



## Mugwump Journal

By  
ED  
WERTHMANN

The SRC should really be congratulated for the fine performance they put on this past Monday evening. I believe the meeting is a definite record-breaker for the shortest ever. The total time came to something like a measly one and one-half hours. I personally wasn't there—but I was attending a buzzing hootenanny at 449 Westmorland when all of a sudden, in trips Ursula Wauer. You can imagine my surprise when I noticed it was only 8:30 p.m.

"Aren't you supposed to be at the SRC meeting", I asked. "It's over", said Urs.

I was shocked, to say the least. Have the days of five or six hour meetings passed into oblivion? I hope that isn't too much to ask.

A few hours prior to typing this, I had occasion to talk to our fearless student leader, Jim Smith. He told me that 16 motions were passed that evening. (I don't read the minutes, myself.) He accounts that the reason for that successful and historical night in SUB Room 103 (Council Chambers) was due to the "Information Sessions" that he (Jim) had called with Council members a few days before Council meets. The idea, according to Jim, is to air out any personal conflicts that the reps may have. Well, if that is what it takes to make an efficient SRC—more power to 'em.

In addition to that, Jim filled me on possibilities for the upcoming SRC elections. So far, a good turn-out. Rumour has it that three people plan to run for Internal vice-president and two for External. Not bad. Other openings are twelve representatives, three senators two Board of Governors' representatives and a partridge in a pear tree. There is also a possibility of holding two referendums during the election. (The date being, by the way, October 20.) One will deal with SUB expansion, the other with NUS. (Yeah for both, I say.)

I was informed also that there are two positions available for CSL Board of Directors. These positions are designed specifically for "students"—so if you want more student input in the company, apply in writing to Jim Smith, President of CSL, SRC President, President of the Student Union (or whatever he is).

Jim also gave another tidbit of information. (My, but he do talk, don't he?) It appears that AFS wants to boost their revenues. UNB's fee was \$200.00 per year, which works out to about \$.04 per student. What AFS wants is \$1.00 per student. That brings the total around \$5200.00 per year. That's quite an increase, eh?

That means that between UNB and Dalhousie, about \$12,000.00 will go into the kitty. All the other campuses combined will put in about \$8,000.00—so how do like them apples! It seems, then, that AFS wishes to have a budget of around \$20,000.00 as opposed to last year's total of \$1,500.00 I'm wondering why they (AFS) want so much. Wouldn't you?

+++++

The new shopping mall on the top of Regent has opened its door—and business is booming. I've noticed in my travels between the Bruns office and home (Silverwood) that many people tend to cross the highway from the back of the Fredericton Mall on Prospect Street to get to the Regent Mall or wherever. This could prove to be a very dangerous procedure. And I can, assure you that trying to keep folks from crossing the highway is a lost cause. What I would propose, however, is that the City Council, the Provincial Government or the Federal Government (anybody) provide a pedestrian over-pass or a reasonable facsimile in that area. I wonder if we have to wait for someone to get seriously injured (or killed, for that matter) before someone will even consider such an idea.

As far as any of this is concerned, will we of the Bruns be the only ones to press for a solution? I hope that other media in Fredericton would jump on the band wagon on this issue and get someone to provide some safety for the taxpayer.

+++++

This issue carries Dave Miller's column and this Mr. Miller takes a few pot shots at our editorial policy (I think.) Criticism is welcome and there will be no rebuttle to most of his comments. However, I will say that two weeks ago a student commented that we weren't being critical enough—that a story we carried on SUB expansion didn't question whether all the expense was necessary. That seemed to me to be the valid criticism, that our role should be a more critical one. I would suggest that if Mr. Miller wants chamber of commerce boosterism or rose-tinted public relations, that he buy a subscription to The Daily Wiener.

+++++

Greetings and salutations, Gene, from Sarah, Judy and all the gang at da Bruns.

## Struggle in Zimbabwe

By GERRY LASKEY

Late last Friday when the peace shuttle of Dr. Henry Kissinger seemed to have failed to make any progress towards majority rule in Rhodesia, Ian Smith, the Prime Minister, announced to the country that his government had agreed to majority rule in two years. Smith, who led the British colony's white government into "unilateral independence" in 1965 remarked earlier this year that "not in a thousand years" would there be majority rule in Rhodesia (called Zimbabwe by its black natives).

The plan outlined by Smith called for the formation of a provisional transition government to effect the change to majority rule in Zimbabwe. The government, according to Smith, would consist of a supreme "Council of State" with equal black/white representation and requiring a 2/3 vote for a majority decision. It would be chaired by a white. A lower "Council of Ministers" would be chaired by a black and have a black majority, but final power would rest with the racially balanced Council of State. In addition to the Chair of the Council of State, the ministries of defence and law and order would be white controlled. Smith claimed that Secretary of State Kissinger had guaranteed the lifting of United Nations' economic sanctions on Rhodesia and cessation of the guerrilla war upon formation of this provisional government.

