

## White Knight to the Rescue

According to University officials, Greeks and members of other campus organizations are going to be given another chance.

Now they have until Feb 15 to comply with the Regents' anti-discrimination statement.

The deadline has been set, after which time the Regents will dress in their shining armor, mount their white steeds and then ride across the fruited-plains of huskerland to destroy the villainous discriminators.

And, of course the spectacle will be beautiful, because then everybody will know that with the eradication of three of four fraternities and sororities, discrimination will be non-existent in Nebraska.

After all, despite what we were told as to the objectives of the Robinson Report, we do know what the results have been.

The Robinson Report delivered to the members of this community the startling, as well as divine, information which reveals a heretofore unknown fact: there is a lot of "prejudice" on this campus.

Reading between the lines, the report further says: that for the sake of expedition, facilitation and vindication, we believe that the Greeks have a monopoly on prejudice and they should therefore be used as scapegoats of the University to show to the public that the rest of this community reigns ethically supreme.

It does not take much of an imagination to predict what will happen after the purge. Quite frankly, nothing.

The Regents (perhaps), the administrators (for sure) will

ride off into the sunset, reticent to leave virtuous names behind (for posterity) and the campus will have become liberalized. The community will have opened its eyes, if for one brief shining moment, to the good and the pure.

And, in all probability, we will never ask the question, Why are all of the Regents white? Nor will there be time to ask the question, Why are most of the Administration's noblemen white? If the members of this community are really proud of themselves, after doing away with a couple of Greek houses, we may never even consider looking into the question, Why aren't "white liberals" too popular with black folk?

And hereafter, the people who look into those questions will be thought of as freaks. Yes, and when the Greeks are gone, there will be new scapegoats and new specimens manufactured and packaged for ostracization.

To be sure, they will not be administrators. They have no need to clean their house, Regents will never even be considered. Nor will it be the university itself, because we know, without a doubt, that this entire institution could not be racist. (That conclusion must be true, as well as valid, since we have been told that the people who manage and operate it has a *priori* knowledge concerning the matter.)

Then after awhile, when the university is no more, when it has gone to its own Hell, someone might consider asking those questions seriously.



## dear editor

Dear Editor,

It seems to me that the role of the Health Center concerning misuse of drugs should be twofold: education and treatment.

By treatment, I mean providing attention to those students who find themselves on a bad trip. Heroin addiction is quite another thing—however, even if only referral services and counseling should be provided for student junkies. I say, "should be provided," please note. If such services are currently being provided, I sure know nothing about it. And I've been a student here for a year and a half. The Health Center seems determined to keep many of its services a deep secret, even from the student body. Such as the fact that everyone at the Health Center knows that they are only too happy to provide birth control information and contraceptives. God knows students need them, but how many students know that? Want to make a survey?

Education about drugs had damn well better start getting realistic. Scare campaigns are worthless. The most important thing kids should know about

is that they shouldn't drive under its influence. About speed—that it slowly destroys the body. About hallucinogenics—that they should be used sparingly, much of it being cut with cumulative poisons. That they should try to buy only that stuff which is considered "pure." That they should trip at home where they are safe or with someone who can take care of them if they get confused or frightened. And that LSD isn't candy. It

should be used, like any drug, with moderation.

It should also be emphasized that the biggest danger in drug usage is being busted. Students should be told what precautions to take and what the drug laws in their state are in effect. And what their rights are.

A very vital part of drug education should be about common prescribed and non-prescription drugs and their possible effects on the individual. It took me nine months to discover that my birth control pills were making me depressed, unhappy, paranoid, bitchy, in short, almost suicidal. I was never properly warned about possible side effects. My friend spent a year of ups and downs in mood coming off two years worth of barbituates, which had been prescribed, unbeknownst to her, for a bleeding ulcer condition. Drugs aren't toys. We know that. We want to know precisely, exactly, what that means. And not by idiotic commercials on the radio that begin:

Boy: Hi, Mom! Mother: (concerned) John, what are those seeds in your room? Boy: (scared) They're...they're nothing! Father: (Bounces something off the wall, presumably the Boy) Get in your room! I'll show you nothing!

