

BOMB BANNING - NOT WITH A BANG

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

I wish to submit the following for the Forum column. It might properly appear as a letter, however I feel that it is perhaps a little long for that section. I do not consider myself a crank, however I am sick—sick to observe how little we have advanced in the ten thousand years since we decided that it might be easier to walk rather than go swinging through the trees. I hope that you publish this because I hope that there is someone who can satisfactorily refute my arguments.

Yours sincerely,
D. Brandon
Arts and Science 2

Your features article on "Ban the Bomb" of Friday last presents a rather loosely-knit and obviously one-sided viewpoint. If your reporters have failed to unearth any arguments against nuclear disarmament, then perhaps the reason is that they are blinded by the obvious. On behalf of those whom you imply are "dull and incoherent", let me say we're with you! We fervently do not wish to be

incinerated by the bomb. We shudder to think of the wasteland which would follow and we are recoiled by the thought of the bestial freaks which the survivors would sire. However I'm afraid that the "Bomb", like Communism, is a fact which cannot be wished away. Even if the concrete manifestations of an idea or a creation are, for all practical purposes "abolished", the idea

behind the form cannot be abolished. We can no more abolish the knowledge needed to produce the "Bomb" than we can abolish the motives for using it.

The "Bomb" represents another, perhaps the final, stage of development in the history of the military weapons. Ever since that day when Cain allegedly smashed the skull of his brother with a rock snatched from the field, we have improved our weapons, each becoming a little more subtle than the last, although the result was always the same. From the bow and arrow came the crossbow and from the blunderbuss came the machine-gun. Our science gods have finally attained perfection—they provide our leaders with the means to blow Everyone to hell. Progress!! The bow and arrow could no more be abolished

than could the rock in the hand of Cain; the "Bomb" can no more be abolished than war.

Let's be honest with ourselves. Do we really want to abolish the "Bomb"? No. We complex human beings could no more live without our arguments and debates, fisticuffs and riots and our wars than we could live without our music and song and sex. The slow grind of our daily lives, the utopian's picture of sweetness and light, drive us to madness. In argument and in warfare just as in music and in sex, we are diverted. It is the diversion that makes us happy; we love to argue for peace but we hate to live in peace. To abolish the "Bomb", we would have to abolish war and riots and the debate and the suburban backfence bickering. Impossible!

I commend your paper on its attempts to reveal some of the implications of nuclear warfare. Good luck to them and to the CUCND and the CCCRH and the Voice of Women and the New Democratic Party. You have my blessings. Please argue and cajole, bicker and debate, march and riot. But, please, do not be disillusioned; you cannot succeed because you do not want to.

It has been said that man has it in him to make his life on this earth a heaven or hell depending on his actions.

See the fireball,
It is a bright fireball,
It is searing my eyeballs out,
Why is it searing my eyeballs out?
Well, anyone for a whole lot of hell? . . .

NFCUS TODAY... AND TOMORROW

By Walter F. McLean, National President, NFCUS

"I consider the National Federation of Canadian University Students particularly important because it officially represents the student council in each university and they in turn represent all of the students within the university; this without regard to politics, class or creed, but on an official representative basis." President N. A. M. MacKenzie of the University of British Columbia has continued throughout the years to feel that Canadian students should think for themselves in a national sense, and that they should act together in their own behalf. Men in business and government across the country have shown their concern and interest in the Federation. Why are the most ardent supporters of NFCUS often outside the Federation while its members often condemn and criticize it? In the next few weeks the National Secretariat hopes to answer some of the questions which NFCUS members may have concerning their Federation, and to work for informed members rather than misinformed or uninformed ones.

Our Federation represents 38 Canadian universities and close to 100,000 students. Ninety-five percent of the students of this country belong to the Federation and have an active voice in determining its politics. There is no doubt that NFCUS has the interests of the students at heart. Why? Because the ideas implemented by the National Secretariat come from the local campuses through representatives, usually the student president to the National Congress, and not out of thin air. Our current series of memos will include articles by individuals on the National Executive and National Secretariat on various aspects of the policies and programme of NFCUS. International Affairs, Finance, Travel, Scholarships, National Affairs, Executive Duties and Co-ordinating Activities will be outlined—resolutions which Canadian students have made for themselves. We are hoping that you will share our concern for the Federation and will show sympathy for the job we are trying to do.

Problems arise mainly because of a lack of liaison—between Councils and Council Presidents; between the Councils and local NFCUS Committees; between Editors and Councils. Student leaders and undergraduates alike often ask such questions as "What is NFCUS?"; "What do I get out of NFCUS?"; "What does NFCUS do?"; "The Federation is often seen as an organization which attempts to invade the precinct of the campus. But surely the main point has been missed. NFCUS is an entire campus! It is only through

informed members and their representatives—the Students' Council—that the above questions can be answered adequately and satisfactorily.

