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IT SHOULD COME AS NO SURPRISE that men who served as President of the U.S. have appeared more than 200 times on our cover—some more often than others. Herbert Hoover was the only occupant of the Oval Office since TIME began in 1923 who was not on our cover, although he was portrayed there before and after his presidency. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who won an unprecedented four presidential elections, was our cover subject a mere nine times. By contrast, two-termer Ronald Reagan was pictured on 44 of our domestic covers.

Richard Milhous Nixon lay near death for four days last week in a Manhattan hospital, after suffering a severe stroke. But even before he died on Friday, we had decided to put him on the cover. Nixon has now appeared there 56 times, more than any other man or woman. This issue contains excerpts from his 10th book, Beyond Peace, to be published by Random House on May 18. In his six most recent works, beginning with The Real War in 1980, the former President dealt primarily with East-West relations. In what he called "probably my last book," Nixon focuses on domestic issues like health care, education and urban decay, arguing that communism's defeat makes it imperative that America live up to its promises. Beyond Peace is the second work by the former President that we have been privileged to excerpt.

Our cover stories on Nixon have reflected both the highs and the lows of his amazing political career. Early on, Nixon caught the eye of TIME's editors as a zealously anticommunist Republican Congressman with a promising future. In August 1952 he first appeared on our cover as the G.O.P. candidate for Vice President. We described him then as a "good-looking, dark-haired young man" who "seems to have everything."

Three times TIME Inc. expressed its support for Nixon as President, with endorsements that appeared in LIFE. Twice we chose him as Man of the Year: in 1972, primarily for his historic opening of China, and the following year (in tandem with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger) for forging stable links with the U.S.S.R. and China. In 1973 and 1974, Nixon was on our cover 14 times as TIME meticulously traced the unraveling of the Watergate plot. In November 1973 we published our first editorial, which called upon Nixon to resign for the good of the country. TIME's coverage of Watergate put the magazine, for a while, on Nixon's ever-expansible enemies list. But he—and we—mellowed during his years in self-imposed exile. As he gradually emerged as an elder statesman of the Republican Party, several of our editors, writers and correspondents were invited to intimate dinners, featuring good beef and vintage red Bordeaux, at Nixon's house in Saddle River, New Jersey, where the host talked sagaciously about domestic politics and foreign affairs.

Hugh Sidey, our Washington contributing editor, estimates that he spent nearly half his career observing and reporting on the former President. "Nixon was most comfortable talking about foreign policy," Sidey recalls. "During the Bush Administration, I did a series of television interviews with the four living ex-Presidents, and, no question, Nixon's knowledge and enthusiasm for these issues was far greater than that of the others. He once told me, 'I have always felt that the country can more or less take care of itself. A President's first job is dealing with peace and war.'"

Surely that last sentence deserves to be part of Richard Nixon's epitaph.

MOST COPIES OF THIS WEEK'S ISSUE CONTAIN, on the opening page of the Chroni- cles section, an ambitious experiment in customized printing. With the aid of inkjet technology and the research services of Congressional Quarterly Inc., we have enabled each individual subscriber in the 50 states to read how his or her U.S. Senators voted in last week's controversial approval of full, four-star retirement for Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Frank B. Kelso 2nd. It is intended as the first of many customized congressional features through which we hope to engage TIME's readers more closely in the democratic process.

Lyndon B. Johnson
President
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LETTERS

Wild Financial Markets

"Wall Street, instead of appreciating the true worth of companies, has become a gambling casino."
Inder Dhillon
San Jose, California

KUDOS TO TIME FOR FOCUSING PUBLIC attention on a potential threat to the stability of the world's financial markets: the wild growth of derivatives (COVER STORY, April 11). These complex new investment instruments have become so esoteric that only those who live in cyberspace can possibly fathom them. Since most of us inhabit the real world, we're fortunate that there are reporters who can alert us earthlings to the danger. Properly used, derivatives can lessen volatility. But $14 trillion floating around the world unaccounted for could lead to a financial meltdown. Congressional oversight is needed.
Lewis Jaffe
Greensburg, Pennsylvania

THE SUGGESTION THAT THERE IS SOMEHOW LESS RISK IN "REAL" INVESTMENTS THAN IN "SURREAL" DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS DEFIES LOGIC. THE IMPLICATION THAT THERE IS SOME SORT OF "CRISIS" LURKING IN THE WINGS IS SIMILARLY BOGUS. YOU HAVE ONLY TO LOOK AT RECENT HISTORY TO SEE THERE IS NO MARKET THAT HAS A MONOPOLY ON RISK OR FAILS TO APPEAL TO HUMAN GREED. WHAT IS TROUBLING IS THE NOTION THAT WE MUST BE PROTECTED FROM OURSELVES AND CANNOT BEAR THE CONSEQUENCES OF OUR INDIVIDUAL DECISIONS. THE LAST THING WE NEED IS ILL-INFORMED LEGISLATORS DECREEING SOME MISGUIDED FORM OF CAPITALISM IN WHICH PEOPLE CAN TAKE RISKS BUT ARE BAILED OUT BY THE REST OF THE POPULATION IF THINGS GO WRONG.
James C. F. McVay
Old Greenwich, Connecticut

WE HAVE GONE FROM TRADING IN PRETEND CORPORATION TO TRADING IN PARALLEL TIME LINES. DERIVATIVE SPECULATION WILL MAKE MANY PEOPLE RICH—MAINLY THE DATA COWBOYS. THE REST OF US ARE ON THE ROAD TO BIG LOSSES. AGAIN.
Karen Darrough
St. Peters, Missouri
AOL: Gamelon

WHILE THE BRAVE NEW WORLD OF DERIVATIVES GIVES INVESTORS AND REGULATORS PAUSE TO CONSIDER THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROLIFERATION OF THESE LITTLE-UNDERSTOOD INSTRUMENTS, THEIR USE AS A VEHICLE FOR RISK TRANSFERANCE IS WELL DOCUMENTED. INVESTORS ARE RISK AVERSE. THEY REQUIRE A MARKET RATE OF RETURN FOR THE RISK THEY ARE WILLING TO ASSUME. A PORTFOLIO THAT INCLUDES A DIVERSIFIED MIX OF DERIVATIVE PRODUCTS (FUTURES AND OPTIONS) CAN PRODUCE HIGHER RETURN WITH LOWER RISK THAN THE SAME PORTFOLIO COMPOSED SOLELY OF STOCKS AND BONDS.

Preston B. Appleby, Senior Vice President
Chesapeake Capital Corp.
Manakin-Sabot, Virginia

WHY ARE ASTRONOMERS SEARCHING IN SPACE FOR BLACK HOLES WHEN THEY NEED LOOK NO FURTHER THAN THE FINANCIAL DERIVATIVES MARKET ON WALL STREET? THAT IS THE NEAREST END-OF-THE-WORLD SCENARIO. GOVERNMENTS HAD BETTER GET THEIR ACT TOGETHER TO CONTROL THIS UNBRIDLED ORGY OF GREED AND SPECULATION. IF THE BUBBLE BURSTS AND HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS loose their life savings and jobs, taxpayers and investors won't choose to put future generations in debt to pay off this financial scandal, which will make the cost of the savings and loan rip-off look like petty cash.

