

continued from page 4

which have had very important political implications. It should be noted, that these slayings of Palestinians have not persisted in the Western memory in the way the violence committed by Palestinians, many years later, has.

The first of these massacres took place on April 9, 1948, against the inhabitants of Deir Yassin. Executed by the Irgun Zvai Leumi, led by Menachem Begin, the massacre was described in the following way by Jacques de Reynier (Chief Delegate of the International Red Cross, on the scene):

Three hundred persons were massacred...without any military reason nor provocation of any kind, old men, women, children, newly born were savagely murdered with

grenades and knives by Jewish troops of the Irgun, entirely under the control and direction of their chiefs.

British historian Arnold Toynbee said the massacre was "comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis".

As you can imagine, memories of Deir Yassin flashed through the minds of many Palestinian refugees after the Sabra and Shatilla massacres. In fact many of these refugees fled their homes in Palestine because of *explicit* threats that they would meet the same fate as the residents of Deir Yassin if they did not flee. If any one doubts that this was the purpose of the Deir Yassin massacre, the words of Menachem Begin will serve to clarify it: "The massacre was not only justified, but there would not have been a state of Israel without the *victory* at Deir Yassin." Similarly, the fate of Sabra and Shatilla will probably serve to

"encourage" Palestinians to flee Lebanon too, which is after all Israel's desire.

Again, on October 29, 1956, the Israeli Frontier Force entered the village of Kafr Qassem. The Force declared a curfew while many villagers were still at work, outside the village. They were never notified that the curfew was in place and that they were therefore prohibited from being out of their homes in the village. So, as they returned, unsuspecting from the fields, 51 were murdered and 13 others were wounded. Among the dead were 12 women and girls and 17 children between the ages of 8 and 17. At that time, as in 1982, after attempts to hush up the massacre, public pressure eventually forced the soldiers involved to be tried. The results were unbelievable, and in February 1959, the Commander who gave the orders to "shoot to kill" was convicted of "exceeding his author-

ity" and fined *two cents*.

There is no doubt that a review of these sorts of atrocities is a somewhat negative approach to the current situation. Nevertheless, it is imperative that the latest massacres be seen in the correct context - as the most recent installment in a series of political statements that Israel, and in particular the present leadership, has no intention of accommodating the Palestinians as individuals or as a people, in any way whatsoever.

It is this position which must be changed if any peace is ever to be achieved in the Middle East. It is the view, that the Palestinians, who have been dispossessed of their homeland, should somehow be "cleaned" out of Israel's envoir, that will make it impossible for the Arabs to accept Israel.

The Palestinians must be allowed to return to their homeland and exercise the right to self-

determination. Despite the bitterness and despair that now fills Palestinian hearts, I have no doubt that once Israelis, and Jews elsewhere in the world, are prepared to accept the Palestinian people as equals, every Palestinian will willingly and eagerly accept to live with them in Palestine in peace.

The Gazette accepts any and all Commentaries from the Dalhousie Community, but a few ground rules apply. All commentaries must be received in the Gazette office by Monday at noon in order to be published that week, and must be double-spaced typewritten of a length no more than 750 words. All submissions must be signed (although anonymity may be granted). Commentaries may be subject to editing on the grounds of racism, sexism, libel, or length.

Letters

A SUB Hallowe'en

To the Editor:

Unfortunately something has gone astray with the tradition of Hallowe'en this year. On accompanying a young brother of my friend I noticed two distinct features this year. 1) Kids: There was only a token force of them as compared to previous years. 2) About 1 in 4 houses didn't participate in Hallowe'en in any form (treats, jack-o-lanterns). Why?

Obviously the recent scares of tampered products and candies have many parents scared as hell for the safety of their children. Halifax is not exempt; reports of 3 cases of tampered candy have surfaced. What can the Dal community do to help remedy the situation?

One answer can be to use portions of the SUB building to hold a supervised party for the kids. A single fee could be charged, if any at all, for costs. Various student organizations could get together and plan such an event, but why bother?

Basically, to put the fun back into Hallowe'en for the kids but also to give the Student Organizations of this city a chance to show they care and want to help and gain some badly needed recognition and respect from the community. Also the personal satisfaction that one feels when they stop to help a child.

I wouldn't be writing this letter if a certain incident that I witnessed on a street corner Monday didn't happen. A little girl tearfully explained to her friends why her parents wouldn't let her go trick or treating. It makes me wonder how many more little girls are around this city in the same situation. I think maybe the Dal community should consider helping some of those unhappy children next year and give them a place to have fun with their friends in safety and protection!

Someone who cares
Robert Lavoie

Place men in homes?

To the Editor:

I found your article(s) on women's issues particularly interesting in your last 2 issues. What bothers me is not the way the problem(s) of wife 'assault and battery' and pornography are defined but the way the solutions are.

In the former instance, why are homes for battered women founded, and not remedial homes for men, who batter? If we value the nuclear family, it is they who are disruptive. Why can't a woman phone such a home if she is being battered and the law force the man to leave the premises and relocate himself either in the home, for help, or somewhere else? Why is it always the woman who must suffer the humiliation of being a battered wife, and identify with the same, and not him being exposed to society as a batterer?

