

## Busted

Police arrest 26 after weekend drug raids.  
Police drug raids net 28 offenders.

—News items.

The headlines above are not direct quotes, but some items quite similar to them recently have found their way onto the front page of the local dailies. Some said it wouldn't happen here, but the long-anticipated law enforcement crackdown on drug offenders is all too apparently under way.

Lincoln citizens, perhaps because of their historic exposure to the University community, generally have been willing to accept most of the unorthodox (by Nebraska standards) events that are likely to happen in the midst of 20,000 students. However, the

use of controlled substances has not been recognized as an acceptable deviation.

Because it is students, or student-aged persons, who seem to be the primary targets of police suspicion in these matters, a need has arisen for summary information of legal rights and procedures in police confrontation situations. Today the *Daily Nebraskan* has published the first of a two-part series ("Busted") which, it is hoped, will at least partially clear up the ambiguities surrounding what is, and what is not, proper procedure when that unfamiliar knock on the door turns out to have come from the long arm of the law.

The discomfiting fact is that too many people, by their ignorance, have consented to procedures which lead to official verdicts of

their criminality. Knowledge in this matter will probably not prevent the implementation of these procedures, but it could enable an accused person to challenge their validity in court.

Anyone who has ever played host to an official visit of law enforcement officers knows the tremendous psychological disadvantage he is placed under in such an encounter. Anger, resentment and fear can cause reluctance to question officials and ultimately, the forfeiture of certain legal rights.

There is no necessity for any citizens, including students, to offer any law enforcement agency an open door policy to either their homes or their lives. Any person who finds himself in the situation described above need not allow himself to be psychologically intimidated into unquestioning acquiescence.

When an agent enters a citizen's home, there should be no ambiguity as to whether he has done so with or without the permission of that citizen, especially when entry is made at the discretion of the agent. Even if a warrant of some kind is produced, the document should be carefully examined by the citizen involved.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, the only information a citizen is required to give law officers is his name, age and address. The citizen is under no obligation to dispell any suspicion that he may have something to hide. Even if the suspicion were justified, it is the responsibility of the law officers to confirm it.

In the event of an arrest, the accused citizen should remember the familiar American Civil Liberties Union admonitions. The arrested person does not have to answer any questions or sign any document. He has the right to telephone a lawyer and to have legal counsel present both before and during any questioning by law enforcement officials.

Most citizens are aware of their post-arrest rights. It is regrettable that so few realize that their right to due process applies to any action which may lead to an arrest.

An effort to increase citizens' awareness of their rights during any dialogue with a policeman should not be interpreted as interference in police business. Policing has the right and duty to enforce the law. But the citizen has an equal right to prevent violation of his constitutional protections.

Tom Lansworth



## Congress' multinational dilemma

As was its predecessor, the 93rd Congress will be concerned with the impact of giant multinational corporations (companies that operate in many countries). Because the United States serves as home for the largest multinationals, (General Motors, Exxon and Ford Motor Co. are the top three), with a combined overseas investment of \$107.2 billion in plants and equipment, knowing about these global corporations is politically and economically necessary.

What effect do the multinationals have on currency flow and world trade? How much do they influence government foreign policy? Do they benefit the foreign countries where they are located?

U.S. international corporations with foreign subsidiaries are now under fashionable fire from big labor and a scattering of well-meaning liberals. The multinationals allegedly "export" jobs to get cheaper labor and then import products that underprice American-made goods, which contributes to domestic unemployment.

Sen. Vance Hartke, D-Ind., and James Burke, D-Mass, have introduced legislation to repeal tax deferrals and credits on U.S. corporations' overseas investments and impose new import quotas. The senators intend, of course, to curb exports of private capital and technology to stop the movement of industry and jobs out of the United States.

But just how helpful to the American consumer and working person is this protectionist proposal going to be? In a 1972 address to the Machinery and Allied

Products Institute seminar, Sen. Charles Percy, R-Ill., asserted that "far from depriving Americans of jobs or acting as a haven for investment capital, our multinational corporations are a positive force both in creating new jobs here and in keeping the United States strongly competitive in the world market."

These companies do not export jobs, rather they out-perform other companies in creating better jobs with better pay and backed by higher investment. Multinational corporations enlarge the market for U.S. exports, providing a stimulus, not an impediment, to U.S. industry and employment.

The more money a company invests overseas, the greater its domestic growth rate in both exports and employment. As Sen. Jacob Javits of New York said in a March 1972, debate with Hartke, the multinationals are "the most important and growing high-wage employers of the worker in the private sector of our economy."

According to several estimates, the Hartke-Burke bill would reduce the profitability of many multinationals by one-half. Even the ultraliberal Orville Freeman, secretary of agriculture under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, says that "if American companies were deprived of their foreign earnings the effect on our economy would be devastating. Many companies might not be able to survive (*New York Times*, March 5, 1972)."

Furthermore, by calling for more import quotas, the Burke-Hartke bill is a legislative attempt to turn back the clock.

It would almost provoke a new round of protectionist trade measures on the part of other countries, sending the world into a devastating trade war far more catastrophic than were the retaliations of the '30.

We must remember that freer trade has contributed to the longest period of sustained and rapid economic growth in history. Import restrictions will lock out new products, thus narrowing the consumer's choice, and will "subsidize" domestic goods, thus raising prices for the average citizen. The Burke-Hartke bill must be junked.

Congress will also be investigating the multinationals' impact on foreign policy, especially in response to allegations that the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. (ITT) had meddled in Chile's internal politics during and after the 1970 election of Marxist President Salvador Allende. While admittedly ITT did initially engage in certain political and economic workings to weaken the Allende rule, incidences like this are few.

Furthermore, the Nixon Administration rejected any ideas of thwarting the Chilean constitutional process following the '70 elections. The new subcommittee on multinational corporations, chaired by Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, is unlikely to turn up evidence of influence in foreign policy by multinationals because there just isn't any.

We trust that the multinational corporation comes out of the 1973 Congress looking the better for its examination.

john  
vihstadt  
**different  
drummer**