



REVOLUTIONARIES AT DAL

Elsewhere on this page is a statement by the Pine Hill Residents on the reasons for their attempted coup d'etat during the annual Dalhousie Model Parliament. We are heartened by the quite obvious feelings of conscience which provoked this somewhat unusual demonstration. We are encouraged by the statement which reflects accurately, so we believe, the feelings of thousands of Canadians about the Parliament of Canada. We are delighted by the open attack on Model Parliament because we have witnessed it degenerate into a badly acted farce over the years.

It is not usual for Canadians to be morally indignant about the state of their country or their politics. We are a pragmatic people who tend to treat all issues as necessitating some form of compromise. Our regionalism and biculturalism have taught us the futility of attempting to impose a particular dogma on the whole nation. The unfortunate thing is that our principles become lost, or never develop, from this compromising method. We are a people without the Word, and in our quest for the Flesh, we are akin to Stephen Leacock's famous horseman who "jumped on his horse and rode off in all directions."

In other words, we don't know where the hell we are going or what we will do if we get there. We need some constant signals to establish our direction; signals which will point the right road

to take. That is, it is high time that politicians in this country began to believe in some goals in order that they might work for something a little more uplifting than patronage.

At this moment Parliament is a squalid mess. Last fall the Canadian people sat in agony watching an insane debate about a piece of cloth. Certainly it is important that Canada have a new flag, and we will salute that flag with enthusiasm when raised, but it is more important that this country begin to deal realistically with the social and economic problems which are part of our technological society. Surely the government might have waited until the forces of senility were expelled from Parliament before it opened the rapturous debate. It would have been more to the point if the House of Commons had spent some energy on place for all citizens. The Canada Pension Plan is one example of this type of legislation; integration of the armed forces is another.

But can the stench from Ottawa be simply explained by our tradition of compromise rather than ideology. We think not. We think that there is something else basically wrong with the body politic of this nation when we witness the rash of resignations from the Liberal cabinet. When politicians commonly resort to dealings which are not in any respect proper, one can be sure that the people in the country have a low opinion of

politics. One can be sure that many decent men have at this time committed the sin of non-partisanship.

When politics is considered to be a petty occupation then democracy cannot long survive that thought. All the good-intentioned non-partisans in the world cannot save the democratic structure. For democracy depends on a dialectic between two opposing ideologies. The possibility of a different group taking over the reins of government only remains a reality to the electorate if the groups have some substantial argument. This is the essence of democracy and this is why citizens must plunge themselves into the hurly-burly of the political arena. It may seem paradoxical but it is true nonetheless that only those who are fiercely partisan for a particular viewpoint can ever be non-partisan for the good of the whole. If one be-

lieves that he does not have a philosophy, a viewpoint, he is mistaken. His philosophy becomes by necessity one of "ego" and if enough individuals succumb they will tear apart the fabric of democracy and permit a dictator to destroy individual freedom.

Perhaps this gives rise to the greatest criticism of the Pine Hill action. They attacked the heart of democracy itself when they stormed its citadel, the representative assembly. Parliament is quite obviously an institution central to Canadian democracy. Once one coup d'etat succeeds there is nothing to prevent other groups from attempting their own revolutions. If their manifesto is correct, presumably these gentlemen would have dissolved the Canadian rather than the Dalhousie Parliament if they had the means to do so. In other words they would have destroyed those good things about Parliament as well as the bad things. A clear case of throwing the baby out with the bath water.

While we recognize that the present political situation both in Ottawa and at Dalhousie renders the action very understandable nonetheless we really cannot condone it. Certainly the Gazette feels that Model Parliament on this campus has lost its usefulness and should be replaced by some other form of political activity. For example a Model United Nations. However, this is not the way to go about abolishing Model Parliament or about reforming that body. These things can only be done through the political clubs.

Politics is not a nasty business; it is the lifeblood of freedom. These gentlemen should have been willing to make the sacrifices demanded of politicians if they wish to influence public affairs. They should all join a political club, or the several political clubs and work within them for the acceptance of their ideas. In short, they should work within the system in order to reform it; they should commit themselves to a political party on the basis of their personal principles, and they should do this now. After all, there are aspects of democracy worth saving. Nonetheless we are glad that these students took part in this demonstration. We are glad because it indicates that there are still some people willing to take action for what they believe. We trust that these students will realize however that the action they took was self-defeating and the only solution, unpleasant as it might seem from within the ivory tower, is partisanship for a cause.

