

Stop complaining

A standard complaint from the Undergraduate Student Government has always been that the administration never listens to students and never involves them in any decisions.

The most current complaint is that the administration does not care whether students want the term system changed and will do exactly what the administration pleases about it.

Actually, though, the administration should be complaining about the students. The administration actually does try to get students' opinions. For example, administrators made sure there were students on the Calendar Commission. They have tried to involve students and get their ideas through groups such

as the University Advisory Board, the University Council and the University Hearing Board.

But it is difficult to get that involvement and those views when no one or too few students are appointed to positions in those groups.

Since last spring USG President George Cernusca has failed to appoint two students to the University Council. He appointed only 10 students instead of 15 to the University Hearing Board and only one student instead of two to the University Appeals Board.

One result of this neglect of duty has been that, while the University Council considered such issues as faculty and student roles in University governance and the Buckley Amendment, only one undergraduate spoke for the other 30,000. That student's term on the Council officially expired June 30, but at the

request of the administration he kindly agreed to serve until he graduated last term. Now, two terms too late, Cernusca is searching for two replacements.

University President John W. Oswald has indicated that he will seek the University Council's recommendations on the calendar system. Even if Cernusca can manage to fill the two vacancies by that time, it is a shame that two new, inexperienced representatives who have not yet established means of obtaining a wide spectrum of student opinion will be faced immediately with that important issue.

The USG must immediately take some time out from complaining and playing politics to make sure students are not denied their rightful involvement in administrative decision-making and the disciplinary system any longer.

First Amendment gives free speech to everyone

By JIM MAGILL
of the Collegian Staff

I must protest against the Minority Veterans Organization President's suggestion that the student responsible for the distribution of Ku Klux Klan cards be expelled and against any more punitive action taken against him.

However reprehensible I may consider this person's actions to be, it is clear to me that he was within his rights under the First Amendment to distribute his views to the public.

In the open letter to University President John W. Oswald, several members of the Minority Veterans Organization said they felt those responsible for circulating the cards had escaped "the severe disciplinary consequences which the offense justly deserved."

Such disciplinary consequences would set a dangerous precedent for anyone who wanted to distribute unpopular and "inflammatory" opinions on campus.

If a student were put on probation for the distribution of leftist materials, every

moderate to far left organization on campus, from the Undergraduate Student Government to the Young Socialists Alliance, would be up in arms protesting the University's violation of his constitutional rights.

If black students had been sent cards saying "Hate white? Join the Penn State chapter of the Black Muslims," would the Minority Veterans Organization demand the expulsion of the perpetrators of the act?

The theory behind a free flow of information in a democracy is that the public must be exposed to all kinds of opinion in order to be able to make intelligent choices. Included in the rights granted under the First Amendment are the right to wear white sheets and burn crosses as well as the right to wear the beret of the Black Panthers and call policemen pigs.

The First Amendment protects Huey Newton and George Wallace. Whenever one group regards freedom as its own personal privilege, the whole concept suffers.

Wanted: better leaders

By PAT SOKAS
of the Collegian Staff

With all our other problems, which include just about every economic woe imaginable, Americans are now being forced to worry about the capabilities of the men running the federal government.

The current difficulties started about a month ago, when the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, Gen. George S. Brown, commented on the "unbelievable influence" of Jews in America. "Just look where the Jewish money is," opined the esteemed general. "They own the banks."

The irritation with the general's lesson in economics had barely subsided when Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz decided to enter the entertainment business. In reference to the Pope and birth control, the cabinet officer said in a mock Italian accent he no play-a da game, he no make-a da rules. Presumably he expected to leave reporters rolling in the aisles. Evidently Catholics have too much invested in gold candlesticks to own all the banks.

The President himself, while not yet

given to ethnic slurs, has hardly become an inspiring figure. New York Magazine devoted the cover of its Nov. 25 issue to a headline reading "Ladies and Gentlemen, The President of the United States." Below the headline was a photograph of Bozo the Clown, which is the name members of the White House Press Corps have given to the new President.

Moreover, competent men do not seem to last very long in Washington. Nixon's Saturday Night Massacre was only one outstanding example of that sort of bloodletting. In a recent mini-massacre, Ford disposed of Energy Administrator John Sawhill, for the high crime of suggesting a gasoline tax, which just about everyone but the President agrees is necessary.

