

Human rights

Bet you thought human rights had come a long way. Women, blacks and other minorities have won major battles in hiring, lending and housing discrimination cases. Many states have adopted laws that protect people from discrimination based on race, sex and religion.

And yet, the strides for gays have been short indeed. When the state legislature returns from recess next week, it will attempt to override Gov. Shapp's veto of a bill that would prevent gays being hired in state correctional and

mental institutions. It would also prevent them from being hired as state policemen.

Tomorrow gays and gay supporters all over the state will protest the override attempt. And they urge you to contact your representatives to encourage them to sustain Shapp's veto.

Because what the bill does is discriminate against people for what they do in their private lives. Thus the issue, though it affects gays for the most part, is not a gay rights issue. It's a human rights issue.

Human rights because gays, like women or blacks, are people above all else. And people should have a chance to compete equally with other people for jobs.

Some people believe employing gay guards in prisons will increase substantially the homosexuality that already exists in our prisons. Then why aren't legislators afraid that hiring heterosexual men to work in female institutions will increase rapes?

It's not right and it's not rights. Support the protest against this discriminatory bill.



'Young Turk' Donald Rumsfeld makes Ford team

By JOHN DeVULT
Collegian Columnist

Jerry Ford and Don Rumsfeld go back a long way — back to 1965 when Rumsfeld was one of the leaders of the "Young Turks," a group of young, rebel Republican Congressmen who literally pushed Ford into the position of House Minority leader.

Last week, Jerry Ford nominated his old colleague to be the next Secretary of Defense and one of the chief players on what Ford calls "my team."

It is interesting to look back to 1965, because it was during that campaign, when Ford and Rumsfeld were allied for the first time, that the political styles that were to mark Gerald Ford and Donald Rumsfeld for the rest of their careers were first spotlighted. And these styles and careers are fascinating because they say so much about why today Donald Rumsfeld is on the Ford team, and about where that team is going.

In 1965, the Young Turks were looking for ways to advance their position in the House. They decided to run a man against incumbent Charles Halleck for House Minority Leader and narrowed their choices to two: Gerald Ford and Melvin Laird.

This was not a battle of ideologies; the Young Turks were as conservative as Halleck. They simply wanted to advance themselves by showing they could beat him. So the idea was to pick a winner, someone whom people liked. He didn't have to stand for anything.

It was here that Ford won over Laird. One of the challengers explained why: Laird is more dynamic. He's got more leadership. But he's antagonized some people, made enemies along the line. Ford has not. There were fewer people mad at Ford.

And so Rumsfeld and the other Turks had their candidate. But non-candidate would be a better word. Ford constantly annoyed Rumsfeld and the other ambitious young men pushing him because that was practically what they had to do: push him physically into office. He was willing to be the challenger and let others campaign for him. But he himself wasn't going to challenge anybody — you make enemies that way. Writer Richard Reeves describes one night when the only way Ford's campaign managers could keep him in the office was to continually send out for food, telling him that if he went home for dinner it would be wasted.

Ford, to nearly everyone's surprise, did, of course win. But what is interesting is the behavior of the principals: Ford for the first time on a national level played the role of the leader who was led, content to fill a seat and let others use his amiability to advance themselves — and, of course, him. And Rumsfeld, while he would show it more clearly later, was a pusher. Ambitious and shrewd.

Both have continued to play these roles in the decade since, and have come to their present positions because they have.

Congress did not hold Rumsfeld long. He was recognized by his colleagues as an extraordinarily skillful politician with ambition to match and his aides claim, though he denies it, that he always felt boxed in by the in-house games of the institution. In any case, he accepted an offer from Richard

Nixon in 1969 to head the Office to Economic Opportunity (OEO) and to join the White House staff as an adviser to the president. Many wondered aloud at the wisdom of leaving a "safe" congressional seat for an uncertain position in the White House. Rumsfeld knew what he was doing.

The OEO position was indeed uncertain: though he denied it, Nixon was in the process of dismantling OEO. But Rumsfeld handled the position with great political finesse, dissolving OEO practically without anyone realizing he was doing it.

But Rumsfeld made his mark in the White House itself. Between OEO and the White House, he put in regular 12-hour days. After he finished at five at OEO, he would often return to the White House and work until eight or nine. He soon impressed Nixon with his shrewdness, hard work and loyalty. Soon, he was dining with the President and being frequently

mentioned for high administration posts. Rumsfeld knew what he was doing.

Not the least of Rumsfeld's traits that endeared him to Nixon was his loyalty. In 1970, one of Rumsfeld's oldest friends, Congressman Al Lowenstein, approached Rumsfeld for an endorsement. Lowenstein was in for a tough race against his mudslinging Republican opponent Norm Lent.

