

# EDITORIAL

## End of the show...

*Better is the end of a thing than its beginning.*

Alright, I forgot. Thanks go to Roggeveen for reminding me this afternoon that this editorial is mine. I wanted to discuss user fees but Oginski hustled my topic in his Second Wind. And I didn't want to fill this space arguing against an obvious abhorrence in any case.

The beauty of having this particular editorial, of course, is that nobody can respond to it, so I am taking this opportunity to reflect upon a year at the Gateway.

I started out feeling as though there was no story too long or complex to conquer. I failed to predict what little time and spirit are left after doing mere news and soon abandoned my grandiose feature plans.

I also looked forward to a year of AI and the boys hitting it off with the best of all working relationships. As you have probably already guessed, I was immediately dubbed the naive one.

That may have been an asset on occasion, but none of us, save Jens with his battle scars and memories, was emotionally prepared for, amongst other headaches, two heated elections. The second slagfest left no staff member free of an involuntary cringe at the words "conflict of interest." New Editor intact, we're trying to forget those weeks.

The working atmosphere is not what I had at first envisioned.

But then I had at first fancied myself as objective, even after Walter Stewart told me otherwise in *Canadian Newspapers: The Inside Story*. For whatever reason, journalists are among the most opinionated group of professionals I know. God save us from ourselves.

Tempers have flared often and none of us leaves without having felt at some point hostility or disgust for some other editor. As the end is in sight, one hopes much of the animosity can also be put to bed for the last time.

Perhaps it will comfort some readers to know that no matter how enraged you have been with our performances, it can never match what we have felt ourselves.

Every 2 AM press night has eaten a little at us so that we should be forgiven for treating the final one, not as a fond farewell, but as a narrow escape. A summer could cure any of us but let me be the first to say...I hope it's a long summer.

Allison Annesley

## ...and coming attractions

There are some ambitious plans for 1983-84; I think you'll be impressed with the new staff.

In the news department, Ken Lenz and Mark Roppel are a dynamic duo sans the Batmobile. Ken is curious about the paper, from the operation of the typesetter to the proposed constitution. Mark will balance that enormous energy with his more laid-back approach to journalism.

Gilbert Bouchard is the new managing editor and will offer an eclectic array of feature articles. Gilbert says the Letters Page will keep pretty well the same format as Jens developed this year.

Film connoisseur Jack Vermeé will be branching out into the Arts section in September. His writing style bodes him well and his access to copious amounts of popcorn would suggest that Jack be welcomed at any party.

The Gateway will certainly benefit with the knowledge of Kent Blinston in the Sports department. Kent provides the irreverence that is needed in a student paper. Besides that, he's a great guy to share a bottle of rum with and I look forward to discussing many issues with him.

The Photo-editors will be Bill Inglee and Martin Beales. Bill is a master's student in history and his calm demeanor should go well with Martin's talent and enthusiasm.

In Production, Janine McDade has already shown an ability to deal with odd-sized articles. It'll still be a learning year for her; readers would be better off should she start to write on a regular basis as well.

The CUP editor is none other than Jens Andersen. Jens tells me he'll be driving a taxi again this summer and that may mean more adventures than his devoted fans can handle.

Circulation will be handled by Tom Wilson. Tom delivered the mammoth *Montreal Gazette* as a kid, so the Gateway should pose no problem.

Brent Jang

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - Brent Jang  
 NEWS EDITORS - Rich Watts, Allison Annesley  
 MANAGING EDITOR - Jens Andersen  
 ARTS EDITOR - David Cox  
 SPORTS EDITOR - Kent Blinston  
 PHOTO EDITOR - Ray Giguere  
 CUP EDITOR - Wes Oginski  
 PRODUCTION - Anne Stephen, Jim Miller  
 ADVERTISING - Tom Wright  
 MEDIA SUPERVISOR - Margriet Tilroe-West  
 CIRCULATION - Gunnar Blodgett

Staff this Issue



see page seven

The Gateway is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. Contents are the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief; opinions and editorials are signed by the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. Newsroom: Rm 262, Advertising Dept.: Rm 256D, Students' Union Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6C 2T7. Newsroom phone 432-5168 (5178), Advertising - 432-4241, Ext. 28. The Gateway is a member of Canadian University Press. Newspaper readership is 25,000.

**gateway**  
 VOL. LXIII, NO. 49



I don't know why I buy this SHIT

## « LETTERS TO THE EDITOR »

### Don't shoot the Princess

In reply to Ben Murray's letter of March 29, found under the headline "Princess or plebian?"

As a staff-member and lover of the Princess theatre, I could not stand idly by while Mr. Ben Murray Arts II spewed out misdirected and undeserved criticisms of the Princess staff, and our film presentations.

First of all, Mr. Murray is rightfully incensed by the poor quality of the print of *On the Waterfront*.

However, Mr. Murray erroneously lays the blame on the Princess. What he doesn't realize is that the Princess, like any other repertory theatre, is at the mercy of the various film distribution companies. These distribution companies rent us the films we show and are the sole agents of quality control. Some, like United Artists Classics, take pains to insure quality prints, while others unfortunately are less conscientious. What it boils down to is taking a chance; if you want to show an older movie, you order it and pray for a good print.

