



## letters

### free education

To The Editor:

Since I believe that news of yesterday, somewhat like yesterday's mashed potatoes, is not of major concern to anyone, I do not normally challenge opinions attributed to me by various news media. However, the question of free education is of such major importance that it seems unwise to me to leave unchallenged the ideas contained in the article, "Free education a detriment" says Wyman, an article

contained in an issue of The Gateway, dated October 15th, 1965. For this reason, I am writing my first letter to a newspaper.

In the first instance, I deny using work words like "detriment," "claw," and "silver platter," words that are enclosed in quotation marks and ascribed to me in the article. If these words are contained in notes taken by your reporters during their interview with me, these notes contain inaccurate paraphrases of my actual statements.

On the issue itself, tuition fees for students, I am, at the moment, agnostic. The arguments used by members of the Bladen Commission to support their contention that tuition fees should remain at their present level—about \$500 per student per year—do not carry conviction. Nor do arguments used by some groups of students for the abolishment of all tuition fees, which seem based on opinion, not fact.

My own student days began and ended in the depression years of the '30s and the situation created a doubt in my mind concerning free education that has never been resolved. The work habits formed during those years, work habits that necessitated earning money during the summer months, and winning scholarships during the academic year, played an important role in forming the work habits of my later years. It was a personal experience concerning which I now have no regrets.

On the other hand, I still remember, only too vividly, the large numbers of full-qualified matriculants who could not obtain a university education, no matter how hard they tried. This is a situation no thinking person ever wishes to see again.

The only major issue concerning tuition fees is whether students should be placed on a help pay-as-you-go basis, through tuition fees, or whether they should be placed on a pay-later basis, through taxation. Since all groups concerned, the public, students, universities and governments seem to agree that adequate financing of universities must be provided, the issue is not per se of major concern to either universities or governments. It is of major concern to students, and it is on this basis that the issue should be decided.

Whether completely free education is part of the best training society can give its young people, is a matter about which I have no strong conviction. If I had been among those of my contemporaries who were

unable to obtain a university education, this lack of conviction would probably not now be evident. My indecision does not arise from indifference, it arises from a clear understanding of the importance of the issue coupled with a lack of convincing evidence by means of which the question can be decided. We must, I believe, look for an answer to the sociologists, the psychologist, and the politician, people who have had professional training in the needs of individuals in society, and the needs of society itself.

Max Wyman  
Vice-President (Academic)

### true social credit

To The Editor:

When Mr. Owen Anderson recently announced his resignation as campus Social Credit leader, stating that "campus politics are non-intellectual," I assume he was referring to party politics. He might well have added that party politics on any level of human activity is non-intellectual — and degrading. Division of nations into political parties was a deliberate manoeuvre to create internal strife—but, this being a "not quite nice" subject, I will allude to it no further.

Nobel laureate Prof. Frederick Soddy declared, "science without Social Credit is sheer suicide." True Social Credit (the authentic C. H. Douglas concept) becomes more applicable with every advance of civilization. Douglas was many years ahead of his time—and his teaching, if understood, would capture the spirit and imagination of all young people. Unfortunately there are powerful forces intent on denying youth any knowledge of the Douglas principles. Alberta "Social Credit" shares the guilt of shrouding Douglas' penetrating and equiring concepts—which if studied would lead civilization out of the darkness into a new dawn and a much happier and more secure future.

Wallace M. Klink  
sci 2

## background to conflict kashmiris seek harmonious ally

Ben Tahir is a Pakistani who came to Canada five years ago.

By BEN TAHIR

When the guns boomed over the high and low grounds in the former princely state of Kashmir last month, it was not the first time that her people had seen such action.

Kashmir, a former land-locked British protectorate had been a separate suzerain state as far as the geographical and historical limits of the Indian sub-continent extend.

The borders of 84,471 square miles of Kashmir skirt five strong powers in that region. To the north lie Afghanistan, the USSR and China (Sinkiang). To the east lies Tibet, not under Chinese control. On the south she borders India, and on the west, Pakistan.

