

The Daily Tar Heel

75 Years of Editorial Freedom

Bill Amlong, Editor
Don Walton, Business Manager



Pamela Hawkins, Associate Editor
Fred Huebner, Managing Editor
Wayne Hurder, News Editor
June Orr, Assistant News Editor

America's Present Crisis: No Time For Factions

There come times when an entire nation—for the sake of its survival—must stand united behind its leaders.

Such a time may be approaching all too rapidly as tensions build and taunts increase along the 38th Parallel in Korea.

And it doesn't matter a big lot, either, that the nation involved is presently embroiled in a totally unjustified war in another part of the world, or that its leader is Lyndon Baines Johnson, a man who many are sincerely loathe to follow.

The questions of both America's Viet Nam posture and of the political and personal unsavoriness of President Johnson must be overridden by the threat of the United States' locking horns—for real—with Communist bloc nations in a struggle that began with the piracy of an American naval vessel and may escalate to the point of all out war.

And this is one that the U. S. didn't start.



President Johnson
... sane, firm policy

Presently, negotiations are stalled in the United Nations, where diplomats have been unsuccessful so far in trying to thrash out the conflict—so armies won't have to.

SHOULD THESE negotiations fail completely, however, and the United States be brought to the brink of either a second armed conflict in Korea, or an all-out World War, it will be time for it to clench its fist and strike back at Communist aggressors—as it prepared to do in the Cuban Crisis.

It will be no time, though, for dissent against American foreign policy to continue in the vein of disruptive militancy that has lately come to be the trademark of many anti-war protests on college campuses and at draft induction centers throughout the country.

This does not mean that an outside threat should stifle all debate inside the United States, but only that the debate should be conducted from a different forum than that of the street blockade.

INDEED, THE United States' becoming involved in a second major conflict—this one, as noted, justified—would be another in the series of compelling reasons why this nation should abandon its shaky and unpopular stance in Viet Nam.

Any nation has only so many resources, and—as has been pointed out—the United States has been wasting a great many of those resources to fight the war in Viet Nam. Because of that conflict's cost, for example, funds have been diverted from fighting the acute poverty which is festering in urban ghettos and has been cited as the cause for many violent racial disturbances.

It has been easier, however, for politicians to shrug off their neglect of the War on Poverty and to point to "the Red Menace" in Viet Nam, than it will be for those same politicians to shrug off the fact that the United States is simply incapable of continuing to do battle with an imaginary Yellow Peril on one front, while having to contend with a very real one on another.

AND SO FAR, there's been no strong objection to the United States' standing up to North Korea, demanding both the return of the Pueblo and her crew and a cessation of border hostilities, and threatening to back up those demands with the strength of this nation's Armed Forces.

Indeed, Congressman L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said on television Sunday night that America should use nuclear weaponry to "destroy North Korea."

This line of thinking—and spouting—seems to go a bit too far. While it is to be expected that such bellicose loudmouths as Rivers, Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi and Sen. Russel Long of Louisiana would be pouring out such thoughts for the consumption of their constituents—it is to be hoped that a bit saner policy will govern America's handling of this crisis.

AND SUCH A sane policy—as has been put forth so far in this crisis—is in the hands of President Johnson. For it is the President alone who controls the Armed Forces; the Constitutional power of Congress to declare war is really more or less an academic question these days, since buttons can be pressed and even troops deployed far quicker than Congress can gather a quorum.



Congressman Rivers
... 'destroy North Korea'

Hopefully, this nation will stand united behind a President who will issue a firm but sane policy—such as the one Johnson has so far maintained in the Korean crisis.

For if the majority of Americans deviates too far either way—seizing this as an opportunity to attempt either a right wing or left wing domination of U. S. foreign and military policies—then the United States is going to be in very sad shape.

Such a time as this is simply not one for factionalism to flourish.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters for publication provided they are typed, double-spaced and signed. Letters should be no longer than 300 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for libelous statements.

Pamela Hawkins

Exams Build Up Trivia Reference

January, that godforsaken month, is almost over. January of the exams and the registration is with us only one day longer.

All that is left of exams are the sheets of yellow paper with letters arranged in neat rows posted outside instructors' doors—little columns with lots of C's, an occasional B and several D's. A very nice curve, if that's the way you figure it.

Maybe it's too late to think about exams, but then again, maybe it is just early enough. A few gripes in the future tense (like for May) might just prompt some changes.

It seems such a waste of time, money, sleep and notebook paper to escape a course with a breathe-easy "C" and not have learned anything in the passing except a conglomeration of dates which are forgotten as soon as the blue book is closed (and sometimes before.)

