

The Daily Tar Heel

75 Years of Editorial Freedom

Bill Amlong, Editor

Don Walton, Business Manager



Don Campbell, Associate Editor

Lytt Stamps, Managing Editor

Hunter George, News Editor

Brant Wansley, Advertising Manager

Years May Change — But Semester Remains

Well now, is everybody all rested from Christmas vacation and ready to start a new year?

Or, should we say, ready to finish an old semester?

For while the year may have changed from one to the next over

Gardner's Running: Ho-Hum

The news is out: The Honorable James Gardner, Fourth District Congressman and hamburger entrepreneur will seek the Republican nomination for governor of this state.

The "news" is only the official announcement; most Republicans in high places knew many weeks ago that Gardner would run.

Gardner's primary opponent, Charlotte businessman John Stickley, called Gardner's decision a "mixed blessing". Well, that's his opinion — but we wonder what the ingredients of the blessing are that are "mixed."

The blessing seems to be mainly that Gardner will not be running for his Congressional seat — a seat that he could no doubt have kept. At the same time, his chances of taking the governorship are slim.

The only problem is, they're not slim enough. The New York Times recently called this year's gubernatorial race in this state "marginal," which must mean that it could be a tossup.

Gardner's entry into the race, therefore, can't be taken lightly, even though he must be considered an underdog to Stickley except in the rural east.

THERE'S BEEN a lot written in recent years about the emergence of the "two-party" system in the South. A primary between two Republicans in this state obviously bears out that trend.

It will indeed be interesting to see the young, popular Gardner running against a much older Stickley. When it's all over with, though, we wonder what it will mean.

Gardner is popular in the East, but the Republican votes are in the Piedmont and Western parts of the state. His only hope would seem to lie in getting Eastern Democrats to change their registration to Republican before the May primary. And even if he could accomplish that, it's not likely that Gardner voters in the East would equal the Republicans in the West who favor Stickley.

Polls taken by Gardner indicated he is popular everywhere. Polls taken by Stickley indicate he is popular everywhere except in the East.

So you can believe whoever's poll you want to.

Actually, when one speculates about the Republican primary, it's like trying to stay awake to avoid a bad dream. Because whoever wins the Republican nomination, the voters of the state will be faced with a choice in November between the Republican and either Bob Scott or Mel Broughton, the two Democratic primary contenders.

And the people of this state deserve a better choice than that.

break, the semester didn't. Which means that students have to return from the holidays to face that ever-so-grim spectre of exams.

A lot of colleges and universities, however, don't work it this way: they have their first semester finals over and done with before Christmas vacation begins.

That way of working things — even if an F or two could really raunch up a few students Christmas spirit — makes for generally a lot more worry-free holiday than does Carolina's system.

For while students from those other schools go home with all the worst behind them, the Carolina student totes his textbooks along with him to study for exams, and maybe to wrap up a term paper or two.

The studying and term papering, of course, have usually fallen into the realm of things-that-might-have-been by the time the holidays end, however.

And so, back to Carolina everybody comes — not a bit more learned after the Christmas non-study break, but just suffering from a combination of New Year's Day hangover plus didn't-study guilt pangs.

There are, however, good things to say for the semester system, as opposed to either the trimester system or the quarter system.

We supposed there are good things to say for it, anyway. Why else would we have it?

One Million Dex!

A million dex! That's right: o-n-e-m-i-l-l-i-o-n-d-e-x.

Why, that's enough to get this entire student body through exams, and to even have enough left over to scatter knee-deep over Polk Place so exam-punchy students could scamper barefoot through them.

It's kind of an Alice-in-Amphetamineland dream.

But dreams get smahed.

So do doors.

Like the ones that South Carolina lawmen bulled through at a Cowpens, S.C., truck stop to find 45 containers full of Benzedrine, Dexedrine and other assorted pep pills. A million of them, the cops said. A whole million.

Needless to say, that is one million dex that won't be peddled to anybody this exam period.

Oh well, it's probably just as well: who'd have the money to buy them anyway, right after Christmas shopping?

