

Violence and youth

At the Impeachment rally Saturday, one youngster made reference to the possible assassination of the President. Whether the remark was a statement of opinion or a rhetorical device is unknown. But one thing seems certain: something is dreadfully wrong in our society when murder would even be suggested, no matter what the context, as a solution to a political problem.

Perhaps the root of this kind of thinking lies in events of the last decade. Beginning with the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy, those years were marred with violence. The young must bear its scars.

But beyond historical events, there are immediate causes. One of them must be TV violence, particularly in children's cartoon shows and some commercials. A study quoted in *U.S. News & World Report* showed that nine out of 10 cartoons aired in the 1972-73 television season depicted some kind of violence.

This is distressing when one considers that today's child, by the time he is graduated from high school, will have spent more time in front of the boob-tube than in the classroom. Psychologists know there is a relationship between the amount of violence viewed and the aggression levels of the viewers. Children are more inclined to be aggressive after watching violence than are adults.

The programs, however, are not the only villains. TV commercials also must take their toll. During a one-minute commercial for a martial arts movie, one

can watch necks being broken, stabbings, eyes being gouged out, people being lashed with karate sticks, and other atrocities committed.

If the networks won't cut back their violence diet, then Congress must. The minds of young people should not be allowed to be influenced in this way.

Michael (O.J.) Nelson

A letter from the editor

This isn't an editorial; it's more like an explanation. Its subject is errors.

Occasionally, a mistake appears in the *Daily Nebraskan*, the kind of mistake not often found in a professional publication. When one appears, it is due not to malice, but to human frailty, and when that happens we make an apology in the form of a correction.

It is these errors which might perhaps help us appreciate the student press. For it is on the student press where many professional newsmen make their first slip-ups. Because they have made them while working for a student publication and felt shame in making them, they might make fewer mistakes later.

The *Daily Nebraskan* always tries to publish accurate information. When we err, we criticize ourselves as severely as those persons who we criticize in our editorials for the errors they make.

The *Daily Nebraskan* staff will continue to try to produce the best publication possible.

Michael (O.J.) Nelson

LATTER-DAY ISRAELITES WANDERING 40 YEARS IN THE WILDERNESS



Impartial America required for peace

guest opinion

By Jawad Azzeh

Jawad Azzeh is from Pakistan. He is a graduate student in business administration.

For the fourth time in 25 years, the Middle East is faced with another war and another ceasefire.

Will this be the last war? And will this ceasefire bring a lasting peace in that area of the world? These are the questions we must ask ourselves. The answer to these questions is simple if one tries to be objective in discussing the issues behind the continued conflict there. There must be justice to all the people of the Mideast and the rights of the Palestinian people must be restored.

Since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, 1.5 million Palestinians are living in camps under miserable conditions. They were driven out of their homes and their lands, so that Jews from all over the world might resettle in their homeland. One cannot expect such acts to be tolerated in the space age in this so called "civilized world."

The United Nations has adopted one resolution after another for the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people. All were ignored by Israel.

Not only that, but in 1967, poor Israel, which is surrounded by Arabs who want to destroy it, as Israeli propaganda machines claim, attacked three Arab countries and occupied their lands. U.N. resolution No. 242 of November 1967 was adopted, calling upon Israel to return all occupied Arab territories and to restore the Palestinian rights.

Again Israel ignored the resolution to gain time, assuming that time is on its side. Israeli officials repeatedly said that the return of the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, Jerusalem, and Sharm El Sheikh is not negotiable. Israel insisted on

adjustments to its pre-1967 borders. This position is in direct conflict with U.N. resolutions and U.S. declarations over the past 20 years, which recognize the independence and the territorial integrity of all nations in the area.

But was this U.S. policy applied since 1967? The answer is no. It seems this principle is applied only in favor of Israel.

Otherwise, how could the United States continue to supply arms to Israel while it occupies the lands of three Arab countries, and defies all U.N. resolutions on the disputed issues? Or how could the United States veto a Security Council resolution demanding an Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories? And does the United States expect the Arab people to continue their friendly relations with this country? Shouldn't the Arabs use their resources to defend their existence? Or could the use of oil for the defense of those legitimate rights be called blackmail?

The Arab people have always been friendly to the United States. They would like such friendly relations to continue, on the basis of mutual respect and interests. It is therefore imperative that the U.S. try to preserve those relations by applying an impartial policy towards Arabs and Israelis. Such a policy may bring about a just peace to all the countries concerned.

To have peace in the Mideast, Israel would have to abandon its policy of military superiority and conquest. Wars do not bring peace. Wars only bring more wars. The only way to establish a lasting peace is to bring justice to all countries concerned. This means that Israel must return all conquered Arab lands and recognize the lawful rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland.