

# BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the Editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of *The Brunswickan*. Letters to the Editor may be sent to Rm. 35, Student Union Building. Deadline: 5 p.m. Tuesdays. Maximum length: 300 words

## Editorial bias?

It is rather ironic that your editorial in the January 18th issue of *The Brunswickan* is entitled "The Source of Bias". Three articles concerning the War in the Gulf show very obvious bias; two against the United States and one against Israel.

First, in your editorial, you equate the leadership and personalities of George Bush and Saddam Hussein by suggesting that citizens of these eventual post-war countries will have to learn that the people in each are not all like their leaders. The moral equivalence implied here is ridiculous; George Bush has acted rationally, cautiously, and has tried to avoid bloodshed by deterrence through a massive military build-up in the Gulf. Saddam Hussein's treatment of his own people is well documented, and his recent apparent violations of the Geneva Conventions are barbaric and unacceptable. Judgement that George Bush is morally superior to Saddam Hussein is not "bias", but an objective conclusion based on factual evidence and accepted moral principles.

The second source of bias in this issue is "Mugwump". Lynne Wanyeki laments over the "double standard" employed by George Bush and the Allies, suggesting that Hussein's foray into Kuwait is akin to the American campaign in Panama designed not to terrorize but to oust an illegitimate leader from power. Wanyeki sarcastically jibes the intentions of the U.N., while she makes no reference to Hussein whatsoever. Her denunciations of the war concentrate solely on America's actions, while it is Saddam Hussein who flagrantly ignores international laws and conventions.

Matin Yaqzan provides the third "source of bias" with his open letter to George Bush. Yaqzan's tiresome anti-Israeli rhetoric is clear; need he be reminded of Israel's precarious position, being surrounded by countries who have repeatedly called for her destruction and have acted on these calls in 1948, 1967, and 1973. Although readers of *The Brunswickan* have to look elsewhere for this information, Israel's use of violence has been in self-defence: the only acceptable form of that use. Thus far in the Gulf War, Israel has restrained itself admirably while again being the victim of unprovoked attacks, this time by "peaceful Iraq".

Yes, it is indeed ironic that you speak of "bias", Mr. Editor, in the same issue that displays it with such proficiency. Or is it just that "bias" is only an attribute of wrongheaded people like myself?

Sincerely,  
Peter Archambault

## Objectionable issues

There were two items in last week's *Brun*, and one incident on campus which I must object to.

Firstly, I feel that Professor Yaqzan's opinion piece on the Gulf crisis is precisely that, one man's warped opinion. It should not have been run as a news item. While you

maintain that he represents a widely held viewpoint, this is irrelevant in light of some of the views he expresses. For example I do not think that advocating nuclear Armageddon for Israel meets even the largest standards for journalistic licence. It is sad commentary on the *Brun* that it sees fit to run a disclaimer over its Gay and Lesbian issues column, but not over a column advocating the mass destruction of a nation.

Secondly, the Dead Meat illustration of Saddam Hussein was in extremely poor taste. Blind Cynicism has its appeal to the simple minded among us, but should not be encouraged. The person responsible for this offense deserves a reprimand and suitable punishment, such as being forced to read all the letters to the editors written by Professor Yaqzan.

Finally, I was disappointed to hear that a group of students had removed the Iraqi flag which was part of a multi-national display of flags in one of our cafeterias. If the knee jerk flag vigilantes is responsible stopped to think, they would realize that flags represent not so much governments, but peoples. There is absolutely no reason that the Iraqi people, as distinct from their government, deserve to be singled out.

In addition, it is not as if the Iraqi government is in the big leagues of the activity business. The so called allies outraged against it all have a few skeletons in their own closets.

Patrick Clement.

