

## CUBA, CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY, AND INSANITY

On Monday, October 22, Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States, made an announcement that shocked the entire world. Cuba is in possession of nuclear weapons which constitute a threat to the Western Hemisphere, and to forstall any action on Cuba's part, the United States is placing her in a state of enforced blockade.

Immediately, the free world concurred with the United States with almost unequivocal agreement. Never before, has there been such immediate and complete agreement with any aspect of American foreign policy.

The only conspicuous exception to this unanimous approval was that of Canada. While, on the one hand, the vast majority of Canadian public opinion is decidedly in favour of the President's announcement, we have been left in an embarrassing position by the lack of sympathy expressed by the Canadian Government.

Mr. Pearson, the Liberal Leader, in view of the situation, has given a reasonable program for Canada. Mr. Pearson's suggestion that Canada should emphatically support the American Government's decision, and that now is the right time for Canada to join the Organization of American States, is truly more indicative of Canadian feelings than the Government's non-committal stand.

In his statement of the twenty-fourth, the Prime Minister stated that Canada neither 'agrees nor disagrees' with the American decision.

On the twenty-fifth, the Prime Minister announced that combined American-Canadian naval manoeuvres, which were to take place in November in the North Atlantic are called off, because the impression might be given that Canada is supporting the Cuban blockade.

Fear of non-support of his minority government is surely not the reason for refusing a statement. The Social Credit Party, in the person of its leader, Mr. Thompson, was the first party to commit itself wholeheartedly to Mr. Kennedy's announcement. This support alone would give the Government a footing. It has been working with this support, despite Liberal efforts, since the convening of Parliament.

Well, if Mr. Diefenbaker does not have the cynical intention of 'politicizing' on the issue, what then is his purpose in refusing commitment on the blockade?

Essentially, it is a question of foreign policy. But, does Canada have a foreign policy?

Recently, when this question was put to a member of Parliament, Mr. McQuarrie, member for this county of Queens, answered emphatically in the affirmative. In elaborating, he said that Canada was a member of N.A.T.O., the United Nations, and other international groups, both defensive and peace-like in nature. What Mr. McQuarrie did not say but implied, is that Canada in light of the cold war, cannot have

a foreign policy that is unlike any other member of N.A.T.O., because in fact we are faced with the common danger of Communism. Many Canadians will argue with this.

What many Canadians do not realize is that Canada has a foreign policy outside of N.A.T.O., a foreign policy which is unstated, but nevertheless evident from the recent manoeuvres of the Prime Minister.

Simply put, Mr. Diefenbaker's intentions seem directed to an exertion of a 'Canadian independence,' -- independence to exert its own will in foreign policy, to create a sphere in which it can present itself as the leader of the 'non-allied' nations. This foreign policy is at one and the same time anti-American, and directed toward the "non-allied".

Several years ago, at a Prime Ministers' Conference, Canada was the only white member of the Commonwealth to favour the expulsion of South Africa. The non-white countries, for the most part 'non-allied', backed this stand, and South Africa was removed.

Just this past week, the Canadian response, or lack of response to the announcement of an American blockade of Cuba, placed Canada in the camp of the non-allied. Although committed to the Western camp in the cold war, through N.A.T.O., Canada's reaction was akin to that of the neutral nations. Mr. Diefenbaker's proposal of an eight country commission from the non-allied nations to look into the situation in Cuba, seemed packed with 'niceties' for the tables of Africa and Asia. In following the middle of the road policy of Mr. Nehru, let us hope that a Red China does not tramp on our toes.

The Canadian Government's reaction to Mr. Kennedy's announcement has another aspect relative to foreign relations. In asserting that Canada neither 'agrees nor disagrees' with the American action, the government seems to be demonstrating something akin to what Parliament did in 1939 -- call a war a day later than Great Britain, just to show we are independent. What Mr. Diefenbaker is saying is: let's not declare a stand on Cuba, because then we will be showing our independence of "Big Uncle Sam."

This aspect of Anti-Americanism is also evident in the Prime Minister's repeated refusal to discuss Canadian participation in the Organization of American States. Mr. Diefenbaker is working under the illusion that the U.S. controls the O.A.S., and that for Canada it is a "hot potato."

In all this, Mr. Diefenbaker is overlooking more than Canadian opinion, he is compromising Canada's position with the United States, to whom we, in the final analysis, are indebted for our freedom. For the sake of a grandiose plan, Mr. Diefenbaker is leading us into the camp of non-aliance, where the woods can't be seen for the trees.

## Why not legalize abortion?

One of the most controversial issues before the public is the fight for legalized abortion. With the sensationalism of the Finkbine case in Phoenix, Arizona, this past summer, the question again became heatedly debated. In view of the morality of the situation most religious demonstrations feel it their duty to offer some guidance. Very few sects have the courage to forbid it outright, others are unable to because of their creeds. Thus the question falls in that nebulous category of personal decision. For Catholics the question hardly exists at all—abortion is forbidden. Unless one has ever felt the weight of such a tremendous decision on his shoulders, one can hardly experience the release—the freedom-of having the situation already resolved.

