Everybody in the states has known for months that there is a lot of dope circulating over in Vietnam. But the dope circulating isn't just weed from Uncle Ho's victory garden.

heroin

As two U.S. Congressmen reported earlier this week, it appears 10 to 15% of American troops in Vietnam are using high-grade heroit. First of all, those percentages indicate that 30,000 to 00 men are regular heroin users. The heroin they are using is 40,000 men are regular heroin users. The heroin they are using a significant point is that it is easy to become addicted to the potent drug.

The Congressmen also reported that heroin is so prevalent that there is no way of stopping the addiction epidemic. The U.S. Command seems to agree with the representatives about the P.O. W. S difficulty in controlling sale and use of heroin. Recently the Command initiated an amnesty program, whereby soldiers who turn themselves in are not prosecuted. The pitiful aspect is that the servicemen who admit to their addiction are probably not

> Obviously then, the problem sooner or later comes back to the States. Already a large number of Vietnam veterans have returned home with their drug problems. And few have been cured, mainly because there is no effective medical cure for heroin addiction. The increasingly recognized methadone treatment (for heroin addiction) has had only limited success in curing domestic heroin addicts. Even the most modern treatment won't combat addiction for those used to high-grade heroin.

> It is little wonder that one of the Congressional investigators said the drug problem itself provides a "compelling" reason for speeding up the troop withdrawals.

> But the President has yet to acknowledge the problem as a reason for expediting troop withdrawals. Instead, the President talks about the need to withdraw slowly and to remember the prisoners of war. But as we withdraw slowly, the President's policy only multiplies the number of prisoners of war-the heroin P.O.W.'s. And they may never be released or freed.

> > Mich Morierty

dear editor. . .dear edi tor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor ...dear editor...dear editor...dear editor...dear editor...dear editor... . dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear edito r. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .

Clarifies procedure

Congratulations to Francis in the Student Professorship Award even if he was too late.

The "nominating"

committee he referred to did

indeed exist -all those living units that cared to respond with three nominations to the letter Builders sent out. The letter, addressed to "Dear President" was sent to each floor in each dorm as well as to sororities, fraternities, and co-ops. On checking back I was able to find a response only from Burr I West (excuse me if I missed someone in a hurried check). If any government failed to bring their item of business up at their meeting, or did you miss that meeting, the complaint should be registered

with them, not Builders. Why two Each Campus Professors? A pat on the back to East Campus for responding situation stinks, that's why! in significant numbers and in consistently naming the same two professors.

It seems a bit ridiculous to say that City Campus students had no alternative to Rozman on the ballot. Two other professors were nominated

PAGE 6

and I've never known an unfamiliar name to stop anyone from voting against what they didn't like.

Some "math" should be corrected, too. Of 1,400 (not 1,500) students caring enough to vote, well over a third (537) chose to endorse Rozman. The other group didn't necessarily vote against him, they voted for someone else.

As to the "vote of confidence" - maybe your phrase applies pitifully to only a small group of students who voted. Surely you must admit that his winning was a vote of confidence-by a group of students. No fallacy there. Since you so violently opposed his selection I can only ask, where were you and your academic-exercise take second friends on voting days? place to entertainment?

Your whole outery boils down to a criticism of student apathy; not caring enough to calibre of our students? nominate and not caring enough to vote. If the whole

be the training ground for twentieth century gladiators only? If this is so (and it seems that it is), I say woe to us I think your editorials will play an important part, if you plead for rationality and good judgment over sentiment.

Sincerely A concerned student

Discusses fieldhouse

Dear editor. I wish to say a few words about the construction of a fieldhouse for the University. As you and all your readers are aware, there's a difficult situation imposed on the campus by the budget. I find it hard to note that you have not

come out strongly against this It seems stifling to me that money can be spent on such a non-academic goal (at this time), which furthers Nebraska's place on the "muscle-map" of the country. Our football players are the best. Devaney is the best coach, but is that all in a University? Does

Are we measured by the quality (or height) of our buildings, but not by the

Or is the University going to



THE PRESS WILL NEVER SUSPECT WE'RE STILL USING DEFOLIANTS!



