

The Opinion

Daily

Tar Heel

Evans Witt, Editor

Thursday, September 14, 1972

Reorganization needed for SG

Most students would agree that Student Government needs improvement. Such controversy as there is revolves on how to change the organization to improve it.

Currently there are two proposals for changing Student Government's structure with an eye to greater efficiency and service to the students.

The first plan to be revealed this fall was put forward by Student Body President Richard Epps. This plan calls for the abolishment of the present Student Legislature and the putting in its place of a 20-man Campus Governing Council that would have virtually the same functions.

This plan is similar to the one proposed last spring but the Epps plan provides for a two year trial period for the new structure. The student body would be given a chance to vote on retaining the structure in the spring of 1975, two years after it would be implemented.

SL members Randy Wolfe and Gary Rendsburg unveiled another plan to reorganize Student Legislature at the SL Rules Committee meeting Monday. This plan calls for the Student Legislature to be reduced from its present 55-member size to a body of from 34 to 38 members.

It also would consolidate the current election districts by eliminating districts based on sex. There would be no more SL seats from solely male or solely female districts under the Wolfe-Rendsburg proposal. This plan would also consolidate the Men's and Women's Honor Court and make those elections from the same districts as the SL members.

Amendments to the Student Constitution, which both of these plans entail, must be approved by

the students. One method is for SL to approve the amendment, whereupon the amendments only require a majority student vote. The other is for the required number of signatures to be gathered to place the amendment on the ballot, which then needs a two-thirds vote for approval.

The Wolfe-Rendsburg plan comes up for approval by the Student Legislature tonight, while the Epps plan will be placed on the ballot through student petitions. If the Wolfe-Rendsburg plan wins approval for a student vote and the Epps plan is placed on the October 17 ballot by petition, confusion and the probably ultimate defeat of both plans would be the result.

We have not had sufficient time to consider the import of either of these plans of reorganization in as great detail as we would like. And we do not believe that the time is right for the Student Legislature to decide whether the Wolfe-Rendsburg plan will be on the ballot. If it is possible under the current elections law, it would be advisable to put off the SL vote on the Wolfe-Rendsburg plan until its merits can be compared more fully against those of the Epps plan.

Since the plan was only unveiled this past Monday, could not the legislators be given until at least next week to consider both plans and to find out what some of their constituents think about the plans?

On one point, we do not think that there is significant disagreement - Student Government needs improvement. For many, a change in structure would seem to be the most auspicious beginning for a change in the quality of Student Government.

The time is right for a change in SG, although the method has yet to be decided.

Robert N. Putnam II

McGovern strategy ineffective

Pity the junior Senator from South Dakota. Running for President of the United States is never an easy thing to do, but it must be particularly lonely for George McGovern, with his present difficulties.

After four months of a phenomenally successful primary campaign culminating in his first-ballot nomination at the Democratic Convention, McGovern seems well on his way to four quite different months of repeated blundering which might well result in electoral disaster for his party. Very few things have gone right for George since the convention, and the near future does not hold much hope unless he makes some drastic changes.

In my column last week, I pointed out McGovern's damaged credibility as a result of his dumping of Eagleton as his running-mate and his complete about-face within the course of several hours on whether he sent Pierre Salinger to Paris to meet with the North Vietnamese. Those supporters who had been convinced of George's honesty and sincerity must have felt distinctly uncomfortable as a result of their candidate's behavior.

The campaign itself has not been going at all well, either. A week or two ago Larry O'Brian, McGovern's campaign

manager, was threatening to quit because of George's apparent inability to organize his staff (running a Presidential campaign with the committee system for making decisions just doesn't work).

And then there have been problems with Sargent Shriver, Tom Eagleton's replacement as vice-presidential candidate. Sargent has never run for elective office in his life - not even for president of his local school board. He tries to make up for this with enthusiasm, but it has been necessary for George to recall him every few days for rudimentary instruction on what not to say. Sargent's enthusiasm for talking, coupled with his relative ignorance of the ideology of McGovern's New Left positions, has resulted in several inconsistencies with which George was far from pleased.

