

hours; it is not surprising it was lost. He was never promised free space for his ad. He was told his request would be considered by the staff.

Although frequently asked for free ad space, The Gazette must usually turn down such requests due to its financial position, which is tight, to say the least. We wish this was not the case.

The best The Gazette could do under the circumstances, was to make a last-minute change to the Calendar to include an announcement of the party.

Star Wars far from perfect

To the editors,

I hate to be overly "paranoid", but the people who write letters such as "Canada doesn't have the sway" (Oct. 10) and "Disagreement with NORAD editorials" (Oct. 17) worry me more than the governments concerned.

Mr. Larkin, I think you are one of the many North Americans

that feel all too confident about the proposed Star Wars program's effectiveness. A comment such as "if they can develop a space shuttle then they can develop Star Wars" is ignorant.

I am not ready to wait until they get the damn system up there before I see if it works. Not when during every other launch the Space Shuttle kicks off; not when during the early 1960's numerous "pioneer" solutions to space travel—not to mention a few astronauts—went up in smoke; not when it can permit governments to make little mistakes like the Korean Airlines disaster, the Cuban Missile crisis, etc.—only this time bigger. I am not ready to trust the same people who built the shuttle and ended up collecting monkey feces on past mis-

sions. Yes, details, details! They matter when you have thousands of megatons floating around up there.

Finally, in the event of even a limited exchange, you would never make it to Europe. Why? They wouldn't be able to use it for another 20-30,000 years! And I wouldn't be sitting here in Halifax. I would be in Sydney... and Toronto... and Gander... maybe a few pieces in Labrador.

Why do you think you would be in Europe among the explosions? Because you trusted the Paranoid Government Brothers! I do agree we need a solution to the hundreds of violations, the "pokes and prods," and the build-up of arsenals, but we can't fight fire with fire.

Mr. Fevens, according to your

views, you seem ready to wait until 2 billion people are educated on the issues and a "grass-roots change" takes place after 210 years (and 20 centuries in Russia) of political evolution. I agree public awareness is high enough already but public reaction is far from it. If the number of people who really cared at all were to speak up, the government would have to sway to popular opinion or they'd be packing up in four years.

Finally, because there are no real treaties, no one knows how much the other guy is packing so they build up "... and it starts all over again." It's a vicious circle. What's a human to do?

Laurie Kinsman
1st year Engineering

SNOW patrol

THE MEN OF THE SNOW PATROL BRAVE THE ARCTIC ELEMENTS TO EXTEND OUR NATION'S SOVEREIGNTY TO THE TOP OF THE WORLD. WE JOIN JAKE AND SCOTT ON DUTY ON THE BARREN TUNDRA...

WHAT A BLIZZARD!
I CAN'T SEE MY
HAND IN FRONT
OF MY FACE!

WE'VE ONLY
GOT 500
MORE FLAGS
TO PLACE
BEFORE
WE GO
BACK TO
BASE CAMP.

THERE'S NOT GOING
TO BE ANY DOUBT
ABOUT WHO'S TURF
THIS IS NOW.
STICK ONE OVER
THERE SCOTT.

OVER HERE?

NO. NO.
OVER THAT
WAY.

ARE YOU IN FRONT
OF ME OR BEHIND
ME?

Joel

Glazov responds to critics

By JAMIE GLAZOV

IT IS WITH SOME DISMAY, if not amusement, that I read the recent article "The True Record" (the Gazette, Oct. 10), which was a criticism of my article "A View of Africa" (the Gazette, Oct. 3). My critic's article, with all due respect, has left me in a state of mindboggling confusion, as I could not, and still cannot, connect any of his points or ideas that are supposed to prove my arguments incorrect.

The writer begins by refuting my statement that "there are many other countries in Africa where human rights abuses are far worse and more numerous than in South Africa." Not only failing to provide evidence to the contrary, the writer does not even touch on the subject. For him, this argument is simply not true. Why? He does not say. He only states that such a statement "must be substantiated." Frankly, that is what the whole article in question was about. If he has mixed up the article with another, then that is fine. If he did not, then he would have seen the many facts I provided showing the horrifying occurrences in many other African countries substantiating the point that, indeed, there are many other countries in Africa where things are far worse than in South Africa.

All of this is really beside the point. Instead of countering these

facts, let alone mentioning them, the writer tries to make his point by enlightening me on some of the injustices in South Africa. I am grateful to him. Even though I was already aware of them, I believe they are worth being mentioned. I am opposed to the many unjust and inhuman conditions in South Africa and made that clear in the article. There is nothing I hope to see more than the annihilation of apartheid. I still do not understand, however, what this has to do with the fact that things are far worse in other countries on the continent.

