



VIEWPOINT

THE BATTALION
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

WEDNESDAY
MAY 21, 1980

Bush stands better chance of gaining party acceptance

by ARNOLD SAWISLAK

WASHINGTON — In some ways, the Democratic and Republican nomination contests this year are remarkably alike, but they also have some differences that could have a strong impact on the 1980 election.

First, the campaigns of Democrat Edward Kennedy against President Carter and Republican George Bush against Ronald Reagan both classify as underdog challenges.

Kennedy, of course, is trying to unseat an incumbent of his own party, which is a challenge both rare and risky. Reagan may not have as obvious a claim on the nomination as Carter, but the former California governor certainly had some kind of squatter's rights dating back to his 1976 near miss. And Bush's campaign was from the first an effort to take the nomination away from Reagan.

Both Kennedy and Bush also are attacking their opponents from the left.

Kennedy's liberal stance is so pronounced that it has provided the Carter camp with considerable campaign ammunition. Bush is actually more conservative than Reagan in some areas, such as tax cutting, but in general he is less clearly associated with the Republican right wing than the frontrunner.

The campaign strategy of the two challengers also shared a common premise. Both Kennedy and Bush claimed if they could get Carter and Reagan alone in the ring, they would win.

Kennedy's strategy failed because he could not get Carter out of the White House. His effort to capitalize on Carter's Rose Garden strategy simply did not sell. Kennedy finally gave up on that line as a main element of

his campaign and turned to attacks on Carter's policies. Bush's strategy succeeded so well it may have doomed his campaign. When the Republican hopefuls goaded Reagan for refusing to debate in Iowa, he came out fighting and knocked all but Bush out of the race in short order.

Bush's claim that he could beat Reagan in one-on-one contests appeared to have some credence in Pennsylvania but it took a licking in Indiana, Tennessee, North Carolina, Maryland and Nebraska. With only two candidates in the field, Bush lost every primary after Pennsylvania except the District of Columbia, where Reagan was not on the ballot.

The big difference in the two challenges is in what is likely to happen after the nominations are decided.

Both the Reagan and Carter camps have begun treating the challengers very carefully, obviously hoping to unify the party when the contests are over. Reagan sticks grimly to his "11th Commandment" forbidding criticism of fellow Republicans and Carter campaign chief Robert Strauss pledges make every effort to smooth over differences.

Bush and his supporters may very well embrace their victors at the GOP national convention. Bush made much of his party regularity during the early stages of the campaign, and actually has said little that would make it embarrassing for him to support Reagan.

But Kennedy, and especially some of his more zealous supporters, have pictured Carter as a traitor to the Democratic heritage. It will be hard for the senator and his enthusiasts to swallow a Carter victory and if they can't, the party may be in for another bloodletting of the sort that helped put Republicans in the White House from 1969 through 1977.

Reality of unemployment clearer than inflation's ghost

by DAVID S. BRODER

PORTLAND, Ore. — If Portland is the center of the political universe, as some of us believe, then the recession — and not inflation — is the dominant domestic issue in campaign 1980.

The state's lumber industry has followed the housing industry into the doldrums, with the state employment division reporting that joblessness in the forest products industry jumped from 10,000 to 16,000 just in the past month.

That parallels the sudden leap in the national unemployment statistics reported this month and underlines the difficulty President Carter and the Democratic Congress face in their attempt to dodge the debris of the falling economy.

Michael Boskin, a Stanford University economist, pointed out recently that the net real spendable earnings of the average American family fell by 7.9 percent from the spring of 1979 to the spring of 1980. That decline in real income, or purchasing power, was the sharpest in 40 years.

The economists are guessing that the erosion in living standards will continue for the rest of this year, but at a slower rate. The expected easing of inflation in the last half of 1980 should close part of the gap between prices and wages.

But that will be little consolation for the Democrats if last month's jump in unemployment — the sharpest increase in six years — signals the onset of a recession more severe than the administration economists had forecast.

Inflation and recession are the twin horns of the Democrats' economic dilemma. They don't like to face either of them in a presidential and congressional election year, but their theory has been that inflation may be politically fatal, while unemployment is merely painful. Thus the frantic efforts in Congress the past three weeks to pass "balanced budget" resolutions for fiscal year 1981, beginning next October.

The members know that it is a proper triumph, likely to be rendered academic by the surge in unemployment and the sag in the economy. But they think it is a symbolic gesture the voters demand.

