

efforts as the "Front" claims to be. In Vancouver, Front members have actually beaten up people participating in demonstrations against racism.

The Arab and Palestinian communities on campus must continue to demand their rights to distribute literature despite the attempts of Hillel to deny them. They should make every effort to bring sympathetic students into their work. And they should avoid any repeat of the Levy incident, which can only throw up barriers between them and the campus community.

Mike Walker

### Rhetorical retort

Upon reading Mr. Ken Shipka's letter (Gateway, Dec. 8) promoting the cruise missile, I decided that it is about time that someone set the record straight for him.

Firstly, the "so-called 'peace' movements" which Mr. Shipka refers to as being a threat: if they succeed in "disarming" the West, the Soviets could just walk all over us. Of course they could. That is why, I am sure, peace activists would like to see both NATO and Warsaw Pact countries disarm.

Second, some facts about the Cruise missile: built by Boeing, the AGM-86 (AGM for air-to-ground missile) is a sophisticated, subsonic missile with terrain-following radar and its own computer control. This means that it can fly below "enemy" radar, which, in turn, means that until the last few seconds, when it may be visually observed, it is undetectable. This, combined with its small size (about five metres long, half a metre or so in cross section) means that, being virtually undetectable from the air as well as the ground, it is a first-strike weapon. In fact, *Aviation Week and Space Technology* can be quoted as saying that the Cruise flies at below 200 ft. (60m), far too low to be detected. I doubt if Mr. Shipka has researched the background of the cruise as thoroughly.

Instead, he proclaims that the Cruise will ensure "peace and freedom". He doesn't seem to realize that he would be jeopardizing people's basic freedoms of speech and the right to live as we please, not as someone else tells us to; as Mr. Shipka seems to be doing.

As for his "only 60 out of a possible 20,000 students" who "indicated that they opposed the Cruise missile" — I was one of those sixty. I certainly didn't see 20,000 Gateways in the paper's office when I cast my vote, and I'm sure that not too many bothered to vote.

Someone, perhaps Mr. Shipka, though I'm not sure, petitioned our Engineering orientation class for votes for the Cruise. When he mentioned the words "for the Cruise missile," a lot of boos were heard. As well, by the time he got to me, near the rear one-half of the class, I saw about, perhaps 30-40 signatures out of 150-200 or more people before me.

Before Mr. Shipka goes dismissing me as a "communist" or "radical fanatic," I want to make clear the fact that I do realize that the USSR is a threat, in a way, to the "free world." They are numerically superior to the U.S. in nuclear weapons, though not so to NATO, and their military machine is growing at an alarming rate: over 1,000 fighters and bombers, thousands of tanks and countless ships per year. However, his assertion of the old "peace-through-strength" rally cry fails to stir any patriotism in me for the American nuclear war machine.

Canada, in the past, has had a reputation the world over for its role in the UN peace-keeping Force, which we still are active members in. We mustn't destroy that reputation by becoming America's puppy dog, to follow it around no matter what sort of trouble it gets into.

I would also like to make one thing clear to Mr. Shipka, which his eyes, glazed over by Reactionary, Anti-Soviet, pro-American propaganda: strength does not ensure peace (sic). In fact, it could do exactly the opposite.

Perhaps the following analogy will make my point clear.

A man notices that his neighbor has bought a shotgun, which, says his neighbor, is for "keeping away undesirables." Then, the man himself buys a shotgun, to make sure that, if he's one of the "undesirables" spoken of, he is prepared to defend himself. His neighbor notices this, hears rumours, and buys a second, and then a third gun. The man responds in kind. This goes on for weeks, until the man says to his neighbor, "if you point your guns at me, I'll shoot you." Well, thinks the neighbor, this won't do. So he buys more guns, because the more guns he's got, the less likely the other guy is to, maybe like, shoot him, huh?

But wait now! The other man has bought more guns. Hmmm, thinks the neighbor, if this keeps up, I'll be bankrupt. So, in one decisive moment, he shoots a hole in the man's wall with his machine gun. Soon, the neighborhood is in ruins from bullets all over the place, explosive shells, incendiaries, the works. But, the guns keep on firing, long after their owners are dead, for they are controlled automatically, and won't stop till they run dry. Doesn't sound pretty, does it?

It doesn't, and it shouldn't. But that may very well be what happens to this planet if the wrong — or "right" — button is pushed. The Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs ended the Second World War — but they also killed hundreds of thousands of Japanese people. They still die by the tens of thousands each year, those who were affected by the blasts. These were from "small" (less than 20 k tonnes) bombs, fission, no less — and only two of them.

Today, there are over ten thousand fusion and neutron bombs, ranging in power from 1 kilotonne neutron bombs to 30 megatonne fusion bombs. A single H-bomb, strategically placed, could flatten Edmonton from the air. What's more, think what even "only" a "few" thousand exploding over the world's major cities would do. In an all-out nuclear war, whether using 1000 km/h Cruises or 30,000 km/h ICBM's, there is a distinct — and real —

probability (not just a possibility, which is bad enough), that *all life on this planet*, except, perhaps, for deep-sea life, would be exterminated. There is a term for this: genocide. It would be bad enough for the entire (or at the very least greater than 98 percent) of the human race to perish (which, itself, is arguable — that it is tragic, that is, not that over nine-tenths would be killed), but when one thinks that mankind could, in a few days, or even a few minutes, destroy nearly all, or even all, of what has taken four and one-half billion years to get where it is, this cannot be considered as anything other than genocide. If you do not do it for yourself, you owe it not only to this species known as Homo Sapiens — for "man the (theoretically) wise," you owe it to life itself to prevent death. Mr. Shipka, not increase its chances. For, if the only purpose of life is life itself, what is the purpose of death?

