

EDITORIAL

Gone fishin'

George Bush is an avid fisherman. And after all, as a fisherman, he should know the meaning of being a good sport as well.

I fish too. But then again, I only fish for bass and perch or the occasional trout, and only when they're in season.

Bush, however, is a fisher of souls: the souls of thousands, perhaps millions, of soldiers and civilians who are sure to die in a protracted Middle East war.

Furthermore, Bush doesn't even have to wait for the right season to go fishing. With the clout of the United States war machine behind him, he can order hunting season any time he likes.

There's just one catch.

He has to stir up enough support from enough different nations to agree that it is *indeed* hunting season, before he can claim his bounty: Saddam Hussein.

After intense global lobbying, the Bush administration has finally been given official permission to use all necessary means to remove Hussein.

The five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council have approved an ultimatum against Iraq. Beginning bright and early in January, the U.S.-led military alliance will assault Iraq — both military and civilian targets — if Hussein does not withdraw his occupation army from Kuwait.

The Gulf crisis will soon be the Gulf war.

With the exception of some progressive newspapers and magazines, however, there has been little criticism about the policies of war in the mainstream media because so much of their information comes from official government sources.

This very complex issue has been transformed into a power struggle between good and evil with no room left for negotiations, compromise or economic sanctions. The bottom line is all or nothing.

The Bush (and Mulroney) administration is no longer as concerned with putting pressure on Hussein to voluntarily leave Kuwait, as it is with consolidating the views of the North American public to begin and maintain a war throughout the winter and spring of 1991.

Western officials talk about a "new world order," but this is hollow rhetoric aimed at achieving a very arbitrary consensus.

Case in point, could the words, "new world order," really oppose a military power like the U.S. if it happened to implement an unfair or aggressive foreign policy in the future?

Probably not. Who would enforce such an order against a superpower anyway? The U.N. would be powerless to do so because the U.S. can veto any resolution made against it.

Let's face it: WAR is a very old game. It doesn't matter what you call it, the net effect is still the same: people die.

Unfortunately, the U.N. has accepted this reality and will sanction military force as an option in the Persian Gulf.

The U.S. is pumped up for war. A threat to world order gives the Pentagon global-police-force its *raison d'être* and keeps the military industrial complex alive and well.

Grenada and Panama were just training manoeuvres. Iraq shall be the true test of U.S. military resolve.

How far will North Americans go for cheap oil?

George Bush, the fisher of souls, may need hip-waders as the fields of precious oil turn to blood and his precarious alliances fragment beneath the explosions and gunfire of an all-out Middle East war.

EXCALIBUR

Editor-in-Chief	Peter Stathis
Managing Editor	James Hoggett
Production Manager	Stephen Perry
News Editors	Jeannine Amber, Brent Poland
Arts Editors	Trevor Campbell, Joanne "Switch" White
Features Editor	Garth Hagey
Sports Editor	Josh Rubin
Photo Editor	A. Clive Cohen
Staff	Bruce Adamson, Frank Cameron, Mary Cerisano, Joan Clement, Mark Dillon, Ed Drass, Jill Flohil, Patrick Follens, David Gardner, Brett Gellert, Jessica Goldman, Kerim Gomeksiz, Hugh Hardy, Jim Hounslow, Ron Howe, Alex Jorritsma, Daniel Judd, Linda Kingston, Andrew Kyprianou, Faisal Kutty, Alex Lam, Brett Lamb, Jennifer Lim, Mattia Magnatta, Azed Majeed, Herschel Marshall, Alain Marsman, Paul McLellan, Chris Mulchinok, Michael Nachoff, Salman Nensi, Sue Pennypacker, Robert Pincombe, Almeida Quinn, Mike Raycroft, Jake Redkin, Peter Roe, Jim Russell, Riccardo Sala, André Souroujon, Swami, Sally Teodoro, Chris Wodskou
General Manager	Merle Menzies
Advertising Assistant	Patty Milton-Rao
Advertising Rep	Meiyin Yap
Distribution Manager	Boris Koechlin
Typesetters	Mary Jankulak, Dave Lake
Board of Publications Chairperson	Kevin Connolly

Excalibur is York University's community newspaper. We publish twice-weekly, and distribute across York and Glendon campuses and various locations within the North York community.

