

More Letters: Vant And Aid

(Continued From Page 2)

dumped. My sorrow is in truth double, for if you really do look like me you need sympathy badly.

John Lauder

Ed. Note: You probably meant "dinged" when you said "dunged", John, but I'll let it go because it swings in so neatly behind Irving's "fecal matter" and Ralph's "guano."

EARTHY END NOTE

To The Editor:

I note with interest that the writer of your front page article in The Gateway of Oct. 26 identifies J. W. Pickersgill as the "author of a Mackenzie King autobiography".

I should be glad to know if the same correspondent could identify the authors of any other King autobiographies, and perhaps even reveal who wrote King's diary?

Your faithfully,
Nicholas Wickenden

Ed. Note: A Gateway sleuth has uncovered the disturbing fact that a pink plot is fermenting on campus. It was an enemy agent who added the "auto" to the "biography." Subversion in our midst; demoralization in our ranks. Arise, young freedomites, and save us!

AN ATHEIST'S RESPECT

To The Editor:

Because girls have feelings, dear Old Fashioned, do not think that they have a monopoly. I am male. There are many points in your letter that I could knock, but I shall only take a few.

I am an atheist but I have enough respect for religion to believe that a woman who has lost her virginity prior to the wedding should not have a white wedding. Sex—true sex—does not tarnish with age; in fact the more one knows, the more experience one has, the more beautiful it becomes. (Do not forget the word LOVE.) So when you say marriage with all its routine must have something new, this only shows me how immature you must be.

You said something about "Sexual Privilege" in connection with marriage. You must be real gone! We are not animals, that marriage is a license for sex. When I marry, I shall marry because I want to share the rest of my days with the woman I love, among other reasons. Marriage is sharing; is give and take. The impression that I get from your letter that you think that sex is just for the male. Not on your life!

You made a point that is fairly good, "How long will a boy's love last?" I think most girls can tell if a boy is in love with them or not, and if they are also in love with him it will be up to them both to make sure that love grows—otherwise it will wither and die. Sex is no joy by itself. Be sure he loves you; then be sure that you love him; then take care.

Unconvinced

Ed. Note: Now tell me, lad, have you actually HAD sexual-intercourse, or are you just up in the clouds—like me?

PHILANTHROPY DAMNED

One of the major points brought out in the debate between John Barr and Robin Hunter was the question of foreign aid.

Both debaters advocated foreign aid as a means of fighting communism, although in different ways.

However both methods have as an end, the raising of the world's standard of living. It would seem reasonable to assume that in raising the standard of living they would raise it to, eventually, the highest level at that particular time.

Obviously they have not considered the consequences. If, for example, all nations were using copper at the same per capita rate as the United States, the world supply of copper, including deposits now con-

sidered uneconomical to develop, would be entirely depleted in five years. A similar situation exists with other minerals.

Let us cease this suicidal humanitarian circle. I do not look forward to the possibility of living in a cave.

Flintstone

Ed. Note: Yes indeed, let's all hurry and knock the copper bottom out of our imprudent humanitarian notions lest they undermine our morality, our sanity, our luxury, our debauchery. Wouldn't it be far more realistic (and a shorter route to the cave) to just use a few of our surplus bombs and eliminate the need for foreign aid?

DANCING BUREAUCRACY

Through the Editor

To John Burns
Chairman of Scheduling Activities

Dear John,

In regard to your letter in the Gateway of October 12 and our letter of October 5, we would like to clarify our remarks with regard to your committee. Let us re-examine the situation.

Last spring, October 5 and 27 were the dates requested by ourselves and confirmed by you for the first two Residence Dances. As there has been no conflict in the 61-62 year between our Residence Dances and the other open university dances, and as we had received no word to the contrary from your committee, we naturally assumed no conflicts this year as well. It was much to our amazement that one week before our first dance we discovered Bicuspid Bounce on Oct. 5 and the Engineering dance on Oct. 27.

We approached you desiring to change these dates to Oct. 12 (also the date for a Pogo Dance) for our first dance and Oct. 26 for our second.

