the brunswickan

university of new brunswick
p.o box 4400
fredericton, n.b.
E3B 5A3
telephone (506)453 4983

CANADA'S OLDEST OFFICIAL STUDENT PUBLICATION

Karen Mair . . . . . Interim Editor-In-Chief

Valerie White . . . . . Managing Editor

Ernest Dunphy . . . . . Advertising Manager

Melynda Jarratt . . . . . News Editor

Alan MacDonald, Jamie Aitken . . . . . Photo Editors

Carole Marie Doucet . . . . . Entertainment Editor

Laura Lee MacLean . . . . . Sports Editor

Mike Gormley . . . . . Features Editor

Jeremy Earl . . . . . Offset Editor

YAHOOS THIS WEEK:

Mark Stevens, Diane Gillis, Blue Mother Goose, Jon Robertson, Brent Staeben, Lawrence Hansen, Garth L. Waite, Tim Martell, Christine Marshall, Alison Luke, Chris Earl, Jerry Flecknell, Brent Thompson, Joanne Drost, Tammi Richardson, William MacMackin, Carmen Meisner, Miriam Debley, Ian MacDonald, Nikita Khruschev, Yashiro Nakasone, & Ronnie Rambo Reagan.

ALSO, SPECIAL THANX TO ED VEITCH OF THE UNB LAW FACULTY AND PETER FORBES.

Typesetters Extraordinaire :

Marsha Phelps, Laura Smith, Belinda Bucket

Ad Design by:
Mike Robichaud, John Adam

The *Brunswickan*, in its 121st year, is Canada's oldest official student publication. The *Brunswickan's* offices are located in Room 35 of the University of New Brunswick's Student Union Building, P.O.Box 4400, College Hill, Fredericton, N.B., E3B 5A3.

The *Brunswickan* is printed with flair by Henley Printing, Ltd., Woodstock, N.B.

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

The *Brunswickan* is copyright 1986 the *Brunswickan*. The opinions expressed within are not necessarily those of the *Brunswickan's* editorial board, its staff, its publisher (The UNB Student Union), or the administration of the university.

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

OPINION...

Larry Speaks??? *No,* Ronnie *Speaks!*

By MARK STEVENS
Brunswickan Staff

Last Thursday *The Washington Post* published an article alledging that the White House had initiated a programme of "disinformation" specifically designed to discredit the Libyan leader, Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi.

Understandably Reagan denied this. "No, we didn't tell any lies, and we weren't doing any of these disinformation things we've been cited with doing", he said with inarticulate honesty. (Oh Larry where were you when he needed you?)

Secretary of State Shultz was a little more voluble, although he too denied that there had been an administrative decision to lie to the media. Nevertheless, he saw nothing wrong in adopting such a tactic. "I think", he said, "that if there are ways in which we can make Qaddafi nervous, why shouldn't we? Frankly I don't have any problem with a little psychological warfare against Qaddafi. As far as (he) is concerned, we don't have a declaration of war, but we have something pretty darn close to it".

So, it seems that journalists on Capitol Hill don't like being taken for a ride. An occupational hazard, surely? After all, as Bernie McMahon, staff director of the Intelligence Committee to the US Senate pointed out, most news organisations would resent NOT being fed incorrect, misleading and fraudulent material.

"What! You mean to tell me that Mad Dog Qaddafi hasn't got rabies."

But not everyone took the bait. Those who were privy to independent sources of information noticed obvious inconsistancies. Senator William S. Cohen (Republican, Maine), a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said that the reports he read indicating that Qaddafi was becoming increasingly instable and was facing internal political threats, "did not seem consistent with other information I was looking at. I can only conclude that the reports were without foundation or someone was deliberately seeking to plant such information," he added.

Unfortunately, Reagan's White House script writers let their creativity run away with them. Representative Matthew F. McHugh stressed that by misleading the media, the credibility of the Government had been seriously undermined. Not difficult, that.

by STEVE BOYKO

This is a slightly different approach to the question of the dangers inherent in possession of nuclear weapons and the benefits of nuclear disarmament.

Every now and then, one reads an article detailing the myraid horrid things that could happen if a nuclear war were to erupt, and how many nuclear devices everyone has, and that we should disarm. This doesn't seem to be working too well; we still have lots and lots of nukes, and more are being made.

The main justification for having nuclear weapons is because everyone else has them; they say they need them, because if they don't have them, Joe down the block with his SS-20s will intimidate them and blow them to smithereens. This is a rather valid and persuasive argument, I think. However, one must realize that most countries possessing nuclear weapons are not insane; they realize the dangers of fallout, as well as the sheer futility of nuking someone, because the land becomes rather inhabitable afterwards. As well, the good guys (us, I guess) have them to keep the Big Red Machine off our backs in Western Europe. It's a well-known fact that the Warsay Pact has a great numerical superiority of arms when it comes to conventional weaponry. What I propose is simple; remove (or at least remove) our nuclear arsenal.

This, unfortunately, removes a lot of deterrence, and the Big Red Machine is likely to roll over Europe and flatten our good friends over there. So we must increase our conventional forces to compensate, and perhaps even equal the Russians' vast armies. We must hire more good soldiers and make more neato weapons. This creates jobs and stimulates the economy. Just think--we could solve unemployment *and* remove the nuclear menace at the same time! And when the Russians see how well we're doing, they're bound to remove their nukes as well and do the same thing...

And what to do with the nukes? Shove them in some reactor; at least they'll make our lights glow instead of ourselves.

The silos could be converted into condos or something. Come to think of it, many of them are in grasslands and such; maybe we can use them as grain silos!

Soon, all countries possessing nuclear weapons will see what a great idea this is, and they'll all toss their nukes away and expand their armies. Soon we'll have huge armed camps facing each other. The U.S. will have lots of troops to squash bad old Libya, Nicaragua, and other nasties, and maybe the Russians will finally flatten poor Afghanistan. Perhaps Britain will pulp Argentina, and France will nail those terrorists...India and Pakistan will have to invade each other, instead of using good old nukes as a deterrent...The Russians and the Americans will have nothing to talk about anymore, once the SALT treaties are thrown out--they won't need any more disarmament summits.

What a great world it would be! Thousands of soldiers patrolling around looking for something to do...

I hope I've been ridiculous enough. Disarmament is a nice dream, but I seriously doubt it will occur in *my* lifetime.