

continued from page 4

and let everyone else deal with politics? Does Mr. McLean not wonder what the coalition was so afraid of when the chair announced that there could be no discussion of its past activities?

And most important, while Jim McLean thinks we were "correct—to be sure (!) in emphasizing that unemployment is a necessary feature of a capitalist economy", he obviously thinks this should only be pointed out in private, but never (God forbid!) as a guide to action in the workers movement! That's dogmatic, right Jim? Well then, perhaps he can explain to us dogmatists just how the struggle to overthrow capitalism will begin if Marxism Leninism is not linked to the immediate struggles of the workers. Or just how the working class will create its own communist party or strengthen its capacity to fight back the state's present political attack as long as it led by sell-outs who call for idealist demands like "full employment" while dividing the workers from Quebec and English Canada, while building up the Canadian State's defense industry, while calling to "transfer" (we call it stealing) jobs from Ontario workers to the Maritimes, and while comforting the ruling class by promising that we'll keep our demands "reasonable"? If he's really worried about "politically conservative trade unionists", he should have tried those up on the stage for starters, and called them reactionary for accuracy.

Get serious, Jim McLean! Try honestly answering these questions and figuring out just who and what

is truly dividing the workers of this country, if not the "self-styled" protectors of the working class who are afraid of the workers' capacity to think for themselves, learning both from theory and their own experiences.

And last but not least Jim—what is more divisive? Analysis, facts, and open struggle? Or lies, anti-communism, and demagoguery?

**IN STRUGGLE!
HALIFAX**

For anyone who is interested in our analysis of the Unemployment Coalition, you may obtain a copy by writing to: IN STRUGGLE!, P.O. Box 7099, Halifax North Postal Station, Halifax.

The debate continues

To the Gazette:

In reply to Dr. Muhtadie's letter to the *Gazette*, I believe that the author has misled his readers by some inaccurate facts and by deleting some important details. Firstly, Palestinians have constantly blamed Israelis for taking land from its rightful owners. What happened, Dr. Muhtadie, between 1948 to 1967, when Jordan and Egypt occupied your Palestinian homeland? Why did Palestinians then not suggest that Arab countries were occupying their land and that Palestinians wanted a state?

Secondly, what gives you the right to state that the Palestinian affinity for this land is stronger than Jewish attachment? Jews, like Arabs, have always lived in Palestine. The reason the Arabs constituted a larger population than Jews, in this area was that Jews

were forcibly evicted from Palestine and were not permitted re-entry. From a Biblical viewpoint, God promised the Jews a homeland in this area. I am not stating that the Jews have any more right to this land than do the Palestinians, but please do not suggest that your people have more.

Thirdly, placing the total blame for the plight of the Palestinians on the Israelis is wrong. Thousands of Palestinians voluntarily left their homes in 1948 by request of the neighboring Arab countries, so that these Arab countries could destroy the Jewish state. Both you and I know that Palestinians have been used as political pawns by Arab countries. Palestinians have remained in Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon in Palestinian camps since 1949, and these Arab countries have not contributed to improvement in Palestinian livelihood. In Israel, Palestinians have been incorporated into Israeli society, working in Israel and participating in Israel's parliament. Where would you then suggest discrimination lies, in neighbouring Arab countries or in Israel?

Fourthly, you stated that Palestinians have expressed their willingness to live in peace with Israel when your people were offered a state in 1947 by the United Nations. In addition, I am baffled as to where such Palestinian peace requests have come from. If these requests emanate from the P.L.O. or the P.F.L.P., they are not requests for peace since both of these terrorist groups are set on the destruction of Israel.

The most important idea I believe is when and how a Palestinian homeland should be created. Before any state can be established, factors of security and geography must be considered. Prime Minister Begin is no fool when he suggests that a Palestinian state, under the present political situation in the Middle East, would be a grave security risk for Israel. Looking at Israeli geography prior to 1967, Israel was 10 miles at its widest point; tanks travelling 60 miles an hour would have no problem cutting Israel in half. It would take a plane to cover the pre-1967 Israel in less than one minute. Do you call one minute

security for Israelis with Arab countries surrounding you armed and ready to fight?

