

Crystal ball foresees Muskie as Demos' compromise candidate

by STEVE GERSTEL

WASHINGTON — The Democratic National Convention is underway at Madison Square Garden in New York City.

That joyous old song of Democrats — "Happy Times Are Here Again" — bravely bales but fails to lessen the gloom gripping party leaders and delegates.

Demonstrators ring the Garden: unemployed, anti-nukes, anti-draft, Hispanics, blacks, gays and, mostly, anti-administration.

Veterans of Chicago, 1968, have an uneasy feeling but there is no violence. New York's finest are in control and Mayor Ed Koch is no Mayor Richard Daley.

But the delegates — the leaders and the sheep — ignore the demonstrations to ponder the grim choice they have to make.

President Carter, who accepted the 1976 nomination in this city and this hall, has come into the convention with several hundred votes more than the 1,666 he needs to go over the top.

But Ted Kennedy, written off several times during the primaries, has stayed in the race, waiting for Carter to self-destruct.

In a desperate gamble to deny the president a second nomination, Kennedy has asked the convention to abandon the temporary rule which binds a delegate to a candidate for the first ballot.

Despite the efforts of Bob Strauss and the pleadings of the president and his top government officials, wavering Carter delegates defect. The rule is broken. The convention is wideopen.

Carter, the soft-spoken southerner who catapulted from obscurity to the White House, is still the favorite of many Democrats. But others question his ability to win in November.

Inflation is double-digit, the recession is worse than expected, unemployment is high and getting higher, interest rates have come down — but not much, the hostages are still in Tehran and the Russians are still in Afghanistan.

But Kennedy cannot take advantage of Carter's obvious weaknesses. His troops are loyal — more loyal than Carter's — but there are not enough of them.

The delegates cannot forget the baggage which saddles Kennedy. Nor can they ignore the polls which

consistently show that a third of the voters will not

their ballots for the last of the Kennedy brothers.

The grim realization sinks in — Carter and Kennedy must both be denied the nomination. A compromise candidate must be found.

But the possibilities are limited. The compromise candidate must have the support of active not tacit, of Carter and Kennedy or the nomination is worthless.

The compromise candidate must have instant recognition. With less than three months before election, it is too late for an unknown.

The compromise candidate will have the dramatic power to once again unite the traditional elements of the Democratic party — liberals, labor, ethnics, the blacks — and reach out to the growing number of independents and the newly-minted affluent.

One of the first mentioned is Vice President Walter Mondale, a protégé of Hubert Humphrey and a holder of a liberal record only slightly smirched in the last two and a half years.

Mondale, although popular with all segments of the party, is finally ruled out by his close association and fervent support of Carter's policies.

Finally, after many trial balloons are floated and captured, the delegates settle on a candidate.

He is Secretary of State Edmund Muskie. Muskie, independent, stubborn and trigger-tempered, is chosen as the candidate who can heal deep wounds within the party and carry the fight to Reagan in the months ahead.

His credentials are impressive: Secretary of State, years in the Senate, four years as governor of Maine, vice presidential candidate in 1968 and a contender for the presidential nomination in 1972.

A long-time favorite of Carter's, who considered as his running-mate four years ago and named him secretary of state, Muskie also comes from the same wing of the party as Kennedy.

An excellent although not enthusiastic campaigner, Muskie showed his appeal to the traditional Democratic strongholds in 1968. His tenure as head of the Senate Budget Committee showed he could cut spending programs even when to do so ran against his instincts.

Far-fetched? Probably. But not impossible.



Hostage crisis could force Carter to make final move — out of race

by DAVID S. BRODER

In the first days since the sickening news came of the failure of the secret effort to rescue the hostages in Iran, Americans have been doing what they always do in a moment of crisis. They have rallied around the President as a symbol of order and authority in a world of anarchy and danger.

The instinctive reaction was deepened by the national anger at the Iranian authorities — whose crudity knows no limits — for making a public display in their capital of the charred bodies of the eight Americans who died in the rescue mission.

