En Garde!

by John Roggeveen

After almost two weeks of largely redundant Roggeveen-baiting and Roggeveen-bashing from within and without the *Gateway* office, here is my reply to the critics. After this I will abandon the issue, so any remaining critics can get the last word, which I am sure they ardently desire.

I have had a tremendous amount of well-intentioned advice about what to do about the Rauca column. Some have said to avoid the issue by ignoring it. Others have advised a hasty retreat. Still others, maybe most, will accept nothing less than unconditional surrender and full repentance for the "evil deed" done by writing the column. They have stopped short of demanding my head so far, grace a dien. But, I shall continue to party and thrust.

First, I must apologize for my lack of precision in laying out my argument. The argument I made was (and still is) based on three facts. The facts, as I see them, are: (1) Rauca committed the crimes a long time ago if he committed them at all (he hasn't been convicted yet); (2) Rauca was a pawn (if you are important enough to make the decisions, you are important enough to make hands dirty carrying them out); (3) Surviving high-level Nazis were punished for the crimes (unless they committed suicide first, or went into hiding, that is). To these I could add a fourth: the hypocrisy of convicting only Axis war criminals.

Now for my critics. I find the most reverend David Gort's criticism of my column as "dangerous ravings" to be hilarious. Healthy discussion and examination of

Arts students concerned

To: James Walsh, "Engineers, scientists best" (Nov. 23, Gateway)

What a debt society owes the scientists and engineers! My "aching socialist feet" need never ache again; and it's indeed a comfort, not having to live in ye olde log cabin.

olde log cabin. For some reason, however, I can't completely enjoy this high standard of living. Could it be that I have a high *fear* of living? Yes, from the creators of the electric toothbrush and portable stereos come the neutron bomb, nerve gas, and other such delights. But of course, say the scientists, we only *make* them... I'm glad, Mr. Walsh, that you concede you toleration of "the principal of a faculty of Arts." But more than learning for learning's sake goes on there: we as Arts students are concerned with social progress, as much as you are for technological progress. Poets and playwrights are needed as much as programmers and physicists. Do not bemoan the eventual loss of your tax dollars on subsidization of the Arts and its students, Mr. Walsh.

on subsidization of the Arts and its students, Mr. Walsh. Worry, rather, about whether or not you'll have an income to support *yourself*. I suspect it will be much easier to replace scientists and engineers with computers, than it will artists and philosophers.

Colin Ellis Arts II

Support and money wanted

Concerning your Managing Editor's note to the letter of Ms. B. McKinley published in the November 18, 1982 edition of the Gateway, your presumption concerning the motion presented at our General Meeting was incorrect. The motion, first put at the General Meeting of October 20, 1982, read as follows:

Moved that NASA donate \$100 towards the Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and support their

Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and support their march on October 30, for peace. Because of a lack of quorum, the motion was not voted on on October 20th, and the meeting was adjourned to November 10th, as required under our By-Laws. At the meeting of November 10th, an amendment was presented as follows:

Moved that the original motion be amended to provide that NASA donate \$200 to the Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and the University of Alberta Group for Nuclear Disarmament and that the money be shared

Both the proposed amendment and the original

important issues never hurt anyone (physically, at least),

Also, I am not advocating the release of Clifford Olson and Son of Sam, Mr. Gort. I am arguing a special case for Rauca and people like him. This does not include high-level Nazis, like Martin Bormann, who may still be in biding asymptotic in South America in hiding somewhere in South America.

Finally for you, Mr. Gort, I did not say that Rauca is a nice man. I reported the evidence I had at hand. You, on the other hand, Mr. Gort, appear to have convicted Rauca before he has gone to trial since you assert that "No, John Roggeveen, Albert Rauca is not a nice man." These are dangerous ravings, Mr. Gort. The kind befitting members of a lynch mob.