Let this demonstration serve as a warning to the present crop of politicians that they had better mend their ways before some groups on a national level take the same type of action. It is always the politician who must provide the first line of defence for democracy. Let us hope that some Canadian political leaders will soon emerge, ready and willing to do this.

Declarations of Pine Hill Residents

Hear ye! Hear ye! The age of the glorious revolution has begun. No longer will the people be trodden under by the terrifying dictators of Model Parliament. No longer will Harry Thompson win elections, or Kirk MacCulloch make his cutting, incisive speeches, or Barry Deville lead his party brilliantly from the back seat of a car. The government is overturned and Parliament dissolved.

At least that's how the script originally read. Those intrepid theologians from Pine Hill, trekked the many miles over to Dal with overthrow in mind and Bible in hand to dissolve our Model Parliament. They didn't quite make it, but they did manage to get the following speech read to the

assembled Commons, shocked into silence by the strong action of the divines.

The speech expresses disgust at the conduct of the Canadian government, and though it does not condemn Mr. Pearson and Mr. Diefenbaker to perdition, it does slap both gentlemen on the hand once or twice.

We think that the manifesto is well worth reading. As the editorial states, it is indicative of a feeling about our Parliamentary institutions which is becoming more and more prevalent amongst young Canadians especially among young Canadians. We urge all who in the least disturbed about the future of this country to "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest", to quote some source or other.

Now hear this; now hear this; Now hear this, and hear it well. We want to make it clear at the outset that the disruption taking place in this parliament has been, and is intended to be non-violent and peaceful. We want no immature or thoughtless displays of emotion, and we hope that the parliament and the public will respect our intentions.

This is a non-partisan coup-d'etat executed by deeply concerned citizens of this nation, to declare our dissatisfaction, regret, indeed our sorrow over the ugly political posture of the nation, and hereby make the following declaration.

WE DECLARE that as we lift our eyes toward the national political scene we are disgusted with what we see. We have seen our national government and our opposition waste an inexcusable amount of time and an enormous amount of money over issues which came to be trivial in comparison to the needs of this country and in relation to the needs of the world.

WE HAVE SEEN a grave absence of political philosophy which can be executed practically and can inspire respect from the Canadian people. We have seen the government trying to solve a sincere problem with what became an artificial issue. We have heard the opposition argue falsely against this artificial issue until the real problem was obscured under a mass of partisan politics.

WE INTERPRET this ugly exhibition as a general disrespect for the Canadian people and an unmitigated example of government irresponsibility in view of the burden laid upon their shoulders.

THE RESULTS of this deplorable condition can be observed in the disunity of the Canadian people, the apparent breaking up of a major political party, in the severe loss of integrity and responsible character of our political leaders, in the loss of confidence of the Canadian people. We look ugly to ourselves; we must look contemptible in the eyes of other nations.

WE DECLARE THAT this parliament is a model of parliament indeed. Just as the national parliament has concerned itself with trifling party politics so this parliament reflects the same lack of sincere political interests on campuses generally and at Dalhousie in particular.

WE RECOGNIZE that less than one third of the campus voted for this model parliament and maintain that this absence of concern for the welfare of Canada and for the well-being of her people is a reflection of the national temper.

WE RECOGNIZE as well the sincere concern and sacrificial contribution of many of the individual members gathered here, and regret the necessity of this drastic action. We hope that these members will look upon our action not as a denial of their efforts but as a positive step in assisting to recognize the local apathy and the national incompetence.

FINALLY we declare that universities are not, as this one is not, determinative in Canadian politics. Even though this Center of learning can be and ought to be, a lively contributing element in our government, it remains a docile beast hardly willing to admit it has a reason for existence.

WE DECLARE that to continue this parliament would be to condone the infamous political situation nationally and here at Dalhousie and that our action here is a voice raised in protest against it. We are all responsible for the future and this is a step to make that responsibility known.

