

LIVE ENTERTAINMENT:  
BLAIR and the BLAIRS  
rock

Thursday, Friday, Saturday

Room at the Top  
On The Big Screen

Wednesday, January 19; 7:30 PM  
Edmonton Oilers vs. Vancouver Canucks

Saturday, January 22; 6:00 PM  
Vancouver Canucks vs. Edmonton Oilers

7th floor SUB  
Open 3 - 12 Mon. - Sat.  
Full liquor license



"I have clinched and closed with the naked North, I have learned to defy and defend; Shoulder to shoulder we have fought it out - yet the wild must win in the end."

\*Robert Service

The black sheep of Canadian liquors.

Soft-spoken and smooth, its northern flavour simmers just below the surface, waiting to be discovered. Straight, on the rocks, or mixed, Yukon Jack is a breed apart; unlike any liqueur you've ever tasted.



Concocted with fine Canadian Whisky.

continued from preceding page

constitute "a group that is touted as being relatively intelligent." Are they a group? The word assumes that there is some way in which they can all be neatly categorized, a horde of several thousand all busily chipping away at their ice sculptures. And who is doing the touting? What is meant by "relatively intelligent"? Next our budding editor tells us that this group has "fabricate(d) a characterization" of themselves (presumably). Of course they did not, John, you did. Why would anyone invent his own epithet? And the belittling of the country, if that is indeed the net result of one ice sculpture, was not the responsibility of a few engineers, but of the person responsible for making the one finger salute in the first place. The engineers, badly or not, simply made the statue to fit the event. What is "despicable" and "contemptible" (sic-you missed that one, Jens) about that?

There is no need for the engineers to rebut your contention. You haven't yet made one. And while the ice sculptures may not be construed as an exercise in intellectual thought, they are at least as pleasing to the eye as the monstrosity that is fast emerging between HUB and the Arts Building. But perhaps you also have something to offer us, John?

David Marples  
CIUS, Athabasca Hall

## Remember El Salvador? It hasn't gone away

Flora McDonald, upon her return from El Salvador as a member of the Interparliamentary Commission; summarized the situation in El Salvador by saying:

"For decades the economy of El Salvador has been dominated by the so called 14 ruling families whose financial power has been backed by the arm clout of the military. Oppression and brutality, poverty for the masses and wealth for the few, have spawned deep-seated resentment, growing unrest and finally full blown civil war. No longer will oppression be tolerated."

As part of the government's campaign of oppression, the University of El Salvador has been closed for over a year. However, faculty and students still meet in high schools, private homes and wherever other facilities may be found to hold classes.

This Wednesday at 3 o'clock in Tory Room #14-9 the members of the U of A community will have the opportunity to meet North America's official representative from the U of San Salvador. Dr. Felix Ullua, professor of Social Welfare law at U.S.S. will speak about conditions in El Salvador, and the university in the context of a civil war. The purpose of Dr. Ullua's tour across Canada is an appeal for aid so that university classes may continue in spite of government censorship.

In addition, Wednesday night at seven o'clock in room 142 SUB, the film "Revolution or Death" will be presented by the El Salvador Campus Committee. Dr. Ullua will also be present at this time to speak with any interested viewers.

If you are interested in participating in the committee or wish further information about El Salvador contact us through our executives at 424-4747/437-4846 or at the literature table on SUB Fridays.

The El Salvador Campus Committee

## CHOPPING BLOCK

by Jens Andersen

Whenever I hear about "the threat of nuclear war" (which is pretty often these days) my thoughts wander to Einstein's quote (I don't remember the exact words) something to the effect that nuclear weapons have changed everything about our world except humankind's way of thinking.

To which I am compelled to say, amen. People still continue travelling along in the time-worn, familiar and fallacious mental ruts, even when they are dealing with the problem that could kill us all. And of course these mental errors don't improve our chances of surviving.

The errors, as I see them fall into four categories:

**Underestimating paranoia.** The classic example of this the idea of unilateral disarmament, which is fortunately only promulgated by a few dreamers on the lunatic fringe. Omnipresent human paranoia ensures that it will never get past the talking stage.

Even in less radical disarmament or "freeze" proposals, however, the proponents often forget that it is natural and quite justifiable for any party in an agreement to be intensely suspicious about the motives of other parties to the agreement. Reagan or Andropov and their goons, after all, might be trying to pull a fast one with a treaty. Hence all the interminable maneuvering and niggling over treaty details.

But "promoting trust" and "reducing fear" are soothing platitudes (see the following section on rhetoric and wishful thinking), and since paranoia is a knotty problem, there will always be those who try to skate around it.