"Smile and waffle" were McGovern's instructions to Shriver for handling difficult questions in news conferences. It seems George thinks that if you smile broadly at the TV camera an inadequate answer won't seem nearly so bad. (A fact which you might want to remember the next time you see McGovern smiling broadly.)

And there have been still other difficulties with the campaign. With all

the emphasis McGovern's strategists have placed on voter registration, it seems unfortunate that the man in charge of this vital area suddenly remembered that he had to get re-elected himself back in Trenton, New Jersey, and bid McGovern an affectionate farewell.

George also has a real problem in what positions to take on the issues. He realized shortly before the convention that his views were a good distance to the left of the typical American voter and has been moving to the right since that time in an attempt to become a viable candidate. In politics, it is hardly unusual for a candidate to move toward the center - that's how you get elected (Barry Goldwater's refusal to compromise his honestly-held but right-of-center views is the main reason he was beaten so soundly by Lyndon Johnson, the more astute politician). George's special problem is that his hard core of support comes from the New Left, and this is a group not apt to view his rightward shift with much tolerance or enthusiasm.

McGovern has apparently decided that the solution to this dilemma is to remain firm in his position on a Vietnam withdrawal, especially since the New Left is probably the only group in the country not yet completely bored with the war as

an issue, after eight years of political rhetoric. A movie actress or a former attorney general going to Hanoi every once in a while to see a bomb crater in a dike helps maintain enthusiasm, too.

Thus with the New Left hopefully anchored to the Vietnam issue, George is left free to move toward the center in other areas. Abortion reform is suddenly a matter for the states to decide for themselves. Leniency with regard to marijuana is somehow mentioned less frequently than before. More moderate plans for welfare reform evolve. Israel must receive as much military aid as she requires. And so forth.

It is possible, of course, for such a strategy to work. Indications at this point seem to be that it is not working, as reflected most significantly by the latest Gallup Poll, which shows 61 percent of those people under 30 surveyed currently supporting Richard Nixon, with 36 percent in favor of George McGovern. The previous poll had indicated a slight lead (48 to 41) for McGovern. While it is possible that one of the polls could be more accurate than the other, it is difficult to ignore the direction of the trend. And if George is beginning to lose the support of the young, he is indeed in deep trouble, for he has gone to great pains to convince everyone that he is the candidate of those under 30.

What is happening is that people who once had supported George more or less on faith are beginning to look at him more critically in view of the recent challenges to his credibility. They are looking at his rapid changes of stance on the issues and they are beginning to wonder.

The ineffectiveness of McGovern's strategies is brought out all the more clearly by the fact that the Republicans have done very little in the way of active campaigning as of yet, and still Nixon's lead continues to grow. It cannot be that Nixon is doing the right things (other than going soberly about the business of being President as though there were no election this year), but it must be that George McGovern is repelling more people than he is winning.

In light of his conduct of the campaign since the convention, this is not surprising. If George wants the election to resemble any kind of an even contest, he had best rethink his strategies, figure out what his positions are then stick to them, and find some real issues to campaign on. He has less than eight weeks left.



Les Wagoner

Student vote can influence elections

Classes have started, committees are functioning, vacancies have been filled on existing commissions, dorm and residence college politics are in full swing. Everything seems to be back to normal. Everything that is, except the placidity usually found in reference to national and state politics.

Checking the study rooms at night one hears McGovern... Nixon; Helms... Galifianakis; Bowles... Holshouser, etc.

Sitting in the rooms of dorm students, one hears the same names, with only slight variations, tossed back and forth. The plat-

forms of the national candidates are not so much in question or debate as are the personalities and past-performances of the two. The same holds true for the other offices, by and large. One would think we were running a national personality contest (?) instead of a serious election judging from what is heard.

Comparisons of Jack Kennedy, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Lyndon Johnson, and George McGovern are made and hashed constantly. Dates, names, decisions - all are tossed around like an academic study-commission report.

