

Daily Nebraskan  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Curt Wagner, Editor, 472-1766  
Amy Edwards, Editorial Page Editor  
Jane Hirt, Managing Editor  
Lee Rood, Associate News Editor  
Diana Johnson, Wire Page Editor  
Chuck Green, Copy Desk Chief  
Lisa Donovan, Columnist

## Just check the box

Say no to drugs to keep money coming

Students who have Pell Grants had better watch out if they do drugs. Well, not really.

Under a new law that bars students who receive federal grants from using controlled substances, recipients of grants must sign a statement that says "I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession or use of a controlled substance during the period covered by my Pell Grant."

The law was implemented March 15, and the Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln put boxes on award notices for students to check if they agree to the statement.

OSFA Director John Beacon said Pell Grants won't be given to students who don't check the box.

So students will check the box. Then they'll do drugs.

Education Secretary Lauro F. Cavazos announced that Education Department investigators will start spot checks on college campuses to see if Pell Grant recipients are using controlled substances, according to an article in The Chronicle for Higher Education.

Jim Bradshaw, spokesman for the department, said no drug tests will be used to check if students are using drugs.

If no drug tests are used, how in the world can they prove that students are using drugs?

Well, Cavazos thinks he has the hard-hitting solution. In his speech at the annual meeting of the National Conference on Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Cavazos said "we expect to rely on tips from the public."

Great idea -- use a snitch to strip students of the money that allows them to get a better education. No fear though, because how many students run to the financial aid office after witnessing drug use?

Wanting a drug-free education system is a great, even noble, idea. But the plan is far too sketchy. There is no way that Cavazos and his crew are going to get students to admit they use drugs if they know they will lose their money, let alone the near impossibility of enforcing such a policy.

Cavazos said that investigators could use drug convictions to take away the grants.

But one of Beacon's concerns with the program was for students who get a drug conviction during the middle of the semester. What happens then? Do the students have to return their grant?

The program is a waste of money and time. Without a conviction, evidence from "informers" is not strong enough to deny someone an education.

After all, education itself is fundamental to the battle against drugs.

-- Amy Edwards  
for the Daily Nebraskan

## opinion READER

### Arms are a constitutional right

I'm outraged, saddened and puzzled. I share James Sennett's outrage that a young girl's life was endangered by some brainless (or worse) clown. It's the same sort of anger I feel when I see a parent whose child is not secured in a car seat. If our concern for the safety of innocents is something more than melodrama then we should address the issue of motor vehicles which kill and maim hundreds of times more innocents each year than firearms do.

I'm saddened when a presumably educated person dismisses issues of constitutionality as "drivel" and advocates giving up our rights in such an offhand manner. I'll wager that Mr. Sennett is somewhat more committed to his right of freedom of speech, which he does choose to exercise. For clarification, "... the right of the people to keep and bear arms ..." is no more "assumed"

than any other right guaranteed by the Constitution.

I'm puzzled that some of those who perceive themselves as champions of civil liberties skip over the Second Amendment as if it's somehow less worthy of defense. As for Mr. Sennett's contention that the police and the military are the only people who should possess firearms, I would suggest that this is exactly contrary to the Constitution.

The populations of El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama and many others labor under exactly the sort of system that Mr. Sennett advocates. Mistrust of and disdain for the "established systems of societal protection" may be the seeds of anarchy, but a disarmed and cowed populace is the fruit of tyranny.

Robert N. Gale  
Lincoln

# LINCOLN'S THIRD LEADING EMPLOYER



## Administrations need sensitivity

Nine hostages remain in Lebanon, yet government does nothing

Terry Anderson, Thomas Sutherland and Frank Herbert Reed. Joseph James Cicippio, Edward Austin Tracy and Alann Bradford Steen. Jesse Jonathan Turner, Robert Bruce Polhill and Lt. Col. William Richard Higgins. Peter Kilburn (found shot April 17, 1986). William Buckley (presumed executed October 4, 1985).

Do any of these names mean anything to you? They should. These are the nine Americans being held hostage in Lebanon. Anderson is entering his fifth year in captivity. Higgins has been held for just over one year.

Can you even begin to imagine what it would be like to be held in captivity for more than four years? Not ever knowing if you would be released or killed, not knowing what has happened to your family. Anderson does not know that his father has died.