Stephen Schaller, Engineering

P.S. I don't, unlike Mr. Shipka, profess to represent the opinion of a "majority." Though I am sure that many will agree with my argument — maybe none will, though — I have written this as my own opinion. I do not demand or declare that everyone agrees with it. I only ask that those who read it consider it.

### Take it back, Orr else!

As members of the British C.N.D. (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) we are incensed by Robert Orr's letter, Gateway 2-12-82. To insinuate that the leadership of the C.N.D. is "top heavy" with members of the British Communist Party, he must know something we do not. The present C.N.D. leadership includes: Chairperson, Joan Ruddock; Vice-Chairperson, Mike Pentz; Hon. Vice-Presidents, Lord Hugh Jenkins and Jo Richardson, M.P.; General Secretary, Mousigneur Bruce Kent; Treasurer, Cathy Ashton; and twenty members of National Council elected at National Conference. We would like Mr. Orr to name the Communist Party members (which, according to him, must be a majority). If he cannot, then an apology and a retraction from him are surely in order.

The C.N.D. is not tied directly to any political party, although affiliations to the C.N.D. have been accepted from groups within all the major political parties. The C.N.D.'s membership is open to the entire population of the U.K.; yet we, along with other peace movements world-wide, are continually labelled as being a Communist front by the pro-nuclear weapons propagandist, without the slightest shred of evidence. People with Mr. Orr's mentality remind us of a statement made by John Foster Dulles, U.S. Secretary of State during the Cold War: "In order to make the country bear the burden (of arms expenditure) we have to create an emotional atmosphere akin to wartime psychology. We must create the idea of a threat from without."

Roddy Campbell, Pauline Schiff, David Schiff, (Visiting Professor, Law Centre)

### Start, freeze, and reduce

Jens Andersen (Gateway, 8th Dec.) can be expected to attack the Canadian peace movement almost by definition. However, this time he used an interesting slight-of-hand by referring to a recent *Scientific American* article which tackles the "tough pragmatic questions" supposedly avoided by the "loonies" on both sides.

In fact, the article, written by defense expert Randall Forsberg, shows clearly that no major power has a first strike capability and argues strongly in favor of a bilateral nuclear freeze. I must point out that every peace group that I know of in North America, including Edmonton's C.N.D., is in favor of a bilateral freeze.

This was also massively supported in a recent U.S. referendum and, in Canada, is the position of the Commons Minority Report on Disarmament committee which included Edmonton South M.P., Doug Roche. Several comprehensive freeze proposals have been made by the Soviet government to the U.S.A. (two to the Carter administration), but have always been rejected without negotiation.

Incidentally, Forsberg's article also clearly shows (p. 53) that every major arms build-up since the war has been initiated by the U.S.A., and, further, that Reagan's START proposals will give the U.S.A. a massive superiority; they are no substitute for a freeze.

People interested in peace are concerned with the thorny issues and view a freeze followed by a balanced reduction as the only sensible solution.

I can do no better than to repeat Jens' last statement: "anyone interested in these (questions) should consult the most recent issue of *Scientific American*."


S.P. Goff, Grad Studies, Geology

#### Acting Managing Editor's Note:

In the future, Manuscripts to the Editor should be a **MINIMUM** of 250 words (that's **ONE** double-spaced typewritten page) long! Triflers need not submit their works.

J.P.R.

All new and old staff should attend the **Staff Meeting** Thursday, 4 p.m., Rm. 282 Students' Union Building



## OPTICAL PRESCRIPTION CO.

8217-112st. 433-1645  
College Plaza

We now carry the 2 year unconditional warranty frame.

## This Month At The peoples pub

Open from 7 p.m. :  
No cover Mon. - Tues. :  
Wed. is Ladies Night :  
& U of A Pub Night :  
(Admission free to U of A :  
students with I.D.)

Jan. 3 - 8: Callboys  
Jan. 10 - 15: Classified

Renford Inn  
on whyte  
433-9411  
10620 - Whyte Ave.

## fitzgerald's

Planning on going  
to the Pub?

Join us for dinner, with a reservation prior to 7 pm., and we'll guarantee a reservation and free admission to the People's Pub.

433-9411




"I have clinched and closed with the naked North. I have learned to defy and defend; Shoulder to shoulder we have fought it out — yet the wild must win in the end."  
— Robert Service

## The black sheep of Canadian liquors.

Soft-spoken and smooth, its northern flavour simmers just below the surface, waiting to be discovered. Straight, on the rocks, or mixed, Yukon Jack is a breed apart; unlike any liqueur you've ever tasted.

# Yukon Jack



Concocted with fine Canadian Whisky.