

Dear Behrend:

As everyone knows, Viet Nam is in the news every day. Our Government has elected to take a firm stand in that seemingly unimportant God forsaken jungle swamp. The reason that the United States Government has made the all-important decision to spend so much time, money and the precious lives of hundreds of American servicemen, is only too obvious. We, as the greatest nation alive, must halt the spread of communism in defending the free world.

The United States isn't in Viet Nam because they want to be there. We are there, because we have to be there. Our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines are there to do one of the biggest tasks ever called upon, and what kind of support are they getting from the United States public? I'll say only this, "It is disgraceful."

I am happy to say that the Behrend Campus and most of the other colleges in the area have shown their whole-hearted support to our government policy in Viet Nam. The Behrend Campus started a program that quickly spread to Gannon, Erie Business School, Villa Maria, and Mercyhurst colleges. As you know, three hundred and twenty-five students presented themselves to the Red Cross on Monday, January 17, 1966, to donate blood to save the lives of our servicemen who are carrying out the all-important campaign in Southeast Asia. I am extremely proud of our efforts in carrying out this Blood Program to a successful finish.

As the recent chairman of this program, I wish to sincerely thank all of the students from the Behrend Campus for their most generous support of this program. This type of donation is one of the greatest contributions we could make to our servicemen next to being there ourselves. You can be certain that this blood was graciously accepted by the Red Cross for this purpose. Sincerely,

James R. Barickman

Dear Mr. Editor,

I strongly disagree with the editorial in last week's Nittany Cub. I don't feel that you fully thought through all aspects of the problem, but rather were anxious to give a hasty opinion. Your statements lacked supporting evidence, they contradicted each other, and they were completely erroneous.

To point this out, you stated that war could possibly destroy chances for fulfillment of a belief. In that same paragraph you stated that a student is "being inconsistent if he looks with disfavor... on a draft policy." What does one have to do with the other? If a student sets his sights for some future goal, why can't he disagree with the draft policy in order to reach his goal?

"The winning of any war is based on production," you stated. Production of what? I would like to know what information you based this statement upon. Naturally, the college student cannot be economically productive while paying for an education that will enable him to surpass the non-college student in economic productivity. Why does the editor place the emphasis upon economic productivity? The college student is mentally productive, mental productivity is the only thing that can win the war in Viet Nam, and is the key to all other productivity in this country. With modern technology and machinery, manpower is not nearly important in industry as the editor seems to think. For example, what good are 50 men working on some complicated scientific problem for 8 hours a day for several weeks, when an IBM computer can do the problem in 12 minutes? What good are 100,000 Marines during a thermo-nuclear attack on the United States?

How can the editor say that the college student who disfavors the draft program is being inconsistent? What is he being inconsistent about? And who is to say that in wishing to

Cont. Pg. 6