Can you imagine being the wife or child of one of these nine? How would you tell your son or daughter that they may never see their father again? Imagine having your husband held hostage for years.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of all is the continued insensitivity of both the Reagan and now the Bush administrations. I can remember when the hostages were being held in Iran. Everyday there was something in the news about it. I even remember the yellow ribbons tied around trees to honor the hostages. All of America was behind them and all of America was hoping and praying for their release.

The hostages were held in Iran for 444 days. They were released on the day Reagan was inaugurated, and when news of their release was made known, all of America breathed a sigh of relief. The new president

bathed in the glow of his success at getting them released. His message was that America would no longer tolerate that sort of activity.

Of the nine hostages, eight have been held for more than 444 days. Yet the very individual who heralded the release of the Iranian hostages eight years ago did absolutely nothing in the name of freeing the hostages in Lebanon.

Not counting the "arms for hostages" deal.

Craig Heckman



It still boggles my mind how the administration could tell us with one face that they would not deal with terrorists, while their other face was doing just that. At least when Jimmy Carter tried and failed to rescue the hostages he admitted it was a mistake -- Reagan hasn't admitted, or done anything.

Ironically, one of the more successful methods of gaining the release of hostages is no longer being used -- Nabih Berri, the leader of the Amal militia. According to an article written by Clyde Mark, Lebanon: The Remaining U.S. Hostage, between 1983 and 1986, Berri secured the release of or rescued nine hostages. Unfortunately he quit working for the release of American hostages after the United States led a boycott of the Beirut International Airport.

It seems to me that it would have been wise for the Reagan administration to make the fullest use of Berri's

services. Assuming, of course, that the administration wanted their release.

The man who took his place has done absolutely nothing to attempt to free the nine Americans being held. Bush continually referred to a "thousand points of light" throughout the campaign last year. I have yet to see even one point of light.

It goes beyond just doing very little to get the hostages released. Both the Reagan and Bush administrations have placed the issue on the back burner -- the backest burner they could find. Very seldom, if ever, do you hear anything from the government on the state of the hostages (except when one is released).

I realize that other issues are important here, like the policy of not dealing with terrorists. Supposedly, dealing with them not only legitimizes them, but it encourages more terrorist activity. Well, it seems to me that this policy of not dealing with terrorists has failed. It has failed in part because the Reagan administration tended to talk with more than one face.

I have a solution to this problem, one that is really quite simple. Kidnap various members of the administration and Congress. Hold them in captivity for a month or so in conditions similar to those in Lebanon. At the end of the month I can guarantee they will do anything to get the hostages released.

The nine Americans being held now and those who have been held and released are true American heroes. It's a shame that all Americans have not yet realized this. They deserve our thoughts and prayers.

Heckman is a senior international affairs major and a Daily Nebraskan editorial columnist.

## Reader suggests leaving country to Sennett

If Mr. Sennett takes such offense at the Constitution of the United States, specifically the Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights, I suggest that he move to the Soviet Union or some other country where he wouldn't have to worry about such troublesome problems as privately owned assault rifles, freedom of the press, or trial by jury.

I would think that a man as obviously intelligent as Mr. Sennett would also be blessed with enough common sense to realize that by attacking the rights of gun owners he will not only help weaken and destroy the Second Amendment, but the entire foundation of the Bill of Rights.

If the Second Amendment goes down, Mr. Sennett, don't you think that will pave the way for the fall of

the other nine? You are a journalist and a religious man, therefore you undoubtedly hold the freedoms of press and religion very highly. I just hope that you realize before it is too late that you will inevitably destroy much more than you think.

Brian J. Allen  
mechanical engineering  
freshman  
NRA member

## letter POLICY

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor from all readers.

Letters will be selected for publication on the basis of clarity, originality, timeliness and space available. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit all material submitted.

Readers also are welcome to submit

material as guest opinions. Whether material should run as a letter or guest opinion, or not to run, is left to the editor's discretion.

Letters and guest opinions sent to the newspaper become the property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous submissions will not be

considered for publication. Letters should include the author's name, year in school, major and group affiliation, if any. Requests to withhold names will not be granted.

Submit material to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.