The Dalhousie Gazette

CANADA'S OLDEST COLLEGE NEWSPAPER
Published by the Dalhousie Students' Union
Halifax, Nova Scotia, 429-1144. Printed by
The Dartmouth Free Press, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
Authorized as Second Class Mail by the Post Office Dept. Ottawa, and for payment of postage in Cash.

Editorials printed in the Dalhousie Gazette express the individual opinions of staff writers, or the Editors. This must be noted in all reprints.

Volume 98, No. 10 Halifax, Nova Scotia, November 10, 1966

TIM FOLEY
Editor-in-Chief

DAVID DAY . . . . . Associate Editor
LINDA GILLINGWATER . . . . . Managing Editor
ROBIN ENDRES . . . . . News Editor
ELIZABETH SHANNON . . . . . Student Council Editor
DENNIS PERLIN . . . . . Sports Editor
BARBARA KIMBER . . . . . Features Editor
FRANK WILSON . . . . . Business Manager
JOHN McKILLOP . . . . . Advertising Manager
MAUREEN PHINNEY . . . . . Secretary
WAYNE SARTY . . . . . Cartoonist
ANGUS GARDNER, SHARON COOK . . . . . Photography
DAVID DAY . . . . . Typography

Remembrance Day should go

Let's do away with Remembrance Day.

It should be obvious to just about everyone in this country that Remembrance Day has become just one more excuse for a long weekend. The number of people that take part in services and official ceremonies continues to dwindle year by year.

In the future the process will accelerate as the number of veterans and persons who were personally involved in the wars decreases.

It was not so many years ago that the Boer War received its share of attention as one of the so-called major conflicts in which Canadians took part. But now the memory has grown dim and no one can identify with it.

It won't take many years before the number of First World War veterans has shrunk to the point where the battles and the deeds will have meaning only in history books.

Even the Second World War has little relevance for anyone under 20. The countries that were our enemies are now our allies - Germany and Japan - and our allies are now our enemies - Russia and China. The whole thing is rather confusing and a little embarrassing to many people.

The trouble is everyone feels that if he admits the present rites have lost their meaning he is being unpatriotic or breaking a sacred trust.

It is interesting to note that the Korean war has never been able to win the same respectability as the world wars. And it is also hard to imagine that the people of the United States will ever be able to raise the Vietnam conflict to the same level.

Mass communications have smashed the false veneer of war that made the killing glorious and heroic. We may not have gained knowledge to prevent or stop wars but we have learned to recognize them as monuments to human stupidity.

But the real question is what does Remembrance Day have to do with the men that fought these wars. They are the ones that made the sacrifices and in some cases are still paying the price.

Why don't we stop being such bloody hypocrits and consider them for a moment.

Giving ourselves a national holiday does not do anything for them. Most of the people that will be outraged by the idea of doing away with Remembrance Day are the ones that feel they have squared their debt with the human race by buying a 25-cent poppy and then spending their Remembrance Holiday in front of the television set. Some of them may go so far as to give one minute pious contemplation out of the whole year. What have they ever done for the old men that sit forgotten in the veterans homes?

And from all those people so concerned about sacred trusts it might be interesting to know what they have done recently to advance the cause of world peace (which all these soldiers supposedly fought to secure).

The dead are gone and those that remember them and identified with their cause will soon join them.

Let us give those faceless lambs of silent battles a living memorial. Let us give up our holiday and remember the waste and futility of war every day of the year. Let us make sure that the state that sent the soldiers to face death now provides the survivors with dignity and life. Let us remember the dead, including the civilian victims, in our churches and temples.

If we don't make the changes time will, and Remembrance Day will take its place with Guy Fox Day and Orangemen's Day.

USA Victimized in Vietnam

Reprinted from The Carrillon, the official undergraduate newspaper of the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus.