The reason for the turn-around by Smith can be accounted for by the culmination of three major factors.

First, Smith said it had become "clear" that Rhodesia could expect no help from the free world to maintain white government. The key in this was the clarification of U.S. policy on majority rule in Zimbabwe.

Secondly was the escalation of the Guerrilla, war conducted by Zimbabwe nationalists and aided by neighbouring states, especially Mozambique and Tanzania. The war has become intense in the border regions and was starting to rattle the calm of the interior capital, Salisbury.

Perhaps the final blow was the pressure put on Smith by his staunchest ally in the past, Prime Minister John Vorster of South Africa. Vorster threatened a complete breakdown in economic ties - Zimbabwe's most vital ones at present - and had slowed down shipment of gasoline several weeks ago as a sample.

Amazement in the entire Zimbabwe community, and joy in the black segment, was short-lived. Immediately, President Samora Machel of Mozambique rejected the statement calling for nothing short of "complete liberation of Zimbabwe".

Spokesmen for the divided black nationalist "African National Council" were optimistic about the reversal of Smith's principle but

worried about specifics, such as the defence arrangements.

Over the weekend the presidents of the five "Front Line" neighbouring states; Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, Samora Machel of Mozambique, Agostinho Neto of Angola, Sir Seretse Khama of Botswana and Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, met to discuss the Smith statement. Overall, they rejected the plan.

The presidents said only a black majority transitional government could transfer power to the African majority. They pointed out that the two-thirds vote rule on the supreme State Council could give whites a virtual veto power over blacks. They also objected to the chair of this Council being white and the control of defence and internal security being in white hands. They claimed that agreeing to this "would be tantamount to legalizing the colonial structure" of Zimbabwe.

However, they did say that the acceptance of the principle of majority rule was encouraging and that Britain (the original colonial power) should convene a legal constitutional conference outside Zimbabwe to work out details. Until a proper transitional government is in power the guerrilla effort will continue.

The U.S. response to this was that the Front Line statement was "encouraging" and that progress was being made.

The United Kingdom sent its African Affairs Secretary, Ted Rowlands, to Botswana on Monday to begin setting up the constitutional conference.

Ian Smith reacted to the Front Line by saying that the black leaders had agreed to the plan he outlined on Friday. The presidents, in fact, were not involved in the talks. He invited Britain to send Rowlands to Zimbabwe for talks.

Wednesday Julius Nyerere of Tanzania told Smith that he had four to six weeks to establish a provisional black majority government.

In Zimbabwe the two key figures of the African National Council (ANC) are moderate leader Joshua Nkomo, head of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and exiled guerrilla leader, Robert Mugabe of the military wing of ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union), the ZIPA (Zimbabwe People's Army). These two have been recognized by the white government as legitimate negotiators for the African community. Of lesser importance is Bishop Abel Muzorewa and Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole of the external wing of ANC.

Nkomo is hopeful that a just settlement can eventually be reached. Mugabe wants his forces to have military control of Zimbabwe during the transitional government.

The next step in the settlement is whether Britain's Rowlands can get Smith to agree to a constitutional conference that will satisfy the Front Line. Just what Kissinger and Smith agree to is a bit of a mystery. In his announcement last Friday, Smith mentioned "certain details" that could not be disclosed at present.

## Football: an s-m trip?

Dear Editor:

Is football a sado-masochistic fetish on campus?

Two lines of grown-up boys face each other on a large rectangle of grass before a crowd of zealous fans. At the sound of a whistle they charge. There follows a few seconds of frantic confusion during which each player attempts to inflict grievous bodily harm upon the players wearing uniforms of a different color. The fans add insult to injury in a tirade of abuse screamed at the players of both teams.

When all players are rendered immobile the whistle sounds again and the combatants pick themselves out of the tangle of cleats and helmets, ecstatic in the delicious pain of the collision. An especially lucky player may lie in a dazed condition until the anxious trainers rush out and solicitously escort him from the field. His team-mates express their sympathy by giving him a pat on the bum.

The football is an incidental accessory to the game. It is used in the four or five feats of athletic

prowess which occur during a game. A player may actually catch the ball when it is thrown to him, or he may carry the ball with him when he makes a run of not more than one hundred yards.

Football players are easily recognizable on campus. They limp. The bruises and bandages which they wear like badges of honor, however, could be mistaken for injuries which a person has suffered in an accident.

Should the university, which promotes worthier tastes, saner attitudes, more gracious manners, and higher intelligence, lend itself to a game the object of which is to maim or otherwise impair their fellow students?

Yours truly,  
Homer Frank

Leave Sound-off  
articles at  
The Brunswickan  
office or drop in  
the campus mail