

## "Israel only democracy" — laughable

To the editors,

In his article, titled "Lebanon a disaster, says Israel," (*The Gazette* Feb 14/85) David Olie quotes Col. Amos Gilboa, of the Israeli army, stating "as a democracy, Israel has a special responsibility to keep the peace in the Middle East. We are lucky to be the only democracy in the Middle East." This is laughable if it was not for the tragic human consequences, in butchery and destruction, that this arrogance of Israel's leaders has brought about to the Middle East. This, together with the pretext of security, are the same justifications used by Nazi Germany, to invade Europe, and the Reagan administration is currently using in its schemes of invasion in Central America.

Another aspect of this statement that deserves demolition is the myth of the Israeli so-called "democracy." The true nature of this *selective* democracy, for Jews only, is best described by the Israeli Jewish writer, Maxim Ghilan who, in an editorial in the February 1983 issue of the Paris based journal *Israel and Palestine*, titled "Israeli Democracy: Values and Limits," wrote:

*"Israel is a Western-type democracy, for Jews only. All Jews living in Israel, or emigrating there, are granted the same kind of rights a citizen of a Western industrial democracy possesses: the right to express his views freely, to vote, to trial by his peers, to remain free from unjustified arrest, to remain free of want and hunger, and to demand redress by legal or administrative means.*

*Arabs, who are citizens of the State of Israel, are less fortunate: By covert or overt means, they are prevented from creating their own, specifically Arab, parties; they are often arrested arbitrarily and may be held without trial according to emergency regulations; they are not granted equal economic privileges, are prevented from access to public housing and loans given only "to those who served in the IDF and allied services" — bodies into which most Israeli Arabs are not admitted. Finally, Israeli Arab workers are economically discriminated against, receiving lower pay than their Jewish counterparts.*

*Arabs in the territories conquered by Israel since 1967 have no rights what-so-ever. Their children are shot, beaten up, jailed; their young men assassinated. Their cars are wantonly destroyed by hammer and bomb. Their elected mayors and leaders are deposed, their trade unionists prevented from organizing. A wholly non-Arab, civilian-military administration rules over them. Their politicians are often deported. Militias of thugs, frequently drafted from criminal elements, are set up to keep them in line. Foreign settlers jeer at them, provoke them, squat in their homes and on their lands. International law concerning the behavior of*

*conquerors in conquered land is openly flaunted."*

This is the form of democracy that arrogantly allocated to itself, in violation of international law, the right to invade its neighbours bringing about the devastation of towns and cities and the killing and maiming of tens of thousands.

Yours sincerely  
I. Zayid  
President  
Canadian Palestine Association

## Welsh settlements

To the editors,

For the past seven years I have been gathering information concerning two Welsh settlements in this region: New Cambria (later Welshstown), near Shelburne, N.S., founded in 1818, and Cardigan, near Fredericton, N.B., founded in 1819. These were the first Welsh settlements in modern Canada—though one in Newfoundland existed for twenty years early in the seventeenth century. Since my book will be published early in 1986 I am making a "last call" for any word about descendants of the New Cambria or Cardigan settlers and about any materials or memories they might possess concerning their ancestors.

Inscriptions in family bibles, early letters, photographs, etc., could all be valuable; and some might be added to the many illustrations already gathered. I have received information from as far afield as New York, Iowa, Michigan, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, to say nothing of Wales. It would be distressing to miss those parts of the story which are undoubtedly scattered throughout the Maritime provinces.

Yours sincerely,  
Peter Thomas  
Department of English  
University of New Brunswick,  
Fredericton, N.B. E3B 5A3

## Callwood no hired gun

To the editors,

I would like, if I may, to correct one or two points in Elizabeth Donovan's "Harassment procedures in chaos" (Feb. 14).

I did not take any information to a meeting of a civil liberties group. Nor, as Ms. Donovan's account may have suggested to some readers, did I bring June Callwood in as a hired gun, stuff her with information or misinformation, and say "Kill!" You don't do that kind of thing with a journalist of Ms. Callwood's stature.

Last summer I got in touch with the Canadian Civil Liberties Association about the case in question, because I was deeply disturbed—as I still am—about what seemed to me violations of academic freedom and due process in it. In November I received a phone call from Ms. Callwood, whom I had hitherto known only through her admirable columns in the *Globe and Mail* and who had heard

about the affair. At the end of our conversation she asked me for the name of someone on the plaintiff's side whom she might speak to, and I gave her the name of Dr. Patricia DeMeo, the case officer who had set the whole machinery in motion. Next day I phoned Ms. Callwood to ask if she would mind postponing any story for a couple of weeks, since the case had reached a particularly delicate stage. To which she kindly agreed.

In January Ms. Callwood phoned me again, having heard more about the case in the meantime and become more convinced than ever that the story deserved telling. We spoke briefly, and this time, when she asked for the name of someone who approved of the new regulations, I gave her the name of Dr. Toni Laidlaw, who had chaired the committee that had devised them. I did not speak with Ms. Callwood again. It is my understanding that Ms. Callwood, in addition to approaching the complainant and defendant, phoned Dr. Laidlaw, Dr. Christine Boyle (the plaintiff's advisor), and Dr. Alasdair Sinclair, Vice-President Academic. The first two, at least, were presumably free to speak their minds to her.

