

Curious George the Terrorist

The Earth Liberation Front claimed responsibility for a \$12-million fire set in Vail, Colorado last Oct. 18. The fire destroyed a 33,000-square foot restaurant, ski-patrol headquarters and four chairlifts. The group, termed radical by the media and militant by the FBI, says it set the fire to protect Vail's expansion into 885 acres of prime Lynx habitat.

In setting the fire, the group disregarded the routes of due process taken by local Vail activists and the state of Colorado's wildlife division statement that Lynx hadn't been spotted in the area since 1973.

It is sad but predictable that an expensive act of vandalism in a place where the beautiful people ski is the

event that makes this form of ecological defense popularly known. 'Monkeywrenching' is the name of this indictable action to Earth Firsters and other radically-termed environmental organizations. To the victims — the corporations, the fishermen, the loggers, the farmers — this action is called Ecoterrorism.

The Ecoterror Response Network defines Ecoterror as "any crime committed in the name of saving nature". The FBI definition of terrorism is "the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives."

The problem with this definition is justification. Who can justify the lawful use of force or violence, and who can say what social objectives are acceptable. I know in society you should be able to swing your arms only so far, but some people — radical

environmentalists, thank them or hate them — don't agree with the idea. The fact this continent is a democracy remains to be seen.

When conservation groups and ecology groups can't achieve by due process what they desire, what should their reaction be? Apathy as the Earth they strive to protect is torn asunder?

According to the FBI's law of terrorism, does the United Nations not have an active body to enforce the laws it deems justifiable when they are not sufficiently resolved by due process?

Political parallels are weak,

EDITORIAL

but does Mother Nature not deserve to have her own active body to protect herself when due process fails?

Does this justify the Monkeywrencher?

Tough question.

In a piece of literature entitled "Monkeywrenching: What's up with that?", it says "[Monkeywrenching] is the final step in the defense of the wild, the deliberate action taken by the Earth defender when all other measures have failed, the process whereby the wilderness defender becomes the wilderness acting in self-defense". In the same piece of literature, it acknowledges Monkeywrenching (lest we not forget Ecoterror), specifically the practice of tree spiking, "has the potential to injure".

Something is wrong with this picture.

A sound environmental conservation ethic should not condone the loss of life, humans included — especially when these

radical environmentalists profess that "the movement is unified by a philosophy of respect for life."

I wonder if these Eco Terrorists are the stewards of time? I wonder if they see a "bigger picture" that corporations and many others fail to see?

There should be no need for justification, or at least clarification, for Monkeywrenching. Monkeywrenching is an extreme case of children protecting their mother. I don't question for a second protecting my own mother. My mother though is not owned and shared; and tilled, and reaped and harvested by billions. The contrast is interesting. We all share the responsibility and need for the earth, but all have different ideals of give and take.

During a testimony by Barry R. Clausen before the American House Subcommittee on Crime in the matter of Ecoterrorism, Clausen described his infiltration of the Earth First! movement. During the testimony Clausen cited that the group "advocated revolution, anarchy and terrorism to [America's] youth." Clausen concluded by stating he was a six-year military veteran that believed in his country, freedoms and rights, and asked the committee to preserve those freedoms and rights.

Some people live in the now, living it up until their end, not caring about their effect on future generations. Others live in the past, the future and present, considering what footsteps they take, and how the beat of a butterfly's wings in one place will affect the earth in time.

I don't condone or reject Monkeywrenching. I hope to raise more questions than I've answered (if any). After hearing these stories, I rethink my basic rights and freedoms in this millennial world.

AVI LAMBERT

LETTERS

Clinton not wagging the dog

To the editor,

News coverage justifies the recent bombings of Iraq, claiming no-fly zones as legitimate. The no-fly zones were not created by the United Nations; they were designated by the US and Britain under the pretext of protecting the Kurds in the North and Shites in the South after the failed CIA attempt to start a civil war in Iraq.

They are simply another excuse for the US and Britain to destroy Iraq. The US and Britain have raised no objection to the Turks killing Kurds in record numbers, nor are objections raised when other nation-states use military force to put down civil rebellions and kill their citizens within their national boundaries. The US has continued to provide arms and support for the genocidal actions of other nations as long as those nations served the US multinational corporations.

The news media must get beyond the point of parroting back the hypocritical rational behind the destruction of Iraq. Analysis of US and British actions to destroy Iraq does not reflect data from UN humanitarian aid groups in Iraq, the findings of the International Action Centre, Voices in the Wilderness and other groups who have an in-depth knowledge of the Iraqi perspective.

I have gathered thousands of signatures on petitions to end the sanctions. Those who refuse to sign always explain their actions by citing Saddam Hussein as the greatest villain of all time. They express fear of Iraq or any other Arab nation being a major military or economic power.

The "repression" and brutal treatment ascribed to Saddam Hussein is the norm in countries the US supplies with weapons and calls allies. There is no mention of Kuwaiti atrocities against Palestinians and Iraqis in Kuwait.

There is no question about, and certainly no challenge to, the injustice and insanity of the conditions placed on Iraq after the Gulf War. The punishment exceeds the crime. There seems to be no consideration of the fact that the weapons inspections are at best a hypocrisy and at worst a means of gathering data to help destroy Iraq.