My favorite example comes from a "Dear UNO" letter by Pax Christi International in which PCI advises the United Nations to "encourage women of the world to help dispel the fear of unilateral disarmament."

I assume - without actually knowing - that Pax Christi hasn't actually lost its senses completely and advocated unilateral disarmament, that this is only an accidental implication of an ultimately nonsensical statement. Nonetheless, the obvious intent of the statement is to try to make people calmly accept some sort of risky proposal, as all disarmament proposals are, without the reasonable response of caution and apprehensiveness.

**Misunderstanding the human will to power.** Or denying it exists. Like masturbation (80% of people do it, and the other 20% lie) people don't like to admit they have one, because they think of will to power in terms of evil stereotypes like amassing hoards of wealth, or gigantic armies (no doubt this is due to Hollywood's influence), but not in terms of developing artistic talents, honing scientific skills, or cultivating a charming personality - which are just as real results of will to power.

Indeed, the last time I made the simple observation that wars occur because of the will to power (which is a characteristic of societies as well as individuals) a horrified reader wrote in saying, "the statement might have been taken from *Mein Kampf*." Well, perhaps it might have. Hitler, I hear, had his lucid moments, and apparently he also read Nietzsche, which was where I first saw the will to power postulated and analysed.

An example of will to power not receiving due



consideration:

Randall Forsberg in her article in the Nov. *Scientific American* makes a strong case for a nuclear arms freeze, and ends her article with the statement, "The freeze represents a modest but significant step toward abolition."

Here she obviously overlooks the fact that a freeze, and perhaps even reductions in nuclear arms, are possible only because no real power is involved - a great many of the arms are simply superfluous. Once a certain level of disarmament is reached, however, numbers are significant. For instance, if by some miracle Forsberg's desired nuclear abolition was achieved, the first country to re-arm would have an enormous military advantage, and the will of any country would be to do so.

Realistically, all it would take to trigger such a re-armament would be another Vietnam or Afghanistan, not to mention a really serious war.

The balance of terror we have now might seem intolerable, but the imbalance of terror that could result from total or partial disarmament would be worse.

**Rhetoric and wishful thinking.** As I mentioned in a previous column both pro and anti-nukers easily succumb to tall talk and Utopian visions that have no hope of ever materializing. Everyone thinks their proposals for arming to the teeth, or beating ICBMs into combines will bring on that phantasm "peace."

Such beliefs happen because certain visions - "worldwide disarmament" "credible nuclear deterrent," etc. are appealing, or can be made attractive by the use of glowing English. Once this is done it is a short jump (at least in the minds of simpletons from the desirability of a dream to its attainability).

Unfortunately there is no evidence that the countries of the world will disarm willingly (and how are you going to compel them?).

Also there is no evidence that a fat nuclear arsenal will keep an enemy from panicking and attacking at a critical moment. In fact, in both cases the evidence is to the contrary. We may, perhaps, even be programmed for destruction by the perversity of human psychology.

But the tender-minded are unwilling to even consider this possibility, and instead they run instinctively to their dubious security blankets.

**Misunderstanding in general.** The human capacity for this seems unlimited. To use a trivial example: the other week a Gateway letter writer said, "Jens Andersen can be expected to attack the Canadian peace movement almost by definition."

Actually, I don't believe any such thing as a Canadian peace movement exists. What is referred to by that name is a motley collection of groups, many of which have ulterior motives, like Pax Christi which soft-sells Christianity on the side, not to mention flogging Communism ("A system of socialist workers without capital, without god"); or Edmonton's own Learner Center, which is just as interested in pushing Soviet junk like the film *History Book* into grade nine classes, as it is in protecting me and you from getting fried in the atomic barbecue. And, lest this last statement raise further misunderstanding: I am not in favor of muzzling either group. In fact exposing people to their bilge is probably excellent aversion therapy.

Contrarily, many "pro-peace" types I find fairly persuasive, as could be easily discerned by my previous praise of Randall Forsberg's article in *Scientific American*. The letter writer, just for the record, interpreted this praise as "sleight of hand."

This and other misunderstandings (paranoias in the Russian and American military seen as war-mongers, well-meaning do-gooders seen as communist dupes, ad nauseam) combined with all the other misconceptions I've mentioned, and perhaps a few I have overlooked, all ensure that not only won't the nuclear weapons problem be solved, it will probably get worse.

**Note:** John Roggeveen is alive and well and living in Portugal with Nazi Albert Rauca, as a recent piece of graffiti in Tory reported. He will be back with *En Garde* next Thursday, however, after this Thursday's 75th anniversary issue. In the meantime he advises everybody to attend Native Issues Week, which he and Rauca masterminded.