That's all I have to say. Now its up to you. Health soldiers of the world unite!

Laura Rambaldi

## The new defense budget hoax

by FRANK MANKIEWICZ

and TOM BRADEN  
WASHINGTON — "In the 1971 budget, American's priorities were quietly but dramatically reordered. For the first time in 20 years, we spent more to meet human needs than we spent on defense." Those are the first words in President Nixon's new budget message, and it leads the reader to wonder if the rest of the message is as patently, indeed, breathtakingly false.

The budget itself is such a gigantic document, and the explanations of it so carefully designed to conceal which shell it is under which one may find the pea, that it will take more than one column to analyze it at the length it deserves.

Mr. Nixon gives away most of the game at the beginning. Immediately after the statement quoted above, he said, "In 1971 (the fiscal year commencing July 1), we must increase our spending for defense in order to carry out the nation's strategy for peace." Unless the "strategy for peace" includes a period of national bankruptcy, this

statement as well is incomprehensible.

The bare bones of the budget, the current year's as well as the new one, show that defense spending is still going up, and will still take more than \$2 of every \$3 disposed of by the Congress, for any purpose.

The new budget, for example, calls for an increase of \$6 billion for what the President calls "military and military assistance programs." This is new money, to be piled on the sum of nearly \$75 billion spent this year. It does not take account of supplementary requests for more aid to Cambodia and Laos which will surely be forthcoming, as the leaders of the nations begin to develop their Vietnamese neighbors' appetites for living off the wealth of the American taxpayer. Even that \$6 billion extra for the Pentagon if not expanded will take care of all the additional money proposed in the budget for revenue sharing with the states and cities, thus deserving the 2-1

military-to-civilian balance in the current budget.

In the fiscal year which will end July 1, defense spending will run in excess of \$74.5 billion as a result of a number of "emergencies" and "supplemental" increases added on since the budget was adopted with a figure for defense spending set at \$73 billion. Even the \$73 billion was an increase over the amount set in the "posture statement" of Defense Secretary Melvin Laird in February of 1970, which put the figure at \$71.8 billion.

In other words, in a year in which the government was "quietly but dramatically" reordering its priorities, the following really happened: The secretary of defense said we would spend \$73 billion, Congress cut that figure (it thought) by \$2 billion, and we wound up spending \$74.5 billion. Now, the President says \$76 billion for next year (which will probably rise to \$80 billion) while human resources spending stayed at \$26 billion this year and may

rise to as much as \$30 billion in the coming year.

That is why all the talk about "reordering our priorities" is not only false, but dangerously so. The fact that the President and the Pentagon engage in this fraud shows they know the public hunger for a real reordering of priorities—this kind of tricky bookkeeping only feeds what President Nixon referred to in his State of the Union message as the widespread distrust of government.

There are other, more subtle frauds, in the defense budget. Administration lobbyists are pointing out that the Pentagon received 9.5% of the gross national product in 1968, 7.4% this year, and will get only 6.8% next year. They say this proudly, as though there is some law that defense spending should normally always go up as the GNP climbs.

But that is like saying a man should buy a new shotgun for self-defense everytime his family increases. That is logic that appeals only to the makers of shotguns.

## THE DAILY NEBRASKAN



MIKE MORIARTY  
editor

CONNIE WINKLER  
managing editor

JOHN DVORAK  
news editor

PAT DINATALE  
advertising manager

JAMES HORNER  
chairman, publications committee

Editorial staff

Nebraskan staff writers: Gary Seacrest, Bill Smitherman, Jim Pedersen, Steve Strasser, Dave Brink, Marsha Bangert, Carol Goetschius, Charlie Harpster, Mike Wilkins, Jim Carver, Marsha Kahn, Nancy Hart, Bart Becker, Dennis Snyder, Vicki Pulos, Roxanne Rogers, Ann Pedersen. East campus editor: Marlene Timmerman. Sports editor: Jim Johnston. Sports writer: Warren Obr. Photographers: Mike Hayman, Gail Folda. Entertainment editor: Larry Kubert. Literary editor: Alan Boye. Artists: Linda Lake, Greg Scott. Design editor: Jim Gray. Copy editors: Tom Lansworth, Laura Willers, Don Russell. Night news editor: Leo Schleicher.