Rex Thompson
Monaco

Examining Clintonophobia


Ruth Wasley
Carmel, California

I WAS QUITE AMUSED BY YOUR ARTICLE AND AGREE WITH THOSE WHO FEEL THAT "CLINTON HAS THIS INABILITY TO TELL THE WHOLE
truth.” Whether the subject is the 1980s middle-class tax cuts, inhaling marijuana fumes, avoiding the draft, gays in the military, health care, whatever, this man cannot tell the truth, and that’s what upsets America. This is why Whitewater won’t stop haunting the White House. Americans, relying on their past experience, believe the President and his wife are hiding something.

Matt Shaheen
Stockholm

“CLINTONOPHOBIA” IS AN ABNORMAL condition that strikes many conservatives today and manifests itself in the classic four Ds of their politics: denial, delay, derision and division. Unable to bring substance to the pressing issues of the day, conservatives see in the Clintons their worst fear: an activist Administration with a progressive social agenda that won’t retreat from its goals.

Michael R. Morgenstern
Cleveland, Ohio
AOL: Mrm11

BILL CLINTON HAS MORE CUTS THAN AN N.F.L. quarterback and Hillary more brains than Rush Limbaugh.

Daniel A. Jenkins
Pacific Palisades, California

How to Treat Asia

I ENJOYED YOUR WELL-THOUGHT-OUT REPORT “Welcome to the Wild East” (ESSAY, April 11). Since 1937, I have been doing business in the Far East and Southeast Asia. China was a relatively free country before World War II, until the Japanese and then in 1949 the communists gained power. China’s rulers have recognized the advantages of capitalism and with that realization comes a modicum of freedom. China, Vietnam and even Singapore still have authoritarian rule to some extent. The transition to a system of full freedom, as we know it, will take generations to achieve and will not be won by threats from the U.S. or other capitalist countries. It took many generations for the U.S. to unite and_legacy equal rights for its own minorities. Let us encourage total freedom for these Asian countries but avoid using the heavy-handed methods currently being considered.

Archer F. Moze
San Carlos, California

Silence Can Be Deadly

YOUR ARTICLE ON DEAF AMERICANS AND AIDS was the first I’ve seen you print on issues related to deaf people [SOCIETY, April 4]. Too bad you had to make us look as dumb as rocks. While we’re not all illiterate simpletons, there is some truth to your article. How about a follow-up on why America finds it so difficult to educate its deaf citizens adequately?

Tom Willard, Editor
Silent News
Rochester, New York

AS DEAF TEENAGERS, WE FOUND YOUR REPORT insulting and inaccurate. We know what HIV positive means. We understand how AIDS is transmitted and how it can be prevented. Thanks to the closed-captioning of TV broadcasts, deaf people are aware of social issues as well as what’s happening in their communities. Our school has a state-mandated AIDS curriculum. Passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act has finally given deaf people the break they deserve.

Zachary Pulso and Nidia Chevez
Mill Neck Manor School for the Deaf
Mill Neck, New York

THE ISSUE IS NOT JUST POOR AIDSA EDUCATION for the deaf but also the failure of the U.S. to educate deaf people in general. Since American Sign Language is the most accessible method of communication for the deaf, it is their “native” language. We must adopt the bilingual education model and teach the deaf in their own language, help them master it and use it as a comparative model for their second language, English. If this were accomplished, maybe the deaf would not only understand the facts about AIDS but would also be educated in all the subjects necessary for survival.

John Sedlak
New York City

That’s Show Business

POOR BABY! DAVID LETTERTMAN SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SHOCKED when Madonna sucked it to him and used four-letter words on his late-night talk show [PEOPLE, April 11]. He makes a living taking unflattering, even cruel shots at people who are not present, including Madonna, upon whom he regularly performs monologue muggings, so he should have been better prepared. The only thing he wasn’t ready for was the way she did it—in his face. But don’t worry, Dave, it’s not Karma, just show biz.

George LaVahon
Sunnyvale, California
AOL: GeorgeL425

I AM NOT SURPRISED BY MADONNA’S VULGAR DISPLAY. What do you expect from a woman who built her career on being shocking and revolting?

Stuart Henry
Lodi, California
Via America Online

Italy’s Champion for Change

THE PRESS CONSIDERS THE VICTORY OF Silvio Berlusconi and his Forza Italia as one of the right wing [ITALY, April 11]. But his party is located more at the political center than anywhere else. It has been supported by those of us who long for reforms and look forward to federalism. To Americans, we might be defined as liberals on the other side of the Atlantic.

Giancarlo Truffa
Turin, Italy

In Defense of Quants

A number of readers look askance at some of the words used to depict Wall Street’s new gunslinger, the quantitative analyst (COVER STORIES, April 11). Sam Kizner of Edison, New Jersey, writes, “Supermerks, high-water-pants alert, idiots savants—these descriptions sound like sour grapes from people who can’t understand the tools of today’s market.” Randall E. Sekeres of Atlanta believes we aimed “for the cheap laugh.” Chris Danielson of Houston wonders, “How can you endorse the use of the word nerd? Granted, the supermerks may be engaging in unusual business practices, but that is no reason to deride their intellect. I am a high school honors student, and I have been called a nerd by people who are a lot dumber than I am—and, believe me, I mean a lot. Since when is it a crime to be smart?”
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New York, New York 10020
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An improving environment

Contrary to public perceptions and fears, air quality in the United States is getting cleaner. Although some self-styled experts might have you believe otherwise, a study released late last year by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) says we’ve made significant progress in cleaning up urban air quality between 1983 and 1992.

The EPA study measured reductions of six major pollutants over that 10-year period and found the following:

- Smog (ground-level ozone) levels dropped 21 percent.
- Lead levels decreased 89 percent.
- Carbon monoxide levels declined 34 percent and sulfur dioxide decreased 23 percent.
- Particulate (dirt, dust, soot) levels decreased 17 percent between 1988 and 1992 (a change in standards in 1987 accounts for the lack of data prior to that).

Nitrogen dioxide levels were down 8 percent.

And, if you’re looking for real progress, very dramatic improvements occurred in the last year of the study (1991-1992): smog, sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide decreased 7 percent, lead levels and particulates dropped by 9 percent and nitrogen dioxide went down 3 percent in that one year alone.

There’s also good news for many cities that had been designated as “non-attainment” urban areas by EPA because of their smog, carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide levels. There were a lot fewer of them in 1992. For example, of the 42 of the 94 areas designated as non-attainment for smog under the Clean Air Act now have air quality meeting the standard—a 55 percent reduction. Forty-one urban areas were designated non-attainment for carbon monoxide. That number is down by nearly 50 percent—21. And how many cities violated the nitrogen dioxide standards in 1992, according to the EPA study? None. Zero. Zip.

That’s progress. And even greater progress will be seen as reformed gasoline becomes available in 1995 in response to the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments.

Positive things are happening on other fronts, too. Not only do cars produce a cleaner exhaust, they also are quieter, lighter and more efficient; houses are better insulated and machines are more energy efficient, so we’re using less crude oil than we otherwise might.

Yet, public perceptions still seem to be that air quality continues to deteriorate and that we’re wasting resources, perceptions not supported by the facts.

We don’t mean to imply that there’s no need for continued environmental improvement. In fact, in 1993, we spent over $1 billion and employed more than 900 people on environmental projects around the world. Moreover, as a company that formulated its first formal environmental policy in 1966—some 14 years before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency was formed—we also recognize there is still more work that needs to be done.

At the same time, however, it would seem that a more reasoned look at the science behind the concerns—and a sometimes closer look at overwrought claims of environmental doom—might be called for.
NATION

Richard Nixon Dies
Former President Richard Nixon died in New York City after suffering a devastating stroke that had left him in a deep coma.

