

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Harry Bryan, Editor

Saturday, December 4, 1971



We endorse snow.

The Daily Tar Heel awards of the week

The What's Cooking Today Award: to the University Physical Plant, which finally took action on a requisition for a Connor Dorm kitchen (submitted one year ago) and tried to set it up in a coed's room. Despite pleas from the dorm maid, the workman set up a stove hood over the unsuspecting student's desk.

The I Will Take A Firm Stance On The Issue No Matter Which Way The Wind Blows Award: to Pete Tripodi, a UNC junior, who said in announcing his candidacy for the 4th District Congressional Seat, "I am basically a liberal Democrat...and I would not and will not hesitate to align myself with either liberals or conservatives to get what is best and what is needed in this district."

The Fix Of The Week Award: to N.C. State basketball players Paul Coder and Bill Heuts, who had charges of marijuana possession thrown out of court in Raleigh Wednesday and played basketball for State that very night.

The Bennett Cerf Memorial Bad Pun Of The Week Award: to journalism professor Walter Spearman, who, when asked by a friend if he'd like to go to Alaska, replied, "No thanks, but Yukon go if you want."

The Putting Fire In The Fire Breathing Dragon Award: to U.S. District Judge James B. McMillan, who ruled Thursday that the City of Charlotte was wrong in firing Harold Murray because he was grand dragon of the N.C. Ku Klux Klan.

The If You're Not The Students' Advocate, You're The Devil's Advocate Award: to Associate Dean of Student Affairs James O. Cansler, who said last week his office is not supposed to advocate everything the students want. But then again, when has Cansler advocated ANYTHING the students want?

The Give 'Em The Bird Award: to Baltimore General Manager Harry Dalton, who traded aging Oriolo superstar Frank Robinson to the Los Angeles Dodgers for four promising minor leaguers.

The Buy Now, Save Later Award: to the wise students who stocked up on exam booklets and speed, the prices of which will be skyrocketing in the next few days.

The Turn The Other Cheek Award: to Secretary of Agriculture nominee Earl Butz, who must find it hard to restrain from answering the critics who have been kicking him around. We hope he won't take it sitting down.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.

Doug Hall News Editor

Lou Bonds Associate Ed.

Lana Starnes Associate Ed.

Mark Whicker Sports Ed.

Ken Ripley Feature Editor

Jim Taylor Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Paddi Hughes Adv. Mgr.

Glen Brank

Text of Indo-Pakistani war won't reflect pain

The growing conflict between India and Pakistan may well become a text book example of modern politics and their essentially barbarian nature.

On the surface, it would appear that Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and her nation are protecting their Hindu brothers in East Pakistan from the murderous intentions of the Pakistani Moslems. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. India has its own gains to be realized from defeating Pakistan.

Most importantly, India sees Pakistan as a threat to Indian domination of the

Asian subcontinent, and the eventual challenge against China for dominant military power in the hemisphere.

Secondly, the defeat of Pakistan would create a sovereign state of Bangla Desh - a convenient, subservient providing India security. Such a new nation, of course, would also relieve the burden that 10 million East Pakistani refugees have imposed on their Indian hosts. India accepts these legions, but the Indian populace is highly upset by the intrusion and resulting drain on their resources.

For Pakistan, the motives are not quite

as subtle; the purposes of President Yahya Khan and his latest achievements are all too clear.

During the past nine months, the Pakistan government has methodically slaughtered more than one million of its Bengali subjects. The reason: East Pakistanis, showing signs of rebelling after years of Moslem domination, had to be discouraged from declaring independence. Once underway, this campaign of discouragement was easily converted to one of total Bengali extinction.

Yahya Khan might have provided better futures for his eastern subjects, but he decided otherwise. Now any peace

attempt, however unlikely, is impossible because India has its opportunity and will pursue it to the end.

That final result is certain from a military standpoint. In sheer size, Indian forces more than double those of Pakistan. Indian combat air forces have an even larger advantage. Geographically, Pakistan must supply its own meager forces through the hostile east. So it faces frontal assaults from the Indian armies and guerrilla harassment from Bengalis.

Of course, the conflict would not be possible without the generous military and financial aid provided by world powers. The credit for all this death and

suffering must go where it is ultimately due.