## Death wish for allies?

I am as well as many others, disgusted by the comments put forward by the Professor of Sociology at Saint Thomas (Michael Clow), in regards to the events occurring in the Persian Gulf. Surely his remarks at the "conference" smack of an intellectual totalitarianism which is offered to the public by so many of the so called intellectual elite. As well, his comments lack any sense of Canadian patriotism which we should all share in this time of strife whether we agree with Canada's participation in the Persian Gulf or not. This obvious contempt for human life by an academic Vidkon Quishing is disgusting to all who cherish the sanctity of human life. Finally, the *Daily Gleaner* has displayed its usual bad taste in publishing such drivel. We are sorry that such as you teach young minds.

William Mountain  
David Pye

## Sadly misplaced sympathies

I have just finished reading the news feature "Modern warfare is immoral" by Martin Yaqzan. While I have the greatest respect for the good professor, I am afraid that, in this case, his opinions and sympathies are sadly misplaced. As a voting citizen of this country I feel it is my duty to illuminate another perspective on the aims of the United Nations Forces in the Gulf. The reasons for the deployment are not as easily dismissed as Professor Yaq-

zan would have us believe.

The Professor begins his (open) letter to President Bush by disputing the five points the President made in explaining the U.N. resolutions to the American people and the world at large. His opening argument disputes the comparison between Hitler and Hussein. Contrary to his opinions on the matter, this comparison is quite applicable. Hussein is a brutal dictator who has shown little or no regard for the safety and rights of the people of Iraq. He has gassed his own defenseless citizens, attacked other nations without justification and is responsible for the brutalizing of the previously peaceful people of Kuwait. Like Adolph Hitler, Saddam Hussein bases his actions on claims to territory that "was" or "should be" a part of the homeland.

The argument that the nation of Kuwait is artificial is not relevant. By this argument most of Europe, Africa and Southeast Asia have claims just as valid for annexing portions of their neighbors. All borders are somewhat artificial. Had the people of Kuwait wished to become a part of Iraq, the invasion would not have been required. The only difference between these two men seems to me to be a matter of scale. This is perhaps the most pressing reason to stop him now, before the cost of doing so becomes too great.

It is quite likely that if the area had no oil, the U.N. would never have gotten involved, but then if pigs had wings.... The simple fact is that the industrialized world does have great interest in this part of the world. No one is saying that the Arabs should not control these resources, nor is the U.S. attempting to control the oil reserves. If the Arabs were to unite peacefully, the U.N. would never have become involved to such an extent. It is the method and the man the world is opposed to. I would rather not have the industrial world at the mercy of this man. Iraq seems to have survived six months of blockade without resorting to "drinking their oil" and it is not inconceivable that it could also survive a six month embargo in order to pressure the West.

Given how unstable Iraq and its leader seem to be, I do not believe anyone who even lightly considers the consequences, can want Iraq to have a nuclear capability. It is unfortunate that Israel has such a capacity but, in all truth, they are somewhat justified in their paranoia. They have been attacked by, and are nominally still at war with most of the Arab nations around them. Three or four million Israelis are surrounded by 200 million Arabs who want nothing less than the total destruction of

the Jewish state. This danger justifies the extraordinary lengths the State of Israel goes to safeguard both their citizens' lives and their properties.

Mr. Yaqzan's fifth point shows a remarkable lack of understanding of the nature of crime. The President is not proposing Saddam Hussein be tried for those Kuwaitis that died in the invasion or the troops slain in battle, but rather the atrocities committed after the invasion. To say that he should not be held responsible for these excesses of brutality committed by his troops implies that Professor Yaqzan would not have held Hitler, as a person, responsible for the brutality and evil carried out by German forces in WWII. I quote, "Why must the crimes committed, if any, by the Iraqi forces in Kuwait, be considered as acts of cruelty on the part of Saddam Hussein as a person". These are not a few scattered incidents, just as the gassing of the Kurds was not a mistake, but rather an institutionalized system of brutality. A leader of such a nation must be held accountable in any civilized international system.

