

BLOOD AND THUNDER

Letters to the Editor reflect the views of our readers and not necessarily those of The Brunswickan. Letters to the Editor may be sent to Rm. 35, Student Union Building. Deadline: 5p.m. Tuesdays. Maximum length: 300 words

Apology in order

My apologies to David Charters for the unintended misrepresentation of his views expressed in the opinions column of November 30th.

PJ Waddell

Buthelezi

Dear Editor:

In Gary Craig's letter of unquestioning praise for Mongosuthu Buthelezi, the Zulu Chief and leader of Inkatha Freedom Party, he accuses journalists of biased reporting and the withholding of facts. Regarding Mr. Buthelezi, I'm not exactly sure what "advocacy journalists" Mr. Craig speaks of, however it is very clear that Mr. Craig himself is unclear as to facts and history of Buthelezi and the Inkatha Party, and so far the benefit of Mr. Craig allow me to debunk some of the myths he and others seem so intent upon presenting as facts.

Myth: Chief Buthelezi is a moderate man of peace.

For many years the South African government as well as Buthelezi himself have portrayed the Zulu leader as a moderate man of peace. But according to South African journalist Phillip Van Niekerk (Globe and Mail, August, 1990) "Now [Buthelezi] is increasingly being seen as a warmonger at the head of a bloodthirsty warrior army". Last March 23, only weeks after Nelson Mandela's release, Buthelezi told his Zulu Chiefs: "We should place ourselves on war footing. Going to war is something which we Zulu leaders understand, and it is something which brings out the best in us".

The words of a "moderate man of peace"?

We know that his tactics have been violent ones. Since 22 July, 1990, card carrying members of Inkatha, wearing red headbands and using a vast array of crude and modern weapons have run amok in several black townships.

Myth: Chief Buthelezi is committed to non-racialism in a United South Africa

The ANC envisions a new constitution which would make special provision for language, cultural, and religious rights, but on an individual basis. It rejects ethnicity as a central organizing principle of political organization, maintaining that it could be manipulated as a way of retaining white privilege.

"Buthelezi has long claimed to be non-racial" says historian Shula Marks of London University "but

the reality is very different. You're not welcome in Inkatha if you are not a Zulu nationalist".

Even South African conservatives acknowledge that the ANC's goal of a unitary non-racial state has always rankled Buthelezi. "a unitary State has always been a problem for Buthelezi" says Conservative Party spokesperson Fanie Jacobs "On the one hand he wants control in the whole country, but his power base is ethnic nationalist. It's difficult for him to escape this reality, because without it, he is nothing." Buthelezi's objective appears to be to use violence to force a meeting with Nelson Mandela which would elevate his personal stature and that of Inkatha as a political movement.

Myth: Chief Buthelezi is truly committed to ending apartheid

Buthelezi's apparent willingness to form seemingly unlikely political alliances casts doubt on his desire to see an end to apartheid, insofar as apartheid means a society ordered along racial or ethnic lines. Earlier this year, alarmed at the prospect of being excluded from the political process, Buthelezi met with the head of South Africa's Conservative the invitation had he not thought it would advance his own political interest.

Steven Friedman, Chief of Research for the South African Institution of Race Relations points out "If Buthelezi felt excluded from the political system he would make an alliance with anybody to ensure his place in the future political system". Even it seems, if that system meant apartheid in one form or another.

Myth: Buthelezi is supported by 1.5 million registered members of Inkatha

It may be true that Inkatha's membership role consists of 1.5 million Zulus. But were they all willing joiners? Zulu workers and Inkatha members in Natal have claimed that they were coerced into joining the party. Many tell how it is difficult to get a job in Natal without an Inkatha membership card. Some maintain that Inkatha membership is a "passport" to work in the two largest sectors of employment in South Africa - the migrant labour system and the government bureaucracy (sic). Chief Buthelezi is nothing more than a petty tyrant, struggling to maintain power and influence. He is a stone in the path of South Africa's freedom. Mr. Craig's admiration of a man such as this is questionable at best, and I would urge him to reconsider the facts.

The Avengers

Unlike Nicholas Oliver, this let-

ter was submitted 5 minutes after it was written not 3 weeks. Oh yeah Nicky sorry to here (sic) about the prank phone calls, it makes my heart bleed.

You've accused these individuals of being "boring" and "really dull." Seems to me they bothered the piss out of you or you wouldn't have written that pathetic article.

I'm not trying to justify the actions of these individuals, but I think the study body is entitled to an unbiased story. Nicky sees the world from such a negative light that he fails to see the positive side of the rocky horror picture show.

It seems that your (sic) upset by the possibility that upcoming rocky horror picture shows may be cancelled. I hope they are, in fact that's why I'm writing this letter.

You and the Student Council have made these individuals into a bunch of egg throwing hell raisers. Personally this doesn't paint the full picture. One must look at the events of October 31 in an optimistic light. These days it's so easy to look at the negative side (right Nicky)

I've never been or come to have been to a Rocky Horror Picture Show but I know that they don't make for good Holson viewing. One might say that these cult movies are works of Satan. According to Dr. Nathan Holyoke these movies make an aggressive and negative impression on one's mind. These movies prey on weak minded individuals who don't have the inner strength to differentiate between them and the real world. These movies have been blamed on rapes murders and suicides.

Nicky has accused these individuals of being selfish and having fun at the expense of other people. I hardly think so. These individuals, I think were protesting this cult movie to send a message to the Student Union that these events are not acceptable. But because some weak willed people are so entrenched in these trashy events they saw these egg throwing individuals as a direct threat to their cult life.

