

To remember is not to glorify

Dear Editor,

I am writing this letter in response to the article that appeared in the Nov. 13 issue of *Excilbur*, titled "Student in chains protests Remembrance Day event". The article dealt with the protest of an Osgoode student against the 21-gun salute displayed in memorial of those who died by the Royal Canadian Artillery.

I fail to see how a tribute to the men and women who died in the wars of the past is an example of the "glorification of war", or worse, an example of "how we are socialized into thinking that violence against others is a sign of maturity", as Mr. Nkombe said. The 21-gun salute is a reminder of pain that knows no glory. It reminds us of bloodshed and fear, but mostly of those who gave their lives for their country. They cared that much. I can guarantee, Mr. Nkombe, that they did not face raining fire to be "mature" or because they wanted to prove their strength. They faced death for their families, for you, for me, for the earth that they stood on. And to me, in a world where life is so short,

letters

this sacrifice means everything. Like it or not, the driving force behind the strength of these brave men and women is the same force that compels people to protest endlessly in search of change and improvement. It motivates hunger strikes and other forms of self-deprivation aimed at the sole goal of being heard. It is the strength behind Nkombe's protest, though he fails to realize it.

I am thoroughly disgusted with Mr. Nkombe's protest. And frustrated. I consider myself to be a liberal person and I strongly believe in standing up against all injustices, as does Mr. Nkombe. Racism, tuition hikes, environmental and ecological destruction...I'm there. I see our world in a sad state, pain and suffering are a given as is persecution and fear. So in a time of such struggle, why is Mr. Nkombe wasting his energy on the protest against a symbol of hope? Against an event that provides a memory that is capable of restoring any lost hope in the strength of the unity of mankind?

Wake up, Mr. Nkombe. Sure, protest promotion of violent toys and portrayal of violence in movies. I'm right behind you. But please don't make the memories that November 11 awakens and the events that honour them fade. Please don't make the struggles of the past, become those done in vain. Because these struggles, my friend, are what made it possible for you to walk in chains, freely, to protest in front of our government buildings. It is what makes it possible for me to write this letter, freely.

Here's to the past. Lest we forget.

Lisa Machado

Do as Excal says not as it does!

Dear Editor,

You, *Excilbur*, and the stores in York Lanes, should definitely re-examine



Tom Schneider

"White Oak Excavated in the Construction of the Common, York University" by Rodney Graham

your policy regarding advertising. There is no excuse for having these glossy inserts in your paper. At *Excilbur*, you are continually writing progressive articles that attempt to enhance attitudes relating to cultures, economics, and other prominent issues. Well, as we say, this is all fine and dandy, but what type of environment are we all going to live in if our environmental attitudes do not change. How can we expect governments or industry to change if we, at universities, do not lead the way? Next time you throw a piece of trash on the ground, throw out a recyclable item or distribute any non-recyclable paper (including advertising, memos, correspondence, etc.) think about the last time you criticized a company for polluting the environment. Does the word hypocrite pop into mind? Think about it!

We must include thoughts of the environment in everything we do and all the policies that we make. *Excilbur*, you disappoint me, with the lack of respect that you have for our environment.

Rick Greater

Glendon centre funded fairly

Dear Editor,

In the past week, the Glendon Women's Centre's financial situation has figured prominently in *Protem* and *Excilbur* news coverage. Unfortunately, neither of these two newspapers presented a fair and comprehensive analysis in regards to the issue of the women's centre's underfunding problems. It is time that the record be set straight.

Like all clubs and services on campus, the Women's Centre has found that it's financial needs have not been totally met by GCSU funding contributions. Out of the centre's request to the GCSU for \$4600, they have been afforded a commitment of \$1000. Due to the fact that the centre did not receive its full funding request, some members of the centre now feel that the GCSU is unconcerned about women's issues. It is important to note however, that none of Glendon's clubs or services have received funding allotments which fully cover their operating expenditures. In fact many clubs have received budget allotments which do not even come close to their minimal funding needs. Are we now to say that because all clubs did not receive "adequate" funding that the GCSU only has a limited amount of dollars to divvy up

among clubs and services. I am confident that our present GCSU would cherish giving all clubs and services all the money they require, but you can not give away what you do not have available.

It is interesting how the Women's Centre translates GCSU support for it only in terms of financial commitments. At last week's GCSU council meeting a new service presented itself to the council, the Peer-Support network, soliciting council's support. An organizer from this new group stated that they felt it was more important for the GCSU to morally support them, not merely financially support them. I am glad to see that there are some people out there who do not translate moral support in terms of a pocket book. I know that the GCSU morally supports women's issues.

Last week's *Excilbur* article (Nov. 27) showed that the York Women's Centre receives \$9,500 in student union funding compared to our student union's allotment of \$1000. *Excilbur* failed to mention that on a per capita basis, as compared to the \$0.30 per student funding allotted by the York's Students' Federation, clearly our GCSU is more generous than York Main.