Letters to the Ed.

Dear Sir:-
 In reply to your editorial entitled "King's and Peasants" it might be noted that this ancient (and hence, a priori, backward) institution, beat the Gazette to the gun on this occasion at least. Before the issue appeared a new student's union constitution for King's passed the committee stage. It wipes out the anachronisms surrounding the offices of Senior Student and Senior Co-ed and amalgamates the Male and Female Student Bodies.

The officers of the Student Union will be elected by secret ballot. A Student Assembly and a Student's Council will share all powers concerning the business of the union. Discipline will be in the hands of Residence Councils expressly chosen for this purpose.

These changes have been made necessary because of the contemporary readjustment of the structure of the university. While the university was a real "communitas" a true collegium or "bound together" group, it was possible for the leader of the students to also be an appointee of the administration, without necessitating conflict within the office itself.

Today however, following the pattern of non-academic life, the university has tended to break up into conflicting interest groups. The students, faculty and administration now constitute parts, in dynamic tension, of no clearly unified whole. It is obvious then that the true leader of the students cannot also be an officer of the administration.

As to the charges of anti-intellectualism, not only does the criticism of the offices of Senior Student and Senior Co-ed merely because of their names smack of an anti-intellectualism which judges the appearance rather than the essence of things, but it reveals an inability to examine his own beams in his own eye. For example, one can hardly imagine a more ridiculous institution than the Student Forum provided for in the new Dalhousie constitution which must pass on all proposed changes in that constitution.

Again having watched the petty, mercenary Dalhousie Student Council in action vis a vis Mr. Guite, I can feel a certain pride in the greater gentility of King's life. At this meeting Mr. Guite treated the Council with the disdain it deserved. Led by Mr. Buntain, the Council took this opportunity to show that it had means of gaining personal satisfaction for an criticisms published about it in the newspaper. The Council believes that culture is fine when talked about across a dinner table with the executive of the Board of Governors, but balks when culture requires money or freedom for the artist.

Wayne Hankey
 IV, Honours Philosophy

would have been handed over to the Yankees long ago.

Your snide comments that King's is "anti-intellectual" and like a "Boys Prep School" shows a complete lack of knowledge of the facts since in the last four years King's has had two Rhodes Scholars, precisely the same number as Dalhousie with a much larger student population.

If we were to join Dal we would become lost in that apathetic mess you have up the hill. Don't forget who wins- whenever some Dal students get up enough nerve to come down to King's on a raid. We haven't lost one for years so they tell me, in fact we've never lost one.

Also when we find out who P. H. is we will make sure that nothing as bad as that is ever written again by him. No matter who he is, he isn't too big to be beaten. Remember our motto, "Deo, Legi, Regi, Gregi" or in translation, For God, For the Law, For King, For Country.

Because of this we demand a retraction.

A Committee of Kingmen for King's

Dear Sir:
 Kudos on your article on the student council candidates. Something that has disturbed me about a democracy is the large number of people who vote without knowing either the candidates or the issues. This is especially true at Dalhousie where many students tend to treat Council elections as a joke.

Your staff is to be congratulated on taking the time to talk to all the candidates and get their opinions on two specific issues. Certainly the article has helped me make up my mind about the Science candidates running for Council.

Incidentally I should like to mention that I feel it is disgraceful that only one Presidential team came forward by nomination day. This shows a lack of interest on the part of the students which is appalling. Perhaps some arrangements should be made in order that the old Council could ensure that there were two candidates.

Once again, congratulations on the way that you have handled the election to date.

Yours truly,
 Ian S. MacKenzie

Dear Sir:
 Last week during the Model Parliament a group of hoodlums attempted to break up the debates. Fortunately they were prevented from doing so by the quick thinking of Mr. McCleave who was the Speaker of the House.

It is shocking that people of our age do not have the sense to see how precious democracy is, and how important it is to maintain it.

If the ideas of the hoodlums become prominent then we will degenerate to the level of a banana republic with a revolution every third month. I sincerely hope that these individuals are sorry for what they did.