But does the Catholic Church presume by this to eradicate individual freedom, to stick to an opinion which most of the world feels is outdated and inhuman? If one could imagine the anguish that Mrs. Finkbine supposedly went through before she made her decision, perhaps the most inhuman action was to allow a person with limited access to truth and conception of values to make any decision.

The resolution of the abortion question, like the resolution of many other crucial issues, lies in the end, or the highest goal, which one has in mind. The Catholic Church as the custodian of Truth has defined the goal for all men, clearly, concisely, and logically. And it is in view of this that she is obliged to denounce abortion.

In an interview given to Life Magazine, Mrs. Finkbine expressed the idea that she realized the preciousness of life, and yet she asked if being unable to dress oneself, to dance, to run, to have a "good time", was life. If these are the final goals of life, if popularity, or ability to dance or dress is the final end of man, then of course Mrs. Finkbine was justified in taking the life of a child who would not be able to do these things. Perhaps this sounds pre-

postorous, but if these are one's attitudes, one can hardly disagree with their implications.

In its own way the same article tried to answer this question for people who do not have the philosophical knowledge of the Church, but still retain some vestige of human values. In their belief that pictures are worth thousands of words, Life showed a little boy without arms or legs smelling a flower held by his mother, who helped to provide the breakthrough in tracking down the drug; a baby laughing and playing with her sister, oblivious of limbs; but most touching were the eyes of the parents whose love surmounted all obstacles. And throughout all these pictures the same message in the words of Pope John XXIII, "Love always chooses life" reverberated.

In view of this, the following article, written by a Polish bishop gives a rather sentimental answer to the question. Medically speaking, which he never intended, it may provide a clue to why many babies are born with ulcers.

The following was written by a Polish bishop while the Communists were trying to get the Church to relax her laws on abortion.

### DIARY OF AN INFANT

Oct. 5:

Today my life began. My parents do not know it yet. I'm as small as the seed of an apple, but it is I already. And I'm a girl. I shall have blonde hair and azure eyes. Just about everything is settled, even the fact that I shall love flowers.

Oct. 19:

I have grown a little, but I am still too small to do anything by myself. My mother does just about everything for me. And what is odd she doesn't even know she is carrying me under her heart, and that she is helping me already, that she is feeding me with her own blood. She is so good. Some people say that I am not a real person, but I am a real person, just as a small crumb of bread is bread. My mother is and so am I.

Oct. 23:

My mouth is beginning to open

## THE UNIVERSITY:

### One big, happy family

By DOUGLAS E. MacLEOD

Before I begin this article, I would like to pass a brief comment on the one written by Douglas E. MacLean. It was, in my estimation, well written and deserving of praise. It indicated that the author read a book called "The American Catholic Dilemma" by Thomas F. O'dea, and that everything in his article came from that source. It was, therefore, a flagrant violation of etiquette, on the part of Mr. MacLean, not to mention the original source or the author. I hope that in the future, he will demonstrate a little more humility and a little less plagiarism.

Although I have heard the university community called a family, I have never really believed it for the simple reason that any similarity between the university and the family is purely coincidental, and necessitates an artificial and forced similitude.

We are all, it seems, brothers and sisters (a relationship which I don't think would appeal to any co-ed), and the president, or some one else in authority, is the head of the family. Should we, therefore, act like a typical family (which would include coming late for meals, failing to rise promptly when called in the morning, quarreling, borrowing money from Dad, and slamming doors)? The answer is definitely No. In comparing the university to the family, we must use some discretion and choose only those aspects of the family which are wholesome and which can be taken over and applied to any group.

That the president represents the authority of Christ, helps greatly in this matter. We can then see in him the "father image" and act as children would

that is, with respect and love.

Since this is possible, can we not (with sincerity) say that the prison warden and his "inmates" constitute a family (an observation which I am sure helps to alleviate the life sentence). The authority of the warden ultimately comes from God, but then so does the authority of Kruschov.

The comparison between the family and any institution requires that the idea of the family be elevated to a metaphysical entity (which seems like a contradiction - and it is). Having done this, we may then say that the university, the monastery, the grammar school, and the penitentiary, are all families belonging to one big family, the nation.

We have only to think about this a moment to understand its potential harm. Can we not take away from the family some of its sacredness by artificially and forcefully applying its particular values to every unit of society within reach and reason?

I sometimes wonder if this artificial application of values does not indicate some unrealistic attitudes. The desire to imitate a family is, at second best, quite inadequate and can lead to confusion. If the university is not a family, then what is it? If we thus begin to label things as they are, the idea of what a family is might lead to more respect for it—a respect urgently needed in our times when the school, the university, the health clinic, the community centre, and the local PTA try (always with the best intentions, of course) to usurp the traditional duties and rights of the family.

