YAF’s Fake

To the News:

Last Thursday evening, December 4, 1969, I attended the meeting of the YAF group, in which Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick was presented via tape recording. (Because of a very cunning advertisement many of us attendants believed that the speech was to be presented by the speaker in person.)

The session lasted nearly an hour, and of this fuzzily reproduced speech, I heard very clearly, in constant repetition, the word “Communist,” and its association. The number of references made to Communism, Communists, etc., seemed to occur every other word.

I began thinking about how easily and loosely the speaker, (and, for that matter, it is for all Americans,) to brand the title of “Communist” on anyone. This “anyone” is, of course a person, group, party, etc., who may hold opinions and have thoughts that shy away from the normal “democratic ideals.”

Democracy, as we all know, stresses the right to dissent and minority rights. It so happens that we Americans get disturbed by anyone with differing ideas, and are so preoccupied with the idea that the dissenter is working with underground elements, that we shout “Communist!” or “Red!”

Because of this, the word “Communist” has become our national obsession; subsequently, I feel that clearer views and distinctions should be made, as there are deprecations in allowing this flaunting and branding to persist.

For one, the evilness and negativity of the words “Communist” or “Communism” tend to agitate suspicion. Suspicion can become so acute that mistrust of mankind tends to prevail. The primary example is the McCarthy trials of the 50s.

Societies and organizations get up on premises of keeping America free employ the psychological method of indoctrination which tends to only perpetuate suspicion—which I feel above all ingrains hate.

Another point of concern is that, if we dismiss all dissent as a “Communist plot” or an underground movement to overthrow the government, we may tend to ignore the fact that legitimate discontent does exist in America.

This is not to say, however, that Americans would prefer not to know about the discontent, but rather that indoctrination of the evils of Communism and its association to dissenters serves to blind Americans to any other problem.

I believe that, if this practice continues, that our society, indeed, will become “ill” from its self-made sickness.

Patricia A. Gignac

Involvement

To the News:

What propels man to commit himself to a situation? Aggression