The case of *On the Waterfront* perfectly illustrates the perils of film rental. The last time the Princess screened the film, the print was in bad shape. We were assured by the distributor that, this time, we would receive a different, better quality one. Obviously, we didn't. This suggests to me that criticism should be aimed at the distributor, not the Princess.

Second, Mr. Murray states that the lights started coming on before the movie ended. Since I was not present, I can't comment on that other than to say that in four years of regular Princess patronage, I can't recall such a thing ever happening.

Finally, Mr. Murray sees fit to throw in a couple of criticisms of our movie screen. His allegation that most of the films shown at the Princess have "1/4 of the original image lopped off vertically," due to our screen size is, quite simply, false. As for his comment that the screen is "some three blocks distant vertically and horizontally," two things need be said.

First, correct me if I'm wrong but horizontal distance can be lessened by moving a few rows closer, can't it? Second, any attempt to lower the screen would result in much justified gnashing of teeth amongst the many patrons who prefer the balcony. The problem being, of course, that they would no longer be able to see the screen.

Well, enough ranting. If Mr. Murray (or anyone else) has a well-founded complaint all he or she has to do is mention it to the staff. If we can't fix the problem, they will receive a complimentary pass. After all, we are not ogres.

Jack Vermeé, Arts (Special) and Princess Pleb.

### Zionism is maligned

Re: "Worldwide Zionist Plot"

A forum entitled "The Agony of Lebanon" was given by Dr. Ismail Zayed last Thursday, March 31st. We were told that this agony was the result solely of Israel's invasion (the PLO influx of 1970 and the Syrian invasion of 1976 were ignored). But Lebanon was just the first object of Zionist plans. The "Israeli Empire" was to include all the territory between the Nile and the Euphrates (an area approximately 150 times Israel's size and 20 times its population)! In addition, the Zionists planned to extend their influence over Turkey, Iran, the Persian Gulf and Africa!!

This specious argument is as old as the hills of Jerusalem. Dressed up in different clothes, it is the statement that there is a worldwide Zionist (read: Jewish) conspiracy to conquer the world. We take great exception to this statement, especially in view of similar statements made in the Alberta community.

We suspect that many people's concept of Zionism has been perverted by statements like this. In fact, the Encyclopaedia Britannica defines Zionism as "a Jewish nationalist movement that has had as its goal the creation and support of a Jewish national

state in Palestine".

Yet Zionism is often slandered as an expansionist or racist movement. Let us start with the first term. Upon creation of the state of Israel by the U.N. in 1948, the immediate response was invasion by five Arab armies (Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon), each bent upon its own aggrandizement. Throughout its short history Israel has always offered land for peace to the Arabs. This was proven dramatically by Israel's withdrawal from Sinai just one year ago. With this recent exception of Egypt, the answer of the Arab states and the PLO has always been: "No peace, No negotiations, No recognition". It is not difficult to see who are the expansionist powers.

Also attributed to Zionism is the "racist" label. As evidence, anti-Zionist charge that Israel permits immigration by Jews, but not by other ethnic groups. In fact, countries throughout the world (including Canada) have always had ethnicity quotas. The "racist" charge is made all the more bizarre by the perpetration of the Arab Boycott, economic warfare waged on Jewish citizens (not Israelis, not Zionists) of neutral countries throughout the world (again, including Canada).

The statements that Zionism is racism or expansionism are slanderous and indefensible. Zionists continue to hope that Israel will be recognized by her Arab neighbours, whereupon a new era of productive peace and justice for the Palestinians can be ushered forth.

Roman Meyerovich, Business  
 Mark Keil, Chemistry

### In defense of rockabilly

I should like to respond belatedly to the Bopcats review in Gateway March 15th, wherein the author bravely re-asserts the tired and worn cliché according to which "there aren't forty good rockabilly songs". As the host of CJSR's rockabilly and old time rock'n roll show *Top of the Bops*, I can assure you that there are a good deal many more outstanding tunes in that genre. I took over the show as host about two years ago and we usually play twenty odd songs. The program airs once a week on Wednesday nights from nine to ten (Gateway layout night I believe) and even if we were not to include repeats or songs which are not strictly in the rockabilly style it amounts to a lot more than forty cuts over the years.

As to the opinion that Jack de Keyser's Fender Stratocaster is ill-suited to the style: this is unadulterated nonsense. Most music aficionados are no doubt aware that Paul Burlison, who cut many rockabilly classics as lead guitarist with the Johnny Burnette Rock'n'Roll Trio, played such an instrument.

Musically Yours, Nicky Nervous  
 Grad Studies of Rock'n'Roll

### Half of total destruction...

Considering the fact that the nuts in Washington (and probably Moscow as well) feel that it is possible to have a 'winner' in a nuclear war, I can't understand the reasoning of disarmament proponents. If it is considered possible to win a nuclear war now, what will happen when there are only half (or one-third) as many missiles? In such a situation, I fear that some of the war-hawks on either side would not think twice about starting a war despite the fact that the final destruction would not be any less awesome.

Remember that although half as many missiles is half as many missiles to a military strategist, the destructive power we are dealing with is so awesome that what we are dealing with is the weird math of infinities where half of infinity is still infinity and the destruction is much the same.

If the superpowers ever get around to using their arsenals then we will be DEAD. No ifs, ands, or buts. The answer is not to cut down on the number of missiles (the numbers make no difference), but