



# Letters

## beauty missing

To The Editor:

I should like to stand up and be heard in protest over the issue of beauty on our campus. For untold issues of The Gateway there have been criticisms of campus architecture, of the veritable squeezing of nature between our ever increasing numbers of ugly concrete and brick monsters; yet one would think that these critics see beauty in nothing but nature and her forests and meadows.

But what about man? Is there no such thing as Art? I cannot conceive of the drab result were we to ignore the beauty of man's own interpretation of his own world. All I see on this campus are indeed concrete and brick monsters surrounded by feeble attempts to copy nature. I see a big empty quad strewn with flimsy saplings and fallen leaves. But do I see the flowing lines of sculpture I might have seen in such a setting in ancient Athens? Or do I see the chaotic grace of wrought iron, or even so much as a statue

of Sir. John A. MacDonald, or Sir Wilfred Laurier, or Sir Winston Churchill to name but a few of the great personalities to whom we owe so much but to whom we pay no respect save a trifling lip service.

I deem it a disgrace that this campus has blindly ignored the beauty of man's creation, that we have been denied the right to a sense of pride in our campus. It is time, I feel, for us all to realize that our campus is sadly lacking in sculpture, and for us jointly to see that this wrong persists no longer.

Peter Fubar

I am hoping, Mr. Editor, that you, as the wise newspaperman that you are, can help me. I am sure that in your tremendous experience in the world of reporting the news that you have come across this problem, and that you can give me some advice as to how I may rectify my obvious lack of qualifications for post-secondary study.

Tom Landsman  
ed 4

P.S. Does the CUS proposal for universal accessibility have anything to do with my problem?

(Perhaps rectification of your problem sits, lies or rests in this area. A more practical answer would be to skip the TTs altogether, any sympathize with yours truly, who has three TTs, back-to-back.—The Editor)

## tt blues

To The Editor:

For some time now, I have been attending classes on TT (as the booklet entitled "Registration Procedure" calls those days). I have two classes on TT, one right after the other. I have found these classes to be very interesting, interestingly enough. I find that I even have to think occasionally. There is just one small, perhaps very insignificant, matter that has forced itself upon my attention: To wit: I cannot sit in a desk for three hours, less a ten-minute break (thoughtfully provided for dashing to the next class).

I have come to the conclusion that I am not built for University life. I see all these other students sitting around me, and they never seem to mind those hard, hard desks that our God-given Administration (Bless you, too, Mr. Premier) has seen fit to provide for our "comfort." I have spent several hours in corridors people-watching (giving forth with the occasional wolf-whistle) to see if I differed from other students in any way. Mr. Editor, I have come to the conclusion that I am neither broad enough where most of my sitting takes place, nor have I the necessary padding (blush).

## fact-checker

To The Editor:

Your implication in "A Portent of Disaster" (Oct. 15) that the Government of Northern Ireland is not democratically-elected will raise eyebrows in Belfast and glasses in Dublin.

The Unionist Party has formed the Government of Northern Ireland continuously since 1920 and in spite of, or perhaps because of, the frequent suspension of Habeas (sic) Corpus and assorted manipulations with electoral districts the House is assembled after a manner labelled "democratically-elected."

Care is needed to avoid assertions lending majesty on false premises.

However, should you feel that your statement is accurate it will be interesting to see your future efforts on behalf of the abolition of the partition of Ireland.

Charles H. McCloughan  
grad studies

(Your political science is superior both to your Latin and to my knowledge of Social Credit.—The Editor)

# india and pakistan wrestle

# grimly for kashmir

The author is a former international vice-president of the National Council of University Students of India, and is presently in Canada studying journalism.

By SHREESH JUJAL

While the United Nations is doing its best to silence the guns on the India-Pakistan borders, the 475-mile-long front line in Kashmir is still a scene of war-like tension which could spark a new conflagration on almost any occasion.

This undeclared war has been viewed as one of the gravest in the twenty-year history of the United Nations, for it was feared that any further escalation might drag the whole world to the brink of a third global war.

The quest for peace was therefore the immediate need of the hour, realized by all major powers from Soviet Russia to the United States. Meanwhile Communist China appeared well set to jump into the turmoil to feed her own grand-scale designs.

The current climax in the crisis developed on the night of August 5 when several thousand armed Pakistani raiders led by Pakistani army officers in plain clothes crossed the UN ceasefire line and advanced toward Srinagar, the capital of Jammu and Kashmir state, with orders to organize a rebellion against India among the Moslem majority.

This was established by the report of the UN Secretary-General U Thant to the security council in which he said, "General Nimmo (Chief of the UN observer group in Kashmir) has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on Aug. 5 were to a considerable extent, in subsequent days, in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the ceasefire line from the Pakistani side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side.

The Indian army then moved to drive the raiders out of Kashmir and cut the guerrillas' supply routes.

Indian action was met by Pakistan's U.S.-supplied Paton tanks and F-86 Sabre jets. Within a short period the undeclared war spread to the international boundary line between India and Pakistan in the west as well as in the east.

But the roots of the conflicts are deeper than the current development.

The essential reason for this international crisis is that the basic facts behind it have been forgotten by those concerned with the vital question of peace.

The ruler of Jammu and Kashmir acceded to India on Oct. 26, 1947 by signing the instrument of accession, duly accepted by the Governor-General of India, Lord Mountbatten.

Pakistan, desiring the annexation of Kashmir, sent armed tribals backed by three brigades of the Pakistani army to conquer the Indian state. India complained to the UN security council regarding Pakistani aggression.

Ignoring the legal accession of Kashmir to India, Pakistan complained about India's refusal to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir.