Much of the rest of this article is a flawed lesson on geo-politics and an attempt to justify both Iraq's invasion and Iraq's long term goals. In my opinion, Professor Yaqzan, these goals can not be justified and it would be disastrous in both the short and long term to let this brutal regime go unchecked. History has proven time and again that neither appeasement or isolationism are effective tools of policy. The long term costs are always too high when they are used as such. The time to act is now.

respectfully,  
Marc D. Lutz.

## Message from an alien

When I came down to your beautiful planet, I was looking for an intelligent life form. You showed me how one can kill the other, how one can steal from another, and how instead of talking and negotiating, you choose to go to wars. You showed me how you pollute your atmosphere to make what you call money, how instead of trust, you burn and tear each other's flags. I believe an intelligent life form will not behave in such manner.

Now, I have to go back to my world and report my findings. I am sure my kind will feel sympathy for you. We are sorry we cannot help you since in our world we do not know what is war, hunger, money or boundaries between pieces of land called countries.

Our world is one land and every body benefits from it. Why can't you learn from this? I guess one more world war will make you learn it. I just hope you come out of it alive. We will return in one year of our time which will be 25 years of yours. Good Luck. Beam me up Chief O'Brian.

An Alien

## Response to Yaqzan

It is difficult to believe that, in light of all which has occurred in the Middle East in the last week, there are still those who believe that Saddam Hussein retains any measure of legitimacy. It is even more difficult to comprehend why anyone who voices support for this madman directs his attacks at Israel, a state which has gone to every possible length to avoid being drawn into the present conflict. However, last week's column by a certain math professor has again demonstrated this individual's lack of understanding of world events.

First, the aforementioned piece claims that Iraq has a right to possess nuclear weapons, as the sole purpose of the possession of such technology would be to deter Israeli aggression. However, in the last week Iraq has demonstrated that it has no qualms about attacking civilian targets, including attacks on Saudi Arabian cities and unprovoked attacks on the Israeli cities of Tel Aviv and Haifa. Imagine for a moment, what would have occurred in these instances had Saddam Hussein possessed nuclear weapons, with consequences too horrible to contemplate. Yet the author claims that Iraq has legitimate reasons to have such weapons.

Secondly, the author claims that the plight of the Palestinians in the "worse" than that of those in occupied Kuwait. The conditions for many living in the occupied territories are indeed difficult and this is a problem which must be solved by negotiation (as Israel has offered to do with legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people). Given the recent reports of how Iraqi soldiers have raped, killed and brutalized the inhabitants of Kuwait, however, such a comparison becomes absurd. The problems in the occupied territories are a result of Israel defending itself from a number of nations (including Iraq) which sought to destroy it in 1948, 1967 and 1973. The situation in Kuwait is a result of naked, unprovoked aggression by a ruthless dictator upon a peaceful nation, for purely economic reasons.

The author's obvious anti-Israeli statements are thus repudiated by the facts. Israel has made peace with one of its former enemies, Egypt, continued on page 21

## The Arts Undergraduate Society

would like to thank the following for their generous contributions:

Mac Tavish For Sports  
Jack Fraser  
Jamie McDougall

The Quarterdeck  
UNBSU  
Dean Of Arts Office

Beaver  
Dave Campbell

All the performers and all those who worked behind the scenes.

and withdrawn from made similar offers. Israel is stated aims are to shown considerable recent unprovoked not Israel which sh Iraq. To suggest t brutal dictator wh sands of his own p major wars, has any a position which i immoral. It would t sit idle and allow amok. The Allies i to check this aggress commended for the Hopefully Sad result in massive ca the impetus for beg his and his alone.

## Two wrongs

After reading P President Bush in I must respond. Yaqzan's letter, t was very one-sided the brutal, sadis Hussein; a man w the murder of his bers of his govern responsible for ins over the world; a POW's as human attack.

Before I go any saying that many p the history behind ent situation in t creation of the Is their close ties w have had negative ing Arab nations.



FOR  
January 25