But when those first reactions of patriotism and injured national pride have faded, it is as certain as anything can be that Jimmy Carter will face the most troubling questions of his presidency. These questions may even force him to ask himself whether he can deal with this crisis while at the same time continuing his tortured, self-limited campaign for renomination and reelection.

The coming turn of events was foreshadowed for me by two letters that were on my desk, awaiting answers, as the terrible news of the Iranian rescue attempt came in. I cite them, not because I agree with them, but because they speak so clearly to the credibility crisis that will soon face this president.

One, written on April 11, came from an Atlanta businessman, who said at the outset, "I confess to being a Republican and ... a non-supporter of Carter."

When former Ambassador (William) Sullivan was in Atlanta about three months ago ... he stated that in February of 1979, after militants invaded the (Tehran) embassy and were driven back ... he sent a cable to the State Department to the effect that if the Shah were brought into this country, the embassy and its personnel would be taken over.

"In October of 1979, Carter's polls gave him a historic low rating of 76 percent negative. He brought the Shah into this country, claiming humanitarian reasons, and the embassy was taken over. The world knows what that did for Carter's campaign, reversing his negative rating to a highly positive one.

"Mr. Carter is now back, according to the polls, to a 68 percent negative rating. What risks will he now be willing to take to reverse the scale? I've already admitted I am biased where Carter is concerned, but this is predicated on 12 years of watching him in Georgia. He is the most politically saturated man I've ever known ... and he can rationalize his motives without any difficulty whatsoever. I am, quite seriously, concerned about

where he might be willing to take the people of this country in order to be re-elected."

The second letter, written two days earlier, on April 9, in London, came from an acquaintance active in British politics.

"As you know from our conversations last year," he wrote, "I have found your president a puzzle from the beginning, but I never shared the view of some of my colleagues that his unpredictability was a menace. But I must say his handling of the hostage situation strikes me as so contradictory in its own terms that I am becoming alarmed.

"You have no idea — unless you are watching from the outside — how unsettling the whole world finds the spectacle of the American President, on whose judgment and will we all rely, allowing his schedule, his activities, his policy and his dealings with his allies to be dictated by that gang of hoodlums holding your people in Tehran.

"The policy of patience made sense to us at first, on the assumption that he was subordinating the 'hostage issue' to the larger strategic considerations in the region. But he has let the hostage issue subordinate everything else in his own thinking, and is asking us in the alliance to do the same thing.

"The cynics over here — including some of your own colleagues in the press — are saying that he is using this issue to hold off his domestic political challengers. I hope you can explain what is going on, or, at least, assure me that the worst interpretation is not justified."

I have written both men that my own belief is that the situation in Iran after the failure of the rescue effort is grim enough in its consequences to need no deepening by doubts about the President's motives — doubts which I personally do not share.

But that suspicion will not be dissipated by my letters, nor by this column, nor will it easily be ended by the words of the president himself. The resignation of Secretary of State Vance assured that the decision to attempt the rescue will be a matter of both domestic and international debate.

President Carter may, in time, find that the hostage crisis is incompatible with politics as usual, in a far more fundamental way than he supposed when he first made that comment last in November. He may find that only by ending his status as a candidate can he gain the freedom of action and credibility of motive he needs to deal with the deepening crisis in Iran.

(c) 1980, The Washington Post Co.

Female middies

First women at Annapolis end four years in fishbowl

by JOHN W. FRECE

ANNAPOLIS, Md. — Elizabeth Belzer, who probably will be the first woman to graduate from the U.S. Naval Academy, knows a misconception about the academy's women when she hears one.

"I'm not doing less. I'm doing different," she said when asked if the modified physical requirements for female midshipmen meant the women were doing less than the men. "My ability is different and I therefore do something that is different.

Belzer has been doing something different since she and 80 other young women arrived in Annapolis four years ago to snap 135 years of tradition and break many a crusty seaman's heart by enrolling in the school that has trained America's naval officers since 1845.