But, man, that's not where it is! These

aren't names to be tossed around, these aren't personalities to be identified with. These are people, and what they do in the next four years is going to determine what kind of country we have to live in.

Do we want to continue to exist under the prevailing socio-economic conditions that have come about under the present administration? Do we want to continue listening to the weekly death toll of Americans in Indo-China or hearing of how many thousand tons of bombs are dropped in North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, etc., or do we want to hear of a complete end to the war that is not a war?

Do we want to continue to have wage and price controls or do we want a return to a workable situation which is dependant upon individual and voluntary control as opposed to big-brother tactics?

Watergate, the removal of campaign funds from proper channels, etc. are indicative of what is happening now. Can't we get off this merry-go-round long enough to get down to brass tacks and stop this mickey-mouse foolishness?

There is a way that we, students of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, insignificant creatures that we at times may be, can do something about these matters. We can get-the-hell out and register to vote and after that, campaign for the issues we believe in, including the voting on election day for the candidate who we believe will come closest to carrying out our wishes.

We, as well as the students across the country, can be more than just a bloc-vote statistic. We can be a dynamic influence on local, state and national politics. But we have to do it from the stance of voting and actively participating in the campaigns of those we believe in.

Realizing that I am sticking my neck out about a mile and a half, I agree with

Gerry Cohen's stance on voting. I agree because I have seen the results of what we have had for the past four years. I have lived under the administrations of six presidents and have watched them as one would an interesting species of animal, and have made a few value-judgements by generalizing party-wise. From these judgements, I conclusively advocate the election of George McGovern, just as I did that of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

I keep hearing it said that we can't do anything on a local level to influence national policy and politics. This is wrong. It is dead wrong. All it takes is for us as students to be involved in these campaigns, to be involved to the point that we are not only willing to register to vote, and then voting, but to the extent that we are willing to familiarize ourselves with the past performances of the candidates and their stances on matters that are pertinent to us, to all of us. Then, get out and campaign actively for these men. Campaign not only up to the date of the elections but even after the elections, so that we are constantly keeping in front of our representatives the goals and ideals for which we are fighting.

Letters to our congressmen, our senators, state-level politicians and even the president, are but one method of accomplishing this. Don't let the issues die after election day, but keep them alive and active from this end by a steady flow of communications to the people.

In less than two months, we go to the polls once again to try to accomplish "government of the people, by the people and for the people." Let's try a little harder this time. Let's not only go to the polls, but let's keep active after the campaigns are over and the election results are in.

In this way, perhaps each will be able to say, "I have done my part."

Joe Hill

Killings obscure a larger tragedy

This past week has been for me a period of self-examination. As an American Jew and an international socialist, I faced the latest episode of the Middle East Crisis with many misgivings. I was appalled at the terrorism at Munich and dismayed once again that the world was fed propaganda instead of presented with an open appraisal of the issues. Zionists and anticommunists claimed that the Black September organization represented both an endemic Arab genocidal fanaticism and criminal forebodings to the "free world." The case for an exclusive Jewish state and for U.S. support of Israel was nurtured by crude emotionalism. Both Nixon and McGovern tried to best each other in backing Israel and condemning the Palestinian guerrillas. The media echoed these superficial political ploys by emphasizing the conspiratorial, clandestine and sanguine nature of the Palestinian guerrillas. There was no attempt to explain why people would take such desperate measures as kidnapping and killing with little regard for their own personal safety. There was scant discussion of the political, economic and social problems that have plagued the Middle East, degraded the lives of the Palestinians, and reinforced the militarism in both Israel and the Arab world.

Yes, there was a tragedy at Munich. Eleven people were killed because they were Israeli Jews. Yet a larger tragedy continues to assert itself. The legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians for a just resolution of the displacement and atomization that followed the establishment of the state of Israel have been clouded by terrorism.