There are a lot of courses like that it seems. They're not hard to recognize. Only thing is, drop-add is usually over by the time the symptoms show up. Usually there's a pop quiz in the first two weeks with the answers buried somewhere in the footnotes. That's the warning.

Then comes the first quiz. You know the routine, it's a broad subject like sociology. Being of medium intelligence, you figure the quiz will be essay questions concentrating on the general trends and the overview. That's what you study, and that's where you're WRONG.

Somehow or other, the charts that you glanced at, and the dates that you got a general idea of are the meat of the quiz. So you rock on out after the first hourly

with an F. You got two more to go, so you don't sweat it.

Second quiz rolls around—At least you know what's coming this time. Cram for the minute details.

Now 500 pages of charts and percentages and dates and studies and names is one heck of a lot to keep straight. You start a week in advance with the intensive study bit—and by quiz class hour you've cut all your other classes that day and your head is a whirlpool of numbers—but you think you know the stuff.

If you're lucky, you remember enough figures to squeak out a "C", if not, you're really hurtin' for the final quiz and exam. And so goes the course.

So goes the course into a lot of fuel for a trivia game. But then, trivia is only good over a beer or on a TV quiz show. It isn't much to show for a semester's work.

That's the way, so many times so much emphasis is put on the "centsy" that the broader concepts, the ones that matter in the long run, are smothered. That's the real pity of exams. There's only so much time to spend on a course and if it has to be spent memorizing charts—well, you can always use it playing trivia, unless your opponent had the same course.

And the grades on exams are so arbitrary.

Once there was a professor who told a graduating senior that he would get a B in the course if he got a B on the final exam. It so happens that this student missed the B grade by one point and con-

sequently was given a D in the course. Since the student particularly needed this B to graduate, one point cost him another semester. One point meant the difference between getting the job that was lined up to begin in February and sticking around to take one more course.

Then in the classroom next door, a prof gives away A's because he likes the way your hair is cut.

Fair?

Of course not. But then that's the way the grade game is played.

Exams make grades, and grades make graduation, and graduation makes a job opportunities. And that's the circle, like it or not.

Then we go through registration, hoping that the courses will be different this

time. Hoping that overall significance of a subject will overshadow the dates and the percentages.

The courses should be worth something after waiting for hours to get into them.

The professors should be worth something if they are teaching at a place like Carolina.

And the grades should be worth something if so much depends on them.

It all should be worth something more than the tuition money.

But sometimes after the exams are over, and the books are being traded in at the Intimate for cash to finance the next semester's books, you pause, and wonder—what is it all worth? Only a head chocked full of trivia?

Maybe.

Supermarket ABC's

THE CHAPEL HILL WEEKLY

The State ABC Board, in what must be ranked as an outburst of progress, has given its sanction to self-service liquor stores.

For all the convenience and ease that this innovation promises, anyone who has been in, say, a self-service supermarket can readily see that the new system is fraught with uncertainties.

In the local A & P, for instance, it is commonplace to see a housewife pop a grape into her mouth, a surreptitious taste test, before buying a bunch. We have also seen shoppers sampling apples, bananas, pears, plums, nuts and kumquats before making their selections.

It is probably not a usual thing, but we saw one young fellow stand in the aisle at the A & P and eat three bars of candy before finally deciding which kind he wanted to buy.

Shopping habits, once established, are pretty hard to change, and there's no reason to suspect that customers will perform differently in the ABC than they do in the A & P.

We can see it now. A young housewife strolls up to the gin, pops the top off a bottle, takes a sip, rolls it around on her tongue and murmurs, "No, I don't think so." Then on to the bourbon, the scotch, the rye, vodka, right on down to County Fair and Singing Sam.

By then she wouldn't need to buy anything, even if she happened to remember what she came in for. Another sale down the drain. Good luck, State ABC Board.

George Bagrash
Research Director
American Council
for Judaism

Letters To The Editor

Israeli Arabs Defended

To The Editor:

Eugene Sarver's views on the Middle East, expressed in a recent issue of The Daily Tar Heel, are at sharp variance with those of a significant number of competent analysts of the international problem. The reason is obvious. Mr. Sarver has not yet emerged from the dense fog of Zionist propaganda.

When the new State of Israel was established, a great mass of the Palestinian Arabs never took up arms against Israel or rendered aid to the foreign Arab states who went to war with Israel. On October 13, 1947, the American Zionist Emergency Council purchased a full-page advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune. Among other things, the "ad" proclaimed: "In Palestine itself no more than 3,000 Arabs participated in anti-Jewish riots at any time in the past."