Of the original 81, 55 remain. All are expected to graduate May 25.

When they do, they will end four years of life in a fishbowl, years in which they have been watched, interviewed, tested, compared, photographed, criticized, and at last, almost reluctantly, accepted and even praised.

"They have proven themselves over the four years," said Cal Shintani, 21, of Odesa, one of about 900 male midshipmen who also will graduate at the end of May. "They're trying just as hard to accomplish the same goals."

Shintani's hesitant acceptance of his female classmates began aboard a Navy patrol boat the summer after his plebe year.

"We had a girl down in the engine room and a fire broke out. She handled the fire and still ran all the engines," he recalled. "Before that, I wasn't sure how women

would react under pressure, but I was pretty impressed with that."

Which is not to say the women have not been ridiculed or resented, or even booed last fall en masse by the males while Adm. Thomas Hayward, the Chief of Naval Operations, looked on with a grin.

"You just don't put women in a traditionally male institution without having some rough spots," said Rear Adm. William P. Lawrence, academy superintendent.

"Young men are proud of the so-called — it's not my term — the 'rite of passage to manhood,'" said Lawrence. "To the young men, it is a point of pride: they've met the challenge. They may perceive (with women at the academy) that that image would be removed."

Resentment against the women, keen the first year, was mostly forgotten the next two, but has resurfaced as the soon-to-graduate women have regained the spotlight.

Male middies eagerly joke about how news stories of their graduation will list the names of 50 or so women, but will never mention the 900 men who also receive diplomas and commissions.

Some, such as Midshipman John Elnitsky, think academy officials sometimes have nudged the women into leadership positions because they are on public view.

"The 'powers that be' sometimes try to help them 'prove themselves' too much," said the 21-year-old senior. "It seemed like whenever you came down to a choice between a man or a woman who were equal, the woman got it."

Midshipmen of both sexes often are riled at Congress' refusal to permit women to fly planes or serve on ships that might go into

combat, a limitation that has reduced them to a second-class status.

"I'd like to be able to say I can go on a destroyer or a cruiser, or fly planes like the guys," said Belzer. "But the fact is that we have moved ahead (with increased opportunities each year since admission). The men realize Congress is the one in control of this — not the women."

Shintani thinks the men and women should be treated the same, but Elnitsky believes the congressional distinctions are valid.

"I'm not in favor of letting women fight," the Allentown, Pa., native said. "I wouldn't want my sister out there fighting with a platoon of Marines."

The academy's women, however, have broken new ground with everything they have done, and most think the combat restrictions eventually will be eliminated.

"I know it's going to come," said Melissa Harrington of Fayetteville, N.Y., who in four years at Annapolis has grown accustomed to meeting challenges formerly reserved for males, such as cruising on Navy ships, parachuting or handling the sensitive controls of a jet fighter.

Since the beginning, the female middies have shared with the men virtually every academy experience, even living on the same halls of Bancroft Hall, the academy's mammoth dormitory.

Some have even dated their male counterparts, although Harrington said with a laugh that for the males "it's not a prestigious thing."

Nevertheless, as many as eight of the 55 who should graduate this May, including Belzer, are expected to marry either a classmate or a midshipman who graduated

in the last couple of years.

Despite that statistic, no one interviewed said there has ever been a serious problem with what the military call "fraternization" since the women were admitted.

Training for the women — 357 have been admitted in four years — is virtually identical to that for the men.

Academically, there is no difference, although the women tend to enter with higher verbal test scores than men and lower scores in math, and prefer majors in the humanities or social studies in greater numbers than the men.

All, however, graduate with bachelor of science degrees.

Physically, the requirement differences are slight. Women are permitted a little more time to run the mile or the obstacle course and they do a different type of pull-up.

Lawrence said the main physical differences are in upper body strength and overall endurance, but said even those have been reduced by improved high school physical education programs for women.

Comparative statistics are distorted by the 17-to-1 male-female ratio, but so far an average of about one-in-three of the women admitted has left before graduation compared with about one-in-four for the men. A four-year education costs about \$89,700.