Terrorism is a political strategy based on acts of violence against individuals either to materially hurt the enemy as in the case of assassination of public figures or to demoralize the spirit as in case of attacking a marketplace or a school. In the terrorist's mind there exists a Manichean world which pits the morally pure against a one-dimensional enemy. It ignores the humanity of people whereby bonds of cooperation and comradery can be established and instead substitutes the action of a select few who by virtue of knowledge or intense commitment will decide the course of political struggle.

Concretely this means that Israeli workers and farmers are driven into arms of a leadership which has uncompromisingly maintained hegemony over Palestinians. There can be no serious appreciation of the case for either a binational state of Jews and Palestinian Arabs or simply a separate nation for a refugee people within a climate of mutual terror where murder is met by murder and reprisal by retaliation.

But what is more disturbing is that a familiar pattern is reemerging which can lead to nothing but incessant hostility. Both Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs have been presently captured by nationalist ideologies which have precluded political cooperation, social cohabitation and cultural pluralism. Both movements have claimed the same territory as their homeland in which the diaspora would become just a memory. Jews who faced oppression in Europe and Palestinians who experienced second class citizenship throughout the Middle East both embraced Palestine or Israel

pre-1948 as their haven.

It should be remembered that not until 1942 did the World Zionist Congress adopt in its program the demand for a separate Jewish state. Until that time serious consideration was given to a binational state where full recognition of the rights of each respective nationality would be granted. In 1944 a Palestinian Arab socialist party called Histadruth (Left Front) captured 20 percent of the vote running on a binationalist platform. In addition, as late as 1946 a non-exclusive Palestinian state was considered a viable solution by the League for Arab-Jewish rapprochement and the Falastin al Judida (New Palestine), two organizations with substantial followings. This cooperative spirit was also manifested in joint strikes of cement and transportation workers in 1947 and participation in the same political parties such as the Worker Party, whose leader Sami Tahan in conjunction with Chaim Weisman, a leading Zionist, supported a binational state. Tahan, however, paid the price of assassination at the hands of Arabs adamantly opposed to such a modus vivendi.

The vision of an egalitarian and pluralist Palestine was also dashed by single-minded Zionists, a self-interested Jordanian government and the Western world who found an easy way out of the moral crisis of Hitler's Germany. The Israeli law instituted in 1948 which held that any Arab who left his land after November 27, 1947, lost all rights of ownership even if he returned before May 15, 1948, the date of Israeli independence, was one of a series of events leading to the estrangement of the

Palestinian Arabs and Palestinian Jews. The terrorism of Haganah, a popular-based commando group and Irgun, a right wing guerilla organization that was responsible for the massacre of Palestinians hostile to the invading Arab armies at Deir Yassin drove many Palestinians towards a position compatible with Pan-Arab chauvinism. The partition of Palestine into Israel and Trans Jordan supported by the U.N. sealed the fate of 900,000 Palestinian refugees who faced a squalid existence on the impoverished West Bank.

It appeared that the same countries, including the U.S., who refused to open its doors to Jews fleeing Nazi fascism opted for a solution predicated on subordinating a relatively weak people who played no role in the European genocidal madness. And the European Jews who were told that Israel was supposedly established in their honor found themselves fulfilling the dreams of Theodore Herzl, Moses Hess and Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky by colonizing a land where both Palestinian Jew and Arab had tried, although, at times, unsuccessfully to live together.

Jews had gained a nation but only by denying the same claim of nationhood by another oppressed people. This tragedy haunts us now and will continue to render us uneasy until we admit to ourselves and the Palestinians that we have wronged as well as been wronged. The embracing of self serving myths and the issuing of sanctimonious denials of responsibility will only deepen the tragic state of affairs between Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs.

The Daily Tar Heel

Evans Witt, Editor

79 Years of Editorial Freedom

Norman Black, Managing Editor
Jessica Hanchar, News Editor
Howie Carr, Associate Editor
Lynn Lloyd, Associate Editor
David Zucchini, Sports Editor
Bruce Mann, Feature Editor

The Daily Tar Heel strives to provide meaningful news interpretations and opinions on its editorial page. Unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor, while letters and columns represent only the views of individual contributors.