At that time the Arab population in Palestine was, roughly, 1,380,000. The Zionist leaders in Palestine exploited the attack by the foreign Arab states to run the Palestine Arabs off their land by a series of laws and measures enacted in 1948 and continued up to well into the '50s. The 40 per cent of the Arab population in the partitioned area was reduced to 10 per cent in the new State of Israel. Large tracts of Arab-owned land were expropriated by "legal" means. By 1964, over one-third of the Jewish population then in Israel was settled on land that had been taken from the Arabs.

The Zionist myth that the Palestinian Arabs left at the behest of foreign Arab invaders in a big lie. There was a war and the native Arabs had no desire to get in the way of either Arab or Zionist bullets.

The conscience of humanity, and this includes a significant number of distinguished Jews who are citizens of Israel, will not condone Mr. Sarver's cavalier whitewash of the massacre at Deir Yassin. The people of this Arab village were known to be friendly to the Jews. There were no arms in this village. It was sacked by the Irgun for purely terroristic purposes. Two hundred and fifty unarmed men, women and children lost

their lives. The Irgun was eventually welcomed by the Zionist-official Haganah in a new pact of collaboration. Deir Yassin was only one of many such infamous acts of murder.

Mr. Sarver's explanation of Israel's treatment of her Arab minority does not accommodate the facts. Writing in the New York Post on January 16, 1966, Drew Pearson—a consistent friend of Israel—said: "Meanwhile, many Jews inside Israel told me very frankly that their government had been remiss in not improving the lot of the Israeli Arabs. They maintained that the military rule for Arabs... was unnecessary and that one motive was to facilitate the confiscation of Arab land inside Israel. These are some of the inequities which many Jewish citizens of Israel protest but which are still in force."

Lipsitz's Views Arrogant

To The Editor:

Professor Lewis Lipsitz's views (Letters-January 7, 1968) that the worst thing that can happen in Vietnam is a U. S. victory, and his assertion that the persons not agreeing with him are automatically being ruled by tribal passions are quite remarkable. They are remarkable in their arrogance and distrust of the United States.

The arrogance is almost of an unbelievable degree. It assumes that he, himself, is completely logical, but that if someone disagrees with him, they are to a degree psychotic. If the persons disagreeing with him are psychotic, it is fairly certain, at least, that their problem is not one of having "delusions of grandeur."

The distrust of the United States is found in the idea that if the Vietnam War is settled to the United States' satisfaction, the U. S. will begin running all over the world, interfering with other coun-

tries, and, by implication, fighting everyone who disagrees with it. Apparently, the reason Mr. Lipsitz thinks this is because the U. S. will then know it is the pre-eminent military power and will know nothing can stop it.

Mr. Lipsitz do you realize that the United States has been, and has known itself to be, the pre-eminent military power in the world for most of this century? In 1945, we had such awesome power in relation to the rest of the world, that in different hands, that power would have been used to conquer the world. That power was not used; but I truly believe, in my tribal way, that there have been few countries or civilizations that, in the same situation, would not have used it.

The U. S. has intervened repeatedly. The historical fact is that the U. S. has also withdrawn as soon as practical from its interventions. And, what is also a fact, most of the time when the U. S.

withdraws, it leaves behind a country with a working democratic form of government and a sound economic base. It is no accident that Japan and West Germany are the third and fourth economic powers in the world. We intervened, and we occupied, but we didn't rape. It is also no accident that South Korea is now self-sufficient in fertilizer, and in a few years will be self-sufficient in food.

I will not disagree with Mr. Lipsitz that the U. S. has made plenty of mistakes. It appears more and more evident, that at least in tactics, the war in Vietnam is one of them. I cannot agree, however, that a victory in Vietnam will change the U. S.'s attitudes, and that in some inexplicable way the citizens of this country will elect capricious mischief-makers to office. For about a third of our history as a nation we have been the pre-eminent military power, we have intervened, we have won military victories, and we have presently withdrawn.

But, of course, since I disagree with Professor Lipsitz, I am looking at this from a tribal outlook—meaning my view of the world is warped and I am psychotic. But, even knowing I must be psychotic, I am still unable to think logically enough to extrapolate the future without paying attention to the past. Possibly Mr. Lipsitz can teach me this trick. Everyone will have to admit that his method of prediction is some sort of breakthrough. Pure logic apparently can work wonders.

Michael D. Lea
Law School



The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Mondays, examinations periods and vacations. Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news-933-1011; business, circulation, advertising-933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.

Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C.

Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.