

Debate skirts issue

These endless, high-flying, "philosophical" debates about sex and when a fetus is a human being completely skirt the real issues. Once again, it is sadly demonstrated how cloistered most of the thinking around here really is. Let's lay it out: There are millions of people in this world who every year have abortions and are going to have abortions. These folks are rarely going to be swayed by the outcome of such morality plays as we've been subjected to in the erudite pages of the *Gateway*. It would be just as useful to these women to pay attention to discussions about life after death or the number of angels that can disco on the head of a pin. The real issue is whether our society is going to continue to allow women to suffer and die at the hands of ill-trained, ill-equipped

and clandestine abortionists. The question is also whether we will continue to restrict access to abortion on a class basis. By this I mean the increasing cut-offs of public funding to abortion clinics for the poor in the U.S. Those with the income will still be able to afford safe abortions, be it with a trip to Britain, to Sweden, or to Washington State, while we will be forcing those "less well-off" into dangerous back rooms. The morality of abortion, just as the reality of abortion, is a private affair. If you can convince a woman that abortion is wrong, fine. But in the meantime, abortions occur. They must be safe, free, and on demand. It is a woman's right to choose.

Fred Judson
Grad Student

Pundit misrepresented

While appreciating the generally informative article which appeared in the *Gateway* concerning the political science forum on the federal election ("Former teacher criticizes Clark," 22 January, page 3) I must take issue with one inaccuracy.

Your reporter attributes to me the statement that Clark "wisely avoided over-representing the West in his cabinet, something Stevenson said John Diefenbaker did not do."

In my remarks I simply pointed out that Westerners were less influential in the Clark cabinet than in the Diefenbaker cabinet, without making any value judgement whatever. I certainly did not, and would not, condemn John Diefenbaker for giving major portfolios to westerners. In fact if any value judgement was implicit in this part of my remarks it was to the effect that Ontario is somewhat over-represented in the Clark government. Therefore the ad-

jective "wisely" in the sentence quoted above represents your reporter's opinion, and not mine.

Garth Stevenson
Associate Professor

Kidnapping foiled again

With regard to the engineer's complaints of insufficient coverage; my associates and I concocted a truly brilliant scheme to kidnap an engineering princess. We had secured the cooperation of two (count 'em two) Edmonton TV stations which would have resulted in city wide coverage of the event. (Don't bother kicking yourselves guys, you'd probably miss.) However the engineers, showing their true yellow colours, refused to even let the girls off campus. Well next year we won't play fair either.

Simon Hemingway
Arts I

Mindless conservative

In response to Mr. Charles W. Farley's ridiculous letter to the editor published in the January 24th issue of the *Gateway*, here are a few remarks.

There is no point in discussing the mindless content of this letter. Despite being in Commerce II Mr. Farley will experience difficulty in marketing this solution to world problems.

While reading this letter I first thought it was a satire of the American ultraconservatist attitude. I still harbour some hope that it was in jest.

You do well as a comic, Mr. Farley, consider it if you fail your exams.

Jacques le Fendu
Graduate Studies



Quixote

by David

Marples

Is Canada irrevocably tied to the foreign and defence policies of the United States?

The question has been put before, but it has acquired a new significance of late, due to the current U.S.-Soviet confrontation in the Persian Gulf. There is a body of opinion, which once included Pierre Trudeau and continues to include Joe Clark, which considers that Canadian defence needs are dependent upon the protection of the United States. Economic and ethnographic ties with the Americans and the latter country's role as the champion of the "free world" have led to the conclusion that a joint-military policy is the only guarantee of safety, against either "communism" or a nuclear attack.

The military links between the two countries are relatively recent, dating back only to 1940, when the Ogdensburg Agreement led to the formation of the Permanent Joint Board of Defence (PJBD), as an advisory body on joint operations. Since the Second World War, the United States has gradually built up a formidable system of military alliances to counter the Soviet threat. Of these, the most important is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), established in 1949. NATO was founded as an alliance of democratic states and "sold" to the Canadian public partly on the basis of Article II, drafted by the Canadian government, which stressed economic collaboration between the various countries.

However, the real basis of NATO was the belief, as propounded by the United States, that the only worthwhile response to Soviet tactics is increased militarism. It is not based on the North Atlantic and the subsequent inclusion of Greece and Turkey and collaboration with Franco's Spain negated its claim to represent liberal democracies. The result of the formation of NATO has been to place a cluster of small and middle states under the leadership and hegemony of the United States. From 1949, Canada's interests have been declared to be identical to

those of the U.S.A., as a guarantor of Western Europe.

However, Canada's accidental geographical location between the two principal antagonists necessitated even closer links. In particular, the creation of the North American Air Defense Agreement (NORAD) on May 12, 1958, was a

recognition that Canada was a vital part of the U.S. external security system. It helped to legitimize the establishment of the Pinetree radar line and the Distant Early Warning Line (DEW), both set up by the Americans in the Canadian Arctic. More recently, North American security has rested upon the usage of "over the horizon backscatter radar" to detect Soviet missiles.

The past two decades have seen the transformation of the Arctic into an American domain. The U.S. airforce carries out air reconnaissance and the U.S. navy conducts ice-breaking and nuclear submarine operations, particularly in the region of the Northwest Passage. Admittedly, there is a formidable Soviet naval presence, but this is dictated by the relative proximity of the major Soviet cities to the Arctic region. Canada faces an unusual situation for an independent nation, whereby her northernmost frontier is "protected" largely by another foreign power, supposedly operating in her interests.

Unless one believes that thousands of cossack-hatted marauders are about to descent upon Inuvik, then it is evident that the accomplishments of NATO and NORAD have been two-fold. First, they have helped to erode Canada's authority as a sovereign state. Secondly, they have placed the Canadian population in imminent danger. The prime goal of NORAD is to intercept missiles and shoot down Soviet bombers before they reach the United States, i.e. *over Canada*. The construction of the NORAD station north of Edmonton is further proof that the first engagements will be over Canadian territory.

Thus the notion that United States can offer protection to Canada is something of a myth. Soviet policies are anathema to most of us, yet the USSR poses no greater threat to the sovereignty of Canada than does the United States. Clearly Canada, as a middle power, is incapable of withstanding aggression by either of its bellicose neighbors. Could she remain neutral or adopt a role of arbiter between the U.S. and the Soviets? If we were to answer both questions in the affirmative however, a third would present itself. Does Canada still have the freedom to make such a choice?



The University of Western Ontario

MBA Program

School of Business Administration
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada. N6A 3K7

Professor Blair Little,
Chairman, MBA Program

will be on campus

Friday, February 1st
from

11:00 A.M. - 4:00 P.M.

To discuss the Western MBA Program

Further information is available through the
Canada Employment Centre Office.

SUELECTION

NEED SOME EXTRA CASH?

The Students' Union requires staff for the General Election on Friday, February 8th. Help us out and earn \$4.00/hour at the same time. For further information, please contact the SU Returning Office (Room 271, SUB) or the Receptionist, SU Executive Offices (Room 259, SUB).