Hillary Speaks
In an extraordinary televised news conference, Hillary Rodham Clinton coolly and meticulously explained some of the financial intricacies of her commodities trading and her family's Whitewater real estate investment. She steadfastly denied that she or the President had engaged in any improprieties, but acknowledged that she had not been sensitive enough to the public's right to know. Though she initially opposed appointing a special counsel, the First Lady now says she welcomes the investigation.

Crime Bill Passes House
The House passed a $28 billion get-tough crime bill that would expand the use of the federal death penalty, put three-time violent felony or drug offenders behind bars for life, increase the number of police and prisons and boost funding for crime prevention and rehabilitation. In a surprise victory for liberals, the Congressional Black Caucus gained a provision that would allow death-row inmates to base challenges to their sentences on statistical evidence of racial bias. The House version must now be reconciled with a Senate bill.

Gender Bias Gets Clipped
By a 6-to-3 vote, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution's Equal-Protection Clause forbids the use of peremptory challenges to exclude jurors on the basis of their sex.

King's Damages: $3.8 Million
After four days of deliberations, a civil jury awarded
PONTIAC CARES with a 3-year/36,000-mile no-deductible bumper-to-bumper limited warranty [see your dealer for details], plus free 24-hour Roadside Assistance and Courtesy Transportation. Call 1-800-762-4900 for more product information and dealer locations.

Always wear safety belts, even with airbags. ©1993 GM Corp. All Rights Reserved.
The promise of its athletic look is fulfilled by the exhilaration of its 210-horsepower 24-valve V6 and turbine-smooth transmission, while the control generated by its sport suspension and available anti-lock disc brakes is enhanced by the safety of its dual airbags.

The new Grand Prix™ Sport Coupe. Purposefully designed, comprehensively equipped, wonderfully invigorating. A megadose of high-quality excitement for today's driving enthusiasts.
**Winners & Losers**

- **NELSON MANDELA**: After Zulus blink, he has chance to unite a peaceful South Africa
- **MICHAEL MOORER**: Battles insecurity to become the first short heavyweight champ
- **WALT DISNEY CO.**: Bad reviews, bounce; Beauty and the Beast sets a B-way record
- **BORIS YELTSIN**: Claims of influence with Bosnian Serbs prove very, very hollow
- **HOWARD UNIVERSITY**: School's lofty image tarnished by cloak of anti-Semitism
- **THE SOLAR SYSTEM**: Unique no longer, as other planets found orbiting distant pulsar

**LAPD Lawsuits: Collect 'Em All**
The $3.8 million awarded to Rodney King by a Los Angeles jury last week is not the first multimillion-dollar sum the city has had to pay to compensate for the actions of its occasionally too interventionist police force:

- An unidentified teenage girl, who was molested by an officer in 1989, was awarded $6.3 million by a jury in 1992 (plus $200,000 for her mother).
- Adaildo Altiman, shot and paralyzed by an off-duty officer, settled a lawsuit for $5.5 million in 1991.
- Benny Powell and Clarence Chance, wrongly convicted of murder, settled lawsuits in 1993 for $3.5 million each.
- Orie Palmer, whose home was damaged during a drug raid, settled a lawsuit for $3 million in 1990.
- Service Employees International, a union whose members were involved in a violent confrontation with police, settled a lawsuit for $2.35 million in 1993.

**Halt! Label Police!** There was more to the crime bill that passed the House last week than such widely publicized measures as an increase in death-penalty crimes and a federal version of "three strikes, you're in." A sampling of the bill's 57 get-tough amendments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Raison d'être</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishes stiff penalties for those convicted of fraudulently labeling products &quot;Made in America&quot;</td>
<td>James Traffinant (D.-Ohio)</td>
<td>&quot;This amendment will send a powerful message that Uncle Sam won't tolerate anyone misleading the American consumer.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes unlawful possession of explosives—federal crime and forbids felons to purchase explosives</td>
<td>Louise Slaughter (D.-New York)</td>
<td>Upstate New York saw five people killed in bombings last summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urges more aggressive federal prosecution of crimes against trucks</td>
<td>Peter Barca (D.-Wisconsin)</td>
<td>&quot;The FBI says crimes against the trucking industry are on the rise.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorizes Federal Government to aid investigations and prosecutions of violent crimes against interstate and foreign travelers</td>
<td>Neil Abercrombie (D.-Hawaii)</td>
<td>Abercrombie's state counts on tourism for over 30% of its economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughens penalty for the illegal sale of a Congressional Medal of Honor</td>
<td>Alfred McCandless (R.-California)</td>
<td>&quot;We have been receiving more and more reports of medals being stolen, ... and put on the black market.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLL:**

**When do African Americans think America will achieve racial equality?**

- It has been achieved......... 5%
- It will be achieved soon......... 30%
- "Not in my lifetime"........... 42%
- Never.................. 23%


**Rodney King:** $3.8 million in compensatory damages for his 1991 beating at the hands of Los Angeles police. Jurors now have to decide whether to assess punitive damages against the police.

**Woolsey Spills Some Beans**

CIA Director R. James Woolsey made a highly unusual public disclosure when he acknowledged on NBC's Today show the existence of major espionage investigation "cases" against officials at a number of agencies resulting from evidence uncovered in the intelligence dossiers of the former Soviet Union and its once communist allies. Woolsey's loose lips infuriated congressional overseers and FBI investigators, prompting Woolsey to backtrack and say the "cases" were actually just "leads."

**Health-Care Maneuvers**

With White House blessing, Senate majority leader George Mitchell began circulating several leaner, alternative versions of universal health-care reforms, including trimmed benefits and reduced employer contributions. In the House, Energy and Commerce chairman John Dingel floated his own new compromise, which offered exemptions to small businesses. House Ways and Means chairman Dan Rostenkowski, meanwhile, argued for a tax hike to help pay for reformed health care.

**Rusty's Social Security Fix**

Rostenkowski also proposed a set of potentially controversial changes to shore up Social Security, a week after release of a government report showing that the system remains in financial trouble. Among the proposals: lower cost of living increases, lower benefits and higher taxes.

**Kelso Retains His Stars**

The Senate voted 54 to 43 to allow Admiral Frank Kelso, the Chief of Naval Operations, to retire with his four stars and full pension. But what was expected to be a
low-key event turned into a bruising battle after the Senate's seven women—Democratic and Republican alike—united to target Kelso for his disputed role in the Tailhook sex scandal.

Kevorkian's Stealth Defense
In the first Michigan prosecution to come to trial charging Dr. Jack Kevorkian with assisting a suicide, his lawyer opened the case by claiming the death occurred in a neighboring county—not the one where he is being tried—and planned to ask for a dismissal.

WORLD
Gorazde's Ongoing Agony
Terrified Muslim residents of the eastern Bosnian city of Gorazde, declared a "safe area" by the United Nations last May, huddled under nearly continuous attack by Bosnian Serb forces for the third straight week. At week's end NATO allies issued a strongly worded new ultimatum to Serb gunners, giving them until 2:01 a.m. local time Sunday to withdraw their forces 1.9 miles from the town center and allow U.N. peacekeepers into the besieged city. The threatened big stick: allied bombing on a far greater scale than before.

Buthelezi Drops Boycott
Zulu nationalist leader Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi canceled his boycott of South Africa's first all-race elections this week. In return, Buthelezi secured a guarantee that the largely ceremonial Zulu monarchy will be allowed to continue and that remaining constitutional differences on the powers of regions will be mediated internationally after the elections. Hopes for a peaceful ballot dimmed over the weekend when two African National Congress workers were killed and party headquarters in Johannesburg were devastated by a bomb.