So, there doesn't seem to be much to say except, "Pass the black coffee, ma'am. It's going to be a long, long night."

Letters To The Editor

To The Editor:

I would like to comment on Nader Fergany's "AN ARAB VIEW OF THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION" which appeared on your editorial page of Dec. 12.

Mr. Fergany speaks of an atmosphere of "bias and misinformation" which the American people have towards the Arab world in their support of Israel, and he has taken it upon himself to give us, the U.N.C. community, the "true" facts as he sees them.

Rather than grace his half truths, distortions, and vagarisms by refuting them; I should like to state a few points which should speak for themselves concerning the Middle East situation today.

1. Israel is a tiny country surrounded by a vast, hostile Arab world. On that tiny piece of land, which was barren before her inception, she has established farms as a result of her irrigation projects, built industries, Universities, and hospitals, etc. etc. etc. She has continuously expressed her desire to live in peace with the Arab world and share her technical knowledge so that their barren lands could become fertile.

2. Yes, the Arab refugee problem is a very sad situation, Israel realizes this and is trying to help by assimilating as many refugees as she can within her tiny borders, as well as through monetary aid.

3. The Arab leaders, on the other hand, have fed their poor, hungry, illiterate masses, a diet of "hate and Destroy Israel" for so long that they are willing to spend billions of dollars to buy arms from Russia and train vast armies rather than to irrigate their land and feed and educate their people.

It is, therefore, the Arab attitude toward the presence of Israel and not Israel herself which has impeded the assimilation of the refugees, prevented the progress of the Arab states, and propagated the tense Middle East situation which exists today.

Sincerely yours,
(Mrs.) Florence B. Glou

To The Editor:

After reading Mr. Fergany's remarks in the December 12 issue of The Daily Tar Heel, I tend to agree that the situation in the Middle East is indeed not better. However, in his letter, which to his credit was obviously well researched, I feel that he not only misconstrues this data, but he also displays a gross misunderstanding of Jewish ideology.

To commence, Mr. Fergany cited examples of problems such as the 300,000 new Arab refugees in the Middle East and the recent naval skirmish in the Suez Canal as a description of the "better" Middle East. Perhaps it would be wise to remember that both of these grave situations resulted from a war provoked by the Arab nations. If it had not been for the blockading of the Gulf of Aquaba, this troublesome situation might not have become a reality.

In light of the current and continued Arab arms build-up and resistance to direct negotiation with Israel, one would have to support Mr. Fergany's thesis that the situation in the Middle East is not improving. Judging from this present stream of events, another armed conflict could indeed become an eventuality. However, if the Arabs would at least recognize the legality of the Israeli state and come to the conference table with Israel, perhaps a lasting concept cooperation and peace could be initiated.

Mr. Fergany's statement that Zionism is a Fascist ideology is based on a badly misinterpreted concept of Judaism. From the earliest traces of Jewish history Jews have considered themselves chosen in the sense that it was their responsibility to spread the idea of monotheism. This responsibility is a part of a proud heritage which inspired Zionism, the movement for a national Jewish homeland.

The idea of a chosen, dominant people striving for an expanding state (which is what Mr. Fergany seemingly implied) has no place in the Zionist movement or in Jewish doctrine.

Mr. Fergany's letter contains several other thoughts, many of which are not well defined. Foremost among these are his disagreement with American foreign policy in the Middle East and his barb at American politics ("Jewish Vote Myth"). However, I will not elaborate on these as I feel that the other areas I have mentioned define my views well enough. In closing, I would like to leave Mr. Fergany with one thought: Would it not be better for two proud peoples to expand their efforts toward cooperation and inter-dependence in a land dear to both of them, than to engage in constant hostilities?

Sincerely,
Tom Bauer
922 Morrison



To The Editor:

Mr. Fergany's interesting Letter To The Editor, (Daily Tar Heel Tuesday, December 12) is an example of how to influence people by presenting half truths. Since half truths are more dangerous than untruths, his letter must be answered.

