



mugwump journal

By Kathryn Wakeling

This weeks letter from the irate proctor of Neville House was quite amusing....it was also infuriating.

I'm always amazed with the statements from the chosen few on this campus who have been spiritually guided in determining what the students of UNB want to read in the Brunswickan. 'Mr Neville' house seems to have been blessed with this honor.

The note at the bottom of the letter dear sir, is not to be taken lightly - far from it. By carefully noting the reaction of students to the various Viewpoint questions (and there have been serious questions as well) Bruns staffers have reached the conclusion that the majority of students would rather have amusing questions. Ruins your theory doesn't it?

I apologize if I am being a little rough on you fella, but it really gets to be irritating when JOe Blow spouts off about something like that and yet....where are you? Reading the paper and complaining about everything except that the lack of staff....

777777

Congratulations Winter Carnival Committe and students...the fluffy stuff has arrived! Lets hope that it doesn't rain or freeze until the end of February.

777777

There are some disturbing proposals before the Academic Policy Committee that are worth noting. One of the options suggested is worked out on the basis of 65 teaching days with final exams ending on April 30th. Mid term break would be reduced to two days plus the weekend and classes would be held on November 11. The reading term would be reduced by one day.

The second option doesn't look any better. It is also based on a 65 day teaching year, but keeps March Break at a full week. However it suggests eliminating the reading period if there is a weekend between the last day of classes and the first day of exams. These options are disturbing, particularly the first proposal, when the consequences for the students are closely looked at.

Apparently there are two students on this committee....if so where are they? Hopefully they will be speaking up on behalf of the campus - March Break is the only space available for catching up on essays or taking a holiday or dare we mention finding summer jobs.

####

SRC elections are in the offing once again. The positions open are, Business, Science, Computer Science, two Engineering, two Education, and two Representatives-at-Large. There are three Undergraduate seats on Senate and positions on the Graduating class Executive are also available. The elections are to be held on February 20th. Interested students should contact the SRC office in the second floor office wing of the SUB.

Tugwell speaks on the Soviet presence in Afghanistan

THE SOVIET PRESENCE IN AFGHANISTAN

A WORKING PAPER PRESENTED BY DR. MAURICE TUGWELL, DIRECTOR CENTRE FOR CONFLICT STUDIES* UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK* AT A PUBLIC PANEL DISCUSSION AT UNB ON JANUARY 9

THE CENTRE FOR CONFLICT STUDIES at the University of New Brunswick came into existence Jan. 8. The Centre studies terrorism, propaganda and subversion, theory and practice of ideological conflict and the media's interpretation of these subjects - with particular reference to conflicts directly or indirectly influencing Canada. Research is objective and free of government influence and political bias.

MAURICE TUGWELL studied insurgency throughout his military career, which took him from Palestine to Malaysia and from Iran to Northern Ireland. Impressed by the central role of public opinion as a factor in internal warfare, he researched this subject at King's College University of London receiving a Ph.D in War Studies in July 1979. He has written a number of books and articles on conflict subjects, and is currently revising his thesis for publication.

The recent Soviet military action in Afghanistan marked the first occasion since 1948 that Russian troops have overrun a state beyond the de facto borders of the Soviet bloc. Afghanistan is the first new jewel in Russian imperial crown since Czechoslovakia was taken 32 years ago. Russian military power has certainly been used in the intervening period to assist overseas "wars of liberation," but always by indirect and limited means. Only within the

bloc itself have Soviet forces operated at full strength during these 32 years, and the occasions that spring to mind are Hungary in 1956 and the second invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. I think it is significant that the restraint which has governed the use of the Red Army since Joseph Stalin's day has been set aside. It may be important for Yugoslavia, Turkey, Pakistan, Iran and Western Europe that the adventure should not succeed so well that those in the Kremlin who favour the reimposition of restraint go unheeded.

The invasion demonstrates that, in spite of fashionable views in the West about the limits of military strength, for those with a strong trigger finger, power still grows out of the barrel of a gun. It also provides us with a classic example of the Kremlin's way of war, which employs violence only when circumstances, whether contrived or chance, reduce the risks to an acceptable level. The combination of diplomacy, propaganda, diversionary operations and full-scale warfare that has characterised recent events in the Middle East is typical of ideology that regards all these activities as weapons to be used in the on-going struggle against the non-communist world.

In Iran the hostage situation seems no longer to be under the control of the Ayatollah or his so-called government. The probability is that the Soviets simply took advantage of a situation that could be counted upon to paralyse American reaction to their Afghan invasion. Nevertheless, the possibility of their being indirectly in control of the Tehran militants cannot be excluded. Either way, the Soviet ability to mount a major military operation quickly and efficiently under the cover provided by the Iranian crisis speaks wonders for their contingency planning and risk assessment, and

for the operational readiness of their armed forces.

The rough edges of the Kabul coup suggest that speed was considered more important than diplomatic polish, but here too operational standards were high. We have seen ample evidence in recent years of Soviet strategic air mobility, and again in Afghanistan this has enabled the armed forces to deploy quickly over long distances. As in Prague in 1968, the procedure was first to secure the airport by airborne landings, then to occupy key buildings in the capital, neutralize the government and if possible countermand any opposition to the subsequent land frontier crossings by the motor rifle divisions. In all these actions the KGB undoubtedly played key roles, as they have been active in Kabul for many months. The very close operational links between the KGB and the elite Soviet airborne divisions provides these plitically reliable and superbly trained troops with remarkable power to seize the initiative in those fleeting, twilight minutes that separate a state of peace from a state of war. By reducing opposition to a minimum and completing the initial military operation in a matter of days, the Soviets have presented the world with a *fait accompli*. Aggression that is, so to speak, over and done with, arouses short-lived world indignation, whereas a long drawn out campaign such as Vietnam and Northern Ireland is a constant embarrassment to its sponsor.

In the campaign so far, helicopter gunships and napalm-armed attack aircraft have reportedly been used to good effect against rebel positions, suggesting that the Russian officer corps have not been slow to learn from US experience in Vietnam, or from its own in the Sinai, Golan Heights, Somalia and Ethiopia. We are told that officers with recent combat experience are rising rapidly through the ranks and one is left to ponder what effect these aggressive, confident young leaders may have on Soviet policy, if cautious voices are silenced by repeated military success, as happened in Germany between 1936 and 1940.

While there can be no questioning the Soviet ability to secure all major centres, or their expertise in deterring subversive though and actions by systematic terror, the capacity of the Afghan partisans to continue and intensify the struggle is yet to be tested. This will depend upon the strength of their leadership, the attitude of Iran and Pakistan and the will and ability of major powers to provide support. An answer to that question lies in the future; what needs our immediate attention is Western reaction to the Soviet action.

The first thing to be decided is the aim. In earlier remarks I have indicated why I think it is important that the hawks in the Soviet Union should be discredited. Therefore by one means or another, the invasion of Afghanistan must be made unpopular in the Politburo.

Cont. on pg. 17

YE OLDE CHESTNUT INN

Tonight & Sat
& Sat Matinee
3-5 pm

Ladies Choice
Bluegrass Band

NEXT WEEK

Miller's Jug

Monday is Happy Day

11:30 am-1:00 pm

Happy Hour

Campus Ministry

M.L. McGibbon 454-7992

Many people often find that they do not have the power, joy or faith that they know should be available to Christians. Their attempts to better themselves end in failure. Disappointed and guilt ridden they may try to stifle those urges to do better, or they may continue themselves toward the unlikely self improvement.

Christianity however is much more than a list of do's and don'ts. A Christian is not just a person who tries to live like Christ; a Christian is someone who has the Holy Spirit literally living within him. (I will put my Spirit in you and move you to follow my decrees and be careful to keep my laws." Ezekiel 36:27.) Paul tells us that Christ paid our debts "so that by faith we might receive the promise of the Spirit." (Galatians 3:14.) There is all the difference in the world between going to God for comfort, advice, etc. and asking Him to take over our lives. It is the difference between knowing "about" God and knowing Him personally. Unless we ask Him to run our lives we don't really want Him. We might want an occasional spiritual high, or some comforting, but we don't want anyone who is going to change us. And Christianity involves the recognition that we need to be changed. "There is no one righteous, not even one; there is no one who understands, no one who seeks God." (Romans 3:11) But that's okay. All we have to be is willing to let Him change us. When He does change us, He gets the credit, we don't. That is why self-righteousness has absolutely no place in Christianity. Don't expect a great miraculous change overnight; don't expect great emotional highs; don't worry about God forcing you to do things against your will. ("I am the vine; you are the branches. If a man remains in me and I in him he will bear much fruit; apart from me you can do nothing." (John 15:5)