The theory that inflation — rather than recession — is the main political threat to the Democrats looks considerably less plausible from this side of the continent than it does in the Capitol's

corridors. On the face of it, a problem that affects everyone, like inflation, figures to be more politically damaging than one like unemployment, which directly impacts a minority of the work force.

But there is evidence that inflation, because it is so diffuse and intractable, may not be as much of a "voting issue" as unemployment. When politicians talk about a "voting issue," they mean one on which the voters discern a real difference between candidates (or parties) and use that difference to decide how to cast their ballots.

There are very important public concerns which are not voting issues, either because all candidates are essentially on the same side or because the voters doubt that anyone can do much to change the situation. Crime is such an issue, and inflation may be one, too.

Opinion analysts Seymour Martin Lipset and William Schneider, writing in the new issue of Public Opinion magazine, make an intriguing point about the relative influence of inflation and recession on voters' attitudes.

"A high rate of inflation seems to have a strongly depressing effect upon the public's expectations of the future," they write, while "unemployment ... does not appear to affect the public's overall view of the future."

A possible explanation for this difference, they suggest, "is that people have grown up believing there are solutions for unemployment ... but the public has no clear sense of how to cure high rates of inflation."

What unemployment does is weaken confidence in the functioning of key institutions, including Congress and the presidency. Lipset and Schneider suggest that people blame rising unemployment on the incompetence of the people running things, while inflation is regarded as more of a natural curse.

"The solution" to unemployment, they write, appears to be to replace the people in charge, while the "solution" to inflation may simply be to shrug one's shoulders and curse the fates.

If that is correct — as the talk in Oregon seems to suggest — the Democrats who have spent the last two years worrying about what inflation could do to them could find themselves blindfolded by the old enemy, unemployment.

(c) 1980, The Washington Post Company

New insights help make this White House book readable

by HELEN THOMAS

WASHINGTON — The market is flooded with books about the White House by those who are ready to tell all.

But for refreshing revelations of past presidents, their lifestyles, their sometimes erratic behavior, their arrogance, the abuses of power, it is worthwhile reading a soon-to-be-published book titled "Breaking Cover."

The author is Bill Gulley, a former Marine sergeant who ran the Military Office from the days of President Lyndon Johnson up to the presidency of Jimmy Carter.

Gulley says there is a multimillion-dollar Secret Fund, held by the Military Office, which only the President and the Military Office are authorized to use. It was created to provide emergency funds in case of an unexpected attack on the country.

But it has been abused, according to Gulley. Funds from the secret fund, he says, were used for a variety of installations at the LBJ Ranch, and during the Nixon era for massive reconstruction and decoration of Camp David, including a \$500,000 swimming pool outside Aspen Lodge, the President's cabin at the mountaintop retreat.

According to Gulley, the Secret Fund was used to subsidize the White House Mess, to build helicopter pads at Richard Nixon's homes at San Clemente, Calif., and Key Biscayne, Fla., and to install a huge generator on Johnson's Texas ranch.

Gulley's book, published by Simon Shuster, is replete with amusing hitherto untold anecdotes, some unprintable in a family newspaper, about Johnson and Nixon. Johnson's insatiable ego, his "hatred of the Kennedys" and his demands for planes and other accommodations even after he left office are recounted.

Gulley was the White House liaison with past presidents. He recalls the first time he went to see Nixon at San Clemente after Nixon had resigned, the former president was "mainly concerned about getting his entitlements."

"Look," he said, "I'm entitled to anything that any other former president is entitled to. (Expletive) You know what I did for Johnson and you know I did things for Ike and Truman and (expletive) I expect to be treated the same way. When I travel I expect military aircraft. I expect the same support I provided. I expect communications and medical personnel, everything they had. And (expletive) you tell Ford I expect it."

Gulley said that Nixon was "shamed, bitter, exhausted, strung out, demanding, combative; he didn't have his head together."

Gulley says Nixon told him that "Ford has just got to realize there are times Henry (Kissinger) has to be kicked right in the —. It's the only way he can be controlled because sometimes Henry starts to think he's the president. But other times you have to pet Henry and treat him like a child."

The author said that "in the last days of the Ford administration, when a farewell party was being planned for Kissinger, his aide, Larry Eagleburger, now ambassador to Yugoslavia, called and asked if they could have some little memento from the plane to present to Henry."

