

Gateway reporter out of line

Dear Mr. Lear.

I anticipate you expect a reply to your open letter of November 6 to Bernie Williams which was one of the most disgusting submissions I have read in the *Gateway* over the past years. Not only do you seem insulted by a legitimate attack on an erroneous previous submission of yours, but you compound the issue by making several inaccurate generalizations and risk the pressing of legal action against both yourself and the

publication you represent.

Forgive me if I'm wrong, but I always thought a reporter is to report facts, not his personal feelings and fantasies. An error in the reporting of these facts, whatever the rationalization,

calls for an apology and a corrected statement of the facts, not an emotional outburst as exhibited in your November 6 letter.

You infer that only fraternity members care about fratern-

nities. If you'd done some research before you "shot off your mouth" you might ask those that fraternities on this campus either financially or through volunteer work actively support, which includes the Grandview Auxiliary Hospital, Rape Crisis Centre, blind students on campus, Golden Bears Football team and the Northern Alberta Children's Hospital campaign to name a few. I agree with you that it is not the *Gateway's* duty to "clear up the myths and misconceptions of fraternities." It is also not the paper's duty to endorse these misconceptions through misrepresentative and inaccurate staff submissions. It is a result of publicly-printed fabricated statements such as yours that fraternities do have their present image, one that is both erroneous and misleading.

In your letter you refer to the movie *Animal House*, which is a Hollywood version of events of an era that ended over 15 years ago. Obviously you cannot or will not accept this fact. If you feel insulted by this letter it is well you should. It was intended that way.

Roy Rampling
Commerce IV

Arts loses voice

Mr. Bhattacharya's suggestion, in the Nov. 1 *Gateway*, that Arts students could be represented by a single departmental club must surely be taken as jest. If indeed he does not trifle, Mr. Bhattacharya (SU vp academic) has failed to understand or give attention to the problems which beset the Arts Faculty. Specifically, the Arts suffers from a lack of recognizable solidarity promoted by its division into numerous departments. To relegate all faculty interests to the domain of one department would be placing impossible demands upon that organization. It could be neither unbiased towards its own interests nor could it provide any ground upon which the faculty could develop a sense of common interest.

Mr. Bhattacharya's refusal to relegate funds to the Arts Students Association (ASA), the only central organization capable of promoting a faculty consciousness, it tantamount to denying Arts students the privilege of such an identity.

I have often lamented the declining esteem of the liberal arts education, but its value has often been defended in the *Gateway* so I will refrain from digressing with regard to this point. However, the Students' Union has failed to seek redress for this problem by delaying any support to the ASA. The problems presented to the ASA are not insurmountable but they

cannot be alleviated within a matter of weeks. This year the association has been supported by a hard core of dedicated officers, who are earnestly striving to make contact with the students and their representatives. I propose that if the Students' Union recognizes the viability of this central organization and ceases to hinder its efforts then some change can be wrought within the student body of the Arts Faculty.

J. Brant
Arts IV
Religious Studies Rep. A F C

But what's in a name?

So that place in SUB has been named at last. *L'Express*, they've called it. Let's see ... that's "le," French for "the" and "Express," French for "Express" ... I get it ... The Express. As in Orient Express or as in fast food express, I wonder?

But why, I wonder too, are we talking French? Nothing against the French, of course (I have a French name myself), but what is there that's French about that place? Those salads, perhaps? *Mais non, mais non, mais non.* A Frenchman would suffer *une petit crise de foie** at the sight of those unlikely marriages of flavour and texture, the inventions of a truly North American mind. Are the sandwiches gallic? Cold beef on a bun, pastrami on rye? You've got

to be kidding. What about the cakes? The sinfully delicious *tortes* are German in name, East European in style, and are created by a Czechoslovakian (may her shadow never grow less).

In fact, some of the food is *European*, but it is an ethnic insult to call it French. You might as well describe a US citizen as a Canadian — we live on the same continent don't we?

Why has a French name been chosen for an eating place that doesn't serve French food?

Humbug, I say!
*the French speakers on the name-choosing committee will have no trouble recognizing this as "a bilious attack"

Anne Le Rougetel
Faculty of Extension

Second Wind

An occasional column of opinion by *Gateway* staffers.

Capitalists make me sick.

Consumers make me almost as sick.

In a recent column, Roy Farran infers that Canada lost the CANDU reactor contract with Argentina because we couldn't resist sticking our 'ethical' nose in where it didn't belong: "All this goes to show that it is a mistake to mix up ideology with the hard-headed business of international trade."

No, this isn't going to be another diatribe about nuclear energy or Roy Farran, although both are deserving. It's about capitalism and the consumer, and the extension of Farran's statement.

No ideology in international trade, no ethics in business; it's all the same thing, and unfortunately it's accepted by nearly everyone in the business world. Ethics are considered important in every sphere of human conduct. Even nations at war attach some, albeit hypocritical, importance to ethics. But business? No way. Ethics might get in the way of profits.

Let's face it. Most businessmen, capitalists, fast buck artists or whatever you want to call them, are interested in only one thing: maximizing profits. They justify their greed in many ways. They are contributing to a higher quality of life for everyone in society, to a more stable political state, or perhaps even to the satisfaction of their basic biological urges. These points are all debatable. What is not debatable is that these people really don't care who they screw, how they do it, or what the consequences are. As long as they're clutching profits in their sweaty little paws, they're happy as pigs in shit, and about as clean. Ethics, who needs them?

The sickening thing is that we put up with these attitudes day in and day out, from the moment we're dumped on our heads to the moment we're dumped back on our heads.

