

Letters

Most incredible doubles

To the Editor:

Not too much attention has been given to university residences lately and little has been said about what goes on in them. Therefore, we at Howe Hall would like to share this incredible story with all the Dalhousie Gazette readers.

Seventeen years ago, two identical twins were separated for certain reasons. John Russell Sanche' spent most of his life in Moncton NB knowing all along through one of his parents that he had a twin brother, though he never expected that he would ever meet him. Hassan Billy-Joe A'ssaff spent a great deal of his life in the middle east also knowing that he once had a twin brother, but it never crossed his mind that he would ever see him again for he never knew Russell's whereabouts.

The most incredible part about this story is that after all these years, they got together right here at Dalhousie. They had this unusual feeling towards each other at first, as if something was telling them to get closer. After further investigations, it was proven that they are in fact twins.

The twins say their separation goes back a long way and for silly reasons which are too personal to be published. But most of all they have given all the people around them here at Howe Hall the feeling that there still is hope in this world. They are now current residents of Howe Hall and are enjoying a strong relationship hoping that this time it will last for ever. The twins thought it would be great if everyone knew about it, so we decided to send our story to the Dalhousie Gazette.

We think it is the most wonderful thing that has ever happened here on campus. It is the single most incredible double.

Michael Joseph Doupe

Radicals vs. Gonzos

To the Editor:

In defending the visit of Hunter S. Thompson, Jeff Jones misses the point I made in my original letter.

The expenditure of \$7,000 on the visit of an American journalist will certainly radicalize taxpayers who are tired of hearing that our universities are having financial problems.

I sense in Mr. Jones' letter a nostalgia for the radical Sixties. At least in the States, young men and women laid their lives and their careers on the line when they set out to change society. In Canada in those days, everyone tried to run the revolution on government grants. I've documented some of these absurdities in *Understanding Canada*.

Radicals do not seek adulation, high fees or disciples. They

expect — and usually get — a kick in the ass. But they are motivated by a desire to extend the ethical impulse to the whole sphere of human activity. They affirm the superiority of the human spirit over all economic and social systems that try to oppress it. Radicalism is also rooted in a feeling of reverence for that which in humans is always trying to outdistance itself.

I know scores of people in Nova Scotia and Canada who are working in this radical tradition. But they are motivated by concern and compassion for others — not by fear and loathing.

Yours, etc,
Jim Lotz

Women love First Choice

To the Editor:

Due to the irritating smattering of protest around campus of late regarding the issue of art on the "First Choice" pay TV channel I feel I must attempt to clarify some points.

Firstly, there is no problem. Television is a sex machine, has been and always will be. The advancement of overt exposure rather than subliminal brainwashing is a bold and creative step towards future, better, programming.

Secondly the insignificant protestations of late bespeak only of the bewildered melodramatic ramblings of a select group of sexually repressed and frustrated less-than-altogether females, who are not only jealous of the new "stars" but are ignorant of the truths underlying the new art forms.

1. Tits and ass are good for the economy.
2. T&A are good fun.

Thirdly, this uncultured menagerie of malicious protestors has ignored one important factor ... the audience. I quote from a recent clipping of the NY Times: "Adult films on a pay TV network have caused some red faces among housewives. But it wasn't the movies that embarrassed them. At the end of each month households in Columbus Ohio receive an itemized bill showing times and dates of movies watched and appropriate charges. A spokesman for the TV company said, "We got a few irrate phone calls from Columbus housewives who didn't want their husbands to know what they were watching."

I hope this ends the problem and that in the future, the insignificant minority shall henceforth remain in their predestined submissiveness and become a little more silent.

Thankyou
Tom (A.) Dickie

Chairman of the keep Woman in her place society
for intellectual gentlemen.

Broaden boycotts

To the Editor:

It was with disgust and dismay that I read the article in your November 18th, Volume 115, number 11 entitled "Boycotts Proven Effective in Third World". This article was authored by Geoff Martin.

At first I thought that I was going to read an article that espoused sanctions and boycotts against all Third World nations that oppressed any portion of their respective populations for racial or other reasons. What I read instead was nothing more than the usual diatribe against ONE Third World nation - to wit - South Africa. WHILE I AM NOT IN FAVOUR OF THAT COUNTRY'S POLICY OF OPPRESSION OF ITS CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RACE I AM ALSO NOT IN FAVOUR OF THAT NATION'S BEING SINGLED OUT FOR CRITICISM WHILE SILENCE IS MAINTAINED AGAINST ANY OTHER SIMILAR NATION IN THE WORLD.

Perhaps Mr. Martin is not aware that there are numerous other countries in the Third World family. Such nations as Ethiopia and Uganda to name just two. Does he condone the actions of such people as Haillie Saliasse of Ethiopia who brutally killed anyone who opposed him and converted all that country's wealth for his own personal use? Does he condone Idi Amin's brutal torture and killing of thousands of his subjects because he perceived a threat to his own power seat? Why single out South Africa and recite the arguments of one person, a Ms. Cag, without offering any rebuttal to any of her statements?

