

If communism is a threat to freedom

In a continuing policy of encouraging dialogue on pressing international issues, a student has marvelled us with his unusually, if not extreme view of global affairs. The man has a window to the world for sure; - and we hope that perhaps next issue his article will be balanced out with yet another contribution from a student or professor with a diametric approach. One cautionary note: any similarity of the author's comments to official 'Brunswickan editorial policy' is purely coincidental and altogether highly unlikely.

By THOMAS OLADIPO OJOWURO
STU [Pol. Science]

I was once travelling in a railway carriage in West Germany which was marked 'Nicht Raucher' (No Smoking). Four young men got in and lighted cigarettes (sic), and two women who had not previously been smoking lighted up as well. One old man showed them the 'Nicht Raucher' notice. One of the two women smoking, an amazon, looked at the old man in the face and said, "Six of us, two of you; that notice is cancelled. This is a democratic country, don't spoil our pleasure".

It is a widely held view that under democracy there must be freedom of the press

That was that woman's idea of democracy, but it was not mine and it was not that of the train guard who arrived on time to personally put out the cigarettes. He said that regulations must be obeyed and that liberty should not be taken for licence under democracy. Many people think that there is no limit to freedom under democracy. They do not know that too much freedom can lead to no freedom. The most dangerous threat to freedom in the Free World is communism. If it is true that communism is a threat to freedom, how can it be stopped?

Some writers have recognized three kinds of freedoms: Natural, Acquired and Circumstantial. All these freedoms are enjoyed by people living under the liberal democracy. In this article, I shall only concern myself with the circumstantial freedom which, if not limited, may result in the death of the liberal democracy.

The circumstantial freedom encompasses all the things concerned with the pursuit of happiness. The right to form political parties, which are the basis of modern governments, comes under this kind of freedom. As much as I know, this right to form political parties has done much to weaken the liberal democracy in this century. I am saying this because this right has so far given the enemies of democracy the opportunity to form political parties whose ideas are opposed to real democracy.

The communist, fascist and the so-called Socialist parties are examples of such parties, and of these, the communist party is the most threatening. Wherever it forces its way to power, the first duty a communist party carries out is to ban all

non-communist parties operating within the country. It does not believe that any other party should exist besides itself. It calls itself a "democratic" party since, under it, the proletariat "dictates". Who does not know that under Communism only the communist leaders count? Recently, there was some talk about the Italian Communist Party's practice of "democratic centralism", or allowing unlimited, open and public debate on all matters within the party. Does that mean that that party will tolerate other parties if it comes to power in Italy? Who does not know that the communists are very clever at inventing valueless theoretical concepts.

My suggestion here is that the right to form political parties under the liberal democracy should be limited to the right to form those parties whose ideologies are inherently liberal and democratic. If necessary, any communist agitation should either be 'caged' or allowed to emigrate to the Soviet Union where he or she will be free to practise communism.



My next target is the press. It is a widely held view that under democracy there must be freedom of the press. Does it mean that the press should have access to every information about executive and legislative actions? I am not one of these people who dogmatically believe that the press must be able to dig out every information about government activities. Such a freedom will be too extreme and could lead to the collapse of a country.

Suppose the press in one particular country, say the United States, had a free access to all military installations in that country, would that be good or detrimental to the security of the United States? That would undoubtedly be detrimental to the security of the Super power.

The reason is that the press is so

competitive that the first journalist who sets his eyes on a new weapon will employ all his power of journalistic monophobia to describe the nature of the weapon. The next day, a headline in the New York Times might read: "New in our arsenal; The Big Pawpaw. Uranium 234 bomb yields 40 KT."

That headline alone has already described the shape, function and content of that weapon and the enemies of the U.S. would quickly react to this information by either producing or purchasing this kind of bomb and possibly one with a more terrible fission yield.

The same detriment would visit the security of West Germany if the Sud Deutsche Zeitung were to report: "The 39th Armoured Brigade under General Eisenbahn is now the backbone of our army. It is equipped with 1000 of our most modern Leopard tanks, each of which mounts a 120 mm gun and an American made Shillelagh missile. From its location 2 miles NNE of Kiel, this Brigade can blast its way into East Berlin within 24 hours." Again, the communist enemies will rejoice at this kind of press revelation and improve both their offensive and defensive capability.

The free world needs political leaders like Nixon to deal with communism otherwise the much cherished freedom will soon vanish

Besides military and other secrets which must be hidden from the press, there are information which a hostile press can use to destroy an executive. I have to cite Nixon's case here. He was, like myself, strongly anti-communist. That Watergate breakin would not have resulted in his downfall had the American press and other forms of media not magnified his "complicity" in that unfortunate incident. The free world needs political leaders like Nixon to deal with communism otherwise the much-cherished freedom will soon vanish. Two years after his fall, Richard Nixon now lives in seclusion on his San Clemente Estate. Will he ever forgive the press?

Free world workers

The right to strike, although hardly expressed in any modern constitutions, is claimed by any worker in the free world today. It is a right whose claim depends on circumstances. However, I must point out that this right has been over-exercised under the liberal democracy.

Nobody questions the right of workers to strike but I do not think that this liberty should be taken for licence to organize illegal and crippling strikes. The picket lines formed under the liberal democracy in one year, if constructed into a single line, will probably run from Boston to Zurich, a distance of 6012 Kilometres!

Strikes have two immediate consequences: first they dislocate economic

business and secondly, they often than not, now the most dangerous function they serve as fertile ground for the germination of communism.

The 1917 Communist Revolution followed the widest which occurred in any country. Communist strikes to their advantage has seen many workers strikes and have been infiltrated then can these communist be stopped?

...strikes will & communists sowing their seeds sooner or later collapse

The only way to educate workers and prevent the consequences of such necessary legislation. Unless this is done, occur and communism sowing their seeds later lead to the collapse.

The right to pursue happiness have so far been exploited. While it has brought happiness to some, maximum destruction is living under the rule of the few. Whereas Thomas H. Merton's drunkenness and intemperance are those things which are forbidden, and John Nature - primitive state. "Though this be a state of licence, not a state of licence, the state has an uncivilized disposition of his person. The state has not liberty to liberal democracy state of exile of the state of assume new dimensions that the state of nature.

But the most

function of strikes

serve as fertile

the germ

communism

Under the liberal democracy, enjoy life is today not to defend the territory. enjoyment will take the past, nobody wants to live in such days. Some of those days, army may claim derelict to refuse to serve during the communist era. democracy?