We were recently looking at some statistics released from Washington on the Viet Nam war. It seems the 400,000 American troops are being supported by aircraft dropping more bomb tonnage per month than the allied air forces dropped in Europe and Africa in 1943. Many more bombs are expected to be dropped now that an 11,000 foot bomber strip has been officially opened in Thailand, backed by 35,000 military "advisers". And of course, the troops are still flowing in at more than 20,000 men per month. But the most amazing statistic of all is the amount of cash being poured into that small country. The pentagon refuses to release official estimates, but informed sources, whoever they are, put the total at about 2 billion dollars per month.

At which point we stopped reading that particular article. It was obviously incorrect, if not outright lies. No national leaders of even a communist country would spend that much on a "brushfire" war, let alone the brilliant, wise, loyal and polite leaders of the U.S.A. That kind of expenditure is an economic equivalent to human wave military charges, throwing thousands of men screaming over a hilltop to gain a given objective, no matter what the cost. The rationale is that you give what you have to get what you want.

And two billion dollars per month is obviously more than the U.S.A. would sink in an effort against a country of less than 30 million people. After all, the average annual wage of the workers in that country is less than $100. If two billion dollars were distributed to every man, woman and child in the country it would mean a monthly gift of more than $65. For a peasant family of five or six people $300 a month would buy a lot of cokes, cars and spray deodorants. And we know who they would buy it from, don't we. So the U.S.A. couldn't possibly be spending that much money on pure destruction when Viet Nam's potential market value is so high.

There must then be an alternative answer to why the U.S.A. appears to be embroiled in a war over there. Is their government the victim of some heinous plot to discredit democracy, free enterprise, and the Flag? Are we all merely ignorant of the complexities of such questions as whether we should fight an atomic war or not, whether we should fear IBM or not, whether God is alive or not? Should we then toddle along, trusting young students that we are, and leave the real world to the mature, hard-thinking, practical politicians who never-went - to - college - but - by - God - made - something - of - himself?

Or should we perhaps quietly muse for a while on just who is perpetrating this atrocity on Honest Lyndon and his associates. After all, in North Viet Nam alone 294 schools, 74 hospitals, 80 churches and 30 pagodas have been deliberately bombed and destroyed as "targets of opportunity", so the guilty agency may be the League of School, Hospital, Church and Pagoda Builders. It would have to be some group that could satiate its greed more readily by having a war, an agency whose product is death. Perhaps the international armament manufacturers. . . .?

In Perspective

History and the Coat of Arms...

By FRED JONES
Special to the Gazette

"The creeping republicans are at it again," cried Dr. Eugene Forsey in the Toronto Globe and Mail. Thus began the coat-of-arms controversy that raged through Ottawa last week finding echoes even in that den of intrigue, Halifax. Statesmen ignited by noisy defenders of our sacred monarchical past, squabbled over the decision of the Postmaster General M. Cote to remove the Canadian coat-of-arms from post office trucks and mail bags.

Dr. Forsey claimed in his polemic that: "What is being ditched is not the symbol of our historical monarchy, the monarchy which the Fathers of Confederation unanimously deliberately chose to preserve, but a historical symbol of Canada itself, embodying (as no merely vegetable emblem can) our historical past, French and English."

This is just not true. The Fathers of Confederation were not free to create their own constitution, "deliberately" or not. The Quebec Resolution which were their initial contribution were changed first in the London Conference and then seven times in drafts of the BNA Act.

R. MacGregor writes that: ". . .there was no general concensus of the authorities in British North America behind the written constitution as eventually enacted in 1867."

The monarchical form was not a free choice but one conditioned by the fact of negotiations between England and colonial representatives before confederation. What is Forsey's "historical symbol of Canada?" A unicorn and a lion leaning on a shield with a crown above. Where is the lion and unicorn in Canadian history - in a Zoo. The Canadian coat-of-arms is an artificial creation unsuited to Canada unless Canada is still considered an outpost of the British Empire.

Forsey spoke of the maple leaf as a "vegetable emblem" but this mere emblem forms part of his coveted coat-of-arms and is the center piece of our flag. The maple leaf is a symbol of Canada - the coat-of-arms is a symbol of England suitable for Anglophiles or those who defend the status quo for its own sake.

