bomb cannot be wished away. This is precisely why our movement is in existence. We will not succeed by wishing, but we at least have a chance of succeeding through action. This is why I and others like me are willing to stick out our necks and take a stand on this vital issue.

BLATANT HYPOCRISY

A stronger United Nations, with a world police force of some form will, I feel, give valuable leadership in the attainment of a workable disarmament. The rule of international law must be established, that world opinion and action may be mobilized against such blatant hypocrisy as the USSR's fifty megaton murder. Canada can play a great role here.

For this reason I do not suggest that the United States disarm unilaterally. This would achieve nothing if the Reds were still armed. It is vital, however, that no more nations

(Continued on page 11)

What's wrong with engineers?

—Nazaza

What's wrong with the Engineers?

Believe me, I am not the only one who has been finding an answer to this question. In fact, I first heard it during a football game (in the gridiron). It was an occasion when policemen were busy throwing out lusty and enterprising engineers for throwing snow-balls at the referees.

But this is not all. Indeed, the question was an expression of a pent-up feeling of utter disgust for all the "sin" of the engineers. I followed this up, and I am convinced there is something wrong with them.

You see, all the engineers I interviewed shamelessly agreed they sort of constitute themselves into an exclusive block on campus for reason of "tradi-

tion." Oh! they say it's traditional in "all" universities for engineers to look differently, behave differently, and talk differently. But the point is: are universities created for people to go in and form cliques, or are they meant to be the "melting-pot" of all men and all knowledge, where inter-mixing is in fact a primary motive?

PICADILLY PROMOTERS

In any event, I am convinced universities were not created because degrees could be obtained there. If it were so, the Picadilly promoters of London could easily have sent in some smart chimpanzee to graduate in "antics" and drama.

Quite apart from the stories that we hear about the engineers' stag parties—where they freely graduate in the University of Bacchus and show their

"striptease films"—it is indisputable they are of all students the most self-opinionated. They never seem to think any other faculty matters but theirs.

The only inference we can draw from this is that engineers cannot figure out what is meant by "learning a trade" and being truly "educated." It could be a disillusionment of economic stability upon graduation, that makes them feel this way. But they should not be so sure these days! What we would advise them to be sure of is the invaluable benefits of a liberal education, acquired only through inter-mixtures, a friendly association with students of all nationalities, and a down-to-earth reversion towards broad-mindedness in all spheres. I don't see how else they may be redeemed, believe it or not!

RANZHY

