



# 75th Anniversary 1908 - 1983



November, 1963

## Kennedy dead

Mourned on both sides of the iron curtain, President Kennedy has passed into history. His tragic death was a great blow to the American people and to the people of the world. Its consequences will not be fully known for a long time.

It is in the field of international relations that we will feel his loss to the greatest extent. The Kennedy administration's domestic record was solid, but not perfect. Especially in the field of civil rights and economic issues, there is good reason to believe that more of the administration's program could have been implemented with greater effort.

In foreign affairs, the Kennedy record in the past year has been one of considerable progress. The test-ban treaty, a general rapprochement with the Soviet Union, and thaw in world tension were all attained. In addition, a compromise on the nuclear-arms-for-Germany issue had resulted in a halt to the spread of nuclear potential.

*...Kennedy was reportedly on very good terms with the opposition leaders in Germany and Great Britain.*

President Kennedy had worked out an understanding with the British with regard to their independent deterrent problems, which regardless of the obvious embarrassment of Mr. Macmillan with the dumping of the Skybolt project, made possible a more reasonable alignment within the Western bloc.

How will the sudden elimination of President Kennedy as an international figure affect these developments? Of course it is impossible to make more than a rough prediction of the probable results of this tragedy. Many variables will influence the course of events.

If President Johnson is unable to exert the personal influence President Kennedy was noted for, especially within the Western bloc, there may well be a greater degree of disunity in the Atlantic alliance. Furthermore, President Kennedy was reportedly on very good terms with the opposition leaders in Germany and Great Britain. If, as seems probable, these two countries change governments in the next year, President Johnson may find it lee easy to see eye to eye with them.

*If public sympathy at the death of John F. Kennedy turns against the Soviet Union...a great deal of work will have gone in vain.*

The major problem is likely to be in American-Soviet relations. Because the late prime suspect, Lee Oswald, was a sympathizer of the Cuban government, and at one time attempted to defect to the Soviet Union, public opinion in the US could suspect some causal relation between the two.

This is highly improbable. Nothing could be further from the interests of the USSR than the death of Kennedy. Nothing could be less in the interests of Cuba.

However, the American people have just lost a very respected leader, and it is unlikely that everyone will be rational in assessing the causes. Even if President Johnson wishes to continue the good relations that President Kennedy built up with the Soviet Union, he may find that public opinion will force him to take a more inflexible line.

If this were the case it would indeed be ironic. If public sympathy at the death of John F. Kennedy turns against the Soviet Union simply because of an unproved suspicion that a psychopathic Soviet sympathizer was in some way acting in the interests of another country, a great deal of the President's work will have gone in vain.

What is to be hoped for is that in their hour of tragedy the people of the United States will rededicate themselves to the ideals of their late President, and work for a greater basis of understanding between all the nations of the world, communist, neutral or pro-Western. This would be the finest tribute to his memory.

**Ed note:** The shooting of John F. Kennedy marked the third time that a President had been assassinated since Lincoln. It's obvious from this editorial how much the loss was felt.



Who is this handsome devil? Why, isn't it Joe Clark? I bet if he showed this around in Winnipeg, he'd get sympathy votes.

*All the editorials you see here are truly representative of how this paper thought about and addressed issues of their day. Certainly, there were many important issues over the last 75 years, too many to represent them all.*

*What you see on this page is what I believe to be editorials that represent how students felt about the world they lived in and the incidents which occurred over the years.*

*The above picture is Joe Clark as Gateway editor, '58-'59.*

September, 1945

## Secret of atom should not be

### The Gay Outlook . . . by Peter Gay

The atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, marked the beginning of a new age, and clearly demonstrated that mankind must choose now between complete world cooperation or total destruction. The first bomb startled the world a little over two months ago, and millions of words have been published about it since, but I have undertaken to write this series of three columns on the meaning of the bomb, because it is of shattering importance to every young person — especially students.

Such questions as to what to do with the secret, what the concerted research will do to national sovereignty and private enterprise, must be pondered by every one. We cannot afford — at the peril of annihilation — to ignore these problems, and never have I been more desperately serious about any subject.

*It would lead to an atom bomb race—a race to find defenses and to build even more terrible counter weapons.*

Before we go on to ask, What shall we do with the secret of the bomb? I would like you to re-read the first sentence of this column. Now....it was written that way, not because it sounds good, or because I am fond of over-statement, but because it represents the bare unvarnished truth. Commercial advertising and Hollywood have used superlatives so indiscriminately that we are incapable of illustrating the paramount importance of a vital issue when one actually arises. But we must think clearly, and act boldly, or mankind will surely go down.