I was impressed by what Ms. Donovan reported about Professor David Lewis's scrupulousness about confidentiality. At the same time, to talk about confidentiality with respect to such a case, or others like it, seems to me to be talking about a fiction. Given the elaborate machinery that has been devised, by the time a case has reached the formal stage it is virtually guaranteed that at least a dozen people will know about it as participants—fifteen if you include all the members of the advisory committee. And this is without taking into account the existence of friends, spouses, and sympathetic colleagues.

In the present case, the DFA executive also knew about it, as did to my certain knowledge seven other people involved in the affair. And if anyone were to assure me that prior to the appearance of Ms. Callwood's articles not a single feminist apart from those formally involved knew about it, I would have to reply that this would seem to me very improbable. After all, presumably part of the point of such an exercise is to make an example of offenders or supposed offenders. And you cannot do that if there is a wall of silence.

The notion that everyone inside a university is somehow bound by an oath of silence seems to me of a piece with the other weightings of the new system against the accused. Under the regulations that have been devised, a male who has been tried for sexual harassment must for the rest of his time here walk around with the Kafkaesque certainty that at least some of the women with whom he has day-to-day dealings, whether librarians, faculty, or staff, will have heard something about the matter, if only in the most general—and in a sense most damaging—terms. ("Oh, Professor McSwine! Wasn't he the man in some

harassment case a few years ago?") Yet any attempt at clearing his name publicly, or even simply defending himself energetically from the outset, is apparently *Bad Form*.

It will no doubt be retorted that if someone wishes to avoid this kind of botherment, he had better be sensible ("mature," I seem to recall, is the word) and come to terms with his accuser during the informal stage of the proceedings. Well, yes, that is indeed a

message that comes across loud and clear in the pages of *A Plan for Positive Action* and in the history of the present case. But it has nothing to do with justice.

The best way for a university to avoid the attentions of journalists concerned about injustices, particularly civil liberties injustices, is to refrain from committing them.

John Fraser  
Professor  
Department of English

## Be nice to me today—or else

SINCE THIS IS THE women's supplement, I have decided to write about something distinctively female. And what is more female than...PMS.



KIM MACLEOD

PMS is the term doctors have chosen to describe the mutiny of hormones

that many women are faced with on a monthly basis. It is that time when we individuals of the female persuasion become a bit emotional and start doing "naughty" little things like hanging cats and "knocking off" unsympathetic lovers. Some women don't realize that they suffer from PMS, and it is these unfortunates who have the worst time of it because it leaves them with no excuse for their bizarre behavior. I have therefore devised this short test. Read through the following and try to imagine your personal reactions. If they fit any of the three categories given you have suffered from PMS. If they don't, or are more unusual, you have still suffered:

**A. You are at the grocery store.** The tea bags are two inches too high to get at. What do you do?  
1. You crawl into the meat freezer and walk all over the pork chops until you are near enough the tea bags to grab some.  
2. You grab a long roll of salami and swing it at the shelf, knocking down every %&¢\$\*?! box of tea bags in sight, not to mention everything else around them.  
3. You cry.

**B. You spend ten minutes working your body into a pair of "one size fits all" pantyhose, only to discover that they have a huge run. What is your reaction?**  
1. You throw them in the garbage and paint your legs blue to match your skirt.  
2. You bathe them in kerosene, hang them on the clothesline, and torch the %&¢\*\*!\$! into oblivion.  
3. You cry.

**C. You are cold and exhausted after a long day of doing errands, and are forced to stand up on the bus because there is a man occupying the last seat with his legs. How do you handle the situation?**

1. You accept the fact that the Gods are against you and try to make the best of things. Finding, however, that you have the coordination of an MS victim, you wind up getting off the bus and walking home in a blizzard, with the wind against you.  
2. You smile sadistically at him before crushing his genitalia with your overstuffed bookbag and throwing the full weight of your body on his kneecaps. (Coincidentally, this action "MAKES YOUR DAY")  
3. You cry.

**D. You are typing a term paper when a small tendril of hair falls in your face. You try tucking it behind your ear, but it's not quite long enough. What do you do next?**  
1. You stop typing and spend an hour or so fantasizing about what you are going to do to the hairdresser who convinced you to "grow it out."  
2. You decide to cut the ?!&¢\$\* thing off and wind up shaving your head.  
3. You cry.

**E. You are alone in your living room, eating your favourite food and watching your favourite TV show. There is a commercial break. What do you do during this period?**  
1. You are overwhelmed by a creative urge to redecorate, and find yourself painting the walls black.  
2. You are pushed over the edge by the idiocy of a cat food ad and perpetrate an act of violence upon your Granada.  
3. You cry.

As you can see, PMS drives a woman to strange acts and it is important that her mate realize her state and be as supportive as possible. She requires understanding. She requires sympathy and companionship. I feel it is imperative that a man give a woman these things during this time of the month. After all...if you don't...she might hurt you!