Under the Independence Act of 1947, the British divided the sub-continent into India and Pakistan.

The princely states numbering several thousands were given the choice of either joining India or Pakistan or remaining independent.

Most contiguous states opted with either of the emerging nations.

Junagadh, Manwadar and Mangrol, however, not contiguous with Pakistani territory, declared their accession to Pakistan.

The Nizam's Dominion of Hyderabad Deccan, a 700-year-old Moslem state, wished to remain a dominion under the Crown, but signed a standstill agreement with India for postal and telegraphic communications.

Kashmir signed a standstill agreement with Pakistan, but her Hindu Maharaja signed the instrument of accession with India against the wishes of his 77 per cent Moslem subjects.

There were also the French Indian possessions of Pondicherry, Karikal Chandernagor, Yanam and Mahe, and Portuguese settlements of Goa, Diu and Daman.

Later in 1947, India sent her

"Liberation Army" into the states of Junagadh, Manwadar and Mangrol, claiming that the majority of the population were of Hindu faith and that the Moslem rulers had no right to accede to Pakistan.

India in 1948 attacked Hyderabad Deccan on the same pretext, while that country was fighting her case before the United Nations. Within four days the 18 million people of Hyderabad Deccan capitulated to the Indian Army and Air Force.

The country was subsequently annexed and given over to the neighbouring provinces. The case of Hyderabad Deccan was shelved at the United Nations.

When Indian troops were sent into the state of Kashmir, Pakistani tribal irregulars fought alongside Kashmiris against the Indian Army and the Maharaja's soldiery.

The hostilities came to an end in 1949 under UN auspices.

A ceasefire line was drawn with about two-thirds of the country under Indian control.

Lt-Gen Nimmo of Australia headed the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan (UNCIP). Of the 40-man staff to oversee peace in Kashmir, 9 are Canadians.

Kashmir, a country four times the size of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island together, is as picturesque as Switzerland. The lofty peaks in the Pamir Knot reach over 25,000 feet, and attract many a mountaineering expedition. The southern plains dotted with lotus-laden lakes bring honeymooners by droves to lavish on the houseboats.

Kashmir's only two roads linking the outside world to them before 1947 wound their way through the present West Pakistan territory.

India built a road in the '50s as a supply route to her 100,000-man army stationed in Kashmir.

Kashmir's dream of making their country an Asian Switzerland has become their nightmare. With three

of the stronger neighbours, India, Pakistan and China, controlling 100 per cent of Kashmiri land even suggesting such a dream becomes quite impossible.

Since 1949, 12 UN resolutions were announced and all were accepted by Pakistan. India has not accepted any.

The Indian argument is based on the fact that Pakistan did not withdraw her forces as the second condition of the UN resolution; the third condition was for India to permit a plebiscite for the Kashmiris to decide their preference to join either of the states.

Pakistan has made several proposals for a plebiscite in Kashmir at the UN and by representations to the late Indian Premier Nehru.

Pandit Nehru had on several occasions agreed in principle that the Kashmir problem should be solved but he had a deep emotional attachment with the country, which he considered his home.

It takes India 100,000 armed men with a large local constabulary to govern the land.

Economically and strategically West Pakistan is dependent on this area, as the Rivers Indus and Chenab flow through Kashmir into Pakistan. Indian attempts to dam their water at will have spelled disaster to the Pakistani agricultural economy.

With the war over Kashmir, India faced an opponent one-fifth her strength. It was the first time the Indian army and air force had met with strong resistance, unlike their easy victories in their earlier adventures. It was a fight between Indian quantity and Pakistani quality; between might and right.

As the Kashmiris can never hope to make their country another Switzerland, the only chance they have is the United Nations, for a plebiscite to choose their ally with whom they could live in harmony and without dread.

## papa lesage investigates

The following is an editorial translated and reprinted from a recent issue of Le Quartier Latin, semi-weekly newspaper of the University of Montreal.

Mr. Jean Lesage found himself very annoyed at Edmonton last Wednesday. Always in the heat of his tour of the West of the neighboring country, the prime minister of Quebec was called on to reply to the decision of the AGEL (Association General des Etudiants de Laval) to not accept the suggestion of the students of the University of Alberta to hold a "Week of the Canadian West" at Quebec.