The youth of Canada reject monarchical symbols and demand that Canada have spiritual as well as functional independence. Canada is the focus of our loyality not some abstract plaque or even the Queen who stands as a figurehead. We must therefore Canadianize the symbols of our past and present so that they mirror our distinctive culture and thereby create a stable nationalism in place of the present parochialism.

Will feudal heraldry withstand the ever expanding American cultural and economic influence? No!

This is the road of folly for its maintenance will only smooth the road for American domination. Forsey and Co. must have a very poor opinion of the Canadian - British or Canadian monarchical link.

I have in no way meant to degrade or question it. Instead I have criticized the stupidity of those who feel that our connection with the Queen rests on the flimsy base of a coat-of-arms. Perhaps they have forgotten the warm welcome Canadians gave the Queen during her last visit.

Their own vehemence in defence of this outmoded emblem actually demonstrates the vitality of the fundamental emotional link, especially in those of the older generation.

However Forsey was right to criticize the method used by M. Cote. A decision on such a matter, a decision almost unreversible once completed, must be considered by the cabinet or better, be approved by parliament. Instead, as Forsey described it, M. Cote used "sneak their gradualism" to eliminate the coat-of-arms.

Therefore the controversy was not in vain although it became ensnarled over the wrong question. Instead of Republicanism the danger was Bureaucracy. Canada was threatened with the gradual loss of the controlling ability of our elected representatives.

Perhaps the outcry raised by Dr. Forsey will help preserve the subordinate role of officialdom and prevent it from seizing bit by bit a dominant role in our society.

The Globe and Mail, Toronto, Oct.19, Page 7

Is Ottawa trying on a republican coat for size?

By EUGENE FORSEY

THE CREEPING Republicans are at it again! Fifteen years ago, the last Liberal government stealthily tried to take Royal Mail, Poste Royale off the postal trucks, in what was finally admitted to have been an outright violation of contract. The public revolted, the violations stopped, and Royal Mail, Poste Royale was restored.

Now these same gentry evidently believe it is safe to try the same game again. We are informed that on Oct. 13, a "post office official" announced that "The royal coat-of-arms on post office trucks and mail-bags is to be replaced by a maple leaf."

This makes no sense except as a step toward a republic. Has this Government a mandate from the people of Canada to make this country a republic? It has not. Does it come out, man-fashion, proclaim its belief in a republic, and ask the Parliament and the people of Canada to give it a mandate for this fundamental change in our Constitution? It does not. It prefers the same sneak-thief gradualism as its predecessors 15 years ago. Take the coat-of-arms off the postal trucks and the mail bags, little by little, replacing it by the maple leaf on "new trucks" or "when old ones are being relettered or when bags are being replaced." Perhaps by the time anyone notices, or tumbles to what is going on, it will have been possible to take the coat-of-arms off other things, too.

The Prime Minister, on Oct. 17, told the House of Commons that it was not the Government's intention "to remove the royal insignia from all government buildings, correspondence, publications . . . and . . . the Speaker's chair." This looks reassuring. But this Government has been known to change its intentions, and the Postmaster General is "to make a short statement in a day or two . . . to remove some of the misunderstandings that have been created."

Besides, the Prime Minister spoke of "the royal insignia"; but what has been taken off the trucks is not "the royal insignia" but the coat-of-arms of Canada; what is on the stationery and publications is the coat-of-arms of Canada; what is on the public buildings is the coat-of-arms of Canada. So without violating any undertaking the Government has yet given the House, whoever started this performance (and it may well not have been the Prime Minister, or even the Cabinet as a whole) can go quietly on, until the glorious, liberating day finally arrives when he, or they, can venture into the light, and, with hammer and chisel, or pneumatic drill, knock the Canadian coat-of-arms off the stonework over the main door of the Parliament Buildings.

Meanwhile, further protest can be answered, as last time, with assorted fairy tales designed to prove that nothing has really been taken away. The Postmaster-General has already provided us with the first: "the mail has never been Her Majesty's mail."

