Editorial

Nixon's image gets new coat of gloss: How soon we forget

A recent article in the Los Angeles Times chronicled a growing phenomenon in America: The reemergence of Richard Nixon as a respected public figure.

Many have begun to praise Nixon as the man who opened the road to China and achieved detente with the Soviets. True statements all, and Nixon should be commended for them. But, in our haste to praise famous men, let's not forget the other side of the coin. (Or, in Nixon's case, the thousand-dollar bill.)

This is the same man who was driven from office in disgrace, the same man who, had he not resigned the presidency, would have been impeached and removed from office. This also is the same man who almost certainly would have been indicted if Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski had been so inclined and if Gerald Ford had not pardoned him.

No one can deny that the Nixon administration had its foreign policy triumphs, but there is a seamier side to that foreign policy that many of these revisionist historians seem to have forgotten.

Nixon was the architect of a disastrous Vietnam policy, a policy that saw this country entrenched in Vietnam for four long years after he took power.

And peace, when it finally came, was a peace that could have been gained four years earlier.

Nixon's Vietnam policy, although stupid, wasn't criminal. His efforts to overthrow Salvador Allende's Marxist government in Chile were.

That bloody coup, and the dictatorship that resulted from it, are direct results of the policy of the Nixon administration.

Perhaps the most disappointing thing about this revisionist drivel is that these people should know better. These historians aren't evil people, and they certainly aren't stupid. Perhaps they are guilty of the same kind of thinking that afflicted so many in Nixon's White House, i.e., results are the only thing that count and how you get those results isn't as important as the fact that you have them.

Even George McGovern, the man whom Nixon defeated in the landslide of 1972, has recently praised Nixon and even had a private meeting with him to discuss foreign policy, or what passes for foreign policy these days.

McGovern, of all people should know that a government, no matter what its foreign policy may be, has no legitimacy if it has no respect for the law.

—Jeff Goodwin



Realism, feeling advance Ferraro's non-token bid

Hanging on the walls of Geraldine Ferraro's office are all the artifacts you might expect of the U.S. Representative from Archie Bunker's home town of Queens, N.Y. There's the requisite picture of Ferraro and the pope. The picture of Ferraro and Jean Stapleton. Even a picture of Ferraro and another Italian, Sophia Loren.

But in the corner near her desk is something a little special. It's a Christmas gift from her staff, a framed poster of the game she's mastering.

Ellen Goodman

It's called "The Woman's Campaign Game." The square the congresswoman currently occupies carries this notice: "You're twice as qualified as your opponent. You've worked twice as hard. The two of you are now dead even. Move to his square."

Geraldine Ferraro, 48, lawyer, mother of three grown kids, wife, three-term member of Congress, secretary of the House Democratic Caucus, an activist for women's issues from a conservative ethnic district, and insider and outsider, is used to working twice as hard. She is now moving closer, square by square, to the one marked Democratic vice-presidential nominee.

Since Gary Hart put a nail in the tire of the Mondale bandwagon, the 1984 campaign has become wide open to possibilities. If the recent votes express anything, it is an amorphous desire for something "new."

Ferraro has risen pretty quickly from one of the women "mentioned," to a permanent place on the short list, to the status of contender. She is now becoming "visible," the art of running without running.

What is attractive about the energetic woman from Queens is her willingness to confront the central dilemma of the Democratic Party in 1984: "How do you deal with all the groups that have been so severely impacted by the policies of this administration . . . without promising them the things they should have but which you know damn well because of the \$200 billion deficit you can't give them."

More impressively, Ferraro has grappled with this question in her own district and occasionally taken heat for her honesty. "I go in and say, 'You can't have it all. If you expect other people to sacrifice you're going to have to sacrifice too." Yet in 1982, she came out of that working-class community with 73 percent of the vote.

In the next few months, Ferraro has a chance to make a mark on the party and on her future. At platform hearings in six cities, she'll try to hammer out "something that is realistic and something that has feeling."