The writer picks out my points that "Black African dictators such as Idi Amin of Uganda have slaughtered millions of black citizens. After conceding that I might be "quite right" about Amin's record, he states that I must be unaware that Amin has long ago been ousted from power and is now in Saudi Arabia. Actually I am quite aware, and am still trying to figure out what difference it makes if I am aware or not, since the fact that di Amin slaughtered hundreds of thousands of other blacks will not be affected with my "awareness". The writer has "no idea why Amin was cited as an example of dictatorship in Africa," adding that "we are not interested in reviewing the happenings of the past..." First of all, I do not know whom he means by "we". If he is speaking on behalf of everyone but myself on this issue, fine. But

I wish not for him to speak on my behalf. I am certainly very interested in reviewing historical occurrences. History has shown us that the forces of "black liberation" have caused the deaths of millions of other blacks on the African continent. Yes, Amin is an example, and so is Mugabe, whom I wrote about in the article. The writer didn't even mention him. It is by learning from history that we might prevent dictators such as these from coming into power in Africa. But the writer does not touch on any of this to prove anything said wrong. To make his point, he begins speaking about Napoleon, Adolph Hitler, Mussolini and the American War of Independence against Britain. How this relates to the plain point that Black dictators have killed millions of other blacks in Africa I will leave to the readers' imagination, since it is still unclear to myself.

The writer goes on to "correct" my statements on Tanzania. He picks out my line which says "Tanzania... under the socialist leadership of Nyerere... has undergone economic and political disaster." He adds that this is an "exaggeration of the realities of the matter." Where this exaggeration lies he does not say. Moreover, he concedes that Tanzania is undergoing an economic disaster. His argument? Not to be found. He merely says the mere fact that Nyerere is a socialist does not make Tanzania a political and economic disaster. Fine, whether Nyerere is a socialist or not, in this case, is beside the point. I never said the latter. I simply substantiated the fact that Tanzania under Nyerere has undergone a political and economic disaster. Moreover, my critic does not even mention the

15 million peasants which have been forcibly relocated in that country and the hundreds of executions and jailings of untried black civilians, which were mentioned in the previous article.

I am then attacked for writing that "Unlike many other regimes in Africa, however, black citizens are allowed to leave the country if they so desire." The writer does not say the statement is not true, just unfortunate. Unfortunate for whom? Maybe it is unfortunate for him since it weakens his argument that the regime in South Africa is an "extreme case of fascism." Anyway, not even trying to show what is false about this statement, he begins speaking about the citizenship problem in South Africa, generously informing me that a black person in South Africa cannot have a passport. I am well aware of this injustice. Those monitoring the occurrences in South Africa know that this law is soon to be done away with. But once again, this all has little relation to contradicting the fact that blacks can leave South Africa if they wish. The writer finished "correcting" this flaw of mine by ending with the note "I have yet to see a human being who cherishes the idea of belonging to no country." I have yet to see one too. I have yet to see many things. The connection between this and the fact that blacks can freely leave South Africa, I will also leave to the readers' imagination.

The final point the writer "analyzes" is my statement concerning South Africa providing its black citizens the highest standard of living in Africa. He does not bring up one argument saying anything to the contrary. He does not even touch the issue.

He simply says that this point is a contradiction to my previous point that South Africans can freely leave their country. What is the contradiction? He does not say. Instead, a new topic is raised. Out of the blue, he asks why South Africans prefer leaving South Africa to live in neighbouring countries like Mozambique and Angola. Here the writer has said something drastically false and contrary to all proven and substantiated evidences to the contrary. Any authority on Africa will tell my critic that, on the average, approximately 500,000 blacks flock to live in South Africa each year. In addition, the writer should remember that the security fences South Africa is now rather anxiously erecting are designed to keep the hundreds of thousands of intended immigrants out, not like in Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique and other countries to the north, to keep people in.

The writer concludes that in the end, "the black people, the white people, and the brown people of Azania (South Africa) will in future breathe a fresh and sweet air of freedom and dignity." I hope that he is right, because I share his conviction. Apartheid is, in its very essence, evil and inhuman, and must be eradicated. I still fail to understand, however, what all of this has to do with contradicting anything I said. The basis of my article simply stated that there are many uglier features in other regimes on the African continent than in South Africa. All these arguments and facts still remain because the writer's "corrections" seemed to have nothing to do with the subjects in focus and had little connection with the topics raised in "A View of Africa".