The UN then passed two resolutions dealing with the ceasefire and the plebiscite question and moved to set up the UN Commission on India and Pakistan (UNCIP).

The initial resolution on Aug. 13, 1948 that "in the event—of Pakistan not accepting these proposals or, forces, regular and irregular, from the entire state of Jammu and Kashmir.

Upon completion India was to withdraw the bulk of her forces, keeping however sufficient forces for the maintenance of order.

The subsequent resolution, on Jan. 5, 1949 acknowledged the right of a plebiscite but was to come into effect only after the first resolution had been carried out.

The chairman of the UN Commission assured the Prime Minister of India towards the end of Dec. 1948 that "in the event—of Pakistan not accepting these proposals, or, having accepted them, not implementing parts 1 and 2 of the resolution of Aug. 13, 1948 (dealing with ceasefire and withdrawal of Pakistan forces from Kashmir), India's acceptance of them should not be regarded in any way as binding."

This assurance was included in the second interim report of the UN commission.

For the last seventeen years Pakistan has totally ignored the implementation of this resolution.

She greatly strengthened her military position in occupied Kashmir (so called "Azad Kashmir") and set up foreign air bases in the territory.

Since then an enormous change has altered the situation. India could not wait indefinitely for Pakistan to fulfill the prerequisites laid down in the UN resolution of 1948. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have meanwhile exercised their rights in the last three general elections, and each time have affirmed their being an integral part of India, although those in "Azad Kashmir" have never taken part in any election.

Some sections of the Western press accepted the Pakistani line that the Kashmir issue is one of religion.

India has embraced secularism as a basic principle of providing equal opportunity to individuals irrespec-

tive of caste, creed, religion or colour. Pakistan is an Islamic state with an autocratic ruler, unlike India, the largest democracy in the world.

India is the third largest Moslem state in the world, with some fifty million Moslems, fifteen million Christians, and various other religious and ethnic minorities.

Some sections of the Western press have said that both India and Pakistan have used military equipment supplied by the United States.

The American government is aware of the evidence that Pakistan, in violation of her assurance to the U.S., has used American-supplied bombers and tanks and other equipment. But India has restrained herself from using any U.S.-supplied equipment.

Pakistan since 1954 has received \$1,500 million in military aid against only \$80 million in military equipment delivered by the U.S. to India.

While Pakistan has been masterminding her military-oriented foreign policy with ambition for Kashmir, she has found it convenient to join with China in an unholy marriage for mutual bargaining in Kashmir.

In violation of international law, Pakistan gave away to China, by agreement, 2,000 square miles of Jammu and Kashmir as if it were her own, without bothering about self-determination. China, on her part, is supporting Pakistan temporarily in line with her expansionist policy and in continuation of her illegal occupation of 42,000 square miles of Indian territory in Kashmir and in the north-east.

India, as a democratic country, has become a stumbling block for China's ambition in Asia.

To humble and humiliate India is China's design today. A humiliation of the Indian democratic set-up would be the death of democracy in Asia.

The permanent settlement of the Kashmir problem does not lie in discovering arrangements to suit interested powers, but in seeking the truth behind the story.



News Item: "More than a million Canadians between 18 and 21 years of age, capable of rational and intelligent political views are being deprived of a voice in the House of Commons."—local politician.

# Viewpoint

On Oct. 18, students' council passed, in toto, the minutes of the four meetings that were invalidated by the DIE Committee. There was little debate, and with the exception of one item, councillors didn't question anything that had been passed at those four meetings. Just exactly what does this mean? What was going on in the minds of those councillors?

The reason that the DIE Committee invalidated those meetings was that a quorum of elected, voting representatives was not present. Not one of those councillors who was absent questioned any of the motions, or moved to reconsider anything. The executive set things up very smoothly by having the minutes considered as a whole, leaving it up to the individual councillor to delete any motion he didn't wish ratified. This on the surface seems innocent enough, but there are some ramifications to such a procedure.

## by babbit

Council, being the conformist body it is, decided to whitewash the whole works, even though some of the motions passed during the summer were hotly-debated at the time, and as the minutes showed, narrowly defeated or passed. Why was nothing questioned? A number of reasons come to mind. Either they had no misgivings whatsoever about what had been done for a good part of the summer, they were afraid to speak out for fear of being branded a rebel, or there wasn't anything discussed of enough interest to warrant it being reshaped. You figure out which.

Is students' council shirking its responsibility? It's forever being accused of being of no use to students generally, and completely out of touch with the campus. Actions like these seem to bear the general feeling out. Councillors seem to feel that they can come to a meeting once a week, stick up a hand to vote, say very little, and go home again. Do any think of their actions on a long term basis? By ratifying all actions passed for four meetings held over the summer in practically as many minutes, they have admitted they don't care, or they completely agreed with the few who did attend those meetings. To me, this seems a rather surprising result. These people have been elected to their position not on the basis of kick-lines (as some think), but because they are responsible people filling a position of responsibility. It is a small wonder that people are disgusted with council as a whole, and probably some individuals, when they take actions like they did. They'll probably go on doing the same thing, time after time, sticking their hand up without really thinking about what it means as an overall consequence. The students' union has grown by leaps and bounds in the last few years, but rather than growing in terms of student involvement, it seems to have grown only in terms of bureaucracy and the size of its budget. When students at the so-called top of the organization pull stunts like that, it's no wonder that no one is interested in student government. I'd rather drink beer myself.

(Babbit is an anonymous U of A student. You too, are welcome to submit an editorial to Viewpoint, whether your name is published or not.—The Editor.)