national and international nature, encouraging discussions of real or hypothetical business situations to expand the mental proclivities of the students, so that they would be able to function in solving the really big problems that face industrial tycoons who developed to the stage where they prefer to occupy their minds on something more pleasurable and less onerous.

Considering the assistance that the Universities are giving to business, it is not surprising to note the reciprocity of service on the part of business toward the Universities. These master promoters know a good thing when they see it. Business grants to higher education in 1959 amounted to the sizable sum of $100.000.000. In the year 1950 the grants totalled $40,000,000.* This increased generosity should be eloquent proof of the fact that the donors are getting at least the usual per cent on their investment.

One of the contributors to the Review forum — H. W. Prentis Jr. — former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, tells us that some people are naive enough to believe that business, in giving such substantial financial support to higher education, might attempt to dictate the course of study. He laughed at the gullibility of such simple minds.

Yet, looking at the case as we see it, those naive individuals seem to have a point. The business element of course is not quite so crude in its approach as to demand a rigid prescribed program be implemented. But if the methods and procedures adhered to by the Universities do not redound to the moral and financial — or the other way about — credit of the "philanthropists," then, the law of diminishing returns would effectively reduce the sums donated to a magnitude that the average layman could comprehend. It can be taken for granted that those who provide $100,000,000 per year to grease the machinery of higher education are getting returns commensurate with such liberality.

Another point over which the reviewing panel seemed to stumble was the acceptance of a four year course in a University as being tantamount to a real education. Our analysis of the prescribed semesters adds up to a training rather than an education. The University curricula is a blueprint to drill young people along the trail of conformity into the price - haggling area of the market place. It is a form of group therapy that plays down individual initiative and leads its victims to vegetate in the valley of mediocrity.

Occasionally a refractory and reluctant trainee steps over the traces and participates in the creative process opportunity presents, but the day is past when pick and shovel artists like Jim Hill, and Donald Mann, can graduate from the school of experience into masterminding railroad empires. The masses must be herded in the proper alleys in business as in religion.

Business men and scholars are not conflicting factions bent on class abolition, but complementary units in the maintenance and longevity of capitalism. The financial and industrial magnates have control of the wealth of the world, but the operational functions of the system must be performed by employees equipped and coached for the purpose.

The teachers in colleges, institutes of technology, and universities prepare the student for his life work. They currently lay emphasis on the greater use of mathematics, and mathematical methodology as a tool in the successful operation of the system. The processing of electronic data is being consistently developed since it was found to be a convenient instrument to facilitate the planning and scheduling of production and distribution. Yes, the scholar is working hand in hand with big business regardless of the rivalries discernible to the oil - sponsored Saturday Review.

J. A. MacDONALD

* Many more millions are spent by big business through its Foundations to subsidize educations. The FORD Foundation only a year ago, granted $600,000,000 to various educational institutions.

Yesterday's Enemies — Today's Friends

A painful chore, often visited upon the workers of the world, is the attempt to change old loyalties and friendships for the new ones that are often demanded by the capitalists because of the swiftly changing international scene. Take the case of NATO'S phantom general — German General Hans Speidel, former boss of Nazi-occupied Paris. In 1957, the year he took over the Allied land force in Central Europe, he was the No. 1 public relations liability of the Western Alliance. He has since then been finding it difficult trying to sidestep some of the hatreds built up among the workers of nations opposed to Germany during WW II. Once upon reaching his London hotel, Speidel flabbergasted his hosts by vanishing into his room, leaving them and the press waiting in the lobby and he had to be coaxed out. At Oslo, the plane taking him to an official visit in the Norwegian capital had to circle the field for an hour and a half while police drove back demonstrators. But most workers seem to have short memories and readily consume the new propaganda fare handed down by their masters, leaving such embarassing demonstrations to a minority.

Writing from London, Wallace Reyburn told us back in 1958 that "Wernher von Braun who succeeded at last in getting in American sputnik well off the ground, has not unnaturally become a national hero in the U.S."

But back in 1944, on Sept. 7, (first V2 attack on London) "von Braun became for the Germans a national hero. So now he has achieved something unique — to become in turn the national hero of two nations that were at war with each other."

According to Reyburn, "like so many Nazis, von Braun now says that of course he really didn't want to make war. What he really wanted to do was send a rocket to the moon. He got sidetracked."

LOTS OF PEOPLE GOT SIDETRACKED

The workers, scientists included, of the belligerent nations wanted jobs and the capitalists wanted profits. This is the natural setup which causes commercial war to develop periodically into violent war. Freedom and democracy existed more as slogans than as reality, then as always. Von Braun practised his rocketry first on Great Britain. Who will be the next candidate for target practice? In the sordid shifting for advantage with the enhancement and expansion of capital as the eternal goal, this is anybody's guess.

Even NATO pals have a tough time getting along together. We were told that the "economic policies of Britain on the one hand and France and West Germany on the other now are so widely split that bickering instead of unity might be shown if all gathered at the one table," according to Harold Morrison, Canadian Press staff writer, last August. In 1957 France became highly incensed over the shipment of arms to Tunisia destined for Algeria's rebels, by Britain and the USA.

You never know what's going to happen next. Nikita Khrushchev is embarassed by the sabre-rattling of his Chinese state-capitalist ally. And down in the Middle-East, while employed by President Nasser in his bid for Egyptian independence from British and French domination, Nazi technicians who had been taught during WW II to hate Jews found it very vexing to have to co-operate with the Russians, whom they had also been taught to hate.

WHO WINS WARS?

We are told by Judith Robinson from London that the "West German trade unions are protesting. For 15 years, patriotic by request, they have exercised wage discipline and encouraged members to work long hours for little pay to help rebuild