

Success

To the editor,

On behalf of the Dalhousie Student Union, the societies and students of Dal, we would like to extend our thanks to Winter Carnival '86 Chairman Brad Conrad, and Candice Eisner, Super Societies Co-ordinator. The Carnival was a great success and offered many fun and interesting events. Thanks are also extended

to all those societies and individuals who helped out with the organization of it. All those societies which participated in the events had a great time. Congratulations to Commerce for being the over-all winners.

Catherine Blewett
DSU President
Reza Rizvi
DSU Vice-President

Inaccurate information

To the Editor:

I write in response to a letter which appeared in the Jan. 16th issue of *The Gazette* by Mr. James Kadyampakeni who alleges that the Dalhousie Student Union has "no legitimate explanation" for having its bank account with the Royal Bank. Mr. Kadyampakeni upholds his position by presenting totally inaccurate information in his letter.

In a recent correspondence from Mr. Dave MacLean, Director of Public Relations for the Royal Bank, the international operations of The Royal Bank of Canada has the following policy concerning its business transactions in South Africa:

The Royal Bank of Canada has frequently and clearly expressed its deep abhorrence of South Africa's apartheid policy and system.

The Royal Bank does not make loans to ANY borrower in South Africa where the Bank judges that the funds would support or facilitate the application of the apartheid policy or the pass law system.

The Royal Bank does not make general purpose or balance of payment loans to the South African Government, because the ultimate use of the funds cannot be clearly determined.

The Royal Bank of Canada has made no new loans and has not renewed any existing loans to the South African Government, or any of its state agencies, since mid-1976.

The above policy statements from official Royal Bank sources, clearly show that Mr. Kadyam-

pakeni is misinformed about the banking policies of the Royal Bank. In 1977, Dalhousie Student Union carefully studied the banking policies of major Canadian banks and decided to transfer its funds to the Royal Bank from the Bank of Montreal. Just last year, Mr. Neil Ferguson, Treasurer of the Dalhousie Student Union, made an effort to study the ramifications of our transferring funds to a Credit Union. Unfortunately, Credit Unions in the city are not equipped to provide us with adequate services for our multi-million dollar operations. Clearly, Mr. Kadyampakeni's allegation that the Dalhousie

its way to be immoral" is an unfair charge. The Student Union has taken every possible precaution in its dealings with the Royal Bank and I assure you that we will continue to do so in the future.

I personally took the initiative to inform Mr. Kadyampakeni the inaccuracies in his letter three days prior to the publication date of the *Gazette*. I had hoped that he would have had the decency to correct the blatantly false information in his letter. Unfortunately, even after being presented with the facts, Mr. Kadyampakeni continued to make unfounded statements.

Now both Mr. Kadyampakeni and *Gazette* readers know the truth.

Sincerley yours,
Reza Rizvi
Executive Vice President
Dalhousie Student Union

something for "peace". And besides, there must surely be a certain satisfaction derived from holding the same view as the gentlemen sitting in the Soviet Politburo.

Senator Ted Kennedy has been the valiant leader of the anti-SDI battle waged in the American Congress. This mighty Democrat from Massachusetts has apparently taken on humanity's struggle for peace because, in his concerned opinion, SDI is not only "illusory" and "reckless" but is "destabilizing" and "dangerous". When Mr. Kennedy and other anti-SDI activists begin using such colorful adjectives in describing SDI they inadvertently raise an interesting question: Is this why we have freedom of speech — to treat serious subjects ignorantly?

If one were to examine President Reagan's proposal from an accurate perspective, a person would see that it is, in fact, not only sensible and realistic, but safe, and most of all, imperative. Why? Well, because facts speak louder than unsubstantiated and evasive arguments.

First of all, it is totally impossible for a defensive system which hopefully everyone knows SDI is to be "threatening", let alone "dangerous" and "destabilizing". SDI is totally non-threatening — it kills weapons, not people. Moreover, it is non-nuclear. In fact, it is anti-nuclear because it can destroy incoming missiles without causing any nuclear explosions or harmful radiation. And best of all, if put into place, SDI will make nuclear weapons obsolete. Where fanciful adjectives like "dangerous" come into this discussion is a mystery at best.