What have Palestinians done to deserve their state? They have not entered into peace negotiations, with repeated requests for such participation coming from President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin, and Palestinians have supported Yassir Arafat and his band of murderers. How do you expect Mr. Begin to relent on the West Bank and Gaza Strip if the P.L.O., who represent the Palestinians, continue to throw bombs into markets and kill schoolchildren? What would a P.L.O. run state do if it were created next door to Israel? Bombs in an open market would be nothing to what could then be accomplished.

This is not to say a Palestinian state should not be created. I feel that Palestinians should have a homeland, just as Israelis, Egyptians, and Canadians have their own. If Palestinians would forget terrorism and try diplomacy, then that's a start. Israel has suggested self-autonomy for Palestinians on the West Bank. Granted this is not what Palestinians want, but it is a start, a chance for a new beginning.

Jews did not gain statehood overnight. It took over fifty years for political Zionism to mold Israel into existence. Palestinian Jews were represented by the Jewish Agency, an Agency committed to a peaceful solution. Terrorist groups like the Irgun and the Stern Gang represented a small minority of Jews. The P.L.O. does not represent a small minority of Palestinians. The P.L.O., a terrorist organization responsible for maiming innocent men, women, and children has become the national spokesman for the Palestinian people. Only by exercising the option of non-violence and no terrorism can a peaceful solution be brought to the Middle East, a solution including a Palestinian state. If Palestinians implemented this alternative, I would then see your struggle for a homeland as a just cause.

Yours sincerely,

Irwin Hirsch

JOURNALIST NEEDED

**Atlantic Region Canadian University Press
A Regional Staffperson**

For: the Atlantic Regional office of Canadian University Press, located in Halifax.

Job Requirements:

the applicant: must be able to type
must have experience in reporting on student related issues.

Job Description:

originating regional news and features;
acting as a resource person for the region's campus newspapers;
maintaining a news exchange with the rest of CUP;
possibility of travelling during the first two months of the job to offer assistance to the region's papers and for news coverage;
the applicant must abide by the CUP code of ethics for member papers and their employees.

—job description subject to minor changes.

Duration of Employment and Salary: third week of August 1978, until the end of March, 1979. \$180 per week, with cost of living increases quarterly, and a full medical and dental plan.

Applicants are encouraged to submit clippings portfolio with their resumes.

French is an asset but not a necessity.

Applications must be received by February 20, 1978. Screenings will take place at the Spring Regional Conference of the Atlantic Region Canadian University Press, in Sackville, New Brunswick, the weekend of February 25, with the voting by representatives of Atlantic papers to take place at that time.

Mail enquiries and applications to:

Valerie Mansour, ARCUP President,
c/o Dalhousie Gazette,
Dalhousie University,
Halifax, N.S.
B3H 4J2

Councillors to vote on Quebec question

Dalhousie student representatives will be among students at member campuses of the National Union of Students who will vote in late February on the organization's future relations with the Quebec student association.

Students will also be polled on Quebec's right to self-determination in a mail vote mandated by the most recent NUS conference in Calgary in October.

Robert Sampson, Dalhousie Student Council President said that the Dalhousie council would be considering the matter at their next meeting. He plans to distribute literature recently received from the NUS central office in Ottawa, so that all council members will be informed of the issue.

The NUS central committee released a document January 11 outlining the position adopted by a working group at that conference, which recommends that NUS recognize the Association Nationale des Etudiants du Quebec (ANEQ), as an equal, autonomous national student organization in a "bi-national Canada."

The central committee at its December 10 meeting in Ottawa

defined "the two nations of Canada" as Quebec, and the rest of Canada outside Quebec. According to the NUS discussion paper, ANEQ hopes to build relations with NUS on this principle.

ANEQ, at its October congress, decided to recognize the right of Quebec to become a sovereign state and officially opposed any interference in Quebec's self-determination. The organization will not take a position with regard to the national question because it sees itself as a "syndical rather than political" grouping, and because "it counts among its members some who oppose independence."

Both motions regarding NUS's relations with ANEQ and the right of self-determination for Quebec were defeated at a Students Administrative Council (SAC) meeting at the University of Toronto in early December.

SAC recommended that NUS seek an "associate" status with ANEQ, possibly under a joint executive committee. The U of T student group also urged that NUS not support any fragmentation of Canada as a sovereign state.