Killing in Rwanda
In the capital Kigali, the Rwandan army shelled the...
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THE GOOD NEWS
✓ A study supporting the efficacy of breast-conserving surgery (partial mastectomy, lumpectomy) for cancer patients was questioned after revelations that some of the data had been falsified. But new research confirms that, other factors being equal, survival rates after the less disfiguring procedures are at least as good as rates after total mastectomy.

✓ Contrary to earlier findings, a large-scale study shows no association between the pesticide DDT and breast cancer.

✓ Researchers now believe that blood tests to detect fetuses with Down syndrome are useful alternatives to amniocentesis, which increases the risk of miscarriage.

THE BAD NEWS
✓ Submersible well pumps with brass parts may contain high levels of lead, according to a recent report. Because lead can cause birth defects and brain damage in children, the Environmental Protection Agency advises people who use a submersible pump to have their water tested and to consider switching to bottled drinking water until the results are in. About 6 million such pumps are used in the U.S.

✓ Despite advances in the detection and treatment of breast cancer, a new report shows the death rate from the disease among black women rose sharply (21%) from 1980 to 1991, while the rate for white women increased less than 1%. A major factor: lack of access to adequate care.


PC DIRTY DANCING
“If an able-bodied person could have been up there doing it, a disabled person should have been able to also.”
—RON SHIGETA, A LOS ANGELES CITY OFFICIAL, RULING THAT NUDE SHOWER DANCING AT A LOS ANGELES NIGHTCLUB DISCRIMINATES AGAINST WHEELCHAIR-BOUND STRIPPERS, WHO THEORETICALLY COULDN’T FIT IN THE CLUB’S SHOWER STALL

Roadblock That Metaphor!
A number of proposed high-tech business ventures have recently gone bust or been postponed. The vexing question: How many droll ways are there to say “trouble on the information superhighway”? Journalists are working hard to exhaust the metaphor's possibilities:

Wall Street Journal
New York Post
Washington Post
CNN's Moneyline
New York Times
Computer Shopper
CNN Moneyweek
Los Angeles Times
Network World
Houston Chronicle

Footnote To History
For 15 months James Ostrowski, left, had a modest enough dream—the governoratorial nomination of New York’s Libertarian Party. But last month something came between the two. Buffalo lawyer and his visions of matching wits with (or being ignored by) Mario Cuomo: a 900-lb., microphone-wielding gorilla named Howard Stern, who announced he was going after the party’s nod. “I think I have a chance to win,” said Ostrowski on the eve of the convention, held at the semicapacious Italian-American Community Center in Albany. “I feel the party is using the party for his own purposes. I don’t think he’s that interested in politics. It’s his diversion for the year 1994. There’s something called principle. There’s something called honor.” There’s also something called celebrity. The final vote tally: Stern 290; Ostrowski 34.

national sports stadium, where more than 5,000 refugees from the country’s civil war had sought sanctuary. Forty people were killed by the bombardment, and hundreds were wounded. In the past two weeks, as many as 100,000 people have been killed in the fighting, aid groups estimate. The U.N. decided to evacuate nearly all its 1,700-member peacekeeping contingent in the face of the continuing slaughter; some Belgian peacekeepers burned their blue U.N. berets in frustration before boarding their flights. On Saturday, rebels were said to have announced a conditional cease-fire to start midnight Monday.

Aristide: U.S. Policy Is Racist
Haiti’s exiled President, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, denounced President Clinton’s policy of forcibly turning back Haitian refugees as “a racist policy.” Shortly after Aristide’s remarks, U.S. officials announced that they would ask the U.N. to impose a complete economic embargo on Haiti in an effort to restore Aristide to the presidency. The Administration permitted 406 Haitians to come ashore in Florida, but officials termed the landing an emergency rescue.

Rabin Says Golan Negotiable
Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin told kibbutz leaders that he was willing to negotiate the issue of the Golan Heights with Syria. “To me, peace is a more important value for the security and future of Israel than this or that group of settlements,” he said. Meanwhile Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat met in Romania to discuss the self-rule agreement for Jericho and the Gaza Strip. A final accord is expected within two weeks.

Perry Visits South Korea
Defense Secretary William Perry, in Seoul for two days of talks with South Korean leaders, said he does not be-
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ENGAGED. SENATOR GEORGE MITCHELL, 60, majority leader from Maine; to HEATHER MACLACHLAN, 35, managing director of a sports-marketing firm. It is the first marriage for MacLachlan, the second for Mitchell, who is retiring from the Senate and was seriously considered for the impending Supreme Court vacancy.

DIVORCING. NICK NOLTE, 53, actor; from his third wife, former model Rebecca Linger, 19 years his junior; after 10 years of marriage; in Los Angeles. The weathered, formerly beefy star of 48 Hrs., Down and Out in Beverly Hills and currently Blue Chips will share custody of the couple's seven-year-old son Brawley.

HOSPITALIZED. WYNNONA JUDY, 29, country singer; for a ruptured disk and a pinched nerve in her leg; in Nashville, Tennessee.

CHARGED. DOM DELUICE, 60, comic actor; with criminal sexual contact; in Atlantic City, New Jersey. The eager-to-entertain funnyman, recently seen in Mel Brooks' Robin Hood: Men in Tights, was a guest at Merv Griffin's Resorts Casino Hotel last month when, according to a complaint revealed last week, he touched a male casino employee in a sexual manner. DeLuise denies any wrongdoing.

CONVICTION OVERTURNED. PAUL HILL, 39, second husband of Mary Courtney Kennedy, daughter of Robert F. Kennedy; in Belfast, Northern Ireland. Hill was one of the "Guilford Four," made famous in the Oscar-nominated movie In the Name of the Father and spent 15 years in prison for a series of fatal bombings in England before being freed by London's Court of Appeal, which concluded in 1989 that British police lied about the evidence used to convict Hill and his compatriots. The decision formed the basis for Hill's challenge of his 1975 conviction on separate charges of helping to kill an ex-British soldier, an appeal now granted by Northern Ireland's senior judge and two others who concluded that fear of "inhuman treatment" prompted his "confession." In deeming Hill's conviction "unsafe and unsatisfactory," the judges in essence acknowledged that Hill had been unjustly imprisoned for more than a third of his life.

DIED. KEN OOSTERBROEK, 32, photographer; from injuries incurred while covering a politically motivated gun battle in Tokoza township, South Africa. Every so often, a journalist covering tragedy becomes a part of it: Oosterbroek, three-time winner of South Africa's Press Photographer of the Year award, died of a bullet wound received during an exchange of gunfire.

DIED. PAUL SIMMONS, 52, journalist and federal official; following a bleeding ulcer; in Washington. Though he held several posts in the Reagan and Bush administrations, Simmons earned a footnote in political history before he ever set foot in Washington. As an assistant to Illinois Governor Jim Thompson in the late '70s, he fashioned the slogan "Are you better off today than you were four years ago?" Thompson passed it on to presidential candidate Ronald Reagan, who rode it to victory in 1980.

DIED. ROGER SPERRY, 80, brain expert; in Pasadena, California. Holder of a doctorate in zoology, Sperry was a pioneer in understanding the relationship between the left and right sides of the brain. Studying patients who had undergone brain surgery, Sperry identified the purpose of the corpus callosum—the bundle of nerves that passes information between the brain's hemispheres. For this he earned a portion of the 1981 Nobel Prize in Physiology.
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Victory In Defeat

Richard Nixon failed more spectacularly than any other U.S. President, yet by sheer endurance he rebuilt his standing as the most important figure of the postwar era.