The word "illusory" also makes the argument turn into a confusing and irrational mess. Far from it, "Star Wars" is a perfectly workable system, of which many parts have already been successfully tested and have proven



highly effective. The "it won't work" syndrome was put to rest back on June 10, 1984, when the U.S. army conducted a spectacularly successful test in the South Pacific.

"But even so" says the SDI critic, "Star Wars" will take decades to get into operation and will cost too much money". One needs little time to realize that such arguments manage to deny the most obvious evidence to the contrary. All experts on the Strategic Defense Initiative have confirmed that a working system can be placed into space by the early

1990's. We are talking five to eight years. That is a far cry from "decades". Also, "Star Wars" would be relatively cheap, to say the least. Cost estimates for the system range from \$30 to \$50 billion. Before you faint, remember that, if figures mean anything, this would be less than 5 per cent of the total U.S. defense budget. Moreover, the system will obviously pay for itself in the long run because it will render many other items in the defense budget unnecessary. If "Star Wars" was brought into existence, it would not be necessary to spend money on all the programs designed to support the old MAD (Mutual Assured Destruction) theory.

The Soviets' obvious anxiety about SDI reveals the fact that they presume it will work. In this case, SDI will greatly devalue the amount of Soviet investment in offensive systems and will substantially complicate the calculations of any Soviet official planning a first strike. In this respect, it is important to remember that experts on SDI say that the system can stop approximately 95 per cent of all incoming missiles. Mathematics tells us this gives a first strike attack a five per cent success possibility. In effect, you have driven the possibility of a delivered nuclear war back to zero, or close to it, because you leave Mr. Gorbachev asking his "scholarly" and "in the fashion" wife: "Do we want to risk a five per cent effective strike?" The answer tells us that the possibility of a first strike has been eliminated. No first strike, no nuclear war. No nuclear war, people live. Sounds complicated doesn't it? Well apparently Mr. Kennedy and his companions find it so.

Commentary: SDI

By JAMIE GLAZOV

IT HAS BEEN ROUGHLY two years now that the Free World has witnessed many of its inhabitants join the crusade against President Reagan's "Star Wars" proposal. The critics of SDI are apparently very worried and have set out to "inform" the public about this new threat to civilization. As though tutoring underachievers, these individuals patiently explain that "Peace is better than War", and that "we do not want to be incinerated." Then they finish with these nice notes of archdescension, the anti-SDI activists generously reveal to their listeners that the Strategic Defense Initiative is a dangerous and humanity-threatening system that will drastically increase the chances of a nuclear holocaust.

The concept of a nuclear holocaust is really quite frightening. One can understand why the sug-

gested dangers inherent in the SDI proposal would cause alarm and anxiety. The only problem with these dangers, however, despite all of their cinematic and emotional detail, in that they do not exist.

To begin with, there is far more to the SDI proposal than its opponents say or think. It is not a question of those who want war or peace or those who would like to get incinerated in a nuclear explosion and those who would not. When denouncing "Star Wars", many SDI critics sound at the ragged edge of weariness and sarcasm. It is, evidently, a tiring business being the few sensitive people on the planet. In describing SDI, they usually say something like "it is bad" or "it is crazy" and then peculiarly add that they aren't really "all that familiar with the matter." In other words, they really don't know what the whole thing is about but it feels good to be doing

Alexander's

Maritime Travel and Canadian Pacific Airlines

present the

First Annual Oland Export Ale

Great Nerf Shootout!

No Skill Required



Fun Easy to Play



Starting Thursday January 16th, 7 to 10 p.m.

and for the following 10 weeks on Thursdays.

We will be awarding weekly prizes for 1st and 2nd place

Team Effort

Weekly winners advance to playoff round for:
Grand Prize - Trip for 4 to Montreal (fun filled weekend)
Second Prize - \$200.00
Third Prize - Dinner for 4 in Alexander's Wine Bar

Contact Alexander's today to find out how you can get involved!
Located in the Brewery Market 423-2095