



APATHY HITS THE KLAN!

Nu-Clear Or Not Nu-Clear . . .

Canada's two major political parties are in the process of taking a firm stand on what is probably Canada's most significant issue since the conscription crisis of World War II.

Lester B. Pearson, leader of the Liberals has made it clear that his party is opposed to the acquisition of nuclear arms for Canadian troops. On the other hand newly-appointed Minister of Defense, Douglas Harkness has come out strongly in favour of the acquisition of such weapons, although this is not yet definite or official policy of the government. Prime Minister Diefenbaker has often spoken in support of the latter view. Hence the adoption of such a policy by the Conservative Party is imminent.

The important thing about this situation is not the relative merits of the two views: nuclear weapons or not. Rather it is the fact that the two 'big parties' of Canadian politics have finally taken opposing stands on an issue of gravest importance to our nation.

For years now the public has scoffed that there was no distinction between Liberals and

Conservatives. To a large degree this was correct.

In the past, the Tories were looked to as the upholders of our close ties with Britain and also the party of high tariffs. The Liberals held the opposing opinion that Canada should seek more autonomy and that tariffs should be lower.

However, over the years the two parties converged to a middle-of-the-road policy intended to be all things to all people. Only on local or temporary issues was there any distinction.

But now the battle lines have been drawn. Positions have been taken on the most significant issue which faces our society today, that of defense. Let no one say henceforth that both parties are the same.

The box-score for nuclear weapons for Canada stands: Conservatives in favor, Liberals opposed. The public now has a basis on which to make a choice between the two major political parties.

Allus 'Agin 'Em

There is an oft-told story about a newspaperman sent to interview an oldtimer who was celebrating his 95th birthday. The reporter said, "Sir, over your long life you have seen many changes come about." "Yes," replied the old man, "and I was 'agin every one of them."

We used to laugh at that old man, and pity him for his narrowness of view. But looking around our world today, we're not so sure he wasn't right.

We live in an age dominated by the belief that change is necessarily progress. In our cultural and sensory tastes, in our technology, in our politics, we hurry to the new.

This attitude has raised materialism to the status of a social religion, carried us to the brink of nuclear annihilation, and punched government fingers into most areas of individual effort. Perhaps we should be 'agin' more of this "progress".

REFLECTIONS

Freedom is a matter of choice. Pun intended.

The word 'free' applies only to persons engaged in some activity that involves choice. It is nonsense for instance to speak of a free country or a free election, unless you are a poet. Poets can say anything and mean it.

There are roughly speaking three kinds of situation involving choice: those involving no choice, in the sense that the decision is determined by factors outside the control of the person; those involving definite choice, in the sense that two or more actions are indicated, and the person determines which it shall be and lastly those involving indefinite choice, in the sense that any action whatever is possible.

It seems clear that if there is no choice, there is no freedom; and if there is a definite choice, there is. But if there is indefinite choice? Merely being human sets limits to human choice, but within these limits the choice is very wide indeed.

If it doesn't matter what, if anything, you choose to do, does it make sense to speak of choice? It appears nonsense to me. But if there is no choice, there is no freedom. So too much choice is as bad as none.

I discovered the other day that the 'ideal sweetheart' of the male is singular, and the 'ideal lover' of the female is plural. This seems hard to reconcile with the philandering tendency of the male, and the apparent lack of it in the female. Unless I am deceived and idealistic, and the actual state of affairs is the other way about, in which case the puzzle disappears.

But there is no puzzle that cannot be solved, and herewith I offer a solution to this one which may be right.

If the male's ideal is singular, is it really surprising that he is forever

trying to find the one woman that conforms to the ideal? And if the woman's ideal is plural, is it surprising that she should be satisfied with whatever man she ends up with?

Wouldn't it be lovely if we had a machine to do our thinking for us. I don't mean the kind that are glorified adding machines. I mean one that could write essays for us, discover mathematical proofs for us, invent a new way of thinking about physics for us. We won't ever have one.

All machines, even the most complicated computers, have to be told what to do. Step by step: First do this, then do that, then do another thing. Somewhere along the line you get the result.

Try constructing a step by step procedure for making a proof for any given math theorem. If you succeed, you will be famous for the rest of history. Then all the unsolved problems of the mathematicians will be solved at one stroke. All the inconsistencies in the sciences would disappear. But a step by step procedure for creating a thing is impossible. Any problem involving a creature solution are incompletely stated. There are unfinished questions, queries about inconclusive data, problems involving assumptions. How do you 'tell' a machine how to supply the missing parts of the problem? How do you build a machine that does things it was not told to do?

Machines able to do these things would no longer be machines, they would be people.

From Woman-Haters To

Womanhood?

To The Editor:

Co-eds on this campus—the good looking ones, that is—consider themselves the epitome of womanhood.

During the process of ostensibly becoming educated, when in reality she is trying to acquire a future "meal ticket", the co-ed, by her second year, acquires a thin veneer of sophistication and intellectuality. Her main recreation is trying to impress others with her sophistication and intellectuality. Consequently, most co-eds have the personality of a wet dish rag.

Look, girls. The guy you marry isn't interested in how sophisticated you are, but in other things. So smarten up. Maybe the guy you go out with tonight will not ultimately become your husband, but for God's sake at least let him enjoy himself, or he may become, as I did, disaffected with University women.

Name withheld.

A Statue

To The Editor:

Throughout history people have built statues in honor of men and women who have distinguished themselves in some field of human endeavor.

Today there is on this very campus a certain somebody who definitely has distinguished himself, and therefore I think it would be only proper if our most generous Students' Council would see to it that a fitting monument to the memory of that great man about campus, Chris Evans.

Chris is the only person who washes his feet regularly. It has

been said that they smell so nice (his feet) he goes to sleep every night with his toes curled under his nose.

Chris doesn't pay any attention to letters to the Editor. After all, who on this campus has anything worth saying besides the great man himself?

Chris doesn't apologize to anybody for anything. Why should he? He's perfect?

Chris is no crank, he's simply "biased against everything."

Chris never, never, makes a spelling error, for he is a most learned man, and there are very few things that he does not know, if any.

Gee, Chris, how do you do it?

"Late flash": A fiery chariot was seen towards the heaven above the U of A campus late last night. First reports did not confirm whether the man at the reins was Chris or . . .

Edward Boldt

P.S. Feelings of intense nausea after reading this letter are only to be expected.

ESS Snarls

Engineering Students' Society
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

To The Editor:

Just a few notes here about this and that: Mr. K. Conrad's underhanded method of sneaking a boat-race win must be commented on for its audacity, if not for its dishonorable and ungentlemanly trickery.

It would take a leather-bound conniving lawyer to conceive the only way out of boating, (if that is the word), an engineers' team.

As the protesting party, in the interests of fair play, the ESS will