CAMPAIGN MODE, 1968: The candidate gave his classic victory sign in South Dakota.

RAYMOND DEPARDON— MAGNUM
THE FINAL DAY: As he departed the White House in disgrace, the honor guard rolled up the red carpet

"Oh, they say, this is the Watergate man and

By JOHN F. STACKS

The significance of any person in history, no matter how complex, can be captured in one sentence. Clare Booth Luce once told Richard Nixon, "You will be summed up: He went to China," she declared.

Her estimation came before Watergate. "Now," Nixon said a few years ago, "historians are more likely to lead with 'He resigned from office.' The jury has already come in, and there's nothing that's going to change it. There's no appeal. Historians will judge it harshly."

He was right of course, as hard-eyed and tough about himself as he had been about other people all his life. It was the same sort of ruthless judgment he had applied to opponents as well as friends, to opportunities and risks, to domestic politics and international diplomacy.

But by last week, as he lay dying in a stroke-induced coma, the verdict on his life and career was becoming, if not softer, at least more complicated. Messages from around the world poured into the hospital in New York City from the statesmen who admired his reach and strength, from the politicians he had dominated and from the citizens who loved him despite his gaping flaws. By the time he died at 9:08 Friday evening, something close to affection, born of such long familiarity, could be discerned, even from his enemies.

Other politicians came and went, but Nixon was always coming back. By sheer perseverance, he was the most important figure of the postwar era. Nixon put the country through some of its worst times, leading the red-scare politics of the 1950s, escalating the war in Vietnam in order to end it, trying with all his enormous energy and guile to defeat the legal processes that closed in on him during the Watergate scandal. Yet an outsized energy and determination drove him on to recover and re-build after every self-created disaster that he faced.

To reclaim a respected place in America's public life after his resignation, he traveled and thought and talked to the world's leaders. After leaving the Wh House nearly 20 years ago, he produced nine books. Just a month before his death he was in Russia trying to get a current sense of the bizarre politics of the nation it fought against for so long. On his return from that trip, he stopped in Washington where he lectured a room packed with members of America's foreign policy establishment. He spoke for 90 minutes without notes and drew a standing ovation for a lucid presentation. On the day that an ebullience struck him mute, page proofs for the last book arrived at his office.

In this issue Time publishes excerpts from that book, titled Beyond Peace. It is kind of last testament from Richard Nixon. It is a tautly apt critique of American foreign policy. His timing was uncanny. T
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Richard Nixon. He had an unerring instinct for the divisive thrust in politics. He succeeded over and over again by making personal attacks on those who opposed him. His own childhood sufferings were transposed into a powerful need to win at all costs. It began with his first campaigns in California and ended with his famous enemies list when he was President.

The anger that trailed after him, which always intensified after his victories because he was rarely a gracious winner, obscured his accomplishments. He was perhaps the most practiced American statesman to occupy the White House in this century. He understood the world in a deep and subtle way. He also had a fine sense of his own country, exploiting the disgust of the "silent majority" as the social and intellectual elites turned first against the war in Vietnam and then against anything vaguely bourgeois.

For a man who used ideology early and often in his political career, he was an astonishingly pragmatic domestic leader. He loathed the Eastern monied establishment that ran the Republican Party as he was rising in it, but his presidential agenda was quite moderate by contemporary G.O.P. standards. He realized that the Great Society programs of the Lyndon Johnson era had failed, but he believed that they were aimed at real problems and that the government should try to solve them.

When he left Washington in disgrace, Nixon retreated to his home in California. It is almost impossible to imagine the pain of his fall, and equally impossible to imagine the strength that kept him going. He nearly died after an attack of phlebitis and thought of taking his own life. Instead, he began a patient and calculated climb back to respectability. When he was still too much the pariah to be seen with sitting Presidents, he consulted quietly with their aides. And by the time Bill Clinton came to the White House, Nixon had virtually cemented his role as an elder statesman. Clinton, whose wife served on the staff of the committee that voted to impeach Nixon, met openly with him and regularly sought his advice. After his death, Clinton agreed to speak at the 37th President's funeral in California. It was a generous act. Nixon had been pardoned again.

To the end, it pained Richard Nixon that his ideas and advice were always diluted by the shame of his fall. "Oh, they say, this is the Watergate man and we're not going to pay any attention to him," Nixon lamented. But America had always paid attention to Nixon. For good and ill, he defined American politics and policy for a half-century, defined it by his successes and by his failures.

In the author's note to Beyond Peace, Nixon recalls that he told former Soviet leader Gorbachev to tell then Russian Vice President Alexander Rutskoi that politics, like war, could be hell. When Rutskoi was released from prison in February, where he had been held following his failed coup against Boris Yeltsin, Nixon thought perhaps Rutskoi had learned "that, for some, there can be life after hell.

History will judge Richard Nixon as much more than the Watergate man. And he leaves another, brighter monument: his own superhuman determination and stamina. It seems almost impossible that he has finally been defeated.
His Final Words

COMPLETED just days before he fell ill, Beyond Peace gives Nixon’s critique of our times. Above all, he urges Clinton not to squander America’s leadership in the world.

THE 1959 KITCHEN DEBATE: Nixon, with Khrushchev, left, who “predicted that my children would live under communism. I cried, ‘Your grandchildren will live in freedom.’”

When I met with Mao Zedong for the last time in Beijing on Feb. 27, 1976, I was shocked at how his physical condition had deteriorated since our first meeting in 1972. He was a shell of the man he had been. He was still sharp mentally, but a massive stroke had robbed him of his ability to put his thoughts into words. The charismatic communist leader who had moved a nation and changed the world with his revolutionary exhortations could no longer even ask for a glass of water.

As we sat in his book-cluttered office in the Forbidden City, I was reminded of President Dwight Eisenhower’s intense frustration after suffering a stroke in 1957. A few days after he returned to the White House from the hospital, he described to me the ordeal that simple speech had become. He complained that when he wanted to say “ceiling,” it would come out “floor.” When he wanted to say “window,” he would say “door.”

Fortunately, Eisenhower recovered completely. Mao never would. As we spoke in Beijing, he was six months from death and a succession crisis was already raging around him. But I was addressing a man who was still the revered leader of nearly a billion people and who had played an indispensable role in bringing about the new relationship between our countries that had begun four years before.

During our conversation, I said that we must continue to cooperate in seeking peace, not only between our two countries but among all the nations of the world. It was painful to watch as he tried to respond. His face flushed as he grunted half-words.

His translator, an attractive young woman dressed in a drab, shapeless Mao suit—one of the worst punishments ever inflicted upon Chinese women by the Old Guard communists—tried to put his grunts into English.

Mao knew enough English to realize that she had not understood him. He shook his head angrily, grabbed her notebook, and wrote out the words in Chinese. She read them aloud in English: “Is peace your only goal?”

I had not expected the question and paused briefly. “We should seek peace with justice,” I answered.
My reply was adequate within the context of the cold war. Today that is too limited a goal for the U.S. Our goal then was to end the struggle between East and West in a way that would avoid a nuclear war and also ensure that freedom and justice would prevail over tyranny. Today, the communists have lost the cold war. Yet it is clear that the defeat of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the 20th century was just the first step toward the triumph of freedom throughout the world in the 21st century. This will be assured only if the U.S.—in its policies at home and abroad—renews its commitment to its founding principles.

At a time when we should be celebrating victory, many observers are wallowing in pessimism, as if we had suffered defeat. Instead of pressing toward the mountaintop and beholding a new vision of peace and freedom for the future, they are wandering in a valley of self-doubt about the past.