This is simply not true, as anyone can satisfy himself by looking at a series of acts of Parliament: 1867, Chapter 10, Section 4 ("the conveyance of Her Majesty's mails"); 1875, Chapter 7, Section 4 (the same), Section 42 ("a mail of Her Majesty"), and Section 58 ("Her Majesty's mail"); 1878, Chapter 2, Section 2 ("Her Majesty's mails"); Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, Chapter 35, Section 47 ("Her Majesty's mails") and Section 64 ("Her Majesty's mail"); Revised Statutes of Canada 1906, Chapter 66, Section 90 ("His Majesty's mails", twice), and Section 91 ("a mail of His Majesty").

Canada's coat-of-arms.

The provisions of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, Chapter 66, apparently stood unchanged until 1927 when, though no act of the intervening years seems to have struck out the words quoted, the revisers dropped them from the relevant sections.

In short, for at least 60 years after Confederation, our mails were unmistakably, by repeated acts of the Parliament of Canada, "Her Majesty's" or "His Majesty's". And the fact that the terms do not now (as far as I can discover) appear in the Post Office Act does not in the least mean that they have become obsolete. If the mails are not, in law, "Her Majesty's", whose are they? The Postmaster General's? Mr. Pearson's?

Invite any constitutional lawyer to answer. No statute that I am aware of calls the Postmaster-General and his colleagues "Her Majesty's ministers"; but that is unquestionably what they are, in law, and what they must remain, unless and until, this country is formally, and legally, made into a republic.

The Postmaster-General says that the maple leaf is "an emblem which will represent a truly Canadian post office and which will give a real interpretation to the Post Office Act." What on earth does this mumbo-jumbo mean? What kind of post office have we had hitherto? German? French? English? Russian? The very first Post Office Act, in 1867, the same one that asserted firmly that our mails were "Her Majesty's" called our post office "the Canada post office" and "Her Majesty's Canada post office." As for the real interpretation: since what is being taken off the trucks in mail bags is the coat-of-arms of Canada, what is being ditched is not merely the symbol of our historic monarchy, the monarchy which the Fathers of Confederation unanimously, deliberately, chose to preserve, but a historic symbol of Canada itself, embodying (as no merely vegetable emblem can) our historic past, French and English.

Perhaps, then, its removal means that we are being softened up not only, for sly, gumshoe, undercover change to a republic, without argument, without discussion, without any decision by Parliament or the people, but also for an equally sly, gumshoe, undercover change to Associate States, or to a counterfeit Canada a la Daniel Johnson, in which Quebec would have made itself for most purposes a foreign country, but would still retain its ministers, senators and members of the Commons in Ottawa, with full power to share in making decisions which would affect only the other nine provinces. If so, I can suggest a more appropriate emblem than the maple leaf to put on the trucks, the mail bags, and anything else the Government contemplates defacing: two jackasses eating the leaves off one maple tree.

Anybody, in or out of the Government, has a right to argue for a republic, or two republics, or one and a half. Anyone, in or out of the Government, has a right to campaign for any such change. No one, in or out of the Government, has any business altering the Constitution of Canada by gradually sneaking us into a fundamental change on which we have never had a chance to pronounce.

Dr. Forsey is research director of the Canadian Labor Congress.

FROM THE TORONTO DAILY STAR

NBC's Wide World of War:

Sunday Spectacular- Saigon

By PHIL JARVIS
Reprinted from the Marker, the newspaper of the Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario.

A very special good morning to all of you viewers at home. This is Mickey Minefield, your play-by-play commentator and I have here with me, that old pro of many glorious campaigns, Babe Ruthless. Morning Babe.

Morning Mickey. The funniest thing happened to me on my way to the battlefield this morning - I was ambushed by three hundred thousand grinning little men. Boy, that was close Mick.