Lowenstein had defended Rumsfeld against liberal critics when Rumsfeld was named head of OEO, and now was asking that, the favor be returned.

The Nixon administration supported Lent, of course, and a few days after Lowenstein's request Rumsfeld's endorsement did indeed go out — to Norm Lent.

Rumsfeld was one of the select group Nixon called to the White House after the elections to analyze the results; Lowenstein and Rumsfeld haven't spoken since.

Meanwhile, Ford was minority leader.

He had trouble from the start, chiefly because he continued to allow himself to be manipulated. This time it was Melvin Laird. Laird talked Ford into taking him on as an aide, and Laird made his first duty the hiring and directing of Ford's staff; before long, as others described it, Laird was "leading the leader."

It was an embarrassing time for Ford. Then President Johnson began making cracks about Jerry having played football too long without a helmet and one day told an aide, who had a baby boy, to "take the kid's building blocks and go up and explain to Jerry Ford what we're trying to do."

Then in 1969, Nixon took office. Ford was at least as loyal to Nixon as Rumsfeld, but the White House didn't treat him the same way. Rumsfeld, Nixon knew, was able and shrewd; Ford was just loyal and malleable.

White House messengers regularly brought speeches to Ford which he readily read on the floor of the House. "He didn't even bother to read the damn things," a Congressional colleague told writer Reeves. "If the White House wanted something said, Jerry jumped up and said it."

The White House, while it continued to use Ford, did not respect him for it; John Ehrlichman leaned back in his chair one day and laughed, "What a jerk Jerry is."

Then, of course, came Watergate. Ford staunchly defended Nixon from the beginning, although he must be credited with showing discretion by keeping relatively out of things once he was made vice president. Ford was made vice president, incidentally, for the same reason Rumsfeld and the Young Turks ran him for minority leader: he was not particularly fit to be President, but at least people weren't calling him names. Nixon, while he agreed to Ford because he knew he had to, reportedly couldn't bring himself to tell Ford the good news himself and had an aide do it.

Rumsfeld treated Watergate much more pragmatically: he got out of town. Early in 1973, having once more seen the hand writing on the wall, he used his White House connections to have himself made U.S. ambassador to NATO. There he remained until Ford called him back.

Now Ford and Rumsfeld, after a decade, are back together again. Rumsfeld was Ford's immediate choice for his chief of staff when he took office last year, and Rumsfeld is credited with much of the smoothness that characterized the transition from Nixon to Ford — or, at least making it look smooth, something Rumsfeld is a master at. Further, as chief of staff, he controlled to a considerable degree who saw the President and what business crossed his desk. Rumsfeld denies, of course, that he has any influence over Ford's decisions, but it is well known that he had much to do with the recent hirings and firings that resulted in "the Ford team" — of which he is now a member. Another Ford-Laird relationship? Probably not, Ford has learned that lesson.

But Rumsfeld bears watching, he wants to be President and already influences one President greatly. Because of Rumsfeld's past history and perhaps even more because of Ford's, it is an interesting relationship.



Letters to the Editor

The Daily Collegian encourages comments on news coverage, editorial policy and campus and off-campus affairs. Letters should be typewritten, double spaced, signed by no more than two persons and no longer than 30 lines. Students' letters should include the name, term and major of the writer.

Letters should be brought to the Collegian office, 126 Carnegie, in person so proper identification of the writer can be made, although names can be withheld on request. If letters are received by mail, the Collegian will contact the signer for verification before publication. Letters cannot be returned.

Surprise

TO THE EDITOR: Lured by a promise of a local supermarket "and the consumer," we recently set off on a bizarre grocery shopping spree! On arrival, we found the cart already overflowing with assorted groceries. A large sign informed us that the store had adopted a new method of grocery buying using "the negative check-off system." Imagine our surprise when we discovered that we were required to return every item that we did not want to its proper place, before entering the check-out lanes.

After an exhaustive hour, we were at last ready to face the cashier register. We questioned the manager about the new system and he replied that "other stores in the chain had tried the old way — 'the positive check-off system' — and did not make enough money to remain in business." We countered with the fact that a sufficient number of customers will gladly pay for a product that is necessary and desirable.

Returning home, we were disgusted to discover that we had overlooked a box of Wheaties and had paid for a product we did not want. Although the Wheaties added only 59 cents to

our bill, similar amounts multiplied by thousands of other customers' oversights constitute an unethical money-making scheme.

Evidently, the store can only stay in business through such consumer oversights, as these are responsible for the only monetary difference between the two grocery-buying systems. Sound familiar?