No one would say that war is good for a country, but it is undeniable that the U.S. has been at its best when confronted with aggression or some other significant international challenge (our space effort after the shock of Sputnik is a case in point). To meet the challenges we face in the post-cold-war era, we must marshal the same resources of energy, optimism and common purpose that thrive during war and put them to work at home and abroad during an era when our enemy will be neither communism nor Nazism but our own self-defeating pessimism.

Charles de Gaulle once said, “France was never her true self unless she was engaged in a great enterprise.” This is true of the U.S. as well. Great causes push us to heights, as a nation and as individuals, that would not otherwise be achieved. Without a great cause to galvanize America, the very unity of our nation will be at risk as we struggle to meet the challenges of the coming century.

If America is to remain a great nation, what we need today is a mission beyond peace.
America Must Lead

IN THE 1992 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN, A SIGN IN THE CLINTON campaign office read IT'S THE ECONOMY, STUPID. That was good politics but poor statesmanship. There is a world of difference between campaigning and governing. We cannot have a strong domestic policy unless we have a strong foreign policy. We cannot be at peace in a world at war, and we cannot have a healthy economy in a sick world economy. We are

We must begin by asking ourselves what kind of world we want now that we have peace. Ideally, all nations should have free economic systems, free political systems, and an unfailing commitment to social justice and human rights. But the world is not a blank canvas on which we can paint our vision. We must take its myriad realities into account as we seek to realize our goals. The U.S. cannot become involved in every nation or region where our ideals have not been achieved. We favor extending peace and freedom—but extending peace without compromising our interests or principles, and extending freedom without risking peace.

A number of arguments against a continued American leadership role in the world have wide appeal:

► Because of the downfall of the Soviet Union, there is no need for American global leadership.
► Since the U.S. carried the major burden of the cold war, other nations should lead now.
► Even assuming that we are the only ones who can lead, we should give priority to our pressing domestic problems.
► The U.S., with huge budget deficits and trade imbalances, can no longer afford to lead.
► Because of our massive problems at home, the U.S. is not worthy to lead.

All these statements are wrong. Only the U.S. has the combination of military, economic and political power a nation must have to take the lead in defending and extending freedom and in deterring and resisting aggression. Germany and Japan may have the economic clout, but they lack the military muscle. China and Russia have the potential military might, but they lack the economic power. None has sufficient standing with all the world's great powers, none has the record of half a century of leadership. As the only great power without a history of imperialistic claims on neighboring countries, we also have something all these countries lack: the credibility to act as an honest broker.

The concept of "assertive multilateralism" being advanced by some supporters of the United Nations can only be described as naïve diplomatic gobbledygook. Even a collective body as close knit as NATO was not able to be "assertive" in Bosnia. Can anyone seriously suggest that a collective body such as the U.N., nearly one-third of whose members have populations smaller than that of the state of Arkansas, could be "assertive"?

We cannot react to every emergency call like an international 911 operator. But we must respond to those that affect our vital interests in the world.

The debacle in Somalia was a lesson in how not to conduct U.S. foreign policy. What began as a highly popular humanitarian relief program under President Bush became a highly controversial U.N. nation-building project under President Clinton. As the world's richest nation, we should always be generous in providing humanitarian aid to other nations. But we should not commit U.S. military forces to U.N. nation-building projects unless our vital interests are involved, a test that neither Somalia nor Haiti satisfied. When we do intervene militarily to protect our interests, we should follow President Bush's example in the Persian Gulf War, using the U.N., not being used by it.

The new buzzword in the American diplomatic community is enlargement. After containing communism for 45 years, we are told that our goal now should be to enlarge free-market democracy. Enlargement is a tricky word. In photography, a negative can be enlarged to a three-by-five snapshot or a wall-size mural. Based on the record so far, the present Administration is aiming for wallet-size. Some officials clearly believe that the U.S. overextended itself during the cold war, particularly in Vietnam, one of its major battles. They tend to resist American involvement, except in humanitarian activities that have overwhelming public support. They have yet to face up to the fact that it will at times be necessary to use American power and influence to defend and extend freedom in places thousands of miles away if we are to preserve it at home. It is a role that will require global vision and big plays from this President and every successive one in the era beyond peace.

Bosnia

SOME OBSERVERS, AMONG THEM HARVARD PROFESSOR SAMUEL Huntington, have warned that if the West mishandles relations with the Muslim world, a "clash of civilizations" could pit the West against Islam. In the former Yugoslavia, Bosnian Muslims and Christian Serbs fight over control of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the former Soviet Union, Christian Armenians and Muslim Azeri- bujanis are fighting over the Nagorno-Karabakh region. In Lebanon, Christian and Muslim militias have been slaughtering each other for years. In central Asia, religious tensions have contributed to the fighting in Tajikistan.

The U.S. must not let the "clash of civilizations" become the dominant characteristic of the post-cold-war era. As Huntington observed, the real danger is not that this clash is inevitable but that by our inaction we will make it a self-fulfilling prophecy. If we continue to ignore conflicts in which Muslim nations are victims, we will invite a clash between the Western and Muslim worlds.

One such conflict that must be marked down as one of America's most unfortunate and unnecessary foreign policy failures is
Our efforts prevented communism from spreading into Western Europe and blunted its expansion in what was called the Third World.

MEETING CASTRO: "It is time to shift the focus of our policies from hurting Cuba's government to helping its people."

WITH DE GAULLE: "All Europeans understand that neither conflicts to the east nor instabilities in the south can be addressed by the alliance unless the U.S. is an active member."

the carnage in the former Yugoslavia, where three years ago communist hard-liners rising from the ruins of Marshal Tito's artificial nation-state mounted a naked effort to destroy the democratic government of Croatia. From the beginning of the war, there have been excesses on both sides, but the cycle of violence began as a result of Serbian aggression against other former Yugoslav republics—aggression for which the U.S. and its allies have consistently and repeatedly failed to exact a price. As early as 1991, along with a number of other observers, I called upon the U.N. to lift the embargo against the victims of Serbian aggression. The U.S., the U.N. and the European Community vacillated, equivocated, orated, condemned and ultimately did nothing to counter effectively the Serbian onslaught. The massacre of scores of shoppers and their children in Sarajevo in February 1994 would almost certainly not have occurred had the West acted sooner.

It is an awkward but unavoidable truth that had the citizens of Sarajevo been predominantly Christian or Jewish, the civilized world would not have permitted the siege to reach the point it did when a Serbian shell landed in the crowded marketplace. In such an instance, the West would have acted quickly and would have been right in doing so.

The siege of Sarajevo can have a redeeming character only if the West learns two things as a result. The first is that enlightened people cannot be selective about condemning aggression and genocide. When the Khmer Rouge massacred 2 million Cambodians in the late 1970s, Americans' outrage was muted compared with the anguish we justifiably suffered over the massacre of 6 million Jews in the Holocaust. The situation in Cambodia, it seemed, was too fraught with contradiction, especially for those Americans who had opposed our efforts to defeat the communists who carried out the massacre.

The other lesson is that because we are the last remaining superpower, no crisis is irrelevant to our interests. If the U.S. had been willing to lead, a number of steps short of the commitment of ground forces—for instance, revoking the arms embargo—could have been taken early in the Bosnian crisis to blunt Serbian aggression. Our failure to do so tarnished our reputation as an evenhanded player on the international stage and contributed to an image promoted by extreme Muslim fundamentalists that the West is callous to the fate of Muslim nations but protective of Christian and Jewish nations.