I'll bet it was Babe! Well, it looks like a perfect day for war, Babe. The sun's shining here at Cong Stadium, the home of the famous Viet Cong Guerillas, there's only a slight wind from the southeast, but that shouldn't effect anything but the fall-out, and the temperature's a warm 70. Yes I think we can say that fighting conditions are excellent Babe.

Yes they are Mickey! You know Mick, I saw the greatest picture at the theatre last night. It was a double feature. The first was "The Bridge in the River Ky" starring Elizabeth Time-Bomb and Richard Burned-All-Over, and the second was Walt Disney's "Around the World in 80 bomb-laden Thunder Chiefs."

Sorry to interrupt you Babe, but now we've got to switch to our special video-tape cameras for today's pre-game show, the bombing of twenty SAM sights and a railway loaded with South Vietnamese politicians. So don't go away now fans, we'll be back in one minute after this important message from our sponsors -- the friendly folks from the Nantuckett Napalm Factory.

* * *

Well, here we are back at the battlefield Babe. Speaking of movies, Babe, I hear paramount is about to release two screen gems in the near future. James Burp-Gun in "Gold Trigger-Finger" and "The Creature with the Viet Cong Brain."

Those should be really great Mickey, but right now let's fill our listeners at home in on today's game. This battle should go down as one of the most hard-fought encounters between these two great armies this season. The Guerillas have suffered a few costly injuries so far in the season, but from what general-manager Ho Chi Minh told me last night, they're really out to get this one Mickey. This is a crucial battle in this year's race for the pennant, and of course both teams are looking for a victory in this year's "sudden-death" finals. Coach Johnson tells me his Capitalistic Warmongers are really up for this one Babe. The Warmongers' record so far this season has been impressive, and we can look for a lot of that old razzle-dazzle so characteristic of this fine team.

You were going to say something Mickey?

Yes Babe. My son was telling me about a couple of great new books they're studying in school. "Alice in No-Mans'-Land" and "Winnie the Poof! Winnies the Ash." Sure wish we had books like than when we were in school, eh Babe?

Yeah Mick. In looking over the statistics of these two armies, I see that the Guerillas have a slight edge in the yards for and against department, but as you know they spend most of their time in a ground attack. They've even been known to tunnel underneath their opponents. The Warmongers are famous for filling the air with passes, and, as you know Mick, you can never forget the threat of Mel McNamara's "Long bomb." He seems to have deadly accuracy in hitting that great new rookie, Herbie Haiphong. Every bomb seems to have his name on it!

The Warmongers' cheerleaders, those high-stepping American Senators led by the charming Morris Wayne are really out in strength today Babe.

Yes they are Mick. Well here we go. The officials are moving onto the battlefield for the opening blast-off. Our referee for today's battle is Charlie De Gaulle, the field judge is Rocky Fulbright and the time-keeper is Louis U Thant, the battle is in good hands Mickey.

Yes it is Babe. All set for the opening blast-off now. Up goes the referee's hands — down comes the Saturn V at centre-field -- and as the mushroom cloud rises, the battle is on Babe!

One week later —

And a very special good morning to all you viewers at home. This is Bobby Bull with Lester Spearson once again at Cong Stadium. I wonder if today's war will be as good as last week's, Les?

I don't know Bobby. Did they ever find any trace of Babe and Mickey?

I don't think so Les. Well it sure is a great day for a war. . .

Voice of the Student

Crossroads Africa

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your coverage of Operation Crossroads Africa and Dr. Robinson in the last issue of the Gazette (October 31). Although I realize that where space is limited, it is sometimes necessary to condense quotations, I feel I must clarify a few points which were left ambiguous.

The article quoted me as saying, "Everyday Western education is so superior to their (the Liberian's) way of life in know-how that we were able to tell them how to do the construction work although we had no previous experience."

By no means did I intend to imply that Western ways of life are "superior" to African ones, or that Crossroads on the project instructed their Liberian co-workers. This would be completely contrary to the purpose of Crossroads, which is to promote friendship and understanding by bringing together people of diverse backgrounds to work on an equal basis.