Still, Ford is astonishingly reluctant to get rid of the people who most deserve to be gotten rid of — most notably the entire Nixon cabinet, which Ford has inexplicably decided to retain. Under similar conditions, Harry Truman wasted no time in selecting a new Cabinet, and Lyndon Johnson made a gradual but

sweeping change over

Ford, by contrast, seems to have made no plans for replacing the Nixon holdovers. Holding on to the Cabinet of a discredited President is neither good politics nor good sense.

The future is only a little brighter. There will be almost 100 new faces in Congress next session, a change which promises to produce a more active legislative branch. The new activism of the Congress is already visible in a rash of overridden vetoes. Such harsh treatment from the legislature might even force the President to shuffle some efficiency and common sense into the upper echelons of the federal bureaucracy.

After all, there is little danger of throwing the good out with the bad. Were Ford's new broom to make a belated clean sweep, little could be lost.

The new President must realize that he can never gain wide popular support or efficient government with holdovers from the old Administration. The sooner the old faces are gone, the better for everyone.



Letters to the Editor

Don't generalize

TO THE EDITOR: James Cory's article on racism, "Please Go to Boston," may have been well-intended under all the sarcasm, but one of the statements he made makes him as bigoted and racist as the Bostonians he so readily criticized. "The hypocrite fabric of Irish-Catholic morality" is as bad a generalization as saying that all Blacks are criminals who do nothing but burn and attack.

The situation extant in south Boston is certainly deplorable, but prejudice against Blacks is not the only type of racism prevalent today. As Tom Lehrer states in his song "National Brotherhood Week," a particularly apt comment on racism, "the Protestants hate the Catholics, and the Catholics hate the Protestants, and the Hindus hate the Moslems, and everybody hates the Jews." Again, it is a great generalization, but there is a ring of truth to it. Pennsylvania is a den of hypocrisy when it comes to religious prejudice. Jewish parents persecute their

daughter because she is in love with a non-Hebrew boy. A young Protestant man's very "devout" family members suddenly become very upset because he tells them he is planning to marry his Catholic girlfriend whom he has been dating for four years. The Catholic children of an inter-religion marriage are indoctrinated by the Church that they are better in the eyes of God than their non-Catholic friends. "Loving Christian spirit" motivates people to try to convert everyone they meet to their way of thinking and condemn everything else. A church in a small community is quick to point out "that nice Puerto-Rican family" in their membership.

Why must there be so many labels? Certainly religious differences as well as racial differences play important roles in close relationships, but continually pointing to these differences only worsens things. Yes, it sounds trite, but can't we all try to accept each other for what we are, with all our faults and merits, and live together as fellow human beings? It's certainly worth a try.

Jan Matthew
6th-journalism and theatre

the Collegian

DIANE M. NOTTLE
Editor

ROBERT MOFFETT
Business Manager

Successor to the Free Lance, est. 1887
Member of the Associated Press
Charter member of the Pennsylvania
Collegiate Media Association

Editorial policy is determined by the Editor.

Opinions expressed by the editors and staff of The Daily Collegian are not necessarily those of the University administration, faculty or students

Publisher's statement

The Daily Collegian is published by Collegian, Inc., a private, non-profit corporation which bears legal and financial responsibility for the newspaper. The Board of Directors of Collegian, Inc., is the controlling body of the corporation.

The Board is composed of three undergraduate students, one graduate student, three faculty members, two professional members, the editor and the business manager. The paper's adviser also serves as executive secretary to the Board, a non-voting position.

Have the media been fair or biased?

By JAMES M. CORY
of the Collegian Staff

The American news media has made every effort to feed rather than clear away the tremendous public confusion regarding matters of international political friction in the Middle East. It can indeed be confusing when thousands of Jews demonstrate in New York against Palestinian representation in the United Nations while, days later, thousands of Jews riot in the streets of Tel Aviv against the latest economic decrees of their government. When Palestinian organizations and individuals whom the American media has smeared and slandered with every conceivable derogatory term and classification are suddenly now hailed as heroes by a bloc consisting of a majority of the world's states. When recommendations of expulsion from the UN are being prepared against the peace-loving, pro-Western state of Israel. The fact of the matter is that, for whatever reasons, the American news media has for years been mounting a concerted and well-orchestrated journalistic hatchet-job against the Arab nations in general and the Palestinian people in particular.

A formidable Jewish political-military state apparatus has existed in Palestine since 1948. The creation of this entity was the essential historical goal of Zionism, the Jewish nationalist movement pioneered in the 19th century by Theodore Herzl. This state was imposed upon the Palestinian Arabs through imperialist intrigue and deceit as well as through well-organized Zionist terrorism.

