

LETTERS

cont'd from p. 4

denial of women's sovereignty over their bodies.

On reading the letter again, I was relieved to discover that Mr. Kim is pro-choice after all, for he writes: "My views on abortion are just that. Mine. I don't intend to push my views on anyone."

Clearly, Mr. Kim recognizes that no one has the right to control someone else's body in the name of their own moral convictions.

Again, I agree with his point that, "abortion is not a problem excluded to women," for it must be confronted by each individual faced with an unwanted pregnancy. Definitely, "it is an issue that all society must address" for with the criminalization of abortion, society would take responsibility for unwilling mothers and the futures of unwanted children.

Mr. Kim calls it a "complicated, controversial issue" and indeed it is, so much so that it appears obvious to both us that the choice must be that of the individuals affected.

But finally, I must caution Mr. Kim for he must realize that it is difficult to have a wholly "rational response" when one's sovereignty over one's own body and the validity of one's own morality is under attack.

Sincerely,
Letitia Meynell

Pro-choice is anti-war

To the editor

In Marcus Kim's letter to the editor Feb. 11, he states that he is not a war monger, and that he hates bloodshed "as much as any other sane human being." He also points out that the prospect of "yet another peace rally" distresses him, as does the controversy surrounding the Gulf War.

At the time of writing the letter, Kim felt he "could no longer remain silent." I find it curious that he felt so pressed to explain his original position regarding the peace movement, yet unwilling to tolerate those that wish to demonstrate their opposition to the war at an organized rally.

It is quite obvious that Kim does not only have issue with the peace movement but primarily with abortion rights.

He commented on his inability to understand why an organization for peace could be co-led by a person who is also prominently pro-choice.

He continued to state that those women that choose to fight for the right to govern their own reproductive organs demonstrate the same brutality as Saddam Hussein did when he gassed "his own" Kurds.

Kim claims that all those vicious murderers of the world (Hussein and all pro-choice women) do their dirty deeds to rid themselves of those that are of a "major inconvenience."

Kim has ignored that abortion is a necessity because so many men find it an inconvenience to wear a condom, or to pay child support after a separation; in effect, abortion rights are an absolute must because these men refuse to take responsibility for their own genetic material.

Many women have no alternative but abortion due to emotional, medical or financial situations that make motherhood an impossibility.

I find it quite interesting that, according to Kim's philosophy on human rights, the power, and freedom to a self-determined lifestyle depends on which genitalia a human being is born with.

This self-proclaimed non-sexist, non-misogynist states that he is anti-choice because he believes in "the sanctity of life." Considering the butchery and death that occurred when abortion was inaccessible and criminal, it would perhaps be more realistic for Kim to call himself a believer in the sanctity of life.

Pro-choice activists believe in autonomy; in the self-determination of one's own future and lifestyle — male or female. That is why they are so against this war.

The Kurds did not choose to be gassed by Saddam Hussein; Iraqi people did not choose to be bombed; most American troops did not choose to kill and be killed (something called the economic draft). These are the atrocities that feminists are fighting. The loss of autonomy.

I suggest that Kim stop following the mainstream media and start studying the history of oppression and its complement, imperialism, in order to abstain from further impotent crusades.

Sandra Bennett
York Troops Out Coalition

Fighting for a just cause

To the editor

This letter is in response to a letter written by David Camfield, "Coalition part of the Problem, Not Solution," published Feb. 13.

He began his letter by stating that "justifications of the Gulf War are simply apologies for an unjust slaughter." Well, this is where your thinking is slightly warped, Mr. Camfield. It is Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait that is an "unjust slaughter."

He only went into for his own self interests, not for any worthy cause, as he would like people to believe. He owed Kuwait more money than Iraq could possibly be able to pay back since all their money is pumped into his military machine. His method of getting out of this debt, was to take over this smaller, weaker nation therefore, abolishing his great debt.

By taking over Kuwait, he would also take over a larger percentage of

the world's oil supply. This would give Hussein the potential capability to hold the world at ransom.

He would raise the oil prices to obscene levels therefore causing a mass wave of inflation worldwide. With these capabilities and this power, I highly doubt that Hussein would stop at the Kuwait border. He would attempt to take control of the Middle East.

We should learn from history and look at the massacre that Hitler was responsible for in Europe from 1939 to 1945. It took six years and 12 million lives to stop that madman. Should we wait that long this time?

In your letter, Mr. Camfield, you explain how the United States and other members of the allied forces, supplied Iraq with their weapons prior to the war. Although this is unfortunately correct, it doesn't make it right for Hussein to use those weapons to violently take over a smaller nation.

Those issues are unrelated. It doesn't matter whose weapons he used; the fact is Hussein cannot get away with violently attacking the people of Kuwait with his selfish endeavour to take control of a sovereign state.

If Hussein is overthrown by the coalition forces, the Kuwaitis will most definitely be liberated from the external aggression of Iraq.