I am Israeli born in Iraq, who left that country as an aftermath of a Nazi revolution led by Rashid Ali in 1942. The revolution was followed by a program against the Jews—and I need not add that innocent men, women and children were massacred.

Therefore I would have appreciated very much to find in Mr. Fergany's letter any sign of a constructive suggestion towards a solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. However no such endeavour was noted in Mr. Fergany's communication. Instead he accuses the United States of being partial and selects those "facts" from the past which can serve his purpose of presenting a picture in black and white of a very complex situation in which both sides have their share of responsibilities and justified rights. Mr. Fergany's way of shedding light on "basic aspects of the problem" do not seem to me to contribute anything. I really do not see any point in arguing along this line.

What for instance is the point of complaining about the results of a war without mentioning who has provoked it? What about Nasser's declaration and broadcasts from Radio Cairo, Damascus, Amman to do away with Israel? What about the political and military moves that preceded the June-war? Does Mr. Fergany think people have so short a memory as to have forgotten all that?

He proposes a "free and scientific exchange of facts", then he accuses the United States of being partial to the Israeli side. Another war between Israel and the Arabs is predicted "... in which a few million dollars—and, maybe, some American lives—could be lost". Just what does Mr. Fergany have in mind? Does he want to provoke a conflict between non-Jews and Jews in America? What evidence has he to prove that American soldiers are going to fight on Israel's side? Is it because he believes the Russians are going to fight on the side of the Arabs? And why shouldn't the Jews in America help the Jews in Israel? Why may the Moslems in Asia and Africa support their co-religionists and the Jews should behave differently?

Such arguments regarding this complex problem really serve no purpose. Why not for a change ponder reasonably about how to meet the human needs of both sides? Fortunately some Arab leaders, including Habib Bouriba, have already recognized the necessity of a political solution as a first step towards stability and peace in the Middle East.

Sincerely yours,
Nissim Shimoni
509 Pritchard Ave.

To The Editor:

I read with interest and dismay Mr. Fergany's letter which appeared in The Daily Tar Heel on December 12. I read it with interest because it intended to express a legitimate Arab view of the Middle East situation which is sincerely felt by the writer; with dismay, however, because it contained familiar misstatements of facts which require correction.

mis-statement: "The Zionists drove nearly a million Arabs from their homes."

fact: There would not have been a single Arab refugee if the Arabs had accepted the 1947 U.N. Resolution which proposed the creation of separate Arab and Jewish states. The Arab Higher Committee called on the Arab population to leave en masse. The London Economist on October 2, 1948, stated that "the reason given was that upon the final withdrawal of the British the combined armies of the Arab states would invade Palestine and drive the Jews into the seas."

mis-statement: "The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arab were comparable to the crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis."

fact: It is shocking to hear this crude lie repeated. Whereas there was no choice except the gas chamber for the Jews who were in the hands of the Nazis, one can hardly state that the Arabs who did leave would have been systematically exterminated if they had remained. It is interesting to note the fact that Israel has not mistreated its 300,000 Arab citizens who probably have the highest standard of living that Arabs enjoy anywhere.

Granted that there is a legitimate Arab nationalism, there exists at the same time a genuine Jewish nationalism. Both must be recognized by each other. As long as an Arab nationalism has as its aim the destruction of the almost twenty year old state of Israel there will be no peace and justice for both Jews and Arabs in the Middle East. I too consider the plight of the Arab refugees a deep human tragedy, but I also would consider the extermination of the state of Israel at least an equally profound catastrophe. That is why I would agree that resolution of the refugee problem is a matter that must be taken up seriously as a part of direct negotiation between Israel and the Arab states which would lead hopefully to a permanent peace settlement.

Sincerely yours,
Rabbi Howard Rabinowitz
Director, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation

Miss Peters Explains Her WRC Stand

To The Editor:

I would like to comment on the implications resulting from the misrepresentation of what I said at WRC, Tuesday night, December 12. (Editorial: "Women's Closing Hours: Why They're Important?"). First, let me say that I am not against any specific rule change, such as doing away with senior women's closing hours. My comments were taken out of the context of what I said, and, consequently, the essence of my meaning was totally misrepresented. Perhaps if the editor had been present to hear my remarks in their entirety, he would not have misconstrued my meaning.