Business staff

Advertising manager: Pat di Natale. Coordinator: Sandra Carter. Salesmen: Steve Yates, Jane Kidwell, Greg Scott, Ray Pyle, Bill Cooley. Business assistant: Pam Baker. Circulation managers: Barry Pilger, John Weggoner, John Ingwerson.

Telephone: editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Neb.

Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$8.50 per year. Published Monday through Friday during the school year except during vacation and exam periods. Member of the Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

The Daily Nebraskan is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government. Address: The Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.



William F. Buckley, Jr.

## Closing the curtain

SANTIAGO, CHILE—The brand new hotel here, in mid-season, has 23 guests, which means that 500 beds are empty. Tomorrow, 60 of them will be occupied by a Cuban delegation. "And they probably won't pay their bill," a young Chilean businessman, busily engaged in disengaging from Chile, remarked in his emptying office, the files packed up, phonograph records in cartons, as he mused on how he will raise the money to pay his debts—he has sold everything except his little beach cottage in the 10 weeks since Dr. Salvador Allende Gossens was inaugurated as President, but there are no buyers.

A professor is trying very hard to master the art of intrigue. He could write you a book tomorrow about some of the great intrigues in European history, but he never knew such a one as his department is engaged in. You see, the balance of power is in the hands of the cook. I kid you not. The university system in Chile has for years and years been dominated by a senate of sorts in which everyone is represented, professors, assistant professors, students, maintenance men; and yes cooks.

The difference is that under Allende the politicization of everything is such that great consequences ensue on the littlest vote. In this case, the question is whether the department will more or less formally establish itself as a revolutionary arm of the Communist-Socialist-Radical coalition that rules Cuba. The cook is in favor of it. The professor in charge is against it, pleading that any such marriage must be at the expense of the integrity of the department's scholarly calling. He was supposed to have finished a book months ago, but he has not begun it. How can he, when he needs to spend the time scheming to muster a majority sufficient to overcome the political dedication of his cook?

Another professor, young, soft-spoken, freshly returned from several years in Germany, looks you in the eye and says goddam it it is a bloody slander to allege that the Allende government is engaged in persecuting El Mercurio, the leading opposition daily. You are told the same thing by government functionaries.

But this professor is something else, because he genuinely believes it to be so that the Allende government is

innocent. It goes as follows: El Mercurio (government spokesmen tell you) is simply one enterprise in a complex dominated by a single family, and over the years the business fell into lax habits. Good government (of the Allende type), is charged with enforcing the laws. One such law holds that the Edwards Bank, an arm of the enterprise, had no business underwriting a particular transaction without sufficient collateral.

As for El Mercurio—why, all the government is attempting to insure is that, like other enterprises, it has paid its taxes. All of this against a background of: a) frozen credit, b) price control; c) wage increases by government's decree; d) the flight of capital; e) the withdrawal by the government of official advertising in the newspaper; f) harassment by a union controlled by the Communist Party; g) the arrest of a prominent executive through the resuscitation of an old and dormant law. There is no question in the minds of the managers of the Edwards Enterprises that eventually they will all be exonerated of any substantive wrongdoing. There is considerable question whether, by that time, El Mercurio will still be publishing. Exit the axis of opposition to the Allende government.

What is interesting—mark this well—is that the young professor, and so many other idealists like him who support so avidly the revolutionary government will not admit to any knowledge of what, in fact, is taking place in Chile. They don't believe it. What they believe is the purity of the government's purpose.

You sit and listen, and a great literature of the past generation runs through your mind. The excuses made by the professors who, early in the thirties, backed Hitler, Allende isn't Hitler or Stalin. But his supporters are of the breed of the supporters of Hitler and Stalin. They will not credit the evidence which every day accumulates before their eyes. There are reasons historical, cultural, ideological, and even moral which account for their blindness.

Meanwhile one begins to understand what Albert J. Nock meant when he wrote in his journal that he thought someday to address himself to the question: how do you establish that you are slipping into a dark age?