It is unjust and insane to expect one nation to disarm in a world filled with nations armed to the teeth. The US is peddling weapons of mass destruction all over the world. While civilized nations are struggling to end the plague of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction through UN actions, the US blocks these UN actions and refuses to comply with international law on land mines and chemical weapons.

Dr. Ingrid Swenson

Beautiful men: show your faces

To the editor,

I would like to respond to the 'beautiful bodies' opinions piece that Walter Derengoski cleverly concocted in the Jan. 21, 1999 Gazette.

Easier road to education, you say? I think not. University is not a pageant where we do a song-and-dance routine and parade around in

our swimsuits to find out who will get the A+. We didn't have a beauty contest to determine who will get accepted to the university. For me, like every other Dal student I know, I sent my transcripts from the last university and high school I attended. And unless I'm mistaken, the information I submitted was interpreted numerically — it said nothing about my genetic make-up or cup size.

Now, as for your taste in women at Dal. Are those standards defined by the latest *Hustler* magazine or are they more stylized towards the *Sports Illustrated* swimsuit edition? Next time you come across one of the "beautiful people" frequenting Dal, you should maybe tell her that her talents as a student are clearly being wasted and she should drop out of school (because she is only getting the grades based on her cup size, certainly not her actual brain-power) and pose for Larry Flynt's team of reputable photographers because the women are getting a little too familiar. Who knows, she may not have thought about that career choice.

Unfortunately, the proportion of "beautiful people" does not apply to the male population of Dal. They do exist in almost every other university in the country, however.

So if your piece is anything to go by, you boys better shape up, clean up or send us some miserable pea-brained Hollywood star to lap up those so-called opportunities we've been parading campus for. Otherwise, at this rate, Dal will become the newest male college — all the beautiful women will leave in search of the beautiful men.

Annelise Johns

Biased reporting

To the editor,

I only read your Nov. 12 issue recently. I live in Ontario and have copies mailed to me in bulk, so my response is unfortunately tardy.

This letter is regarding your story on the front page with the heading, "Forum brings *Playboy* out from behind closed doors."

I found this article extremely biased against the two *Playboy* reps and therefore question the accuracy and quality of the reporting. Because I am not on the Dal campus to experience the attitude towards these two men, I am forced to rely on what I read in the Gazette.

The headline suggested these two men have been having secret parties where the people are welcome by invitation only. However, in the article itself, it is stated parties are open to anyone.

Reporter Sally Thomas also adds the following to her story, "After the forum, Wildsmith, but call him 'B.W.' please because it 'goes with the flow...'"

This is an example of the subjectiveness displayed by Thomas. It seems to be the newspaper's style to use last names after giving the full name for the first reference, but Thomas throws a smart alec remark in to supposedly toss shame on the two *Playboy* reps.

I read the story to learn what was happening regarding the two *Playboy* reps on campus, but was left only thinking it will now be hard to trust Sally Thomas' capability to report without opinion.

Mathieu B. Yuill

The Gazette welcomes letters - letters "under 300 words" letters with a point, letters that deal with some currently relevant topic, letters that will interest someone other than the writer, letters that hit the heart of the matter faster than your head hits the pillow. Any matter, interesting matter, in "less than 300 words"

The Gazette, rm 312, SUB, 494-2507

THE DALHOUSIE GAZETTE

editorial board Volume 131, no. 16

Editor-in-chief: Natalie MacLellan • Copy Editor: Greg McFarlane • News: Shelly Robinson • Arts: Avi Lambert and Karan Shetty • Sports: Patrick Blackie • Focus: Brianna Johnston • Science & Environment: Andrew Gillis • Photography: Pascal Languillon • National News: Mark Reynolds and Phil E. Lewis • Opinions: Vanessa Owen • Dalendar: Mufaro Chakabuda • Office Manager: Janet French • Online Manager: Karen Parker • Art Director: William Roberts • Ad Manager: Dallas Shannon

contributors

Andrew Simpson • Aaron Dhir • Jeanne Ju • Chris Lapan • Paul Maloney • Terry Hawes

Student Union Building, Dalhousie University, 6136 University Ave, rm 312, Halifax, NS, B3H 4J2.
editorial tel. 902 494-2507, facsimile 902 494-8890. e-mail. GAZETTE@is2.dal.ca

For advertising information, call 494-6532 or visit our ad manager, 9am to 5pm daily.

The Gazette welcomes letters to the editor and commentary. All letters will be printed up to four per week. The printing of additional letters will be at the discretion of the Opinions Editor. Letters may be edited for length above 300 words and we reserve the right to edit commentary.

All submissions must be typed double-spaced on paper, e-mailed, or on a Mac or IBM 3 1/2 inch disk, in a WP version not greater than Word 6.0 or equivalent. The deadline is Mondays at 4:30 p.m.

Founded in 1869 at Dalhousie College, the Gazette is Canada's oldest student newspaper. With a circulation of 10,000, the Gazette is published every Thursday by the Dalhousie Gazette Publishing Society, of which all students of Dalhousie University are members. The Gazette exercises full editorial autonomy and reserves the right to refuse or edit any material submitted. All editorial decisions are made collectively by the staff. To become voting staff members, individuals must contribute to four issues. Views expressed in the Gazette are not necessarily those of the editors or the collective staff. Unless otherwise noted, all text © 1998 the Dalhousie Gazette Publishing Society.
ISSN 0011-5819