One remembers that, the year before, the campus of the University of Alberta was the scene of a French-Canadian Week and the Albertans expected to return the same this year. President Sarrault of Laval threw cold water on their illusions by replying to them that Quebecers already knew enough about the Canadian West, while the Westerners did not know Quebec. In the same breath, he made them understand that we had to build Quebec and

that we had no energy to spend for nothing.

You can easily imagine Mr. Lesage's disappointment when Western newspapers trained their sights on this business; he who had gone to "explain" Quebec to Canadian—he had some difficulty explaining this. And the lesson he can learn from it today is exact: that of informing himself on what Quebecers want before going out to "explain" them to other countries. Moreover, Mr. Lesage himself threw this brick because, as the president of the Edmonton students' union said so well, the majority of arrangements for French-Canadian Week at the University of Alberta the year before were made with the Quebec Government, students playing only a minimum part.

Mr. Lesage should not commit the students to his pan-Canadian enterprises. He should not think he can reverse at will the blow struck by the convention of free-thinking students last year, when he succeeded by his paternalistic tactics in having reversed a resolution favoring unilingualism in Quebec.

Mr. Lesage said at Edmonton that this business came up after he left Quebec. "It is plain I must investigate to find out what really happened." And look! Mr. Lesage is going to demonstrate to these simple students that they must not sabotage his prestige campaign in foreign countries. Mr. Lesage added that, "in their refusal, the students of Laval do not represent the policy of the Quebec Government which wants to encourage exchanges between English and French Canadians."

Mr. Lesage allows himself to tell others what we think and what we want but, when Quebecers show themselves against his Government, they are only extremists without importance. He had better learn, this Prime Minister, that he is not the only one who has ideas in Quebec. We want to make it plain to Canadians in the West that there are plenty of lies in Mr. Lesage's sermons, that it is not true that Quebecers are ready to continue with the experience of Confederation, even though remodelled. And . . . on false prophets!

## Viewpoint

Perhaps you should ask what is beneath the wrappings before you freely accept the package deal of free education. Perhaps you should question the meaning of a "Free Educationalist's" use of the word "right" before accepting the consequences of its enactment . . .

The basic premise of the Free Educationalists is that their birth and proclaimed merit gives them an automatic right to that which has been created by others. The basic method of exacting their claim, when others do not recognize such a right, is through the resort to force—legal force.

The final consequence of utilizing legal force based on the premise named is the perversion and destruction of liberty. The final state of affairs is the deliverance and sacrifice of any minority (or majority) to the arbitrary dictates of any ruling clique. It is the realm where no one is legally protected from having to comply with the unfounded demands, whims and emotions of others.

Why? One need only remember that the police and law courts were originally established to protect man's rights to life (therefore his earnings or property), to liberty (therefore his safety from the force of others) and the pursuit of happiness (without violation of another man's right to life and freedom).

If the law courts, in carrying out the demands of a given faction (for example, Free Educationalists), deny a basic constitutional right and deprive a man of part of his property, then that constitutional right no longer exists. Any right that is given by permission (and therefore can be arbitrarily revoked at any time) is a contradiction in terms.

If you support the Free Educationalists and others who hold similar premises, or if you refuse to consider the issue and not pass moral judgement, don't bewail your predicament when you discover that faith and force have become the standards of conduct and action. You will have deserved it.

But if you believe that no man should initiate the use of force to achieve what he considers to be his right, then you must stand up and say so. If you believe that you have the right to your own life, freedom and pursuit of happiness, then you must condemn anyone who attempts to destroy your right by force.

. . . the wrappings are iridescent, fascinating the eyes by its ever-changing colours. And you begin to believe that beauty must be beneath . . . beauty, wonder and perfection. And only after having accepted the gift do you realize that the iridescence fades slowly into an all pervasive gray. And you as a separate, identifiable individual, no longer exist.

(Ray Singer is a third-year science student at U. of A.)