Later the Block "A" Club realized that it had a dance scheduled for the Saturday of Thanksgiving Weekend, a date when many of their members were away. They apparently went to you, asking for a re-schedule. You then came to us asking to change our new dance date, Oct. 12 with their Oct. 6, plus plans of a football weekend for Oct. 12 and 13. We then agreed to change back to our first proposed date because we had the understanding that if there was not the Block "A" dance on Oct. 12, a Phys. Ed. dance would be held for the football weekend.

We decided to revert back to our first date because competing with the "Bicuspid Bounce" was the lesser of the two evils.

This was the final arrangement. In assessing the sequence of events, we would like to make the following points.

1. The scheduling committee did not inform us of a dance conflict. Despite this conflict, two dates, Oct. 13 and 26, were originally open with no scheduled dances. Could our dances not have been shifted to these dates? Is this competent scheduling?

2. We could not exchange our date (Oct. 12) with the Block "A" because very few men remain in residence over the Thanksgiving weekend. We had to either compete with a football and Pogo dance, cancel our dance, or compete with the Bounce. We chose the latter.

Though the Block "A" predicament was no fault of yours, we felt that they should have been made aware of the fact that their dance fell on the Saturday of Thanksgiving Weekend. The remainder of the onus rests on them.

This is the content of our grievance and we feel it no longer needs to be debated.

Yours truly,
The Men's Residence House Committee

Ed. Note: Now please, fellas, let it rest.



An American Protests

Kennedy's Cuba Crisis

By Dr. Charles Hobart

Dr. Charles Hobart is an American who comes to the U of A from Redlands, California. He is an assistant professor of Sociology. This is his first year here.

If we are to believe an Edmonton Journal report, Dr. Hobart is distinctly out of step with his fellow Americans as he protests Kennedy's latest Cuba moves.

* * *

Many people look at the Cuban crisis and see only Russia. I want to comment from the perspective of Cuba's predicament, a predicament which America created, and which makes available to Russia the role of defender of the underdog.

The Cuban crisis should be evaluated from a moral as well as from a physical danger perspective. From either one the American policy appears difficult to justify.

Morally speaking the following points seem relevant. Has the United States supplied nuclear armaments to small nations on Russia's borders? Certainly: to Turkey, for one. The justification appears to be that Turkey is so weak by contrast with the USSR that the threat of nuclear retaliation could provide an adequate defense against possible Russian invasion.

But precisely the same reasons support the Cuban quest for rockets. And Cuba has added justification. The US did instigate one abortive invasion effort; it is again a staging area for groups preparing a new assault; it is the scene of a general clamoring that Castro be unseated, whatever the cost.

Castro certainly has a moral right to defend his regime against this threat. Indeed, America has driven him to the only source of arms available to him—the Russian sphere—and to the only armament adequate to the magnitude of the threat—a nuclear one. It is thus a defense which he is justified in seeking, if he is justified in defending himself at all.

BATISTA WAS BAD TOO

The suggestion that he is not morally justified in attempting to defend his regime because it is dictatorial collapses, given the fact that the US sustained the equally dictatorial Batista regime for years.

But should not Castro be satisfied with Russian guarantees of Cuban territorial integrity when these are backed by Russian-based rockets? No, because Russia cannot be trusted: her ends, at some future date, might be better served by sacrificing Cuba, just as she once not only failed to honor such a treaty with Poland, but joined Germany in partitioning Poland. Castro's wish to have closer physical control of the rocket deterrent on which his survival probably depends is understandable. It appears unlikely, however, that the USSR will fail to insist on some control.

How to prevent irresponsible usage of these rockets is an urgent and vexing problem. Unfortunately it is one which the US has created by seeking the downfall of Castro in the first place.

The US is protesting the threat to world peace involved in Russian supplied defences to a sovereign nation located eighty miles from her shores. This can only seem hypocritical, when the US has insisted

on her right to supply arms to Nationalist Chinese, troops on Quemoy and Matsu, which are located within five miles off Chinese Communist territory.

Moreover, Kennedy's timing of the blockade crisis, coincides precisely with the closing days of a hard fought Congressional election. This appears to some as irresponsible risking of world annihilation for partisan political gain.

KILLED BY WHOSE ROCKET?