Russia

NO OTHER SINGLE FACTOR WILL HAVE A GREATER POLITICAL IMPACT on the world in the century to come than whether political and economic freedom take root and thrive in Russia and the other former communist nations. Today's generation of American leaders will be judged primarily by whether they did everything possible to bring about this outcome. If they fail, the cost that their successors will have to pay will be unimaginably high.

Will Boris Yeltsin be able to continue to provide the leadership Russia needs to achieve the goals of the second Russian revolution—political and economic freedom at home and a nonaggressive foreign policy abroad? The product of a unique period in Russian history, Yeltsin cannot be judged as if he were the president of a stable democracy with an established constitutional order. If he acted like one, he would probably fail. Yeltsin is a tough and sometimes ruthless Russian patriot. Otherwise he would never have been able to come to power and withstand the numerous challenges to his rule. Mikhail Gorbachev started reforms without understanding their likely consequences and then backed down when the dangers became apparent, exposing himself—as one former senior Soviet official described him to me—as a "brutal wimp." In contrast, Yeltsin
acts pre-emptively and decisively. This is the key to the continuing support he has among the Russian people despite all the pain associated with his country’s transition to democratic capitalism.

Yeltsin should be supported but not idolized. By idealizing Yeltsin’s government, the West runs the risk of personalizing its Russian policy and creating a potential trap for itself. If he fails to live up to our overly optimistic expectations, the West’s Russian policy—while basically sound—may lose public support. While supporting Yeltsin, we should remember that there are other democrats in Russia—many of whom have disagreements with him about the constitutional division of labor. If we do not develop good working relationships with the new generation of Russian leaders, we will be caught flat-footed by unexpected shifts in the political landscape, as we were by the strong showing of Vladimir Zhirinovsky’s Liberal Democratic Party in December’s elections.

On March 14, 1994, I had the privilege of being the first American to address a meeting of an elected Russian Parliament, when I appeared before a committee of the State Duma, the lower house of the new Russian Parliament. The Duma is the breeding ground for future Presidents. Every leading candidate in the 1996 elections, with the exception of Alexander Rutskoi, is a Duma Deputy.

Many in the West were shocked when former Vice President Rutskoi and others charged in the armed uprising against the Yeltsin government last October were released from prison by the State Duma’s grant of amnesty to them and to those who tried to overthrow Gorbachev in August 1991. For all this, Rutskoi’s almost certain re-entry into public life will have a positive political impact.

In March 1994, I called on Rutskoi, whom I had met twice before, in his apartment in Moscow. He is a ramrod-straight war hero who looks at the world in a pointedly direct way. He had been out of prison for only 10 days and was still wearing the beard he had grown during his five months there. Our talk had an eerie quality because of a simultaneous and totally incomprehensible conversation between two large parrots in separate cages in the middle of Rutskoi’s sitting room. He apologized for the noise, saying that the birds had had more room in his dacha, but that the Yeltsin government had taken the dacha away. The birds were not speaking English, and I knew enough Russian to know they weren’t speaking Russian. He said that he had acquired them during a tour in Kuala Lumpur and that they spoke only Malaysian.

Rutskoi said that he intended to run for President in 1996 but added ruefully that while he was in prison Zhirinovsky had “appropriated a lot of my political base.” As we discussed his impressions of the domestic scene, including the shocking rise in both organized crime and street crime in Russia, he said somewhat ominously, “I am able to bring law and order, I know how to do it.” He predicted that Russia’s transition to true democracy would take a minimum of 10 years.

Russia will inevitably be strong again. The only question is whether a strong Russia will be a friend or an adversary of the West. We must do everything in our power to ensure the former rather than the latter. The most dangerous mistake we could make would be to ignore our differences or attempt to drown them in champagne and vodka toast at feel-good summits. Rather than papering over differences with diplomatic gobbledygook, we must find ways to disagree without damaging one of the world’s most important strategic relationships.

The second most dangerous mistake would be to neglect our responsibility for assisting Russia in its transition to freedom, or arrogantly to scold or punish it for every foreign or domestic policy transgression, as though it were an international problem child.

What the U.S. wants most from Russia is a nonaggressive foreign policy. That Russian policy has become more assertive, even heavy-handed, is not in dispute. Yeltsin and his pro-Western Foreign Minister, Andrei Kozyrev, talk proudly about the newly muscular defense of Russian interests in the “near abroad” — the ‘Russians’ term for the other former Soviet republics. Still, I do not think a new imperialism looms. I have spoken with several Russian politicians of different persuasions, including President Yeltsin, who were nostalgic for at least some aspects of the former Soviet empire. But with the exception of the supernationalist fringe, all the Russians with whom I have spoken seem to understand that the past can no longer be re-created.

As I write these words on March 30, 1994, the overwhelming conventional wisdom in the U.S. foreign policy establishment is that the prospects for the survival and success of economic reforms in Russia
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PLASTIC MAKES IT POSSIBLE.™
The chances for a lasting peace in the Middle East are the best they have been since the creation of the state of Israel.

IN EGYPT: "Seven million people lined our routes as Sadat and I traveled the country in cars and by train—one of the most overwhelming receptions ever accorded a state visit...."

I vividly recall calling on Deng Xiaoping in the fall of 1990 months after the Tiananmen Square crackdown. After me in the Great Hall of the People, I told him that there was a worse crisis in the relationship between our countries than we imagined. After the cameras left, he became far more animated. China's battle-scarred old survivor was almost totally sincere about a surreal character, with the officer shouting my comments into his left ear and his screaming at the right. While he had no hearing, he had no difficulty seeing his responsibility to a try's paramount leader. He told me that after years of studying the Chinese people, China's relations with the United States were now more or less independent. China would never forgive their leaders for using China as a weapon against another nation. In almost the next breath he introduced me to Fang Lizhi, the dissident who was then being expelled from the U.S. embassy in Beijing, and made a highly consensual position for ending the standoff.

Deng's message was unmistakable: Our difference bridged by discussion behind the scenes but would be resolved by hot exchanges of public rhetoric. A few months later, L'Zhi was released, but on China's initiative, not in response to the U.S.

In late 1992 Deng was widely believed to have given

China

DURING ONE OF OUR MEETINGS IN San Clemente 21 years ago, Leonid Brezhnev expressed concern about the growing threat of China. When I said that it would be at least 25 years before China became a significant economic and military power, he held up both hands with fingers outstretched in what I thought was a sign of surrender.

The translator finally interpreted his gesture. "Ten years," he said. Brezhnev was closer to being right than I was. The world's largest communist society could become the world's richest capitalist economy in the next century.

Some observers contend that we no longer need a close relationship with China, since the threat of Soviet aggression has disappeared. The other side of that coin is that China will take a longer path to modernization because of its leaders' own awareness that a healthy relationship with the West is essential for economic progress. The U.S. needs to protect China against possible Soviet aggression. Both concepts are wrong. In the era beyond peace, China and the U.S. need to cooperate with each other for reasons completely unrelated to the Soviet Union or Russia.

China has emerged as the world's third-strongest military and economic power. It is strong enough to play a major role in regional conflicts in Southeast Asia, the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. It is the only country that possesses the necessary leverage to rein in North Korea's ominous nuclear weapons program. We should not underestimate China's ability to disrupt our interests around the world if our relationship becomes belligerent rather than cooperative.