Kennedy and Bayhalone on Calley response

Anglo-Saxon law." Not since

Magna Charta had Anglo-Saxon

law been said to call for

appointing new judges when

the populace does not approve

(D-lowa) stepped around the problem. By April 4, he was saying "mercy" should be

applied, "judging the crime

itself and not the temper of the

country." Hughes added: The

President is the only man who

can judge that," thus ignoring

the law, which expressly leaves

the President out of the

process. Hughes said he

'couldn't state today" what

Harold Hughes

of the verdict.

Mankiewicz and Braden

WASHINGTON-Now that Congressional mail on the Calley verdict has switched from con to pro, President Nixon's instant intervention appears not simply as blatant politics, but as bad politics, too. Mr. Nixon tried to appease what he conceived as a majority, but which turned out to be a largely sectional minority-which dwindled as

the facts became clear. But if the President behaved badly under fire, so did most of his potential rivals.

LISTEN for example, to the words of Sen. Edmund Muskie (D-Me.) the day the Calley verdict was announced and outrage first began to be heard: ... case is still in the judicial process and I wouldn't want to comment ... He still has several avenues of appeal open and I would assume he would take one or more of them as is his right. And that's where the question of his guilt or innocence is to be resolved."

While Muskie was ducking, Sen. George McGovern (D.S.D.) was circling. McGovern said, on that same day, "I am deeply troubled by the My Lai massacre and the subsequent conviction of Lt. Calley. If what this young officer did was wrong, and it doubtless was then American bombing and shelling of villages across Indochina have been terribly Hubert Humphrey straddled. The 1968 nominee avoided comment until April 2, after the President had released Calley from the stockade. Humphrey "commended" the President for his action, expressed his "great sympathy" for Calley, then scrambled back by saying that jury of combat veterans had found him guilty. Humphrey thus made it to both sides.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), the leading Democratic choice among Republicans, came up with the silliest response of all. Jackson noted at a news conference on April 1 that "there was a surprising outpouring of feelings," and then added his bucketful to the flood. Jackson proposed an immediate review of the "case, verdict and sentence" by a high-level investigating panel composed "the best people President can get.

"THIS IS THE TIME." said Jackson, "to be cool and

his position would be if he rational and treat this case in the best traditions of were President.

> Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.). after some initial waffling from California ("Here we have a young military man wearing the uniform ... willing to risk his life and yet because of this battle-type situation he's now to spend his life at hard labor."), went on in the same statement to go against his mail and state that "If we are a civilized nation ... I don't want any decision or policy to give the feeling that our country condones the useless slaughter of women and children

over the job of judge, Bayh was

Once the President had taken

Daniel's position that Mr. Nixon had done great damage to the system of military

SEN. EDWARD KENNEDY (D-Mass.) came out best on the issue. To an overwhelmingly pro-Calley Alabama audience, he first said "No" to a question whether he would join in asking clemency, then said there was "no rational justification" according to the "facts proved by court-martial" and then noted that the Calley trial "has perhaps for the first time demanded that Americans confront the moral issues of the war and the fundamental question of our pursuing it." And so it has.

indignantly denounces 'Spiro

Agnew who supported the

shooting of looters,' since

'fewer than 250 died in riots.'

while 25,000 are killed by

drunken drivers. Whereupon he

asks sarcastically, 'why not

Why call for shooting looters

when no one is heard to

suggest the same treatment for

"NOW proportionately, I

think drunken driving leads to

injury less often than rioting-

the deadlier crime?"

shoot drunken drivers? . .



William F. Buckley, Jr. Theunmakingof Ramsey Clark

During this period, hopefuls are bringing out books; either that. else authors are writing books about them. In the case of Ramsey Clark, it is not fair else wrote his book, the widely heralded Crime in America. It is a true expression of this amiable, well-meaning man who, in the world of thought cannot even ride a bicycle.

Every now and again, the American critical mechanism really goes to work on somebody like Ramsey Clark; and this has now happened.

IN THE CURRENT Commentary James Q. Wilson of Harvard goes through the book and concludes, pained, that "As a statement of personal, moral and political conviction, it reassure those who wish to avoid coming to grips with the crime problem and will disappoint those who wish to think seriously about it." As analysis, he finds that the "book contains individual

sentences supportive of a wide range of mutually inconsistent positions." And consider:

"Even the question of whether street or violent crime is important enough to worry about is left unclear. On page 49 we are told that since only one person in 400 was the victim of a crime of violence in 1967, the average individual's chance of being a victim was once in 400 years.' If one assumes that only half of all violent crimes are reported, then the individual's chances are 'once in 200 years.' The implication is clear: what are we so excited about?

