

Germany's Problem Must Not Be Allowed To Stand In Way Of Peace Settlement

By ALEXANDER FARRELL

Despite the bitterness engendered by the war, not a few people in Western Europe and North America looked upon the division of Germany in 1945 as a tragedy: a tragedy for the German people and for the world. They consoled themselves with the thought that it could not last.

Alas, that has turned out to be a vain hope. Today it looks as if the division of Germany will last for a very long time indeed, and the would-be architects of peace, instead of wishing away this ugly fact, must try to incorporate it in their plans. It is useless and dangerous to continue insisting that this division be ended as a necessary prelude to the achievement of a real peace, the only alternative to extinction.

The great difficulty here for the western powers, of course, is that they have dedicated themselves to the cause of German re-unification. One need only recall the Berlin-Schoenberg declaration of July 29, 1957, when West Germany, Britain, France and the United States reaffirmed their determination to press for this goal, to realize how firmly this dedication has been made.

By any moral criterion, then, West Germany has the right to expect the loyal support of her allies in her efforts to bring all Germany together again. "Loyal support" has its limitations, however. It does not mean that the western allies would be justified in risking war to restore the shattered sovereignty of Germany over all her own territory.

The risk of war is being run as long as the cold war continues. Since neither West nor East can enforce

peace on their own terms, the task of relaxing international tension must be approached in a more conciliatory spirit than has so far been evident in post-war diplomacy. Statesmen dare not make the issue of peace or war hang on situations which they dislike but are powerless to remedy without resorting to force.

Such a situation is posed by Germany. The spectacle of a divided Germany makes western policy-makers officially unhappy but there appears to be nothing they can do about it. These men must ask themselves seriously, therefore, whether they are justified before all mankind in letting it be an obstacle to peace in an age when a war fought with hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles would blast not only the German problem but all other temporal problems into the vastness of eternity.

This is not a call for pacifism or appeasement. After all, a divided Germany does not have the inherent character of an obstacle to peace. It is one only because men who have the responsibility of leadership are making it one. It is a problem only because men insist on regarding it as one. Ultimately, the division of Germany must be accepted, if peace cannot be had any other way.

One need not scoff at the idea that a real peace is possible without the re-unification of Germany. Many people in Germany have maintained to me that peace on those negative terms would hardly be more bearable than the cold war. But, in the long run, must that necessarily be the case? While it might be embarrassing to say this out loud in Munich or Berlin or Bonn, history is replete with examples of peoples adjusting themselves to "intolerable" and "unjust" situations.

History may be calling upon the German people to make an adjustment of this nature. They are still burdened by a collective tragedy, in the sense that their aspiration to national unity is going unfulfilled in a world continuing to see itself divided into nations. They feel they have lost their national identity in a world where the nation still remains the deepest fountain of positive law and justice and the best guarantor of security.

Eventually, the German problem may be dissolved, rather than solved, in a movement toward a European and possibly even global community. The time may soon come when national aspirations, now very dangerous, will be outmoded. Instead of seeking to rebuild sovereignties like that of Germany, diplomacy will aim at reducing still other sovereignties and submitting them all to a supra-nation. In any case, the rule of law on a supra-national level is a vital goal for the peace of the world.

In the meantime, conditions seem ripe for an experiment in disengagement. If western allies and Russia can persuade each other to pull out of Germany, and leave the Germans themselves more authority to confront the German problem, then they may find themselves on the verge of a lasting East-West settlement. From the military point of view, it would have been dangerous a few years ago for the United States to pull out of Germany prior to a settlement. Now that missiles are flying around, this strategic tenet has been invalidated.

Introducing George Naylor

He Is Still Young At Heart

For many years now the Music I course has been given by an Englishman, and this year there is a continuation of the tradition; but with a difference. We have had two lecturers, both English. (If you can't beat 'em . . .") With the departure at Christmas of Mr. S. Hylton Edwards for sunnier climes, George C. Naylor took over the course for the remainder of the year.

In one respect, Mr. Naylor follows in the distinguished tradition. Trained at Leeds Training College, and the Royal College of Music, he has five diplomas and degrees in music and a diploma of education. He was on the music faculty at Mount Allison for two years, and had considerable success with the student productions, the choral society and the dance band too. Mr. Naylor is still young at heart.

He worked his way through college as a dance band musician and now applies this training to his teaching, which results in a fresh and individual approach to the subject. Already he is making his presence felt, rehearsing the "Wagon" orchestra, and playing for dances around the campus—talk to anyone who was at the Poor Man's Law Ball. Where do you see him? Frequently around the campus there is seen a streak, as he dashes in and out—he's also a full time soldier: sergeant in the Royal Canadian Band and somehow finds time to be working off the last year of a Dal Bachelor of Music degree. Tranquilizer, anyone?