Nicky called these individuals imature (sic) shit disturbers, I call them DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH. Who avenge people who corrupt the world. The world would be a better place to live if we had more corageous (sic) individuals like them. They are soldiers of fortune who will do their best to clean up the world ignoring the consequences they may have to pay.

I won't defend the method that they used to protest this faith, but I feel that they were forced into such drastic action. Though it made a mess and cost the student union money, they should have taken this into consideration before they decided to show such trash.

So why did the avengers take such drastic action? it can only be hypothesized (sic) that they were forced to. For the past few years complaints have been brought forth to the student union about the content of the films, but the student union has failed to negotiate. Just like Brian Mulroney wouldn't budge in the Oka crises Sadaam Busane (sic) wouldn't budge in the Persian (sic) gulf crises, inforced (sic) action was called for. The United States had it's Vietnam now it's time for the Rocky Horror Picture show to have it's.

Unfortunately like Vietnam veterans these individuals are being wrongly condemned (sic) for their actions. I don't know who they are, but I feel that they should be given purple hearts of medals for their victory in a moral battle.

Furthermore I think Nicky Oliver has a lot of nerve in down playing their moral mission.

Juanita Ricardo

Smoker extinguished

Dear Editor,

I want to tell you a little story that happened to me in the S.U.B. cafeteria this past Wednesday. My friends and I are sitting at a table in the cafeteria enjoying our morning coffee, (the table was situated in full view of two non smoking area signs) when all of a sudden "Mr. Workers" (the ones that are fixing the windows on in the S.U.B.) come in, sit down next to us and light up their cigarettes. A girl at the next table notices that my two month old baby is sitting on my friends lap, and kindly asks the men to put out their cigarettes for the baby's sake. They very rudely refuse.

Now I don't want any trouble, but I'm asthmatic and my tolerance to smoke is practically nil. I went upstairs to S.U.B. staff to see if they would send someone down to stop them from smoking. HA! No such luck. I'm told that they can't do anything without direct authorization from Kim Norris, who just happens to be on sick leave, and that his replacement would not be in until later on in the afternoon. I returned to the cafeteria and politely asked the men to refrain from smoking in that location. They refused. I pleaded my asthma and my baby's health. They replied that they had been smoking there for four weeks and they weren't going to stop for me or any baby. Okay...I now felt compelled to take matters into my own hands and defend my territory

as well as my baby's health. I took my trusty 500ml of A&W Rootbeer and asked them once more to extinguish their cigarettes or I would have to do it for them. They just laughed and refused so I took my bottle of rootbeer and poured it over one of their cigarettes. Amazing how quickly the other cigarettes were extinguished.

Immature, I grant you; but in my point of view, necessary to the health and well being of my child and myself...And to all those who smoke, I have no problem with smokers or smoking as long as its done in the appropriate places at the appropriate times.

Yours Truly,
Kathleen Johnson-Tracy

"Okagate" revisited again

Dear Editor,

First of all I would like to say that I missed Sean Maloney's article on Oka when it first came out, but I have managed to catch all the responses to his letter, and I have come to the conclusion that these people neither watch the news nor read the newspaper, of if they do they have a nasty tendency to take things out of context. As well as stooping to name calling, these people do not have a firm grip on the facts. It just so happens that I do watch the news, read newspapers and I even listen to CBC radio. In addition, I know several of the people sent to Oka by the military, so I have eyewitness accounts of what went on at Oka. So in light of this, I feel that I am in a good position to state the facts. Knowing the facts of any situation enables one to form well grounded opinions without name calling.

To start with I seem to recall that the Indians had asked that the military be brought in to replace Securitate du Quebec forces, not a bad idea as the S.Q. is Canada's version of the stereotypical 'deep south cop' with the sunglasses mirrored in the inside. So the army is sent in, about 4500 troops. Wow, what a huge number. Wrong, about half of these people were acting in a support role, ie. cooks, medics, mechanics etc. So we still have over 2000 troops, still seems like a lot doesn't it? Well, its not. Not if you wish to establish a firm patrol area and perimeter, and still have your troops able to get food and rest. My next point is that it seems that some of the Indians facing our troops, were not Canadians but who were in fact, American ex-green

Continued on page 19

Continued from
beret vietnam v
are wanted in th
down a nationa
Here is another
fact, the barrica
were illegal. Mu
the Indians had
the night flights
into and out of
a few of the Ind
the Oka crisis a
have nothing ag
but you won't s
handling a gun.
the Indians at
with every thin
matic rifles to
guns of M72 ro
who knows wh
on those night
People have
trampled right
one to point th
ernments nigh
seizures of we
quite legal. Pro
that. As to the
you follow th
voked a few y
replaced wit
pertinant (sic)
another point,
there were onl
they were not
given any 105
they were sen
situations such
scare someone
them away. S
had at Oka;
mean trying t
into a golf cou
our native pe
erantly (sic) to
of course we
Armed Forces
and order, wh
ing a gunfight
the live foota
this. Anyone
weapons seiz
at provocatio
cognizant of t
were seized in
army, and th
After all, you
without any g
In the final
do not make a
smart to take
government.
to restore law
repress the m
was the real i
ruption of law
other group of
up roadblock
think they wor
the Mayor of
but what the l
was illegal, t
So in the futu
tion not war.

Andrew H

Nick
Rock

Dear Sir,
This letter
letter submit