The point came up when Miss Pett asked me how the summer's experience had affected my values or anbitions. I replied that I had been very impressed with the great importance of education.

We found while working with uneducated people that our background which we take for granted (for example simple arithmetic) made us better equipped to solve problems that we might encounter in construction.

Secondly, referring to our reception by the villagers, I was quoted as saying, "It was tense in the beginning. I was amazed - we became close." What was amazing was not that we were able to make friends with the people, but that they were so exceptionally hospitable and that we became so close as we did during our very brief (six and one-half weeks) stay.

I apologize for not being more explicit, and I sincerely hope that no one misinterpreted the words in the article. Operation Crossroads Africa was an extremely valuable experience for me and many others, and is a worthwhile effort towards better human relations.

Yours truly,
Joan Robb

Dear Sir:

I read with some amusement your editorial "condemning" PLAYBOY magazine for, among other things; selling "sick sex," removing blemishes from its girls, and portraying "brainless concubines." While you are to be commended for your defense of EROS, your attack on PLAYBOY is neither justified nor factual.

After professing your belief that the human female nude is "a very beautiful thing (which) throughout history has inspired artists...." you proceed to censure PLAYBOY for removing the "imperfections which make the subjects real," you ask, "Have you ever noticed that PLAYBOY girls never have any hair on their bodies?" I am struck by the fact that the women portrayed in "The Kiss," the Sistine Chapel mural, and "The Birth of Venus" (among others) have no hair on their bodies either! Are these people, therefore, "unreal?" Are Rodin, Michaelangelo, and Botticelli to be "condemned" for the lack of imperfections in their works? Is a woman's beauty proportional to the amount of hair on her body?

You are guilty, also, of the delinquency committed by too many critics and most censors. That is, you have not thoroughly read the entire work which you denounce. If you had, you would have discovered that such features as "The Playboy Philosophy" and "The Playboy Forum" are not trying to peddle "sick sex," but are striving, rather, to free us from the repressions, taboos, and falsities which have made a truly beautiful act the source of guilt, shame and censure.

A thorough reading of any "Playboy" issue will prove that its purpose is to bring the discussion of sex into the open, to show that a subject which has, for too long, been regarded as sinful is actually beautiful and pleasurable, and to provide entertainment in the forms of short stories, interviews, editorials and articles as well as pictorials. PLAYBOY is not "peddling sexual fantasy" anymore than are GLAMOUR, VOGUE, or MADEMOISELLE, all of which portray beautiful, blemishless women.

Dear Halifax:

Congratulations for being Canadian! It must give you a sense of pride and security in our high standard of living. If living means appreciation of life, we Canadians have the lowest standard of living in the world, in spite of the fact that it costs more to live in Canada than in any country in the world (ask Bill Powers) with the exception of the United States.

I refer to the situation in Africville, where money talks against equality, where the white majority has printed on 'clean white' paper (I presume) "I'm white, a cleansed color" and where pressure is being pressed upon Kwatcha and the few persons that are trying to do some good.

I wonder if any of you belong to the KKK Halifax branch (of that tree of evil fruits). More than likely you don't for being a typical individualistic student you probably will not get off your 'Royal Canadian' to do anything pro or con in respect to the previously mentioned cause. I wonder if any of you people belong to the Canadian Nazi party, Dalhousie branch (of a very warped tree) or here again I may be hovering under another oath of misunderstanding for you probably pull a sin of ommission, or perhaps, 'I didn't know.' Just to prove the validity (or invalidity) of my accusation get in touch with Kwatcha and see for yourself. Then: sit on your 'Royal Canadian', drink your coffee, discuss your small town college philosophy or weather.

D.B.J. Snyder, Arts III
Graham Hall, United College
Winnipeg 2, Manitoba

Students of Manitoba conform to Canadian ways.

The Science Ball will be held November 18 at the Lord Nelson Hotel. Music will be provided by Arne Benson and his Orchestra. Tickets $3 per couple will go on sale in the canteen from November 8 to 18 between 12:30 and 1:30.