The atom bomb is not just another weapon of war — it is based on age-old research. For thousands of years men have sought to find the constituents of matter and use them. The medieval alchemists dreamed of it; but scientists were not started on the right road until the 1890's, when the Curies discovered the instability of matter. From then on, theoretical physicists like Einstein or Bohr (men who searched for knowledge, not for a weapon

of war) advanced step by step, leading toward the Manhattan Experiment.

Three countries share the secret, and with it the awful responsibility as to what to do with it. President Truman — undoubtedly under strong pressure — has recommended to Congress that the U.S., Canada and Great Britain keep the secret. Secretary of Commerce Wallace has taken the opposite position — a position which I wish to advocate here. It seems absurd to attempt to keep the secret of the atomic bomb, absurd for two reasons; reasons of selfish national security and more far-sighted international morality. Many scientists, including Niels Bohr, are now arguing as I am doing. Why?

First of all, the question arises, Who besides ourselves could obtain the secret through their own research, and could then afford to manufacture the bomb? Obvious answer, the Russians; and Senator Connally undoubtedly meant the Soviets when he argued for our keeping of the secret recently, by stating that there are

some nations that we do not quite trust. Don't Senator Connally and his friends realize that this is not a question of trust? The Russians, who have nationalized research and are spending billions on science, are apt to discover the principle of atom smashing, along with its "practical application," if not today, then within six months or a year. What then? It would lead to an atom-bomb building race — a race to find defenses and to build even more terrible counter-weapons. And, as Henry Wallace rightly pointed out, the Russians could devastate our country with only a third of our own bomb supply. Keeping the secret is bound to lead to the most destructive war in history; even if we should emerge the victors, the only Americans left to celebrate would probably be a few cave-dwellers. For wholly selfish reasons, therefore, we should turn the atom bomb secret over to the United Nations Organization. As for the effect of the bomb on international morality and national sovereignty, more next time.

September, 1910

## No more war?

There have been recently some interesting developments in connection with the International Peace movement. The ideal of the permanent abolition of war is something with which no right-minded man can refuse to sympathize, and while the practical man with some knowledge of history and biology may feel dubious of the result, he will refrain at least from sneering.

It was only the other day that the press announced the gift by Mr. Carnegie of the princely sum of ten millions of dollars towards the furthering of the cause of world peace. Perhaps even more significant is the statement that Mr. Taft is to propose to the American Senate the amendment of the existing arbitration treaty between Great Britain and the Republic to the effect that the contracting parties should agree to submit to arbitration questions affecting their "national honor." It is probable enough that the British Government — regardless of which political party were in power — would listen sympathetically to any such proposition — supposing it should receive the sanction of the American Senate.

As a matter of fact a moment more opportune for the discussion of such an idea could hardly be selected. Canada is the only one of the British nations whose interests are frequently apt to bring her into collision with the American Union, and everybody knows that Ottawa and Washington, after years of petty mutual mistrust, are now, with practically all differences satisfactorily adjusted, on the most cordial and neighborly good terms.

October, 1970

## FLQuebec

There are 21 million political prisoners in Canada. With the implementation of the War Measures Act the traditional rights and freedoms of all Canadians have been suspended.

The War Measures Act was supposedly aimed at the FLQ and its supporters, but they are not the only ones whose actions may be labelled "subversive". Merely the act of writing, or reading this material could put you under suspicion of posing a threat to the "security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada".

The implications are extremely broad since the terms of the Act are so imprecise, a fact which has not been overlooked by Vancouver Mayor Tom Campbell: "I would

*The war measures was not a necessary step by the government in dealing with the situation in Quebec.*

suggest that the draft dodgers had better start dodging. Get out of here, boy, because we're going to pick you up."

The Act takes the form of a Canada-wide mandate to policing agents to detain anyone they suspect of "subversive activities", without actual evidence. There is a maximum period of 21 days without charges being laid, and ninety days before setting a trial date. That they find drugs instead of an anti-government force is not going to make a difference.

The War Measures act was not a necessary step by the government in dealing with the situation in Quebec. The institution of an act used before only in wartime is indicative of a far more encompassing situation than at first seems evident. The kidnappings are not just isolated events in an otherwise calm time. They are part of a continuing restlessness which has steadily been building pressure, and which is probably not yet at its peak.

The real problem existing in Quebec today is not with the FLQ and its terrorist activities. It goes much deeper into the spectrum of the French-Canadian society and its attempt to achieve what it feels is equality and release from the repression of the English majority. That too is not the final analysis, since the struggle itself is rooted in economics and inaccessibility.

The FLQ has responded to a frustrating and perhaps seemingly hopeless situation with violence. The government has retaliated with a typical one-upmanship in their attempt to contain a situation which was obviously fast becoming out of their control. The true meaning of the struggle in Quebec has in the meantime been relegated to obscurity.