

Slimy, gutless anonymity

Re: Raymond Conway's letter of 18 Jan.

I would like here to respond briefly to a letter written as a response to my letter of 13 Jan. "Raymond Kozakewich" suggests that I develop a capacity to laugh at myself and essentially that I shed the veil of arrogance that he accuses me of bearing. I would suggest to "Mr. Kozakewich" that I may, indeed, lack a sense of humor and a degree of fact that might otherwise make my observations less controversial and more substantive; however, "Mr. Kozakewich" lacks the self-respect, honour, and sheer fortitude required to sign his real name to his letter of 18 Jan. What does this "Mr. Kozakewich" have to hide?

However controversial my comments may be, I have felt no need and will doubtless feel no need in the future to hide behind a pseudonym as "Mr. Kozakewich" had done. GRAB SOME GUTS MR. CONWAY!

John A. Middleton, Arts II

Hillel bully, not Oscar

In his letter to the Gateway, January 18, 1983 Mr. Klar seems to be ignorant of jurisprudence: one must not only be honest, but appear to be honest.

It is increasingly becoming the common opinion on campus that Hillel considers itself above the law. Hillel can harass the Arab Student Association by shutting down its booth and defacing its posters but when retaliatory action is taken they talk of court action. Hillel finds itself in the role of the immature bully. It doesn't take much intelligence to know that when you harass you can expect retaliation.

Mr. Klar attempts intimidation by stressing in his letter that he is an instructor in the Law Faculty; according to the U of A Calendar he does not possess a Ph.D., nor a LL.D. Should civil action be taken, the Students' Union has no other option but to be the *amicus curiae* of Oscar Ammar. We are not discussing the terrorism of Yasser Arafat or Menachem Begin, but whether the Arab students at this university have a right to human dignity. In jurisprudence this right to humanity transcends the written law. Mr. Ammar allegedly violated a technical law with his human response; should we allow the bullying tactics of Hillel?

The bullying tactics of Hillel have caused considerable anti-semitic sentiment unfortunately. They might be winning the battles but losing the war. Ironically, the Arabs are Semites racially and linguistically; perhaps the Palestinians have a better claim to the name 'Semite' than the members of Hillel.

It seems to me that both Mr. Ammar and the members of Hillel should make a public apology to the University, and then we should drop the matter. Peace is a distinct possibility. It is better than war.

S. Black

Underhanded maneuvers

Although I stand by my earlier letter stating that Oscar Ammar and friends made a mistake in breaking up a Hillel meeting featuring an Israeli Colonel, Mr. Ammar's upcoming appearance in Kangaroo Court compels me to write again.

The facts of the matter, as I understand them from one of the complaints lodged against Mr. Ammar, are fairly straightforward. Colonel Levy had barely begun to speak when a couple of professors in the audience started heckling him. Soon Mr. Ammar and some others burst into the room and started heckling loudly enough to stop the meeting. The Colonel apparently gave up and left.

The students and faculty who are pressing to have Mr. Ammar expelled or suspended from the university will no doubt complain that their right to free speech was attacked when Colonel Levy was shouted down. No doubt they will paint Oscar as an anti-democratic extremist who would as soon murder a Jew as speak to one.

Well, what about the incident last fall when Hillel members pressured the Students' Union into shutting down an Arab Students' Association information table? Where was their concern for free speech then?

What about the repression of West Bank Palestinians by Hillel's Favorite State?

What about Lebanon? Has Hillel gone to the survivors of Sabra and Chatilla and told them of its concern for free speech?

Somehow Israel's violations escape Hillel's freedom-loving scrutiny. Instead, the free-speech crusade is focused on Oscar Ammar, who scandalized all of humanity by heckling a speaker.

Hillel is using Mr. Ammar's careless exuberance to divert attention from the most recent of Israel's outrages and force the local Palestinians and Arabs onto the defensive. (For this Oscar Ammar should indeed be sorry.)

The Israel Fans should stop trying to use the Students' Union and the University to muzzle the Arabs and Palestinians. They would do better to re-evaluate their slavish devotion to any and all actions of the Israeli State; they would do us all a service if they figured out that one does not have to support massacres of Palestinians to be Jewish.

As for the University, it should not involve itself in the matter. If Mr. Ammar broke the law, this is a matter for the courts. The University should have nothing to do with Hillel's underhanded maneuvers to muzzle their opponents.

Mike Walker

Note on the phony war

It was with great interest that I read, in the January 18th issue, the two opposing viewpoints concerning the boycotting of South African products. I agreed with some of the pros and cons in both, but most of all with the general conclusions of both authors that change is needed in South Africa.

Change, however, has been needed in South Africa for a long time, but while the world

governments, in both the East and the West, hypocritically condemn the South African government openly for political reasons, and support them privately for economic reasons, change is unlikely.

The United Nations remains only vocal. In case you didn't realise 1982 was the U.N. year for Implementation of Sanctions against South Africa; it was a year that never was. It would seem that while there may be some negative repercussions for all the people of South Africa if "blanket sanctions" were implemented, such a situation is unlikely to occur. Specific product boycotts on the other hand at least keep the South Africa debate alive and serve an important educative function as a result, for example through letters and articles in Gateway.