It is obvious to anyone today that the family is in the limelight chiefly because of the works of sociologists, psychologists and other observers of human nature and behavior. It is perhaps even more obvious (and fortunate), that many a hardworking father and mother do not have time to read these; if they did they would find out, with impressive de-

now. Just think, in a year or so I shall be laughing, and later talking. I know what my first word will be. . . Mama.

Oct. 25:

My heart began to beat today. From now on it shall beat all by itself for the rest of my life. But after a time it will tire, and I will die.

Nov. 2:

I'm growing a bit every day. My arms and legs are beginning to take shape. But it will be a long time before these arms gather flowers and these legs raise me to mommy's arms.

Nov. 12:

Tiny fingers are beginning to form on my arms. Funny how small they are. I shall be able to stroke my mommy's hair with them. And I shall take my mommy's hair to my mouth and she will probably say: "Oh, nasty!"

Nov. 20:

It wasn't until today that the doctor told my mommy that I was living under her heart. Oh, how happy she must be! Are you happy, mommy?

Nov. 25:

My mom and dad are probably thinking of a name for me. But they don't even know that I'm a girl. They are probably saying Andy or Jim, but I want to be called Ava. I'm getting so big already.

Dec. 10:

My hair is growing. It is smooth and shining. I wonder what kind of hair mommy has?

Dec. 24:

I am just about able to see. It is dark around me. When mommy brings me into the world, it will be full of sunshine and flowers. I have never seen a flower, you know. But what I want more than anything is to see my mom. How do you look mom,?

Dec. 28:

I wonder if mom hears the whispering beat of my heart? Some children come into the world sick, and then the delicate hands of the doctor perform miracles and bring them back to health. But my heart is strong and healthy. It beats so easily . . . you'll have a healthy daughter, mom!

Dec. 30:

Today my mother killed me.

tail, what a really lousy job they are doing of raising their children. There are such things, you know, as traumatic experiences, complexes of every description, sociological accommodations, conflict, peer groups, and distorted parent images; they (parents) could also worry about whether their children will grow up to hate them simply because their knowledge of complex modern youth is so terribly inadequate. Parents have enough to worry about already, and an outline of how many things could really be guilty of does little to aid the harassed housewife or the breadwinner caught up in a machine age which threatens to smother his own sense of human dignity.

This does not mean that the study of the family should be abandoned, but it does mean that its discoveries should be applied with charity and understanding. The saints of the twentieth century are not all behind cloister walls, or encamped in the jungles of South America; the majority of them are surrounded by dirty dishes, howling babies and unpaid bills.

In this discussion as to whether the university is a family or not, I have only one last thing to ask: Where's Mom?

### S. U. Meeting —

— Continued From Page One — will be called. Should there be two unsuccessful attempts in obtaining a quorum, the business at hand will be turned over to the Executive of the Students' Union who will then decide the issues.

Meanwhile, the Executive has held five meetings for the purpose of deciding the budgets of the various societies on campus and of reviewing the new constitution which will be placed before the students at the General Body meeting.

The Students' Union Executive has also decided to donate a trophy for the most improved player on the Varsity Football team. Trophies already exist for the Most Valuable Player Award won last year by Frank Garrity, and the Most Valuable Lineman Award captured by Don DesRoches last year.

## BAN WHICH BOMB?

The recent crisis precipitated by Dr. Castro's concern for Cuban power, makes one think that Sir Bertrand Russell is as crazy as we think he is when he demands the abolition of nuclear weapons. Of course, to advocate the complete disarmament of nuclear weapons, as some of our pacifists do, is folly. The results of such a policy would bring the death blow to our civilization. But, what the Cuban situation does point out is the folly of permitting the enlargement of the 'Nuclear Club.'

Dr. Castro's stock-piling of weapons, for no other purpose but to threaten the Hemisphere, should bring home a message to those Canadians who advocate the acquisition of nuclear weapons. Only a short while ago, a regime that now threatens us was hailed in Canada and the United

States as being the saviour of the Cuban people, the friend of the United States, the answer to the tyrannical regime of Batista.

If Canada accepts these weapons, what is going to stop other countries from asking for them? What argument will the U.S. use, for example, in refusing West Germany the same weapons? She, just as much as Canada, is a member of N.A.T.O. There is no reason to believe that Germany would not use them to regain her Eastern Frontier, which she passionately desires.

What, for example, would power hungry people like Nkrumah of Ghana do with nuclear weapons? What would Israel do with them if she got into another fight with an Arab country? What would Sukarno do with them? What is Cuba threatening to do?

### FASHION SHOPPE

141 Great George St.,  
Charlottetown,  
P. E. I.

For all Furniture  
Needs — See

FIRESTONE HOME  
and AUTO LTD.

Gt. George St.

### BURNS JEWELLERS

Prompt Engraving Service

Great George Street

Charlottetown — Dial 6632