It would be prudent for the centre to look towards doing some fundraising, which aside from creating revenue, would make students more aware of their service, if not their existence. In conjunction with fundraising, they should look towards decreasing expenditures. For example, a Women's Centre member said that "\$500 won't even cover (the) telephone bills." When Bell phone services cost \$42 a month, servicing costs would equate to less than \$336 for a eight month academic period, leaving over \$164 for long distant calls. In fact, more money could be saved if the centre refrained from long distance calls and communicating by means of a letter and a \$0.40 stamp. Refraining from having events in which approximately \$150 is spent on coffee and doughnuts would also mitigate the centre's financial problems.

The centre's financial problems might only be temporary; the GCSU has proposed a referenda concerning increased funding to the centre for next year, and in addition to that, GCSU President Mark Adlam is seeking out further sources of off-campus funding (eg: Government funding). Patience and budget restraint would earn the centre more respect rather than automatically fighting pitch financial battles with our Student's Union. The Women's Centre is important to Glendon. Al-

though many of their services are duplications of existing and more professional services, they do provide some new and innovative services much needed on campus, such as a research centre and food bank. Let's end this petty bickering and work together as concerned students.

James Pickering

Excal should support SCC

Dear Editor,

I had intended to submit a letter to the Editor to be included in the November 20 edition of *Excilbur* thanking Elaine Bellio for her "even" coverage of the SCC's decision to lay off a number of its employees. Even if the article's headline sensationalized the decision by announcing it as a "sacking" of staff to cut costs. The term maybe colloquially "correct"; however, it gives the misleading impression that the decision was done in haste and without thought as to the consequences and alternatives. The decision was made by the Finance Committee after much thought and deliberation. No one liked taking such a step. Nonetheless, to secure our financial obligations with the University measures were required to meet that end. Since the SCC operates on the premise that the various departments are to work together, all three, the Information Centre, the Underground, and the Programming Department, were down-sized. The aim still is to secure yet provide the greatest service but at a lower cost. The SCC endeavours always to fulfil that aim.

It was with a great deal of puzzlement then that I opened the *Excal* on Thursday Nov. 20 to read the Editorial. Were it not for the seriousness of the article's allegations I would not have stooped to reply. What I find in the selection is an elaborate *ad hominem* attack against the SCC Executive and Finance committees. As the Arts Editor, "I. N." shows his personal bias and vested interests rather than a balanced presentation of the issues. I too lament the lay-offs; of course they affect people. Nonetheless, the difficult decision was made so that the SCC would work to secure the centre's long-term objectives. What I. N. fails to appreciate is that no one department in the operation has a special priority over another. Despite the article's claim, Programming was not singled out for "amputation". That *The Underground* is not as busy as projected

is true; no one is denying that. However, I would have thought that all student groups within the centre who have a direct interest in its long-term viability, including those at *Excilbur*, would work towards promoting the restaurant so that the cultural and musical events I. N. speaks of can be returned as expeditiously as possible. Unfortunately, I. N.'s ill-thoughtout comments are singularly and narrowly negative.

Gary McNeely
SCC Chairperson

Israel should think twice

Dear Editor,

A recent ad discussing Israel's security concerns raised an important dilemma. On the one hand, Israelis (like Arabs, we hope) are sick of the fighting that has surrounded the Jewish state since the Jews returned to the Holy Land. On the other hand, from 1948-1967, before there was an "occupied territory" and "land for peace", the Israelis suffered from constant warfare and anti-civilian terrorism on the part of the Arab states and terrorist groups. Even last year's SCUD attacks showed how vulnerable Israel is from a simple geographic perspective. My grandparents live near Tel Aviv, and were there to be a Palestinian state, they would be in easy range of hand-held missile launchers. If the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict is any indication of the future, the Israelis would do well to think twice before giving any land back. As Jewish supporters of Israel often say: "Better criticized than eulogized."

Israel Ellis

Sheuftan takes balanced view

Dear Editor,

I attended Dan Sheuftan's presentation on the Odds for Peace in the Middle East, and although I found him at times blunt, he was neither slanderous nor racist.

His comments on the violence in the Arab world (I do not remember him ever saying anything to the tune of "all Arabs are violent") were justified. He was speaking about the odds for peace, and his point was that the instability, and lack of peace within most Arab regimes (and he cited examples such as Syria and Hama, Iraq and the Kurds, etc.) poses a problem. When questioned by a student, he clarified that he could not comment on the "nature" of Arabs, but simply on the events that have occurred over the last century.

Later during question period, Sheuftan did tell a student that he was either lying or ignorant. This student was denying that Palestinians in the West Bank supported Saddam Hussein's SCUD missile attacks on Israel during the Gulf Crisis. Palestinians did support the SCUD attacks to the point where they were cheering on the roofs as the missiles flew overhead. Anyone who denies that this support existed is indeed either ignorant of this support or lying.

Sheuftan was critical of all the players in the Middle East. He criticized Arab leaders, George Bush and even Israeli leaders. Sheuftan said that he does not support Shamir, and called Israeli housing minister Ariel Sharon "stupid".

Sheuftan is an important Israeli academic with vast experience in the Middle East. He is in contact with

Continued on page 7