The 55 senior women are from 24 states, the most — eight — from Texas.

Of the 26 in the first class who left, six were gone by the end of plebe summer and 18 had left by the end of the first year.

Carter's handling of Iran crisis taking toll on his administration

by HELEN THOMAS

WASHINGTON — President Carter has said for many months that the American hostages have been in his mind every waking moment. He said it again to a gathering of community leaders this week.

But there is strong evidence that high visibility of the Iranian crisis is now taking a political toll on the administration, and presidential aides have recommended that it get a lower profile at the White House.

Carter also has decided to end his self-imposed exile against travel outside of Washington until the hostages are safely home.

The frustrations of the last six months and the ill-fated rescue mission all have added up to a change of signals. Carter's political strategists are buoyed that he has decided to come out of the Rose Garden.

The problem is not that Carter has done badly against Sen. Edward Kennedy by staying in the White House. If anything, they are saying that he has the Democratic nomination sewed up.

But Ronald Reagan, the apparent Republican winner, has gained in the polls and is now perhaps too close for comfort. So, Carter is hitting the road again.

Many newspaper editorials have applauded his decision to move around the country and to adopt a benign neglect

approach to the hostage situation.

Carter has been faulted for the concentration on Iran, some critics saying that he has ignored the nation's pressing problems, particularly inflation.

In an appearance before the League of Women Voters recently, Carter did not mention Iran.

Little is said these days from the administration end on whereabouts and the condition of the hostages. But it is understood that the location of their captivity is known.

Back to the drawing board is the order of the day — reassess and to try another round of quiet diplomacy, hoping that the Iranians by the time a new Parliament is organized see the light.

Carter has not fared badly politically in the ordeal. He showed that for months, the American people willingly backed his policy of patience. Then, when their patience and began to run out, he tried the high-risk rescue mission and failed.

And he found out what his predecessors — particularly F. Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs invasion — had learned: Americans generally feel it's better to have tried and failed than never to have tried at all.

His polls are up again even though he did put the lives of least some of the hostages in jeopardy.

So he has a temporary reprieve — time to try and nail down four more years at 1600 Pennsylvania Ave.

the small society

by Brickman



THE BATTALION

USPS 045 360

LETTERS POLICY

Letters to the editor should not exceed 300 words and are subject to being cut to that length or less if longer. The editorial staff reserves the right to edit such letters and does not guarantee to publish any letter. Each letter must be signed, show the address of the writer and list a telephone number for verification.

Address correspondence to Letters to the Editor, The Battalion, Room 216, Reed McDonald Building, College Station, Texas 77843.

Represented nationally by National Educational Advertising Services, Inc., New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles.

The Battalion is published Monday through Friday from September through May except during exam and holiday periods and the summer, when it is published on Tuesday through Thursday.

Mail subscriptions are \$16.75 per semester, \$33.25 per school year, \$35.00 per full year. Advertising rates furnished on request. Address: The Battalion, Room 216, Reed McDonald Building, College Station, Texas 77843.

United Press International is entitled exclusively to the use for reproduction of all news dispatches credited to it. Rights of reproduction of all other matter herein reserved. Second-Class postage paid at College Station, TX 77843.

Opinions expressed in The Battalion are those of the editor or of the writer of the article and are not necessarily those of the University Administration or the Board of

MEMBER

Texas Press Association
Southwest Journalism Congress

Editor Dillard Smith
Asst. Managing Editor Rhonda Warren
City Editor Becky Swann
Sports Editor Rusty Clark
News Editor Lynn Blum
Focus Editor Rhonda Warren

Staff Writers Nancy Anderson
Uschi Michel-Howell, Debbie Nelson
Cathy Saathoff, Jana Smith, Todd Wood

Photo Editor Lee Roy Leschper
Photographers Lynn Blanco, Steve Clark

Regents. The Battalion is a non-profit, supporting enterprise operated by students as a university and community newspaper. Editorial policy is determined by the editors.