Maybe we cannot guarantee that there will be an end to other Middle East wars, but at least a crazy man like Hussein will hopefully fall from power.

Although he claims that he is fighting for "the unification of the entire Arab world," really he is fight-

Reader offended by use of Canadian flag

To the editor

We attended the "Support the Troops" Rally in the East Bear Pit hoping to hear the views of the group which opposes the "Troops Out of the Gulf Coalition."

The rally was in progress when the onlookers were joined by a group with a yellow sign which read "Israel out of West Bank, Gaza and South Lebanon." They were standing at the back, but the crowd noticed them immediately as the first display of any dissent.

Members and supporters of the Troops Out of the Gulf Coalition were presented but were silent. This was an agreed upon method of action decided upon at the group's last meeting. Instead of protesting vocally, the group was handing out literature concerning the Feb. 14th anti-war teach-in.

The camera focussed on the yellow sign and, as this happened, some onlookers yelled "Go Home, Go Home" and a few others, carrying a large Canadian flag, pushed their way through the crowd and held the flag in front of this yellow sign, in an attempt to divert media attention away from the sign.

ing for his own self obsession for power.

It is not "Western Imperialism" that has caused Middle East crises in the past. It is the regional quest for total Arab control that has been the root of the problems.

Israel was a sovereign Jewish entity in this region as far back as 1000 BC and there has been a Jewish presence there ever since then.

Israel was founded as a socialist state and it still retains many of its socialist characteristics.

Therefore, your statement on Western Imperialism forming the state of Israel, falls flat on its face. *Maybe, Mr. Camfield, you should open some history books before you open your mouth.*

For all these reasons and many more, the people of the world should stand united behind the international coalition (including Arab countries) in the Gulf. They are fighting for a just cause and should be commended.

Sincerely,
Shauna Marcovici

U.S. aggression hiding under cover of U.N.

To the editor,

Anthony Stille's obtuse response (letter, Feb. 6) to Phil Jackson employs many of the standard arguments used by militarists and patriots in defending the Gulf war.

These pro-war hacks always use the tired refrain, "nobody wants war."

At this point the two factions divided; one group behind the flag and another behind the sign.

Both sides chanted opposing slogans and unfortunately there were some outbursts of physical violence. By this time, all attention from the organized rally had refocussed onto this clash. Organizers of the Troops Out of the Gulf Coalition recognized this violence as contrary to their aims and asked their supporters to regroup away from the rally.

As members of the Troops Out of the Gulf Coalition we were distressed by the entire incident.

First, we are offended by the use of the Canadian flag, a symbol all Canadians respect, in an attempt to suppress the right of peaceful protest and freedom of expression.

Canada is a nation which supports the freedoms of all people regardless of ethnicity, country of origin or beliefs, by doing this they disregard these principles, which are entrenched in our constitution.

Also, we were angry to see some onlookers displaying anti-Arab sentiment expressed in insults such as "Go home crazy Arabs" and other comments. These comments en-

danger the balance of the various ethnic groups on campus.

As well, we do not condone violence as a means for solving conflict in any situation, as demonstrated by our opposition to the Gulf war.

We need to clarify another very important issue, which has been widely misunderstood. Contrary to the assumption of some, those who oppose the war are not anti-Jewish, but rather are against the occupation (and bombing) of the West Bank, Gaza Strip and South Lebanon. The occupation of one country by another must not be justified under any circumstances, including the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq.

In addition, we feel that it is important to re-emphasize the position of the Troops Out of the Gulf Coalition. The coalition had not planned to protest at this rally but many of the members felt the need to support the right of the group with the yellow sign to peacefully and unobtrusively represent their views.

This letter, we trust, will clarify the incident in the Bear pit as well as illuminate our own views on the issue.

You are the first to speak up now about the noble aims of the UN. The fact is that the US is using the cover of the UN for yet another act of aggression, like a drug lord laundering his blood money through a legitimate bank.

Normal Baynes

East Moon

CHINESE CUISINE
CANTONESE, SZECHUAN & SEAFOOD
L.L.B.O.
NO MSG. ON REQUEST

6th ANNIVERSARY

Special thanks to our patrons

15% DISCOUNT

(WITH THIS COUPON)

EVERY TIME YOU DINE-IN
AFTER 3:00 P.M.

Not valid on buffet, special offers or with any other coupon
Offer expires March 31, 1991



738-1428
Local Delivery


2150 STEELES AVE. WEST
(1 block east of Keele St.)

DANCE! DANCE! DANCE!

SUNDAY, MARCH 3, 8 p.m.

Earl's Tin Palace (150 Eglinton Ave. E.)

Tickets: 8 bucks, at the door



Co-sponsored by:

J.S.U. (UofT)
J.S.C. (Seneca, Scarborough, Glendon, Ryerson)