"One thing we should be excited about," said Professor Wilson, "is the misrepresentation embodied in these figures. If the avarage person has each year a one in 200 chance of being a victim then his lifetime chances of being a victim are probabilities over his life expectancy. If the average man lives seventy years, then his chances of being a victim of a violent crime at some time are seven in 20, or about one in three, not one in 200 " PROFESSOR SIDNEY

Hook, writing in Fortune, is equally mystified. "Clark's failure to face up to the necessity for hard choices in the prevention and control of crime results in a shocking absence of common sense There is no conflict between liberty and safety," he declares. 'We will have both, or neither.' That is sheer balderdash. In many situations, liberty and safety are inversely related . . . The safety of a traffic system depends upon restriction of motorists' freedom to drive in any lane or at any speed they please."

It is left for Professor van den Haag, in National Review, to inter this pathetic book, around which the left-liberals are forming. I give you an example of what happens when you analyze Ramsey Clark:

"Clark." (says van den Haag), "has mastered misleading comparisons. He

as Clark should have known. He also knows that this is the only relevant comparison, since elsewhere he (rightly) attacks as misleading, statistics which state crime frequencies rather than crime rates (proportions). However, both drunken driving and looting are certainly Policemen should arrest the offenders and, if they resist, or force is needed to control them. Nobody advocated shooting looters after arrest The Vice President (unlike Clark, Lindsay et al.) urged that the necessary force be used to make arrests and to prevent continuation of the criminal action. I am sure Mr. Agnew advocates no less for any escaping or resisting offender. driving or walking, drunk or sober. So do I. It is the former Attorney General who advocates an exemption for looters-not, as he disingenuously suggests, the Vice President for dranken drivers."

much more in the extensive review, is 24-karat analysis, and it leaves Mr. Clark and his jejune book quite simply speechless. Or rather it should It hasn't, of course: Mr. Clark is busy reciting his good sounding cliches everywhere--the college students go mad, by the way, mad with pleasure, while, far away, the muses of rigor and thought, sulk in their gardens, despondent as they have not been since the golden days of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Now that, of which there is

AND MI DONE IT THE AMAZING ADVENTURES OF In recognition of seal above and beyond the call of duty (and forgiving CALLAN or: I get VFW posts the most excite ment in years) and as that the Army's killing burning, destruction, etc. does have a code of ethics .. We'll court-marshell I'd just like 706

MICK MORIARTY, editor CONNIE WINKLER, managing editor JOHN DVORAK, news editor GENE HILLMAN, advertising manager JAMES HORNER, chairman, publications committee

EDITORIAL STAFF

Staff writers: Gary Seacrest, Jim Pedersen, Marsha Bangert, Dave Brink, Carol Goetschius, Steve Strasser, Bart Becker, Mike Wilkins, Charlie Harpster, Marsha Kahm, Steve Kadel, Dennis Snyder, Ann Pedersen, Roxanne Rogers, Vicki Pulos. Sports editor: Jim Johnston. Sports writer: Warren Obr. Photographers: Gall Folda, Bill Ganzel. Entertainment editor: Larry Kubert. Literary editor: Alan Boye. East campus editor: Marlene Timmerman. Artists: Linda Lake, Greg Scott. Design editor: Jim Gray. Copy editors: Tom Lansworth, Bill Smitherman, Laura Willers. Night editor: Leo Schleicher. Night editorial assistant: Rodney Wortman. Schleicher, Night editorial assistant: Rodney Wortman. BUSINESS STAFF

Coordinator: Sandra Carter. Salesmen: Steve Yates, Barry Pilger, Jane Kidwell, Ken Sevenker, Tom Hafel, Par di Natale. Business assistants: Janice Stapleman, Charlotte Owens.

Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Nebr.
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 Avertising Service, College Press Service.

Address: The Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN

Chr. Builders Student

Faculty Relations

President, Nebraska

Rog Bonnesen

Builders

Carol Evans

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1971

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN

PAGE 7

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1971