Russia has been the chief India backer, particularly in regard to the superior armaments of the Indian forces. The Kremlin has not proved to be particularly enthusiastic about the bloodletting, but why object too strenuously while on the winning side?

The United States, on the other hand, has been a regular patron of Yahya Khan to the tune of \$4 billion (this largely to offset a Chinese influence). But U.S. pleas for a peaceful settlement have gone unanswered. In the meantime, the

American position becomes more blurred as Congressional leaders denounce Pakistani atrocities.

Perhaps all this concern is unfounded. Even if Pakistan is defeated, even if a separate Bangla Desh state is created, even if Russia and the U.S. find their political proteges stepping out of line, it will all be nothing more than another text book case within ten years.

And unfortunately, the text books can not accurately reflect the pain and suffering of millions of hapless non-combatants caught in this modern version of international politics.

Letters to the editor

The usurper pleads for peace

To the editor:

Dressed in the cloaks of saints, the pleaders for "a lasting peace" in the Tar Heel issue of November 20, are undoubtedly Zionists, long experienced in deceiving the Zionist-stunned American public, they give a picture of an innocent daily threatened Israel; Israel, the fortification of democracy in a Communist Middle East.

The whole situation, pleaders, is not what you stated. In 1948, when Israel was established, more than one million Palestinians were deprived of their homes and land. They didn't understand and will never understand why they have to give their own houses to people persecuted in Germany. The problem is a Palestinian problem, and "Israel is because Palestine is not." And now Israel is not to be termed an imperialistic state! Isn't it imperialistic to steal another's home? Of course, according to Zionist logic, this is not so. They are allying themselves with the liberal movement in America. Isn't it ironic and ridiculous? A thief is a liberal, and democratic; a usurper is a pacifist!

In his *Der Judenstaat* (1896), Herzl lays the general policy of the Zionist movement. He advocated Jewish colonization of either Argentina or Palestine with a view to eventual creation of a sovereign Jewish National State. The frontiers of this state, if created in Palestine, were to be "the northern frontier . . . the mountains facing Cappadocia (Turkey), the southern, the Suez Canal, and the eastern, the Euphrates."

For the indigenous population of Palestine, Herzl said, "We intend to work the poor across the frontier surreptitiously by providing work for them in transit countries but denying them any employment in our own land." (See *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, edited by Raphael Patai, translated by Harry Zohn, Herzl Press, London, 1960, Vol. I, p. 88 and Vol. II, p. 711; and *The Diaries of Herzl*, edited and translated by Maariv Lowenthal, London, 1958, p. 124.)

The question which arises from this is what claim had Herzl and his Zionists in Palestine (Note that they want more than Palestine!)? Further, isn't this imperialistic in itself? Is this not usurpation?

The whole endeavor culminated in the infamous Balfour Declaration of 1917, which follows in its entirety:

His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

Now the "non-Jewish communities in Palestine," meaning the Arabs, were 462,000, or 91.7 percent of the population, and the Jews were 58,000, or

8.3 percent. The Arabs owned 25,670,000 dunums, or 97.52 percent of the land, and the Jews 650,000 dunums or 2.48 percent. (A Survey of Palestine, prepared in December, 1945, and January, 1946, for the Information of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry Jerusalem, Government Press, 1946, pp. 141, 185, 372, 367.)

And what right had a British foreign minister to give away the land of others?

In 1944, four years before the establishment of Israel, the Arabs were 1,210,922, or 69.5 percent of the population, and the Jews numbered 528,702, or 30.5 percent. The Arabs owned 24,588,700 dunums, or 93.5 percent of the land, and the Jews owned 1,731,300 dunums, or 6.5 percent. (*Ibid.*, pp. 141, 185, 372, 376.)

There is a recognizable rise in the Jewish population between 1917-1944. This was due to the Jewish immigration, protected by the British mandatory authorities in keeping with the Balfour Declaration.

What right did Israel have to take over Palestine? And you "pleaders for peace" made the claim that the Arabs want to push Israel into the sea! It was the Arabs who were pushed into the sea of sands! Further, you write to the American public, unfortunately expecting their ignorance beforehand, that "if a case of Russian aggression exists in this world,

then it is most certainly to be found in the Middle East."