Think back. How many times have we all been shafted on something we've purchased, be it goods or services? And how many times have we all submissively accepted explanations as to why we can't claim recompense? Will we say we have measured out our lives in consumer complaints?

We take it all in. We stand in line like the suckers of P.T. Barnum with our cash (or credit card) extended, waiting for it to be plucked from our hands and replaced with colored beads. We nod and turn the other cheek as the ad man tells us we need to drive this kind of car, or drink that kind of beer. We tsk tsk about the obscene profits made by oil companies. We can't quite understand why asbestos or nuclear power companies don't provide adequate safeguards for their employees. And yet, we continue to consume, and we continue to support an economic system that puts profits before everything else.

Is it my paranoia, or are things getting worse? We are smothered in goods and services in quantity, but what we're desperately wanting is quality. Instead of the latter, we have staggering amounts of waste: human, material and environmental.

It's time that we told our business and political leaders to shove it. It's time we stopped listening to the bullshit, and stopped allowing ourselves to be manipulated in the game of profiteering. Unless we insist on ethics and even ideology in business, we will have an economic system that panders to our desires, and not to our needs. And that's not good enough.

Reader Comment

by Eric Stephanson

James & Shelley Douglass, founders of the Pacific Life Community based in Bangor, Washington, and longtime peace activists campaigning against the Trident Submarine Missile System through nonviolent direct resistance, will speak at public meetings in Edmonton today and tomorrow; at the invitation of the University of Alberta Chaplains' Association.

Tonight, Thursday, November 8 at 7:30 pm they will speak at Garneau United Church on the theme "Pilgrimage in Nonviolence; A Response to Nuclear Arms."

Friday, November 9 at 12 noon they will speak at an open meeting in the SUB Theatre on "Living at the End of the World" and "Simple Living in the Nuclear Age."

One of the great dilemmas of our age must surely be that although the majority of people of all nations do not want war, particularly nuclear war, — although we know that nuclear war could easily obliterate all life on planet earth — yet nevertheless the nuclear arms race proceeds at an ever increasing rate, with ever growing chances that sometime before the end of this century, someone, somewhere, will touch a button to bring on the final holocaust for every member of the human race.

Consider these statistics:

In a world of limited resources over one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) are not being spent each day on weapons of destruction, while tens of millions of

human beings suffer poverty, starvation, and marginal human subsistence at best.

In recent years the U.S. has added more nuclear weapons to its arsenal than the Soviet Union, going from 4,000 strategic nuclear weapons in 1970, to 9,000 in 1978. During the same period the Soviet Union increased its arsenal from 1800 to 4500 strategic nuclear weapons. Each country can obliterate the entire urban and industrial complex of the other regardless of who strikes first. The U.S. has 35 strategic nuclear weapons for every Soviet city over 100,000 while the Soviet Union has 28 strategic weapons for every U.S. city over 100,000.

Politicians and others say the development and deployment of these arms of Armageddon are necessary for the peace and security of the world. Yet it is clearly obvious that what is so glibly called "deterrence" by these people is really a massive hostage system — in which there can be no winners or survivors.

In other words nuclear bomb installations are not a defence, they are a provocation to attack, and in fact, draw enemy fire. The main Trident base in Puget Sound, Washington, 60 miles south of Vancouver, for example, would be one of the first targets in a "limited nuclear exchange". The Canadian government supports the fallacy that the Trident base strengthens the U.S. nuclear umbrella which also shelters

Canada. Yet William Epstein, Canada's disarmament expert with 25 years experience at the United Nations, demolished this false notion of security in the Feb. '78 "Canadian Forum" magazine. He declares that the Trident base is a direct threat to Canadian Security. An all out strike on the Trident base would put an instant end to Vancouver and Victoria. Calgary and Edmonton would die within days, under a vast radioactive dust cloud. How does it feel to be considered "expendable civilian collateral" in a "limited nuclear exchange" between the superpowers?

The military and political leaders say that we should take comfort that our national security rests in what they call "Mutually Assured Destruction" (M.A.D.). Because there would be no winners in a nuclear war, the argument goes, no one would be crazy enough to send the first missile. Unless, of course, you could somehow knock out the enemy's weapons in a lightning quick first strike.

And that is precisely what the Trident system, and others now under development, are prepared to do. These are not defensive weapons; rather they are designed specifically as first strike weapons which would potentially destroy the enemy's ability to react. As such they constitute the greatest threat imaginable to the survival of humankind.

What are the alternatives to nuclear arms as "deterrents" to war? What can you and I do that can possibly make a

difference in relation to the immense death machine the nuclear weapons constitute today?

Begin by learning first hand both factual information about nuclear arms, and the personal experience of James & Shelley Douglass, two articulate leaders in the resistance against Trident; which was called by Robert Aldridge, it's designer, the "ultimate first strike weapon". In 1972, Aldridge, underwent a personal transformation, in which Jim Douglass was instrumental, that resulted in Aldridge quitting his work as an aerospace engineer at Lockheed Missile and Space Company in which he designed multiple warheads of such extreme target accuracy as to be of "first strike" capability, to begin writing inactive resistance against nuclear arms.

It was Jim Douglass who exemplified a way of opposition, an alternative to nuclear way "defense" arms, who inspired and sparked Robert Aldridge to liberate himself from the military-industrial complex.

Hear Jim & Shelley Douglass at SUB Theatre, 12 noon, Friday. There will be opportunity for questions from the floor, and time for personal interaction with the Douglasses. Saturday there will be a nonviolence Training workshop from 9:30 - 2:30 in SUB 158A Meditation Room led by Jim and Shelley Douglass, with opportunity for more intensive personal growth. If you are interested in participating in the workshop please contact me at 432-4621 or 437-4029.