From the perspective of physical danger, one may ask: "Would you rather be killed by a Cuban-based rocket or by a Russian-based rocket?" "Are you prepared to go to war to defend your right to be killed only by a rocket launched from Russia? Russian achievements in rocketry development and space exploration strongly suggest that Russia does not need Cuban bases to devastate any part of North America.

America should draw slim consolation from the support of the Organization of American States. Even US State Department experts acknowledge that the majority of Latin American countries are moving rapidly toward Castro-style agrarian revolutions. A unanimously pro-American OAS vote today may only



The time has come, my friends, to recognize the hidden but utter genius of some students. The one I speak of is named Jim Park. He will likely go down in varsity history as a hero of the Engineering Wars.

Mr. Park, through means unknown to us, managed to get the ESS to print in their "newspaper," The Getaway, one of the most vicious criticisms of the engineers ever written. This was done despite full knowledge of inevitable retaliation.

Mr. Park has also expressed the wish that those engineers unable to read, refrain from questioning him regarding their classification.

After reading the disgusting material printed in the Getaway, I wonder why some of the more intelligent engineers allow such guano to be made public in their name.

Discussions at the recent leadership seminar did not include two of the newest groups on campus. These groups are the Birch Johns Society for the Preservation of Wooden Toilet Seats and the University of Alberta Autombomb Society.

The aforementioned seminar did discuss one topic of pertinent interest—that being co-ed residences. Delegates chose to ignore the fact that all bats live co-ed style.

Cousin Bertram tells me that Ragdoll Emily, of recent UFC fame, is planning to attend the Wauneita formal in the company of SUB president D. E. Jenkins. This should keep things lively on the reception line.

P.S. I would like to know how many nurses, having attended last Saturday's dance in the company of engineers, are now thankful for Dr. Vant's lectures.

anger a heavy anti-American vote in five or ten years: the governments welcomed Nixon, but the Latin American students, "leaders of tomorrow", often jeered him.

As an American I am especially distressed by the way the American position must appear to the "neutralists," the African, Near Eastern, and Far Eastern countries. Khrushchev's taunt: "We do not need Cuban bases in order to wipe you off the map" must sound convincing to them in view of Russian space achievements.

They saw us stand idle during the tragic Hungarian uprising and again during the building of the Berlin wall. They have heard of the \$800 million US investment in Cuba which Castro expropriated (in retaliation against US economic sanctions); they know of American concern to safeguard investments abroad. To what do they attribute our taking a "firm stand" now?

TOO LATE TO ASK?

It is too late, and yet, with further Latin American revolutions in prospect it is not too late, to ask: could this not all have been averted? It could have been, I think, but only if certain things had been taken into consideration.

It is time the US learned the lessons suggested by Orwell's description in "1984" of "the Five Minute Hate," by the benefits Red China reaped from jumping into the Korean War, by Mexican revolutionary expropriation of US oil interests in the 1930s. Every new revolutionary regime is confronted with the problem of consolidating its position, of winning the emotionalized support of a partly hostile populace. This is best done by fomenting fear and hatred of an outside enemy.

And it is one of the prices of power, of a heritage of gunboat diplomacy, and of "economic imperialism" that the "Colossus of the North" is ready-made for the role of outside enemy. Thus, the friendship of a revolutionary country will always be hard won; the US will have two strikes against her from the outset.

The US needs to learn that revolutionaries will probably expropriate her investments quite regularly when they take over. Revolutionaries reason that the masses of people had no voice in permitting these investments in the first place; that heavy profits have been made through exploiting resources, including ill-paid native labor; that the investment has usually been amortized many times over, and so it "rightly" belongs to "the people". These arguments have much of justice, if not of legality, in support of them.

The "two strikes" against the US could have been offset had there been awareness. As a nation which had earned enmity by facilitating the brutality of Batista the US needed to make a significant and generous gesture if it wanted Cuban friendship. To have abandoned the obsolete Guantanamo Bay Naval Base and donated its facilities to the establishment of a new university would have been such a gesture. It would have been one appropriate to the supernaturalistic sensibilities of a young revolutionary country.

It is ironic that America's bungling response to the Cuban revolution has given Khrushchev the opportunity to make an offer which furthers—very slightly—international arms control, at the expense of the US "defense" establishment in Turkey.