Yours truly,
 Sid Davies

Free-Thinker Sees Quebec

Editor's note.
 This article presents an interesting look at the Catholic church in Quebec. It was written in 1958 for a special issue of the McGill Daily, but though it is undoubtedly a bit out of date, nonetheless, provides very valuable information on the role of the Church in that province.

Naturally the influence of the bishops and priests has been eroded since the Liberals started the quiet revolution in 1960. However it is important that English-Canadians understand something of the religious roots of French-Canada. After all, this is probably the only revolution in the world which the Roman Catholic Church can claim to have some control over.

A FREE-THINKER LOOKS AT QUEBEC
 reprinted from The McGill Daily

One of the most remarkable features of Quebec from the sociological point of view is its extraordinary imperviousness to ideas of change in the social organization.

This is true of North America as a whole and particularly of Canada, but above all of Quebec. The cause may be found in the conservative outlook usually associated with populations of peasant origin, the isolation and general ignorance of external developments in which the bulk of the French Canadian population remained for more than a century after the English conquest, and the influence of the Church.

The Church's influence is strong in Quebec for several

reasons. The Catholic clergy became the natural intellectual leaders of French Canada after its ties with France were severed, and subsequently, retained the confidence of the settlement.

It is, therefore, generally recognized that although French Canada owes its survival as an integrated ethnic group to the Catholic clergy, it paid a price the level of which has not yet been completely realized or assessed.

Yet, for all its religious education, French Canada in practice does not offer evidence of more than superficial compliance with the dictates of the Church. French Canadians appear inclined to follow particularly the more external and ritualistic aspects of religion, perhaps at the expense of the more essential, and the clergy itself is probably responsible for the deviation.

The French Canadians confess regularly and attend mass on Sundays, but apart from this and a somewhat oblique compliance with the canons of sexual restraint, they show little evidence of being a God-abiding people. Among the educated and leisured classes, it is fashionable to pay lip service to religion while conducting one's more private affairs according to other standards.

It was pointed out to me that the students were subjected to other influences than that of the Church in their family, social links and intellectual pursuits and above all, found it necessary to adjust their set of values when they found themselves in direct competition with people not so governed.

Some explanation might be found in the method of indoctrination. Fear of everlasting pain in a hell rendered quasi-real by years of suggestive persuasion is to the Catholic what fear of Siberia is to the Russian worker. The Church has probably overdone this aspect in Quebec. Cynicism is fostered by insisting upon the observance of too rigid a moral code.

Nevertheless, I lean towards the belief that there is a more fundamental reason for the aberrations observed. Wherever Catholic education is mentioned, there is implied the philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas. The Church's fault was to adopt Aquinas' as its official and unchangeable philosophy.

With an insistence on Aquinas and the other doctrines of the Church, there is little room in the school curricula for mention of other ideologies once the essentials of technical education are covered. For instance, there are many Liberals in Quebec politics, but remarkably few who know anything of the writings of Hobbes, Bentham, Locke, Berkeley and Hume.

Emphasis on official doctrine, therefore, is sufficient to drive out foreign ideologies by the simple process of monopolizing all available time. Needless to say this applies with even greater force to the more extreme forms of socialism, and to Marxism, which is held to be opposed to and absolutely inconsistent with Catholicism.

As long as the Catholic Church maintains its influence and its control of educations in the Prov-

ince of Quebec, there need be no fear as to its social orthodoxy - at least while the present favorable economic conditions subsist. Furthermore, as a minority group anxious to preserve its separate language and social system, French Canada will necessarily oppose all forms of federal government centralization without which no form of socialism could establish itself in the country.

How long French Canada's social conservatism will survive a weakening of religious authority is, of course, problematic. There is every reason to believe that the sudden disappearance of Catholic ideology would leave room for a host of others since care has been taken not to teach them. Hence the French Canadians would be unguarded against them.

The key to Quebec's future lies in the system of education it will adopt and the extent to which it will succeed in divorcing it from Church control. Influential Church personalities have maintained that the Church is not anxious to retain responsibility for education that far exceeds its own requirements to train young people for the priesthood, but even if this were the official view of the Church, one might doubt of its sincerity.