While many people on campus might argue over the pros and cons of boycotts, few would support separate racial development as a way forward for South Africa, at least not those who know what Apartheid really means. Education about the current situation must form the first step towards deciding how best to encourage a peaceful and steady road to future democracy and prosperity in South Africa. Gateway does its best to inform its readers, but the campus for the most part remains unaware of the imminent bloody revolution which gets progressively closer with each additional year of oppressive, undemocratic and racist government.

I am planning to form a Southern Africa discussion circle with aim of promoting education about Apartheid on campus. I invite any students concerned about the future of South Africa to contact me.

John Gould, Geography (GS)

Down with scapegoats

While Mr. Middleton may have reacted a bit strongly to the Engineer's ice statues, he does have a point. To blame one individual or group of individuals for all the troubles of the nation is, at best, naive and simplistic.

Bruce Pollock, Arts II

Gag Levy the pariah?

The existence and expansion of the State of Israel creates enormous hardship for the Palestinian people. They have been driven from their homeland, and have been hunted down by the Israeli forces, directly and indirectly, in Jordan and Lebanon. The ferocity of Israel's actions is increasing. Air attacks on refugee camps, commando raids and a limited invasion, have paved (sic) the way for a full scale invasion of the Lebanon, culminating in the massacres in the camps of West Beirut. The actions of Israel must be condemned and those, who perpetrated them, must be brought before a court of law.

The plight of the Palestinian People is an issue that the student body of the U of A cannot ignore. It is also an issue that shouldn't be hidden behind a discussion on freedom of speech.

Freedom of speech is basic to our society. Col. Levy, through his involvement in the atrocities in Beirut, has placed himself outside our society.

Sincerely yours

M. Ingen-Housz, grad studies

Not long ago we had a recent mutant of the Stern Gang causing a ruckus to have the 'P.L.O.' shut out of S.U.B. Now we have some fools with definite P.L.O. leanings shutting down an Israeli defense force Colonel's speech. Big difference: both ways it's the pot calling the kettle black.

Granted, there is little we can do over there to keep them from murdering each other's children and poisoning generations to come with their hatred, but we are fools or worse to permit them to continue their insane and evil war over here in defiance of our most basic institutions. They, and all others who would act thus, deserve our most extreme censure - not to mention a few rotten eggs as well (figuratively speaking, of course). Let's get our act together, folks: any people who scruple or fear to trample scorpions in their midst are bound to get stung.

Duncan P.A. Campbell, Arts IV

A problem to chew on

I object to the Students' Union allowing a chewing tobacco company to set up a booth to hand out free samples in the Student Union building. Recently, the Students' Union has espoused its moral fibre by supporting a move not to sell beer products in R.A.T.T. made by (apartheid) South African-owned companies. What about the well-being of U of A students, the interest of which the Students' Union is charged to defend?

If the smoking of cigarettes is disgusting and dangerous, then the chewing of tobacco goes right off the scale. One can easily see that the concentration of carcinogenic material in the 'liquified' tobacco wad is greater than in smoke. Also, the intimacy and length of contact of these materials with the inside of the mouth as it is swirled around is greater than for cigarette smoke inside the lungs. There are studies showing that there is a greater risk of cancer from chewing tobacco than from smoking cigarettes (can anyone help me with the specific references?). Out of curiosity, I approached a salesperson at the booth and asked a simple question: 'Does chewing tobacco cause cancer?' Answer: 'No, it doesn't. It doesn't enter the lungs. Its smokeless'. I replied: 'But, is there a risk of mouth cancer?' Answer: 'Well, I've been chewing it for ten years, and I've never had a problem. And I haven't met anyone who has had a problem'. Where have we heard this argument before???? Not that I expected the guy to say, yes, it does cause cancer and we recommend it not be used. But it did make it clear that the tobacco companies are following the same strategy that was (is) used to market cigarettes. That is, they deny the health risks (in the absence of a large mass of definitive, undisputable studies which

continued next page

LETTERS

Letters to the Editor should be a maximum of 250 words. Letters must be signed, and include faculty, year and phone number. No anonymous letters will be printed, although we will withhold names. All letters should be typed, if possible, or neatly printed. We reserve the right to edit for libel and length. Letter do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway.

ENJOY THE BEST Coffee & Tea

at

JAVA JIVE

H.U.B. MALL

Monday to Friday
7:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.
Saturday
9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Sunday
10:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

SUELECTION

STUDENT UNION GENERAL ELECTION

NOMINATIONS ARE NOW OPEN
FOR THE FOLLOWING POSITIONS:

SU EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

President
VP Internal Affairs
VP Academic
VP Finance & Administration
VP External Affairs

UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC BOARD (UAB)

President Men's Athletics
President Women's Athletics
VP Men's Athletics
VP Women's Athletics

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

1 Student representative

CLOSING OF NOMINATIONS:

1700 hr., Thursday, January 27, 1983

ELECTION DAY

Friday, February 11, 1983

For further information, please contact the SU Returning Office (Room 271, SUB), or the Receptionist, SU Executive Offices (Room 259, SUB).