In an effort to win the support of German Jews for the Allies during the First World War, the British government entered into negotiations with Dr. Chaim Weizmann's Zionist Federation. What resulted from these negotiations was the now infamous Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, in which the British government pledged itself to create in Palestine a "national home for the Jewish people." In 1922, when Britain was granted a mandate over Palestine, the population of that country was 92 per cent Arab and 8 per cent Jewish. Yet the terms of this mandate referred specifically only to Jews. The Arabs being referred to as "the existing non-Jewish communities." Thereafter, the Jewish Agency became a virtually autonomous government within Palestine, representing Jewish interests in matters such as immigration and the purchase and settlement of land.

What followed, naturally enough, was that Jewish immigration to Palestine tripled, from 10,000 to 30,000 a year so that by 1935, the Jewish proportion of the population had risen from 8 per cent to 30 per cent. Violent Arab reaction led the British government to create the Peel Commission in 1937. This subsequently recommended that Jewish immigration to Palestine be limited to 12,000 a year and, incredibly, that Palestine be partitioned into separate Jewish and Arab states. Had these recommendations been accepted, the Jewish 30 per cent of the population would have received 60 per cent of the arable land. The Palestinian Arabs rejected the plan.

Further recommendations were proposed in a British government White Paper published in May of 1939. In this White Paper, Britain specifically rejected the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. It was proposed instead that, after a 10-year transitional period, Palestine should become an independent, binational state. The Jews in Palestine rejected this because it blunted the essential thrust of Zionism itself,

The picture painted by the Zionists and their friends in the American media of an infant Israel fighting at birth for its life against brutal Arab aggressors is an absurd fiction.

the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

The fact that fascism had attempted to destroy European Jewry provided a powerful impetus for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. The end of World War II also brought new waves of illegal immigrants, Zionist terror groups and underground armies such as the Haganah, the Irgun Svei Leumi (National Military Organization) and the infamous Stern Gang initiated widespread campaigns of bombings and assassinations. Two notable incidents within this scope were the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem on July 22, 1946, which caused the deaths of almost 100 British, Jewish and Arab governmental officials and the Stern Gang's assassination of Lord Moyne, the British Minister resident in Cairo. Contemporary Arab terrorism is childplay compared with the ruthless terrorism unleashed by the Haganah, the Irgun Svei Leumi and the Stern Gang prior to the British evacuation of Palestine. These terrorist actions and methods became incorporated into the state policies of what became Israel.

On April 2, 1974, Britain requested that the Secretary-General of the United Nations "place the question of Palestine on the agenda of the General Assembly at its next regular session." A Special Committee (UNSCOP) was subsequently appointed. The Committee investigated the situation and submitted, on August 31, 1947, two plans: a Majority Plan for partition of Palestine and a Minority Plan for the creation of a federal state. The partition plan proposed, and eventually accepted by the General Assembly, provided for a "Jewish state" populated by 497,000 Arabs and 498,000 Jews while the proposed Arab state was to include 725,000 Arabs and 10,000 Jews. At the time of actual partition, the Jews actually owned only 10 per cent of the total land area of the "Jewish state." For example, the Negev (Southern Palestine), in which Jewish land ownership was less than one-half of one per cent, was included in the area assigned by the Majority Plan to the "Jewish state." Naturally, the Arab countries and the Palestine Arabs rejected what came to be called the Partition Plan.

Determined to have the Partition Plan adopted by the General Assembly, the Zionists, with the open and active cooperation of both the United States and the Soviet Union, now mounted a frenzied lobbying effort. Threats, blackmail, character assassination and other forms of intimidation were used to cajole the unwilling into voting for the Partition Plan. The Liberian delegate, for example, complained to the American State Department that the way in which he specifically had been approached to vote on the Partition question amounted to "attempted intimidation." Under these rather clouded circumstances, the General Assembly, on Nov. 29, 1947, adopted the Partition Plan by a vote of 33 in favor, 13 opposed and 10 abstaining.

But the Zionists were taking no chances. After the General Assembly's vote, widespread violence broke out in Palestine. It became quite clear to all parties that the Partition Plan could not be implemented without further, and even greater, violence. Consequently, on March 19, 1948, the American representative in the Security Council recommended that the Palestine Commission "suspend its efforts to implement the Partition Plan" and place Palestine temporarily under UN trusteeship. It was at this point that the Zionist terrorist groups launched a virtual war against the Palestine Arabs, fully determined to drive them ruthlessly from the pre-partition "Jewish state" and thus render the irresponsible, arrogant, reactionary, criminal blunder called the Partition Plan a fait accompli. On May 15, 1948, when the British withdrew from Palestine and the Arab states declared war against Israel, already some 400,000 Palestine Arabs had been driven from their homes, in many cases by force of arms, in the ostensible "Jewish state."

