



Letters

Keep the faith

I would like to extend my deep, sincere thanks to the several hundred people who help in my recent legislative campaign. Additionally, I would like to thank the Emerald for their endorsement in this race.

Even though we did not obtain a majority, I do believe we successfully expressed a concern for our state's future and our quality of life. I believed deeply in the principles and issues which I tried to enunciate, and the 45 per cent I received should be gratifying to us. I carried the University and West Eugene Areas substantially, losing to my opponent in the strongly Republican suburban precincts north of the Willamette.

The high-spending campaign of the opposition was bankrolled by some of the more selfish interests in Oregon. These included banking interests, developers, Pacific Power and Light executives, auto dealers and lumber interest power brokers. We can safely assume our spending of \$4,500 was countered with \$7,500 by the opposition. Despite her public claims that she would try to hold her spending close to the \$5,000 level, Representative Burrows' spending leaped 50 per cent from the 1974 campaign.

After such an experience as this, or the defeat of the Nuclear Safeguards Act (Ballot Measure No. 9) it is easy to abandon faith in our democracy. Carl Jung effectively described alienation as when "individual man knows that as an individual being he is more or less meaningless and feels himself a victim of uncontrollable forces..."

I reject, as Jung did, this attitude. As individuals we can effect change. I urge you to be involved, as I plan to be involved, because this is what can improve our lives. Remember that our involvement need not be confined to electoral politics, which, like all things, are limited in scope. Our most important task is to build a society where we care about each other. It happens every day — not just at the ballot box.

John Stewart
Democratic Legislative
Candidate, District 41

National or Arab?

In response to Mr. Effarah's letter of Dec. 3, 1976, I am gratified to know that my statement questioning whether mid-east Christ-

ians and Jews consider themselves to be Arabs was the only part of my long editorial which he felt moved to refute. I concede the point that some Lebanese Christians do consider themselves Arabs, but the second half of my proposition concerning Jews still stands. It remains unclear that Jews can be subsumed under the label Arabs. In any case my partly erroneous statement was peripheral to my overall argument, which criticized fuzzy thinking and unmotivated rhetoric.

Ironically, Mr. Effarah exemplifies nicely just such a posture. Notice that (within the confines of one sentence!) "Arab revolutionary movements" are co-referenced as "such national movements". The "movements" are either national or Arab in scope, but not both. Or can it be that "the movements" are national and international, overcoming the semantics of the (oppressive) English language in one great dialectic leap?

There are real questions which are glossed over in Mr. Effarah's letter. In what sense do the 15 million mid-east Christians constitute the source of leadership for Arab revolutionary movements? To which Arab revolutionary movements does Mr. Effarah refer? Who among the 15 million Christians support which movements? I invite my adversary to explain, rather than generalize about these issues he has raised.

Mr. Effarah regrets that he cannot present the facts now. I join him wholeheartedly in this regret. His provocative challenge to debate publicly overlooks the fact that we are already engaged in just such a debate. If he hopes to improve the image of the cause he supports, it will not come through partisan generalization, but rather through a convincing presentation of facts and clear thinking.

Thomas E. Lengyel
Visiting Ass't Professor
Anthropology

Confused rhetoric

Who writes your editorials? The editorial in your Nov. 19 issue ("Class War in Lebanon") appears to have been written by the same hand that produced the statement labeled "opinion" (same issue, same page) and signed (collectively?) by the "Organization of Arab Students."

However, I am more fascinated by the editorial and for obvious reasons.

It contains a mixture of Marxist phrases and Arab nationalist symbols — a melange which originally seemed strange but to which one has become quite accustomed by now and should know by rote. The left wing of the "Labor Zionists" were, believe it or not, the originators of that particular (socialism-nationalism) linguistic mix.

The editorial tells us that the "leftist front" is nothing less than a "broad-based force" (love those words!) of "working class Lebanese and peasant Moslems, Jews and Christians." This should take care of the available religious spectrum but since it is a "class war" why were members of the "New Intelligentsia" (presumably of working class and peasant background) excluded from the "broad base"? But then this "front," we are informed, is led ("At the forefront of the struggle...") by the "Palestinian people," without class distinction whatever. Are Palestinians working class and peasant merely by being Palestinians? What has happened to the Palestinian bourgeoisie whose sons and daughters attend Western universities and constitute the core of the "intelligentsia" and the civil service in so many Arab countries? Do they count for nothing in that "broad base" or have they ceased to be Palestinians? Or, did they perhaps join the "vanguard" (another good word used by our editorialist) of the counter-revolution — the united front of the United States, "Arab and Zionist reactionaries" intent upon thwarting the "aspirations of the Arab masses"?

We all know the question "What did you do for me lately?" A variant of this is the attitude that "if you are not with me on all things

then you are not with me, period." Three years ago Sadat was the "valiant" son of the downtrodden masses; today he is, of course, a running dog of imperialism. Only a year ago Assad, an on-and-off friend of Sadat, was the standard bearer of Arab hopes and aspirations — now the editorial refers to him and his troops as "U.S.-backed Syrian invaders." Who is a friend and who a foe? Curiously, the editorial (and accompanying "opinion") neglects to tell us that these "U.S.-backed invaders" rolled into Beirut atop Soviet tanks. In fact, the Soviet role in all of this is not once mentioned in the editorial (or in the "opinion") which appears to take off after everybody else.

And to top it all off, for good measure, the editorialist admonishes us that "As members of an institution of higher learning we must look at the world critically." Right on, brother. Where did you

fail and why? Weak on Marx, the writer of that editorial knew enough to paraphrase the Master (did he read him as well?): Whereas Marx told us that it is not enough to describe the world, one must also try to change it, our editor (more ambitiously) is not satisfied with mere description but he wants understanding (of "the world" no less) as well as change. Quite a task! But how can one understand what he does not see and cannot correctly describe?

In the eternal debate as to whether half a loaf is preferable to no loaf at all, there was always the temptation to hold out for the promised pie of the future. The dilemma is easier to resolve in the face of all these half-baked sample crumbs which are thrown to us with monotonous regularity.

Joseph R. Fiszman
Professor, Political Science

BUT FOR THE
BLACKS
I WOULD NOT
BE PRESIDENT.



BUT FOR POOR
SOUTHERN
WHITES
I WOULD NOT
BE PRESIDENT



BUT FOR LABOR
I WOULD NOT
BE PRESIDENT



THE ONLY GROUP
I DON'T OWE MY
VICTORY TO IS
THE MIDDLE CLASS.



THEY VOTED OVER-
WHELMINGLY
AGAINST
ME.



I'VE GOTTA
WOO
THEM