Jerry L. Wood
grad-ceramic science
Albert Shearer
grad-mechanical engineering

Congratulations

TO THE EDITOR: This is directed to the two girls I saw stealing some books from the library at 3:30 on Saturday, Oct. 25. Congratulations. You have just qualified for the lowest life form on campus. By stealing those books you may have deprived some honest student of a source for their papers. The

library operates on a system of honesty and you two are extremely immature for doing something so thoughtless and inconsiderate. Incidentally, although I was not able to prevent the theft, I did manage to sketch a quick portrait of the girl on the outside (I'm an artist). So, to the tall, light-haired girl: I can identify you and will do so if I see you on campus.

Name Withheld

Alternate proposal

TO THE EDITOR: On Nov. 11, the University Faculty Senate will vote on the proposed Academic Redemption Option (ARO). Under this proposal, a student enrolled in a BA or BS degree program may erase 18 original credits by substituting 18 credits of new courses that fulfill a student's requirements to graduate. ARO would replace Pass-Fail and M3B, the policy which enables a student to drop an F.

If ARO passes the Senate, it will actually hurt students and will promote "cum" inflation. ARO allows students to drop any grade they are dissatisfied with up to 18 credits. This advantage allows poorer students to raise their academic rank to that of the hardworking good students by simply dropping low grades. Meanwhile, those students who already get high grades have no way of being recognized. They are being unfairly discriminated against since there is no way to differentiate between a grade received the first time around and a grade received when the course is repeated. Actually, ARO helps no one. The low grades are only dropped from the "cum" and not from the transcript. Future employers or professional schools will see the poor grades anyway!

As an alternate proposal to ARO, the Liberal Arts Student Council supports the plan of Dr. Robert Dunham which proposes to extend the drop period to eight weeks, to retain Pass-Fail and to rescind M3B.

Since there has been no abuse of Pass-Fail, why abandon it? Pass-Fail gives students the opportunity to explore areas of interest without feeling the pressures of grade competition. It is based on the same premise as ARO-academic freedom and flexibility, but without harmful side effects like "cum" inflation.

By extending the drop period to eight weeks, a student is given more time to know whether a course is right for him or her. Eight weeks of drop enables a student to keep a grade off a transcript altogether instead of dropping it from the "cum" average, but keeping it on the transcript as provided in ARO. At the present time, many of the colleges in the University allow free drop until the seventh week as long as the student petitions for it. (i.e.-Liberal Arts) Other universities such as Temple and Penn allow students to drop up until the last few days of class.

There is no need for M3B with the extended drop period and Pass-Fail. M3B has been confusing and controversial. These other two policies give the student opportunities to drop a course when he is doing poorly or to take the course Pass-Fail, without the fear of failing.

On Tuesday, the Faculty Senate will decide on ARO, Pass-Fail, Eight Week Drop and M3B. Although both proposals studied in this article are of an inflationary nature, eight drop, Pass-Fail and the rescinding of M3B is the lesser of two evils. ARO fails to solve the problems and only helps to create them.

Mary R. Musca, president
the Liberal Arts Student Council

the Collegian

JERRY SCHWARTZ
Editor

ROBERT A. MOFFETT
Business Manager

Editorial policy is determined by the Editor. Opinions expressed by the editors and staff of The Daily Collegian are not necessarily those of the University administration, faculty or students.

The Daily Collegian is published by Collegian, Inc., a private, non-profit corporation which bears legal and financial responsibility for the newspaper. The Board of Directors of Collegian, Inc., is the controlling body of the corporation.

The Board is composed of three undergraduate students, one graduate student, three faculty members, two professional members, the editor and the business manager. The paper's adviser also serves as executive secretary to the Board, a non-voting position.

The Board can be contacted through Linda Quigley, executive secretary, at 865-2531, or at the Collegian office, 126 Carnegie.

BOARD OF EDITORS: EDITORIAL EDITOR, Sheila McCauley; EDITORIAL ASSISTANT, Karen Fischer; NEWS EDITOR, Robin Moore; ASSISTANT NEWS EDITOR, Glenda Gephart; WIRE EDITOR, Paula Gochour; FEATURES EDITOR, Cathy Cipolla; COPY EDITORS, Jean LaPenna, Diane Nottle, Leon Pollock; SPORTS EDITOR, Jeff Young; ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITOR, Dave Morris; PHOTO EDITOR, Eric Felack; ASSISTANT PHOTO EDITORS, Ira Joffe, Tom Peters; EDITORIAL CARTOONIST, Tom Gibb; WEATHER REPORTER, Tom Ross.