What I am against is a prospective policy change based largely on a liberal point of view without taking into consideration the views of the administration or those of a more conservative nature. I stated that I was not representing Kappa Delta sorority in my remarks. I was simply presenting a point of view I thought that the Council ought to take into consideration in discussing this important issue.

Although there has been an abundance of clichés about personal responsibility

and freedom, there have been few substantial reasons for doing away with senior women's closing hours and few confrontations with other points of view to test the validity of this liberal stand.

Doing away with senior hours just because UNC-G or other universities have; just because this seems inevitable; or just because of personal dislike of this rule are not adequate reasons for doing so. Rather, the long-term effectiveness of the rules of all the units of authority from the family on up should be taken into consideration in relation to the total scheme of things. For it is in the small, transitional units of our experiences that we internalize the values and beliefs with which we view the largest units of which we are a part, such as our government.

History has shown us that the wisdom of a particular decision to change a policy has often been faulty by not openly confronting one point of view with others; by not viewing both the positive and negative effects of such a change in order to predict the value of this change not only with respect to those who will be directly affected in the present, but also to those in the future.

Furthermore, the value of tradition lies in the fact that throughout time in decision-making, one point of view has been confronted with others. This process has usually resulted in new ideas and policies founded on reason and sound judgment. We should consider these ideas in formulating our policy concerning senior women's hours.

I challenge each girl to take all viewpoints into consideration and to decide for herself the stand she should take on this major issue. Then, the final vote will reflect thoughtful consideration and the final policy, sound and wise judgment.

I invite anyone who has an opinion on this issue to come to WRC on Tuesday, January 9.

Sincerely,
Carol Anne Peters
Women's Residence Council

Another Reply To Mr. Byerly

To The Editor:

I wish to reply to Professor Byerly's letter (Dec. 13) because I think discussion of the issue of responsibility to one's country may be the most positive effect of the anti-draft movement. Professor Byerly seems to assume that responsibility to one's country means the obligation to accept the leadership of the President and Congress if they speak for the will of the majority and to follow the edicts of duly constituted authority.

I think we need to ask, "What is the reason we follow the authority of this government and not another?" The usual reason, unfortunately, is that we were born in this country and accept it as our homeland. Another, perhaps more mature, reason is that we believe in the ends of the society which the government represents and thus accept authority as a satisfactory means by which the ends of the society can be achieved.

Societies as large as nations tend to have two categories of ends, immediate political and social ends both explicit and implicit and essential or long-range ends. Often the two conflict; sight of the immediate goal (e.g., McCarthy's ideal of an America free of communism) blinds the nation to its more fundamental purposes (the right to freedom of thought and expression). Often even the majority opts for the immediate goal. When this happens, true responsibility to one's country becomes the courage and insight to perceive and defend the essential purpose of the society.

With specific reference to the draft law, we must distinguish the short-term goal—victory in Viet Nam—from the long range goals—defense of the fundamental nature of American society and the establishment of a world-wide peace. On each count, some modification (perhaps not elimination, though coherent arguments for elimination can be raised) of the draft law is necessary.

The provisions of the current draft law (made more, not less restrictive in June, 1967) allow a man to follow the dictates of his conscience and abstain from making war only if he is opposed to all war and if that opposition is the result of religious training. The law denies freedom of conscience to the many in 1967 who do not accept religious values but base their decisions on philosophical definitions of man's nature cannot, in the light of scientific discoveries and philosophical refinements, accept any absolute laws of action but prefer to decide about a specific situation on the merits of that situation seen in relation to one's system of values. But because they see no eternal and omniscient god, they find it difficult to accept absolute statements of value. I understand freedom to mean the opportunity society gives the individual to determine his mode of action in a particular situation, a determination that is usually the result of relating the conflicting demands of the situation to some general system of values. Responsibility to America, then, means trying to make America redefining her central commitment to freedom of conscience in terms of contemporary realities.

Charles Altieri
203 Bingham