It is morally wrong to subject one country to editorial rhetoric with respect to its treatment of any portion of its population without subjecting all countries who treat any segment of their populations to discrimination for whatever reason to the same editorial rhetoric.

Therefore I would suggest that the Dalhousie Gazette offer articles on the treatment the Polish Solidarity Movement has received from it's Communist Government. Also criticize Uganda, Ethiopia, Argentina and almost half of the rest of the world as well.

It would also be nice to see an article published concerning the addressing of the question as to whether the plight of the South African black is remaining stagnant or have any changes taken place to alleviate their situation during the past twenty five years or so. I suggest that proponents of boycotts and sanctions against this particular country read two recent articles on this very subject. One is the report of the Anglican Synod of Canada published during their annual conference held in June 1980 in Peterborough, Ontario wherein Canon M.A. Hughes proposed a motion seconded by the Right Rev. Reginald Hollis, Bishop of Montreal, that that particular synod adopt a policy of NOT imposing sanctions against South Africa. The motion was carried by a substantial majority. Also for reading should be a 79 page study done by The Centre for Business Studies, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of the Witwatersand, P.O. Box 31170, Johannesburg, South Africa, entitled "A Case Against Disinvolvement In the South African Economy". It clearly advocates change by evolution (through the Trade Union Movement) rather than change by revolution caused by economic chaos as a result of boycotts and sanctions.

Commentary

Ideological indoctrination exists in West as well

by Geoff Martin

Last week, a commentary opposing the peace movement was printed in these columns ("Power-stripping and infiltration of Peacemakers"). The writer, Mr. Glen Johnson, ostensibly provides us with "good, honest, information" designed to prove that the world peace movement is a Soviet-front for the purpose of weakening the NATO allies.

By definition, one cannot dispute that which is fact, and for the most part the commentary was factually accurate. What I intend to do is dispute his value judgements and interpretations which turn his "good, honest information" into polemical distortions.

Mr. Johnson says that the disarmament movement is neither "a truly spontaneous and homegrown response to the threat of a nuclear holocaust" or a "means to advance the cause of peace". While it is true that agents of the Soviet KGB have been involved in the peace move-

ment, Mr. Johnson completely ignores the recent strident statements of President Reagan which have provided the real impetus of the Peace movement. If you lived in Europe and the US President said "We (America) can win a nuclear war in Europe," would you not become nervous?

Mr. Johnson's attempts to discredit William Sloane Coffin and Cora Weiss because of their positions as "prominent leftists" illustrates Mr. Johnson's inability to accept facts which do not correspond to his ideological assumptions, something which we all suffer from to some extent.

I believe that the present Alvar Magana government in El Salvador does not deserve the label "democratic," and that it is an oversimplification to call the Democratic Revolutionary Front (FDR) communist rebels, since only two of the eleven parties in the FDR are actually "communist parties". In

addition, despite American attempts to discredit the FDR they have never proven direct Cuban, Nicaraguan or Soviet involvement. As for the question of Cora Weiss' support of the Viet Cong in the Vietnam war, what is so shameful about that? The government of Ho Chi Minh was not perfect, but one could easily come to the conclusion that it was better than Bao Dai, President Diem, or any of the other rulers of South Vietnam during the same period.

Mr. Johnson also says that a nuclear freeze in the United States will not allow the West to redress the recent "Soviet buildup". To even make a claim like this is lunacy and illustrates the nineteenth century mentality which prevails in the Reagan and Andropov governments. Mr. Johnson is assuming that it is possible to measure who has nuclear superiority, especially when one side has only a slight marginal superiority.

I would argue that in all areas the US generally has more accurate missiles, whereas the Soviets have more powerful payloads. Considering the number of missiles per warhead and whether they are MIRVed or MARVed makes it even more complicated, and perhaps redundant.

I also find it perversely amusing that Mr. Johnson accepts the idea that NATO should use nuclear weapons against a Soviet conventional invasion of western Europe. Mr. Johnson assumes that American use of nuclear weapons against Soviet ground forces would not force the Soviet Union to use nuclear weapons against NATO forces in Europe. In my opinion, escalation would be very probable.

Mr. Johnson claims that peace activists "trust" the Soviet Union, yet he should know that trust is not an issue in arms control agreements. Any arms control agreement will contain effective verification

measures, since neither side trusts the other by definition.

Essentially, I think Mr. Johnson does what he criticizes the peace movement of doing. He has been completely taken in by the American international position. One of his most important presuppositions is that we are 'good' and they are 'bad'.

If we are to make moral judgements, we should condemn both the Soviet Union and the United States for their actions in the world. For example, my perceptions of the Soviet war in Afghanistan and the American war in Vietnam are strikingly similar.

My own perceptions tell me that Mr. Johnson is a pro-American polemicist and as a result he views reality from that perspective. All I ask is that he be more consistent and less self-righteous in his unequivocal support for the western position on the disarmament issue.