We will attempt to tell you first of all what is planned for the year, so that you will know in advance of the many projects and benefits which NFCUS offers its members. Next, we will outline "The State of the Union"—what our Federation is and what it stands for. Canadian students tend to be basically self-centered, with a pronounced lack of concern for matters not bound up with their own immediate environment. The student should be encouraged to develop wider responsibilities arising from his position as a member of a university community that knows no frontiers and as a citizen in a democratic state. He can begin by doing his part as a NFCUS member—by learning about his Federation, and then by upholding and selling it. Can we count on your support, your interest and your efforts—to publicize NFCUS and to offer constructive criticism of its progress and policies? The Federation is as strong as its weakest unit! It's a pity that weakness is often little more than ignorance.

Forum, an innovation this term, is a space in which students may present their views in the form of editorials. Controversial submissions, especially those bordering upon libel, will be given first consideration.

Writers are asked to submit their "editorials" typed double spaced. All submission must be signed. If anonymity is required, articles must be enclosed in envelopes addressed to the editor-in-chief and marked "confidential."

COMMUNISTS, CORRY, AND CITIZEN SYCAMORE

In a recent issue of The Gateway, Sycamore admonishes us to be on guard against communist permeation. Before moving to set up shifts of watches, this Citizen thinks it only practical to pause a moment and identify the enemy more exactly.

Obviously, anyone who seriously threatens us with annihilation can reasonably be regarded as an enemy. Mr. Khrushchev and the American Press would like us to believe we are so threatened by Mr. Khrushchev and his bombs. Well, are we? Only by him and his? In any case, Mr. Khrushchev could hardly permeate any faculty unrecognized, particularly if he were tagging a load of bombs after him. The persons actually in control of world affairs are not directly available to us on this campus so when we speak of immediate and personal guarding we must concern ourselves with people within reach.

Sycamore claims Communists are The Enemy. What is a Communist? A Communist must be defined as one who adheres to or accepts Communism. But in order to identify him objectively in the real world, we must determine what overt symptoms or characteristics he will show.

First we must examine the meaning of the word "Communism". What is Communism? Is it an economic theory? Is it a distinct organized body? Is it a nation state? A culture? A philosophy? Is it a mystic union of persons having a certain not-too-specific something in common?

Examining my own conception of Communism, I find an irrational hodge-podge of brain-washing, "1984", 50,000,000 (500,000? 500,000,000? 50,000 . . . ?) megaton bombs, dim grey communes, the human-type acquaintances of Dr. Zhivago and a short, stout, shouting man with a shoe in one hand—the whole with a connotation of comparatively mild horror. Such a concept does not have a high yield of fact supported by evidence. My "evidence" for

whatever "facts" there may be is to be found in summaries and opinions in such magazines as Newsweek and MacLeans and in press reports in daily papers. Was the press reliable in its reporting on Cuba? Such an eminent personage as Prime Minister MacMillan questioned the reliability of the press in the Berlin Crisis. Then how am I to know how much of this "evidence" is reliable? This Citizen's opinion is that some is and some isn't. What proportion is which? How will I ever know?

Passing from the question of what Communism IS, this Citizen would ask if there are degrees of adherence to and acceptance of whatever it is that Communism is. There seem to be schisms within this fold as within others. The Trotskyites and Leninists are bitterly opposed on what they consider to be important points of doctrine. Which is more Communist? Marshall Tito's behaviour, the old reports of various purges behind the iron curtain, and the report of the recent student demonstration at Moscow University to permit free speech to peace marchers, would indicate that Communists vary in their degree of commitment to the Russian Regime endure totalitarianism. Which is and the extent to which they will more Communist, Malenkov or Khrushchev? Is the Russian Oligarchy an expression of pure Communism? Peking at times would disagree. Which is more Communist?

At the same time, lest our guards

become our governors, we must determine what they are to guard; that is, what they are TO PRESERVE.

I assume we all want to preserve our liberal constitutional democracy, much as it is outlined and examined in the 650 pages of L. J. Corry's Democratic Government & Politics (1951 Edition). Bearing in mind Dr. Corry's comments on Freedom under the Law (pp. 437-440), should we then pass a law making it a felony to belong to the Communist party? A nice, objective category but not too effective unless we could somehow persuade all communists to join the party. Should we legislate against BEING a Communist? This would be extremely dangerous without a definition including a more objectively determinable criterion than an accused's "awareness".

Should we take the ban on Communism into a less formal area of enforcement and ostracize Communists, denying them employment, companionship, etc.? Again, how do we recognize them? Possibly we could gouge out their eyes and if they grew two new ones take this as an indication that they had not been reading Communist literature. And what of those Communists who had not been reading Red papers recently enough and grew new eyes anyway? Also, the poor wretches in the Slavonic Languages Department who read Russian books as part of their job?

The word "Communist" has become a derogatory epithet. It has become to many of us synonymous with "bad," "evil" and "enemy." Regardless of whether or not this is morally justifiable, it hardly helps clear thinking. The Russian and Chinese totalitarian governments are Communist. Therefore, they are evil. This is a circular statement. They may indeed be evil, but why are they evil? Does it follow that all Communists are evil? Does it follow that ONLY Communists are evil? Does it follow that ONLY Communists are threatening our democracy?

What else are we threatened by? It has been said that we are threatened by an idea. What idea? The idea of some people that they want enough to eat? The idea that North Americans should not be a privileged

(Continued On Page 7)