Excalibur is an autonomous corporation with a mandate to inform, educate and provoke thought among York University's diverse population.

The distinct opinions and articles appearing in Excalibur belong first and foremost to the individual writers and are not necessarily shared by any other Excalibur staff or board member.

Final editorial responsibility is retained by the Editor-in-chief.

EDITO RIAL 736-5239
TYPESETTING 736-5240
ADVE RTISING 736-5238

MAILING ADD RESS
Room 111, Central Square
York University
4700 Keele Street
Downsview M3J 1P3



LETTERS

Excalibur welcomes letters to the editor on all topics. We will publish, space permitting, letters up to 500 words in length. They must be typed, double spaced, and accompanied by the writer's name, signature and telephone number. The opinions expressed belong to the writers and do not necessarily reflect those of Excalibur staff or directors. However, we will refuse letters that are racist, sexist, libellous or those which attempt to incite hatred toward an individual or an identifiable group. All material is subject to editing. All submissions must be addressed to the Editor-in-Chief, Room 111, Central Square.

**Fight racist
Excal cartoon**

Re: Fight cartoon, Monday, Nov. 26

One week after your front page championed the fight against racism on campus, you have published one of the most racist cartoons I have seen in three years at York.

I refer of course to the "great fight" cartoon. Your depiction of a black woman, "Andrea the animal" (sic), managed to cover all the bases of classic racist stereotyping. Why was this woman barefooted and draped in an animal skin? Why the grotesque facial characteristics? This was a sketch so insulting as to be worthy of an average KKK flyer.

In actual fact, nothing in the way in which this woman was drawn even encouraged the reader to identify with the main theme of the cartoon, that of a political confrontation.

Instead, everything encouraged the reader to laugh AT HER as some sort of "African Queen" figure. The humor was not about her—IT WAS HER and her ethnicity and that is not very funny at all, in fact that is racism.

While the depiction of the woman in the cartoon was crudely overt and offensive in its stereotyping, the portrayal of Jean Ghomeshi as a starving refugee was also an image loaded with a message.

Was the implication that Ghomeshi minus his hair/image was "just another Indian"? It certainly seemed that way, why else draw him looking like an emaciated

Ghandi, a figure which, even with the broadest artistic licence, he does not resemble in the slightest?

Again, the humor was not about Ghomeshi at all, it was about his ethnicity.

Overall, we were presented with a cartoon of two ethnic stereotypes about to do battle for the entertainment of the gathered audience, presided over by some slimy fight promoter, very amusing.

In conclusion, I fail to see how Excalibur can expect to be taken seriously in its support for anti-racism when its own cartoonist willingly or unwittingly perpetuates precisely the kind of stereotypes we are fighting against.

It would be nice to think that Excalibur and its cartoonist would have the guts to print a retraction of this degrading piece, however I have a feeling that they will carry on business as usual, basking in their own ignorance.

Phil Jackson
International Socialists

**No editorial
on handcuffs**

To the editor,

I shall be succinct: why was your Monday Nov. 26 editorial wasted?

The potential for a Ghomeshi-Shettleworth debate seems insignificant compared to the front page item.

Do you not have an opinion regarding the possibility that York security officers may be carrying handcuffs? There wasn't an

article on Ghomeshi and Shettleworth in the paper (save for a front-page photo), so why the editorial?

Are you going to delay your "handcuff editorial" to the issue in which this letter may appear, thereby saving some face?

If this is the case, such an editorial would have been more pertinent had it appeared in the Nov. 26 issue.

In short, jeers for a waste of an editorial column.

It smacks of sensationalism.

And then there's that racist cartoon... The previous editorials have been very relevant, and have been an intelligent expression of your opinion. It is disappointing to see a drop in editorial quality—not at all in the form, but most definitely in the content.

Concerned, I remain
Pierre Toth

**Activist term
misused**

To the editor,

I am writing in response to the use of the term activist by the editor in this Monday's issue of Excalibur.

First of all, I think a difference should be made between people who actively contribute and participate in the political and social life of our university, with those who only manage to make time to sign a *petition* as they pass through central square.

Active participation entails more than voting once a year, it is the commitment to participate and actively shape the political and social processes that sur-
continued on page 5