A batterer is an addict of sorts, like an alcoholic, and we should have institutions like AA to deal with them. His first wife may leave him, but another will come along, and the problem is no nearer to being solved. Meanwhile the taxpayer must support 'all' his victims.

As for pornography - how have we approached any solution to its existence? The only approach is controversy. If a boy witnesses battery over a prolonged period of time his 'reality' is shaped by that. Our 'realities' are all shaped by

prolonged exposure to one thing - it's why North America is a country of Christians and not Moslems. That same boy will have that same 'treatment of women' attitude reinforced, if he starts consuming pornography which has sado masochistic or degrading content, and it reinforces his 'reality' of what is acceptable. It's like saying battery is a good thing, which countries in Asia profess to, because it keeps the women in line. I guess our society still approves of pornography because we have not evolved to a stage yet where we don't accept it as women's place, which is very submissive. The women portrayed are certainly submitting to the 'sexual wants and tastes' - but not needs - of men. If men need this kind of sex then women are fools for having sex with them. Historically women have been, so they have a pre-conditioned attitude to what is their place.

I also see pornography as a kind of addiction. Why, when you have a magazine of the most explicit material, do you need to continually spend the 7 or 8 dollars for more of the same? I have heard of men who literally collect boxes of the stuff.

- Name withheld by request

Truth and Tories

To the Editor:

The article and letter (October 28 and October 21 issues) concerning Heather Roseveare's involvement in the unsuccessful student demonstration have caused me some concern. I would like to clarify a few points.

Firstly, Mr. Allen makes mention of Miss Roseveare's presidency of the Nova Scotia Progressive Conservative Association. There is no such position or organization within the framework of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Secondly, while I can certainly not condone Miss Roseveare's actions, as a loyal Conservative it would seem to me that if she felt it necessary to participate in this demonstration, she has every right to do so. As a conservative she certainly has the right, and I hope that her fellow Dal students would also afford her this right, regardless of her politics.

Sincerely,
Brian MacLeod

President, N.S. Progressive Conservative Youth Federation

No argument here

To the Editor:

Unfortunately, it would seem that the Gazette has not done its homework. Britt Dysart, the Men's Residence Rep, an Arts student, has not exchanged positions with either Heather Roseveare or Phil Dunn, but rather maintains his own position on council.

The Gazette has misinterpreted the views of the Men's residence rep. In no way did Mr. Dysart differ with Atul Sharma on the issue of student protest. His point was that many students expressed to him a feeling that this type of protest was both inadequate and ineffective. Seemingly, if an attitude of this nature exists in certain factions of the student body perhaps there is a problem in demonstrating to the students the initial purpose of the march.

Mr. Dysart does not disagree with Mr. Sharma on the necessity of making Student Union views known to the

Government but rather communication of the purpose of demonstrating is not always clearly understood by the student body as a whole. Once this is achieved the validity of the student voice will not be able to be disregarded.

Leone Steele
Chairman of the Grants Committee

Not me, him

To the Editor:

May I suggest that people who wish to address me identify their true selves. If the Dal Student Directory 82-83 and the Oct. 30 executive meeting of the Nova Scotia Progressive Conservative Youth (NSPCY) are valid indications, Anthony Allen does not exist, but, rather, Andrew Demond does.

Mr. Demond, as vice-president of the NSPCY, questions my participation in the march as related to my duties as chairperson of the Communications Committee of the Dalhousie Student Union, and my position as president of the Nova Scotia Progressive Conservative Campus Federation (NSPCCF). Perhaps he is only trying to deflect attention away from the fact that he and other young Tories also participated in the march, equipped with a giant banner reading "Trudeau says fuddle duddle to students". The Dal. Gazette (Oct. 21) reports that their behaviour "managed to screw up the intent of the march" and "only served to negate any impact the march had".

Furthermore, if Mr. Demond fervently believes in a separation of one's duties, he should have frowned upon his colleague, Jim MacDougall, policy director of the NSPCY, when he ran for Chairman of the Dal Student Council earlier this year.

Having won the presidency of the NSPCCF and the chair of the Communications Committee unanimously, compared to Mr. MacDougall's record of running for president of the Dal PCY (and losing) and running for chairman of the Student Council (and getting one vote), Mr. Demond fails to recognize the faith of the electorate in my ability to carry out a diversity of activities, something Mr. MacDougall clearly does not have.

As a reporter this past summer, I often wrote articles concerning provincial government activities. If Mr. Demond was truly concerned over my overlapping of functions, he should have addressed me months ago.

Lastly, it is paradoxical that Mr. Demond writes a letter about the NSPCCF as the NSPCY has publicly stated they do not recognize the existence of the organization.

Sincerely,
Heather Roseveare
chairperson, Communications Committee
president, Nova Scotia Progressive Conservative
Campus Federation

It's all in a name

To the Editor:

The Dalhousie Student Movement (DSM) commentary is full of distortions. The Dalhousie Student Council (DSC)