While the education system in Quebec is in many respects satisfactory, a number of reforms are necessary. The present Quebec government has never quite gone this far though ardent pursuit of its own policies has sometimes produced the same results. This stems from the familiar assertion that it is better to love God than to know Him

CHRISTIANITY AND CHRISTIANS

By RICHARD LITZ

One can hardly expect to pick up a modern newspaper and find headlines which openly condone racial bigotry and religious intolerance. However, I should like to refer to the questions raised by Miss Drew and Miss Hawgood in their report of the IVCF

Editor's note.
 This article is a reply to one written a few weeks ago on the Inter Varsity Christian Fellowship conference held during the Christmas holidays at the University of Illinois. The author attempts to prove that the basic premise that Christian love is the answer to the world's problems is quite obviously wrong if one will just look at the behavior of the Christians themselves.

The Gazette feels that it is unfortunate that recent years have seen the downgrading of the religious argument on the campus. Not that we are interested in proselytizing a point of view - far from it. We do feel, however that an intelligent discussion of metaphysical questions is extremely important to any community of learning.

The convention they ask "Why have riots in the Congo risen to such violence that doctors, missionaries and nationals have been murdered in mass slaughters? What causes a man to hate be-cause of the color of another's skin?"

Misses Hawgood and Drew attribute these sentiments to the wide scale rejection of God by man and consequently, the inability of man to distinguish between right and wrong. I assume that the logical conclusion to be drawn from the entire article is that all the injustices of the world arise from the lack of Christian love.

What then is the Christian love? Since the Congolese have been dismissed as evil by the IVCF, ie., they cannot grasp the true meaning of Christian love, fellowship, etc., I too will dismiss them temporarily, and define Christian love in reference to this great Christian continent of ours.

Christian love is that perfect love which exists between all Christians of every colour. They do not resort to acts of violence against men of different color or race. They love everyone. There is no housing problem for students in Halifax. There are no lynchings in the Southern States. Civil rights workers are not killed in America, especially not by Christians. Christian policemen don't unleash their dogs at men attempting to register to vote. Above all, Christian ministers do not uphold the convention they ask "Why have riots in the Congo risen to such violence that doctors, missionaries and nationals have been murdered in mass slaughters? What causes a man to hate be-cause of the color of another's skin?"

to the discord evidenced in racial unrest and political corruption, then the centres of highest learning would be the centres of highest morality. This is not the case." In addition, Mr. Fife, Missionary Director for IVCF felt that "government is not the solution. What we really need is to return to the Bible." This supposedly will solve all problems.

Godless students who have struggled in the cause of civil rights in the South would see the light and return to the flock. Science as a body of knowledge would be abandoned. We would give up all material comforts because as Mr. Fife says, "Money is no protection against sickness or death." We would be struck down by a great thunderbolt from the sky. (Presumably the bolt might be struck by Christians here on earth).

The message from the IVCF continued that the tension reflected in man's inability to distinguish right from wrong is a result of man's "lack of communication with God." Therefore it is the Christian who can discern the good from the evil. To quote from the article, "The Christian God is the only true Love..." and all other concepts of god are lacking in this respect."

Only the Christian can choose the right way and therefore the non-Christian can choose only the wrong way and are doomed to eternal perdition. This should,

no doubt, prove a strong incentive to non-Christians everywhere. Christianity "is the victory of good over evil... and Christians need not be ashamed of the truths they know." No indeed. They can flaunt them at the entire non-Christian world, if they want to.

Christianity can then be regarded as a mission in just such a way as Americanism is the mission of Americans. We must accept the Christian way. We must force the Christian way on the "enemy" in the Congo. We must abolish learning. After all, "He rose from the tomb and thus secured the victory of good over evil, of life over death." Please note that death is evil. This may appear to be somewhat obscure to the non-Christians who have spent their entire living doing wrong things and not realizing it. And others may have difficulty in determining that "turmoil in his own mind" which he has because he is not a Christian.

I think that the IVCF missed the point. They claim that our troubles are due to the turmoil in every non-Christian. But the Christians aren't making a very good show of easing the confusion in the world. Perhaps the confusion lies not with the non-Christians but with the Christians. And maybe we would be better off without their "truths." After all, what would Dalhousie be under the Christians? It would probably be a Bible School.