"I called the Air Force One office, got Col. Les McClelland, the pilot of Air Force One, and asked him to have something sent over. He said, 'Bill, Kissinger's already taken everything off the thing but the landing gear. Does he want that too?'"

He said that when he first met with President Carter, he was told by Carter, "Camp David costs too much money. I want it closed."

Gulley said he asked Carter if he knew what all the facilities were at the retreat. "Yes, cabins," he said.

Then Gulley explained to him about the bomb shelter, the emergency communications center and other facilities.

"It's especially ironic in view of what Camp David has come to be for Jimmy Carter," said Gulley, "but it was the same with everything. He had the answers before he added up the numbers."

Talk shows help book publishers flourish

by DICK WEST
United Press International

WASHINGTON — In the last decade or so there has been a multifold increase in the number of books published in this country each year.

The statistics alone might lead you to believe America is in the throes of a cultural awakening the likes of which the world has seldom seen. But when you start looking between the covers,

you can see this is not the case.

The majority of the books being published today, including some on the best-seller lists, don't remotely resemble literature. Even what are known in the trade as "nonbooks" are dignified with dust jackets by the score.

I was talking with a local book scout about this phenomenon and suggested that the tastes of the reading public must be steadily deteriorating.

"The reading public has nothing to do with it," he replied. "The publishing business no longer is geared to the demands of readers for books. It is geared to the demands of talk shows for authors."

In recent years, he pointed out, the talk show format has grown beyond all imagining. There are radio talk shows and television talk shows; network talk shows and local talk shows; early morning talk shows, afternoon talk shows, all-night talks shows and talk shows at just about every hour in between.

"The staple guest on all of these shows is the visiting author," the book scout continued. "Without a steady stream of authors dropping into the studio to be interviewed, most talk shows couldn't last out the season."

"This insatiable demand imposes great strains on the publishers, whose responsibility it is to provide the books that are plugged on talk shows. In their mad scramble to supply the daily quota of authors for talk show interviews, they have been forced to drop all pre-text of literary merit."

"The main test now is wordage. If a manuscript, however feeble, is long enough to fill a book, bombs away!"

Although most books nowadays are published primarily to provide authors for talk shows, the scout told me the source isn't as dependable as talk show producers would like.

"There have been a few spot situations in which talk shows had more air time than there were new books to plug," he said.

"Some talk show hosts have tried to alleviate the shortage by writing books about themselves. But those are stop-gap remedies at best."

"We may soon see the networks and larger independent stations buying publishing firms, or starting up new ones, in order to produce their own supply of authors."

I asked the scout whether talk show plugs really stimulated book sales. "Oh, absolutely," he said. "If the number of sales ever equals the number of talk show appearances by the author, it's a best seller."

Letters

More flak for Dr. Miller

Bad advice

Editor: I have just received Debbie Nelson's account of Pres. Miller's rejection of Ms. Zentgraf's hand at graduation. I am utterly dismayed by the lack of manners and good judgement.

I cannot apologize for Dr. Miller, but please convey to Ms. Zentgraf assurances that Dr. Miller does not speak and act for this Aggie. I heartily congratulate Ms. Zentgraf upon a successful completion of her studies at A&M.

Dwan V. Kerig '46
Professor of Law
University of San Diego (Calif.)

Editor: It is true that housing prices can rise and fall. But unlike other investments including securities, savings accounts, life insurance, precious gems and metals, housing satisfies the basic need for shelter.

So long as dollars decline in purchasing power and/or household formation increases, housing will continue to be in strong demand. Mr. Alan D. Phipps' letter in The Battalion (May 7) failed to recognize this; his advice is misleading.

Jack P. Friedman

Readers' Forum

Guest viewpoints, in addition to Letters to the Editor, are welcome. All pieces submitted to Readers' Forum should be:

- Typed triple space
- Limited to 60 characters per line
- Limited to 100 lines

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 use for reproduction of all news dispatches copyright in it.

Rights of reproduction of all other matter herein reserved.

Second-Class postage paid at College Station, TX 77843.

MEMBER

Texas Press Association
Southwest Journalism Congress

Editor: Dillard S. ...
City Editor: ...
Sports Editor: Richard ...
News Editor: Lynn ...

Staff Writers: ...
Debbie Nelson, Cathy Saathoff, ...
Meyer, Jon ...

Photo Editor: Lee Roy Leschep

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

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