As for you, Mr. P.F. Thompson, I do not think "that the passage of time has absolved Rauca of his crimes against humanity." Nor has he been "declared innocent" by me. There are, as I have shown, other reasons for not incarcerating Rauca. In addition, someone in Law, like yourself, should realize there are many sound, pragmatic reasons for having a statute of limitations, even for murder. For instance, people's memories fade and distort with time, so one cannot be certain of the evidence presented.

Finally, Mr. M.P. Wagner, if you are serious about impressing upon other war criminals that Canada is finally treating seriously the killing of civilians during war, you should be calling for trials for the planners of the Dresden raid, the Nagasaki A-bombing, and other Allied crimes. As Lenny Bruce said, we aren't morally better just because we kill our "enemies" from a distance.

Suicide news is upsetting

Upon picking up the Thursday, November 18 issue of the *Gateway*, I was shocked to see your front page article about Tuesday's suicide at the Lister Residence. I do not believe that an incident of this nature should

be made front-page news by your paper or any other. Suicide is a very disturbing matter and has enough upsetting effects without becoming front-page news. This is especially true in a residence such as ours, which has nearly 1300 people living in a close, almost family-like atmosphere. Tuesday was a strenuous enough day, without having to read about it again on Thursday in your paper

Much of the information you printed in the article had not been made public for a number of reasons. It was through the actions of your reporters in talking to fellow residents that the information was gathered. These actions can only serve to further agitate the people involved.

An article such as this can only serve to further upset, not only friends and acquaintances of the victim, but the public in general. I believe that the editorial staff at the Gateway should re-examine its priorities and determine exactly what stories are of the most benefit to the students at this University.

> Mel Wirth, President Lister Hall Students Association

Nuke the war criminals!

Re: David Marples' Nov. 23 letter, "Nazism is dead, but evil remains."

"The true criminal's life sentence is his conscience." People commit crimes, from the humblest bank heist on up, because they don't really care about the consequences of their actions on other people. If we could depend upon the consciences of criminals, there wouldn't be any crime. I agree with part of what Mr. Marples says—that

Nazism is dead, and we must primarily devote our time to dealing with the evil forces of the present day. Our courts, however, are not clogged with Stalinist, present-day Soviet, or Third World (right and left) criminals due to a number of causes, among them the absence of a U.S. first-strike capability vis-a-vis the Soviets; this even has to do with South Africa, despite Soviet antagonism towards it, because of the U.N. charter and the lip service which we have to pay towards "national sovereignity".

David Marples also wrote that demanding the death serves only to satisfy a blood lust on the part of the hunter". I disagree. For one thing, the death of her rapist does provide some satisfaction for the victim. For another, it absolutely precludes the possibility of any future victims of this one man who has proved that, unlike normal people such as you or I, he is capable of this horrible act.



motion were voted on and defeated.

George Walker Manager

Fee indexing is done, the issue is allocation

I am writing in response to your article appearing in the Nov. 23 issue titled "Something rotten in Athletic Services?

I think the point has to be made that, yes, last year there was a great deal of debate concerning whether or not UAB fees should be raised, and, if so, by how much and under what conditions. But in May of this year the decision was made by the B of G and the solution was endorsed by the Students' Union. Increases in Athletic fees are now linked to increases in our tuition fees.

Any further discussion must focus on how the fee revenue is distributed among the many competing programs and services. I would encourage any students interested in the athletic program to become involved and continue the healthy debate regarding what we as students receive for our money. I would also like to stress that this can and should be a positive process.

> Elizabeth Lunney Commerce IV

John Savard

If this topic was merely tossed into the garbage then we will forget, and our children will never even know.

> Michael Nochomovitz Arts I

That mad, raving, dangerous John Roggeveen is still wrong

a concerned friend. Wesley R. P. Oginski, Science III (who wishes to remain anonymous)

All parasites on this bus

In his letter of November 23 Mr. Walsh makes a statement which is absolutely incomprehensible (except perhaps to cretins) to the effect that he is against the education of Arts students being "....subsidized by MY tax money,...." I wonder how he feels about having *his* education being subsidized by the taxes of, say, teachers, journalists and symphony musicians.

> Bruce Pollock Arts II