The vice-presidential spot has always been a matter of calculator politics. What could Ferraro bring to the ticket? In one bold move, she could change Mondale's image as an old-style politician wedded to the past. On a Hart ticket, Gary and Gerry would be the envy of any TV anchor team. Among other things, the contrast between them and Reagan-Bush could be a stunning statement about the changing of the guard.

As for a constituency, Ann Lewis, the Democratic political director, says that Ferraro has the ability "to reach across the spectrum of the Democratic party" from the elderly and blue collar ethnics in her district to the national constituency of women. "What the Democrats need to win," says Lewis, "is voter turnout. How do you energize voter turnout? What kind of nominees turn on and turn out the voters?" She believes that a woman candidate could make a positive difference, and so do two-thirds of the top Democrats polled by Gallup.

Ferraro has spent time thinking about the platform and about making a race for the Senate in 1986. She admits: "The odds are very great that if someone said to me We need you,' I would say 'I'm ready.'"

But she also says directly that no woman will be brought on the ticket as a token. Any woman would have to bring her own political strengths. The bottom line isn't male or female, she says, but "can we beat Ronald Reagan?" For that comment, move the lady from Queens three squares ahead in the political game.

©1984, The Boston Globe Newspaper Company/Washington Post Writers Group



Reaction excessive

We write this letter in response to the overwhelming reaction that the "Serendipity" cartoon (Daily Nebraskan, March 5) has received.

This has been the most blatant example of overreaction and stretched intentions that we have seen here at UNL. A simple one-liner with an elementary illustration has spurred a bevy of exaggerations about the original intent of the column.

March officially has been proclaimed "Nebraska Humor Month" by our governor, Bob Kerrey. If people (be they Hispanic, Caucasion, et al) cannot sit back and take a good, long look and laugh at themselves, (especially this month) then who CAN they laugh at? Remember the adage: "Laugh at yourself and the world laughs with you."

Letters

This cartoon does not "patently portray Hispanics as sombrero-laden immorals," as Olivia Guerra said, (March 12) nor does this cartoon "depict that domestic violence is something to laugh at," as Janet Ward has suggested (March 12).

The cartoon was merely a play on the word "tequila," which just happens to be of Hispanic origin, and had "her" as the object.

Granted, this article may have been avoided by the editors, but people with a sense of humor need not be offended that this simplistic cartoon was published, for it is emotional overreaction that causes friction between the sexes and between ethnic groups.

These conflicts are not caused by guileless one-liners.

Greg Witt sophomore engineering and 2 other students

AAUP's visions belie facts

Recent articles and distribution by the American Association of University Professors portray unionized Rutgers University as the flagship of academic utopia. Having recently visited that institution on three occasions, I must report that my observations do not corroborate this vision.

Guest

First, if the financial status of their faculty is superior to that of NU faculty's, they hide their largesse well. If they owned Mercedes or even Cadillac cars, they evidently were not driving them on the days I was there.

If the faculty members are superior performers in the academic world, they have not made their administrators aware of it. They recently have gone through major external reviews. The results were not complimentary and the administration has moved major elements of the faculty into different colleges or units with the intent of improving the quality of the programs. Promotion and tenure proposals are being screened very rigidly by the administration.

In order to bolster funding, the administration has proposed that Hatch Act funds, historically directed toward research in agriculture, be opened for general use. To save money, the administration wishes to place all Cook College faculty members on acadmic-year (nine-month) appointments — an excellent idea if you can get plants and animals to stop growing during the summer months. To generate dollars, the administration has begun long-term leasing of "unused" areas of the campus for industrial development, including areas of the Cook College campus.

Although UNL faculty members may gripe about facilities, compared with Rutgers we are much better off. They have nothing like Kimball Hall, the Nebraska Center, ETV, or the proposed Performing Arts Center (incidentally has anyone thanked Dr. Varner or Dr. Massengle for their efforts to obtain this facility?).

The AAUP is singing the siren song of something for nothing. The subliminal message is that "we can get more money for you without any effort on your part — and we can shield you form the administration so that you will not have to work as hard." If AAUP can successfully peddle that line, I'm going to look into buying stock in

AAUP.

W. E. Splinter Head of UNL Ag Engineering Department