## **OPINION: Clive Schaefer**

by Ken MacDougall

Clive Schaefer, senior news editor and editorial writer for radio station CHNS, is by his own admission a conservative a right wing conservative. although he vehemently insists on not being labelled a John Bircher

This identification with the right does not embarass Schaefer; indeed he is proud of it. He feels there are sufficient numbers of persons in broadcasting who identify with the "left", and there must be some representation of the opposite

We must analyze Mr. Schaefer's ideas as being those of a person dedicated to his beliefs. His views are coldly, logically and methodically worked out.

ON THE RECENT AM-CHITKA BOMB BLAST:

'I was in favour of Amchitka. As stated by the US Secretary of Defence, Melvin Laird, it was necessary to build up some credible nuclear deterrent to offset the nuclear buildup that's going on in Russia.

"This (Amchitka) was the means to do this, at a point removed from doing harm to people. It's something that had to be done. The experiment, as it turned out, did very minor disruption to the ground around

DIDN'T THE REPORTS OF THE SHOCK WAVES RE-CORDED AROUND THE WORLD INDICATE TO YOU POSSIBILITY POTENTIAL DISASTER?

"Now here you are hypothesizing. This would possibly have been very credible before the blast, but in the event of the blast taking place, when you're worked up to the state of something that could happen, then you go back and worry about what could have happened that didn't happen; that's really an exercise in futility."

ON STOCKPILING:

"You might be led to believe that the nuclear situation had reached some form of being static. This is not true. As recently as two weeks ago the New York Times reported the sighting of a whole series of missile implacements in the Soviet Union which were spotted by reconnaissance satellites, and in a strange switch of position (New York Times was anti-ABM) they suddenly began urging the Americans to do something in the way of reviving the lagging nuclear program."

ISN'T THIS IRRELEVANT? IT SOUNDS LIKE A GREAT COMPETITION OF NATIONS, A GAME.

"It's not exactly trying to prove who's the better of the two, it's who's going to survive. It's not just a competition where, say, at the end of the year 2000 they call in the judges and decide whose system is better."

ON RUSSIA

"It has been the Russians' stated policy that they intend to bury us. Khruschev has said it and everybody thought it was a big joke. I don't think it's a big joke."

WHAT OF KHRUSCHEV'S PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE POLICY TOWARDS THE END OF HIS TERM OF OFFICE? "Did he have that policy, or

did he only try to give that appearance? They (Russia) didn't discontinue their atomic armaments, they discontinue their conventional armaments. They may have tried to conceal their continuance of these programs in some way to make it appear that they were changing their tune, but they really haven't . . if you mark out the spheres of influence on the world map today and compare them to where they were 40 years ago, you can see what's happening. This is cause for alarm.

ON KOSYGIN'S VISIT:

. . I don't think it amounts to anything. It's just window dressing. These visits . . . are generally a sign that they are in some kind of trouble; that they need help.

ON MAINLAND CHINA AND TAIWAN:

"I think Taiwan is the voice of the average Chinese in the broader sense. It doesn't speak for them politically; it can't because it doesn't govern them, but I think it speaks for the inner feelings of the average Chinese, the feelings that they have about freedom. The figures - 35,000 refugees out of mainland China into Hong Kong in the past month - show that they must be running away from something. They have to go through fantastic obstacles to get out, and yet they're still doing it. This is a very strong barometer of the feelings within China."

COULD YOU COMPARE THIS WITH THE OUTFLOW OF REFUGEES FROM THE UNITED STATES (DRAFT RESISTORS) THAT WISH TO ESCAPE U.S. IMPERIALISM?

"I don't think that there's a million of them, is there? What's the figure? 70,000? It's an odd thing, because the people that are leaving China are leaving to fight. I think the ones who are leaving the United States are trying to avoid fighting. I think there's a basic psychological difference.

"They (draft resistors) probably don't believe in the American political system, but they don't really have anything better to put in its place. Their alternatives are what? Anarchy? They propose a system of complete absence of government, which is a fallacy. There's all shades of political opinion, but basically they come to Canada to avoid being called up to fight in a war they didn't want to fight in."

CAMBODIA THE ESCALATION:

"This is a strategic move. When you're underg retreat you have to protect your rearguard so the thing is, Nixon went into Cambodia because the Communists were already there, and the same with Laos. They had no right to be there, but they had been there for The legitimate recognized governments (of Laos and Cambodia) had been waging an unsuccessful war to try to rid their soil of the overflow of Communists without success. They had built this nest of sanctuaries all along the border and the Americans went in to clear those out.

"As they (the Americans) pulled out of these areas, they would leave weaker and weaker forces there which would be subject to attack from these



really truths? For instance: — Of the Parti Québécois' 24% showing in the last provincial election, does Mr. Schaefer not realize that the populace has been perpetually migrating to the cities. Consequently, can we actually not expect the PQ to fare still better in the next election?

Can we actually believe the reports of alleged sightings of new missile silos in the Soviet Union? The CIA has been known to fake it before. Why not now, particularly in light of the deception of the Vietnam war as told in the Pentagon Papers?

- How do you justify the protection of the governments of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia when the initial forces sent into Cambodia (the South Vietnamese Rangers) who are supposed to take over

wonder just how the American dollars were spent in training the Rangers. Secondly, with GI's returning with stories of active blackmarketeering by soldier-age Vietnamese, does this not in fact show that the South Viet-

namese government is indeed

Americans withdraw, were so

hopelessly mauled by the North

Vietnamese. It makes one

corrupt? Then why protect it? There are many, many more points that one might wish to take issue with in Schaefer's arguments. However, despite our own feelings, we cannot help but be impressed by the logic he uses to form his rationale. He gives us ground to think, and that in itself is good. How deep you wish to go into his arguments depends on how much you really believe or disbelieve this man.

sanctuaries as they withdrew. Though Schaefer's arguments, as far as they go, 'As it was only basic military seem valid to him, are they

strategy . . . it's not an invasion . . . it was an incursion. It was not an invasion aimed at overthrowing the legitimate government; the American force was there to protect the governments of both those countries while at the same time ridding the area of the forces that would have attacked the Americans as they withdrew.'

ON ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM:

"The record of elections in South Vietnam has been very good. Bear in mind South Vietnam is a country at war. Despite that fact they have held a number of elections. There was only Thieu running this time, but in our own state when we were engaged in war (World War II) there were no elections. The country just couldn't afford the rifts and divisions among the people . . . they had one goal in mind, and that was to get rid of Hitler."

ON THE MONARCHIST LEAGUE (of which Mr. Schaefer is a member) DO YOU BELIEVE PERPETUATING THE MONARCHY WILL HELP UNITE THIS COUNTRY?

"I think it is one of the strongest forces we have to overcome divisions of the English and French because both of these peoples in their great numbers are promonarchy. If we ever became a republic, then I think you would see a breakaway of Quebec.

ON THE 24% SHOWING OF THE PARTI QUEBECOIS IN THE LAST ELECTION:

"That was largely a vote in the city areas. I think that in the city areas where you have a large concentration of industrial people, university students, people who are traditional anti's, the Parti Québécois might have accumulated most of its votes." ON OBJECTIVITY IN THE

NEWS MEDIA:

"Objectivity is trying to present both sides of a discussion or an argument. Objectivity (as some one said) is a myth; I don't think it's a myth, actually. You can't present two sides simultaneously, but you can present them in sequence. Of course, then you can be accused of