Thus, even before the British mandate on Palestine ended, the Zionists had mounted a terrorist offensive which amounted to war against the Palestine Arabs. This is confirmed by the Zionist leader, David Ben Gurion, who stated, in his book "Rebirth and Destiny of Israel," "As April (1948) began, our War of Independence swung decisively from defense to attack." These attacks just happened to include the massacre of 250 Arab men, women and children by the Irgun Svei Leumi on April 9, 1948 at the village of Deir Yasin, as well as the assassination of UN Mediator Count Folke Bernadotte in the Israeli-occupied section of Jerusalem by Israeli soldiers on Sept. 17, 1948. By slaughtering the Arab villagers at Deir Yasin, the Zionists hoped to accelerate the pace of Arab flight from the "Jewish state." In this, of course, they succeeded. It was only at this point that the Arab states intervened to protect the Palestine Arabs from Zionist terrorism.

The picture painted by the Zionists and their friends in the American media of an infant Israel fighting at birth for its life against brutal Arab aggressors is an absurd fiction. The truth is precisely that the Arab states attempted, unfortunately without success, to prevent an armed settler population from uprooting the native people by force of arms. In this sense, at least, the states of Israel and South Africa are built upon the same, utterly reactionary, foundations.

Golda Meir's famous statement to the effect that "There is no such thing as the Palestinian people" reflects the entire, brutal Zionist position on the question of Arab repatriation in what was formerly called Palestine. The Zionists hold that the Palestine Arabs, if, indeed, they exist at all, are now the responsibility of the Arab states, and specifically Jordan. By making such ridiculous claims, Israel wishes to force the

Palestine Arabs to concede to the permanent existence of a Jewish state in Palestine and consequently to renounce all historic ties to their homeland.

The general position of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), presently under the leadership of Al Fatah's Yasir Arafat, is that Palestine has been invaded by a warring settler population who have driven out the native people and set up a state which relies on military aggression and police terror for its very survival. The facts clearly support the PLO's position. On the basis of this general position, the PLO calls for the establishment of an independent, binational state in Palestine and for the dismemberment of the Jewish state of Israel. For that matter, Israel simply refuses to discuss the question at all, either through debate within the UN or through direct talks with the PLO, allegedly because of its "use of terrorism."

Since its birth in 1948, Israel has conducted a policy of ruthless land-grabbing through military aggression against her Arab neighbors. Since this time Israel has, in effect, policed the Middle East for the American State Department in return for vital diplomatic support and even more vital munitions. The 250,000 Palestine Arabs who remained in Israel after 1948 have been subjected to a policy of virtual apartheid. Israel periodically invades the sovereign territory of the neighboring state of Lebanon, blowing up Arab houses, taking many lives and generally terrorizing the population.

The picture of the Palestine Liberation Movement painted in the American media is deliberately, and often cunningly, false. The PLO sees itself essentially as a military organization continuing to fight a war against Israel that has not ceased since 1948. From this point of view, then, what are inevitably dubbed "terrorist attacks" in the American press are seen as perfectly justifiable, bona fide military operations conducted by the PLO against the state of Israel. It is true, of course, that civilians are frequently killed or wounded during the course of these military operations, but then there are literally countless examples of Israeli attacks and atrocities directed against militarily defenseless Arab civilian populations, for example, the terror bombing of Damascus during the October War.

The Zionist leaders maintain that the essential ingredient for peace in the Middle East is Arab recognition of the state of Israel. That, in itself, is nonsensical. Why should the Arabs accept the existence of an aggressor nation, supported financially by the Western imperialist powers and established through the almost wholesale forced evacuation of fellow Arabs from the land of Palestine? Neither the PLO nor the Arab states could logically accept the existence of such a state which, in both word and deed, has declared itself their mortal enemy.

The fact obvious in itself, is that the people of what is, for the moment, Israel and all the Arab peoples desire peace, cooperation and friendship. Contrary to the hysterical myths printed in the American press, neither the PLO nor any Arab state desires the annihilation of the Hebrew population of Palestine. The Zionist state now once again prepares for war. But war in the Middle East will only be eliminated and replaced by friendship and cooperation when the Zionist state-machine is dismembered and replaced by an independent, binational and socialist Palestine, in which both Hebrews and Arabs can participate democratically in the administration of the state power.