

"I want a million dollars, Don Johnson, and two one-way plane tickets to Tahiti."
-Brenda Paul

"Aaaaarrggghhhhhllleeeeeuuuhhhhhnnnnn!!"
-Hunter S. Hutch



THE BRUNSWICKAN

Calum Iain Johnston

Editor

M. Kaye MacPhee

News Editor

Karen Mair

Entertainment Editor

Ken Quigley
Ernest Dunpy

Sports Editor
Asst. Sports Editor

Richard Hutchins

Features Editor

Katherine Davidson
Cindy Davis

Advertising Manager
Ad Design

Tim MacKinnon

Offset Editor

Sandy Rabasse

Photo Editor

Eric Semple

Samurai

Advisory Board
Timothy C. Lethbridge
Michael MacKinnon

Typesetters
Practically everybody,
but especially
Tim Lethbridge

Genetic mutations of the week: Mark Savoie, Mary Scott, Jamie Aitken, Rick Gagneur, Kate Johnson, Derrick Stanford (When did you say they'd come in?), Gumby, Leith Chu, Allan Brown, Astro-boy, Drew Brown, Dean Michaels, Lauren Grieve. A few others who are forgotten, but not unappreciated, and, of course, shnookums.

The Brunswickan, in its 120th year, is Canada's oldest official student publication. The Brunswickan office is located in rm.35, Student Union Building, University of New Brunswick, P.O.Box 4400, Fredericton, N.B. E3B 5A3.

The Brunswickan is printed with flair at Covered Bridge Printing, Ltd., Hartland, N.B.

Subscriptions are \$20 per year. National and local advertising rates are available at (506)453-4974. General phone 453-4983. News line 453-4973.

The Brunswickan is copyright the Brunswickan. All rights reserved. The opinions expressed within are not necessarily those of the Brunswickan's editorial board, its staff, or its publishers (the UNB Student Union), or the administration of the university.

All letters to the editor must be typed and double spaced, and signed along with phone number. Names may be withheld by request. The Brunswickan reserves the right to refuse publication of letters with libellous, sexist, or racist material. Letters over 250 words may be edited for brevity.

Articles in the Brunswickan may be freely reprinted provided proper credit is given.

OPINION...

Is divestment best for Blacks?

By TIMOTHY LETHBRIDGE

There is a great emotional attraction to pulling investments out of South Africa, but if we would like to see a stable, free and prosperous democracy with majority (i.e. Black) rule, then we must let logic ride above our emotions.

Change can come about in two ways: violent overthrow or negotiated and orderly transition.

We have seen the results of violent overthrow in other countries—look at Uganda, Iran, Argentina or even Stalinist Russia—there is a great risk in this form of change that there will be much worse widespread suffering after the change than before. The disadvantage of orderly change is that results are not immediate and some people suffer before the change occurs.

Other than rapidly, there are very few advantages to violent overthrow. On the other hand with orderly transition, the industrial and business infrastructures can be maintained, as can what is good in the political system. In South Africa, the parliamentary system, if Blacks were added, would have many of the positive qualities of our own.

With violent overthrow, the leaders

of the revolt will likely become the leaders of the new regime. They will tend to use in the new regime the autocratic, secretive and antidemocratic leadership methods they used to run the revolt.

With orderly transition, however, it is the moderates who stand the best chance of taking power because it is the moderates who can find areas of middle ground on which to base compromises and thus keep the peace. The moderates can then continue these effective techniques in the new regime.

The logical mind should accept, then, that if at all possible the orderly transition approach should be the one taken.

What would divestment do? On a large scale it would cause companies to pull out of South Africa leaving their employees out of work. This would be followed by unrest due to bad economic conditions and, coupled with unrest already present due to dissatisfaction with the government, stimulate the overthrow of the government.

Could a worsening economy caused by divestment stimulate a negotiated solution? Hardly. The worsening economy would make patience much shorter so discussion

would stand less of a chance.

This is fine, you may say, but what incentive is there for the government to negotiate? The only incentive the government will listen to is something that will get them votes. A worsening economy caused by divestment may cost them votes, but these will go to the opposition party who are much more White-supremacist than the incumbents.

The only way the government of South Africa will be encouraged to actively negotiate would be if the South African voter felt this is the best thing. We must therefore, from the outside world, convince the White voters that change would be advantageous—show them the advantages of improved international relations, show them that moderate Blacks can work with moderate Whites by stimulating discussions, suggest viable new political structures that would ease the Whites' fears etc.

While stimulating the voters, of course we should never forget to keep the pressure on the government by way of verbal protests.

Let us think logically. Let us think how politics really works. And let us be thoughtfully constructive to help South African Blacks instead of randomly destructive.

MacRUMBLES:

"Students, demand divestment now!"

by KAYE MacPHEE

Canada is a land of tradition.

Historically, a tradition we appear to favor is singling out a group of people on which we bestow our undivided attention, albeit temporarily, and "take care" of them. Examples which immediately spring to mind are our native peoples, the French, and not too long ago, Japanese Canadians.

It is no great surprise then to see that there are Canadian corporations remaining faithful to this particular pastime. Currently, however, we are reaching beyond our own shores to carry on the tradition.

Who are we oppressing this time, you ask? The blacks of South Africa. Why? Simply because of another tradition which Canada holds near and dear - the love of profit.

It is well past time for these corporations to rethink their ethical and social responsibilities as investors. Remaining in South Africa and/or continuing to invest in South Africa effectively supports its white supremacist regime.

It is one thing for corporations to continue to operate in this deplorable fashion, however, when universities, which in better days were the beacons of social awareness and social change, become involved in this ethically repulsive conduct, one must take direct action.

The Board of Governors of UNB have yet to truly address this issue. John O'Brien, UNB Comptroller, tells us the university's total financial involvement with companies dealing with South Africa is "only" 3.2% of their total investments, however, this amounts to about \$520,000.

James O'Sullivan, Vice President of Finance and Administration, said, "The purpose of the Board is not to discuss moral or political issues. The Board concerns itself with making the highest return on investments."

There are times monetary concerns are superceded by moral ones, and this is such a time.

Johnson and Johnson, one of the companies in which UNB invests, wrote to their stockholders on the issue of divestment: "We have been in South Africa since 1930 and have a strong commitment to our 1,400 employees, more than half of whom are black. It is not right to abandon them to an uncertain future; therefore, we are opposed to disinvestment....Such action would hurt rather than help blacks by depriving them of both job opportunities and improved education."

Steven Biko, a black South African activist, was persecuted and eventually murdered by the South African police. He was killed because he was seen as a threat to the white supremacist government. In Biko's words, "Foreign investments support the present economic system of injustice. We blacks are perfectly willing to suffer the consequences of corporate withdrawal. We are quite accustomed to suffering."

Ultimately, the decision to divest is up to the Board of Governors, but whether or not it will be an issue for their consideration is up to the students of this university. The students must demand this and demand that divestment be voted on no later than February of this year. And that the vote be in the affirmative.

If you are firm in your conviction that it is morally repugnant to you to attend a university which will profit from the oppression of a peoples; if you tell the Board this by continued lobbying; if you keep the pressure on, the Board will have to give in to the majority - the students. That is why McGill finally and totally divested...pressure from the students of that university.

Tell the Board of Governors you want them to "start some new traditions"...DIVEST NOW.