Denis Sips The Brimming Cup

by DENIS STAIRS

Screaming headlines in last week's *Argosy* announced that Fidel Castro and a junta of four officers had seized control of Mount Allison's Model Parliament. Prime Minister Max Dingle and Professor J. G. Greenslade, speaker, were abducted from the House and detained for possible execution. They were later released. Apparently government intelligence had learned of the impending revolution, but defensive measures were foiled by the attack coming ten minutes earlier than was expected. The "coup" supported by ten government dissenters in the House, was completed within nine minutes. Castro will control campus politics until next January when he will allow free elections.

* * *

It seems that the *McGill Daily* has lost some student reporting talent to a rival publication. Joe Azaria, Editor of *Montreal's* notorious, if interesting, scandal-sheet, *Midnight*, was interviewed by *McGill* reporters last week. Complacently seated behind an orderly desk in his spacious office the Iraq-born newspaperman claimed that his paper's policy is to reveal society's more sordid moments in the hope that these may thereby be rectified. Asked about an article he had recently published entitled "McGill is Tops in Sex", he answered, "I consider sex to be natural wherever there are young people. Everyone indulges in it. *McGill* more so than other universities". To inquiries about the source of his information, he replied, "There are four students on your campus who work for me part time. . ."

* * *

According to a recent article in *Western's Gazette*, Dr. John Paul produced some rather ominous statistics in a talk to members of U.W.O.'s Psychology Club. "Three students," he said, "in every class of 100 will be alcoholics in 10 years." Although London has the highest alcoholic rate of any centre in Ontario, he assured his audience that students did not enter into the problem. "To become an alcoholic takes approximately 10 years," he claimed, "and students have not been drinking that long before they come to university." Stating his qualifications for speaking on alcoholism, he said, "I have been drunk at least three times . . . thoroughly."

* * *

Dalhousians who have paid a visit to the Art Room in recent weeks may appreciate this anecdote given by a Winnipeg art critic when expressing his views on modern art. Two gentlemen were looking at an abstract painting. One said, "What is it?" The other replied, "It's a cow eating grass." "What cow would hang around after the grass was all gone, stupid?"

Frontiers and Free Thinking

For many years American historians regarded the history of their country as beginning with the Revolution, or with the 'spirit of '76' resulting in a democracy. But one day a young historian, Frederick Jackson Turner, decided to blaze a new trail in historical writing and release his impressions of his country's history and its culture.

Turner regarded frontiers more as a process than as a place.

As civilization in pioneering days in America moved westward until its advance seemed no longer possible, new areas were explored, new resources found, new ways of life were evolved, necessitating departure from traditional and conservative means of living.

We are told that the inquisitive probing of trappers, farmers, soldiers, and explorers, developed a certain type of American citizen. Turner saw the frontier as the birthplace of an independent, resourceful, shrewd American.

The tendency, however, to be anti-social produced a distaste on the part of the frontiersman for any kind of direct control. He wanted to be a free-thinker and an individualist. One disadvantage in this respect, Turner states, was the disrupting forces of the frontier—causing difficulties in maintaining political unity and loyalty. But he noted, too, that the influence of the frontier was coming to an end by 1893.

Free thinking and independent action are desirable on the part of a frontiersman or a writer, but certain social regulations make co-operation with others more advantageous.

A writer may develop his own ideas and habits, yet submission to the code of good writing standards will help him to do more efficient work.

Turner considered the influence of the frontier life as one vital to the formation of an American culture. The original prospect of free land was an all-important factor. The existence of an area of free land, and its continuous possession by the advance of American settlement westward, explain the American development.

"The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic Coast, it is the Great West," says Turner. He considered section-

alism more important than Old World legacy in their contributions to American culture.

In this respect he disagreed with his old teacher, Henry Baxter Adams. Turner realized he was working on a new field and proceeded cautiously in developing his ideas and writing them on paper.

The first inkling of his ability, the first expression of his new theory, was made in 1893 when he presented a paper on "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" at the World's Fair in Chicago.

At the age of 32, Turner was thrust into the foreground almost immediately.

His influence was great but the quantity of work produced was not great. In 1906 he wrote "The Rise of the Great New West". In 1920 he produced "The Frontier in American History."

"The Significance of Sections in American History" appeared in 1932, the year after his death. It won the Pulitzer prize, awarded posthumously.

Before his death Turner had established himself as an outstanding historian—the man who originated the 'Frontier School' of American History.

In Wisconsin, where he was born, his parents were able to give him the best education available. He received his first degree from the University of Wisconsin. He received his Ph.D. from John Hopkins University in Maryland, where he studied history under Adams. For four years he was professor of history in his home university. In 1910 he gave this up and taught at Harvard for 14 years.

Turner thus had preparation for free thinking.

Writers who would do creative writing today need preparation and training. In their pioneering efforts they may experience scratches, bruises, disappointments, and of course some encouragement when deserved. But all these are stepping stones to a greater and fuller enjoyment of thinking and experience and culture. It has been said that the need is great today for new writers.

Sometimes the writer may try to be anti-social and expect his ideas to be accepted contrary to the accepted usage of the editing world., but he learns that, although he has his rights, yet he has his responsibility to conform to truth and sincerity and reasonably to satisfy the reading world.