This is really a sad thing. It is the expansionist policy of Israel which pushed the Arabs to seek Russian aid after they had been rejected by the United States. The Americans, regardless of their vast oil interests in the Arab world, are supporting an aggressive racist state simply for a "handful" of Jewish votes. For these votes and for the political fortunes of individuals, dependent on these votes, the United States pursues a role in the Middle East which really contributes to the spreading of Communism.

Eid Dahiyat
207 Carr Dorm

Bloody rhetoric hurts argument

To the editor:

RE: Bruce Sampson's latest article, "Are the blacks committing suicide?"

I cannot understand Mr. Sampson's penchant for diatribe, or rather for unfocused bloody hyperbole. I can understand his justifiable anger at the specific injustices he mentions in his column - the slaying of James Cates was certainly wrong and wrongly tried. Attica

Patrick Mullen
942-6642

Ken Ripley

Soul food: Jesus as a man

Throughout the year, Christians follow Jesus Christ as their "Lord and Savior." Christmas, however, is an annual reminder that Jesus was also a man.

Too often we forget that Christmas to many is merely a time for commercial profit, another vacation, or at best a time for men to express some kind of "good will" to each other. The holiday has come to have its own meaning as an experience in itself, and its religious significance is buried under tons of tinsel, cards and presents.

The pre-fabricated manger scene and the plastic figures of the baby Jesus still serve, however, as belated homage to a solitary man born 2,000 years ago. Though the date was arbitrarily chosen by Christians, Christmas is still a birthday.

The world didn't stop in its tracks when Jesus was born. A star may have shined brighter than usual, and the pre-occupied people in Bethlehem may have noticed some unusual strangers in town and perhaps some commotion in a stable, but the talk of the time was about the census of Caesar Augustus. Few

people had reason to care that another baby was born.

It wasn't until he was older, after all, that Jesus began to attract attention, slowly at first within his own area. Only after he had been active a while did people begin to notice the carpenter's son wandering around the countryside from village to village.

Three years after Jesus began his ministry in Palestine, the fame he had attracted led to his death in Jerusalem, and by then he had shown himself to be no ordinary man.

The Bible records the miracles attributed to Jesus, miracles that inspired fear in the Jewish rulers and wonder in the minds of the people. These miracles revealed the compassion of Jesus, as he healed the sick and fed the hungry. They gave some dramatic hint of the power of Jesus, power Jesus claimed was God-given.

The Bible records the moral authority of Jesus as he moved beyond the bounds of contemporary religious tradition, criticized the religious structure of the day, and demanded the utmost of obedience and perfection of his followers.

The Pharisees and scribes withered under his intellect, fumed at his condemnation, blanched as he broke their laws. Jesus was no respecter of personal pride, injustice, greed or oppression. He was a threat, and he was killed.

But the Bible also records the love of Jesus as he moved among the poor and the despised. He forgave as easily as he condemned. He spoke of love, of mercy, of the brotherhood of all men and the obligations of one man for another. He spoke of the love of God for all men, and through his miracles he demonstrated that love. He could be angry, but he was moved to cry over Jerusalem, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not!"

But the Bible also records that Jesus was very much subject to human frailties. He resisted all the temptations man is exposed to, but he suffered them. He grew tired, hungry, thirsty. He could be hurt. He no doubt was frustrated again and again by the crowds clamoring for miracles and for him to be "king," by the stubborn refusal of the Pharisees to heed his words, and by the occasional pettiness and slowness of his own disciples. Finally, he was alone, only one man among many, and - at the end - he was deserted and betrayed.

Even if there were no resurrection for Jesus, no ultimate triumph that today causes Christians to rejoice in a "living Lord," Jesus stood out among the Jews as a man unique. He stood out so much from the lives and characters of those around him that he had to be killed - he was a threat.

For a long time Christians have blamed the Jews for the death of Jesus, but it was people who killed Jesus - the same kind of people who exist today. And it seems entirely possible that were Jesus alive today, sooner or later he would be killed. He would still be a threat.

Someone told me last week that "Jesus is too good for the world. We don't deserve him." Maybe we don't deserve a man like Jesus. Sometimes it seems we deserve only our own destruction.

But the wonder of Christmas to Christians is that God did come to earth through Jesus Christ the man, not because we deserved Jesus but because God loves us. "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," John writes, "full of grace and truth."

Christmas celebrates the birthday of Christ, but Jesus himself was the birthday present.