While most Americans give China high marks for its free-market economics, they rightly criticize the government's continuing denial of political freedom to the Chinese people. However, cutting back our trade with China by revoking China's most-favored-nation status would be a tragic mistake. We cannot improve the political situation in China through a "searched earth" economic policy. Revoking China's most-favored-nation status would hurt the free-market reformers and entrepreneurs who hold the key to China's future. Not only would it devastate the mainland's economy, it would lay waste to the surrounding region as well. No other nation in Asia supports our linking MFN status to human rights.

Today China's economic power makes U.S. lectures about human rights imprudent. Within a decade, it will make them irrelevant. Within two decades, it will make them laughable. By then the Chinese may threaten to withhold MFN status from the U.S. unless we do more to improve living conditions in Detroit, Harlem and South Central Los Angeles.
It's my job to set the tone for this company.

That starts with laying it on the line inside the company and out. We call that straight talk.

Straight talk means our investors hear the upside and downside of every opportunity.

It also means facing up to hard issues—admitting mistakes and fixing them.

Straight talk means if we fall short, we'll hear about it. That's good. It makes us do better.

Straight talk is more than words at the end of an ad. It's something we have to live by.
The Clinton Presidency

THE FOUNDERS WANTED GOVERNMENT STRONG ENOUGH TO PROTECT their security but not so strong as to threaten their liberty, so they placed careful limits on the realm of Federal Government action. But they also understood that freedom could not survive without a strong presidency. In foreign affairs, the case for a strong presidency is overwhelming. Legislators have limited constituencies; the President represents the nation. Just as it was wrong for Congress to enact the War Powers Act in 1973, limiting the President’s power to conduct foreign policy because of the unpopularity of the Vietnam War, it would be wrong to limit the President’s power to conduct foreign policy in the future because of the failures of President Clinton’s policies in Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia. There is always the possibility that a President will make mistakes in acting during foreign policy crises, but it is more likely that the Congress would make an even greater mistake by not acting at all.

Today the problem is not an excessively strong presidency, but a hobbled one. Obsessed by the danger of an imperial presidency, many seem oblivious to the dangers of an imperial Congress. There are now more than 25 subcommittees in the House and Senate dealing with foreign policy. Foreign policy cannot be conducted by committee. Meanwhile Presidents, with their limited terms, are more accountable to the electorate than an imperial Congress, to which incumbents are re-elected as much as 98% of the time. The President is subject to impeachment, congressional power over the purse, and other political and congressional constraints. And Presidents, particularly conservative ones, will always be restrained by an adversarial media.

Does the U.S. have the will to lead? In the 1992 elections, 62% of the voters cast their ballots for presidential candidates—Bill Clinton and Ross Perot—whose campaign theme was that the country was in the throes of crisis and decline. Clinton and Perot were wrong. We are in the ascendant. We demonstrated what we can do during World War II and the cold war. Now that we have peace, our challenge is to demonstrate that we have the will to lead beyond peace, where our enemy is not some nation abroad but is essentially within ourselves.

From the 1960s on, our laws and our mores have been driven by the cultural conceits that took hold during the heyday of the counterculture, including a denial of personal responsibility and the fantasy that the coercive power of government can produce spiritual uplift, cure poverty, end bigotry, legislate growth and stamp out any number of individual and social inadequacies.

The founders created a land of opportunity. For more than three centuries, opportunity was enough because the culture conditioned people to take advantage of it. But we have created a culture in which appallingly large numbers ignore the opportunities offered by work, choosing instead those offered by the interwoven worlds of welfare and crime. Our task now is not to invent opportunity but to enforce honest work as the route to it. We need
When the people of the world look to America for leadership, we also want them to see a uniquely good country, not just the strongest and richest country on earth.

A CHAT WITH DENG: "The nations of East Asia trust each other only slightly more than we trusted the Soviet Union during the cold war. These animosities could lead to arms races and even war."

BETTING ON YELTSIN: "If Russia turns to reactionary leaders, the hard-line leaders in China and other dictators in the world will be heartened."

to get America back on track before it sails off into the abyss.

What many commentators now join in calling a crisis of the spirit has affected all classes in American society. Mrs. Clinton deserves credit for her courage in articulating the absence of higher purpose in life, despite the fact that since the late 1960s many of her most liberal supporters have relentlessly assaulted traditional values in the name of liberation. Unfortunately, most of the Administration's remedies would make the problems worse. Liberals remain committed economically to a further vast expansion of the welfare state; socially to an agenda of personal liberation from traditional morality and to equality not of opportunity but of result; and internationally to a weak multilateralism whose object is to make America a follower rather than a leader.

The Clinton health plan, all 1,342 impenetrable pages of it, is less a prescription for better health care than a blueprint for the takeover by the Federal Government of one-seventh of the nation's economy. If enacted, it would represent the ultimate revenge of the 1960s generation.

The Administration's ambitious agenda to increase the size and scope of government repeats the domestic policy mistakes of the past. What the U.S. needs is not bigger government but a renewal of its commitment to limited but strong government; economic freedom, which is the only way to assure prosperity and individual liberty; and a moral and cultural system that strengthens the family, personal responsibility and the instincts for civic virtue.

The present Administration has added revenues from its massive tax increases to the peace dividend from the end of the cold war—which it has magnified through excessive cuts in defense spending—but despite its overly optimistic predictions, it still faces an out-of-control budget deficit. Even the most deft political shell game cannot hide much longer the fact that the recurring deficits are largely the result of decades of unchecked spending on domestic programs and entitlements. The liberal lament is familiar. President Reagan, they chant, simultaneously doubled the defense budget, reduced taxes, and cruelly cut essential social programs, so that the rich got richer, the poor got poorer, and the country amassed an enormous debt that put the U.S. economy at a significant competitive disadvantage in the world economy.

This dire portrayal is wrong. Dramatically ending a prolonged period of stagflation and slow growth, which were lingering legacies of the Great Society, Reagan's tax cuts and deregulation stimulated an economic boom, seven years of uninterrupted growth during which the American economy grew by nearly a third—or by the size of the entire West German economy. The most serious shortcoming of the Reagan and Bush Administrations was their failure to cut the level of entitlement going to those who are not poor, though it is true they received no encouragement from the Democratic opposition to cut these programs. There is no reason why Americans should receive Social Security, medical benefits and other government subsidies without regard to their ability to pay. Only one dollar of every five of non-means-tested entitlement goes to the poor. If our political leadership summoned the courage to cut these programs on a means-tested basis, we would achieve substantial savings and also more fairly distribute the burden of cutting costs to middle- and upper-income taxpayers. On the contrary, the current Administration has continued to fight not only to preserve the present levels of entitlement but to expand the application of this corrosive principle in new and costly ways. We must not stumble blindly into what Margaret Thatcher derisively called the "nanny state." We should build on the many positive accomplishments of the 1980s and correct some of the decade's serious mistakes.

Americans do not know how to be second, or even first among equals. They only know how to be the best. After World War II the U.S. became the leader of the free world by acclamation. No other option was even conceivable. We should be just as resistant to playing a secondary role now. But if the U.S. is to continue to lead in the world, it will have to resolve to do so and then take those steps necessary to turn resolution into execution.

Above all, America must rediscover its commitment to the pursuit of excellence for its own sake. In the land of liberty, we have sometimes risked making an obsession out of individual freedom without requiring a concomitant sense of individual responsibility. More devastating, the absence of a national challenge has reduced our sense of common purpose. In modern America too many forces—ethnic and cultural diversity, gaps between rich and poor, distrust between old and young—pull Americans in different directions; too few impel them to pull together.

The greatest challenge America faces in the era beyond peace is to learn the art of national unity in the absence of war or some other explicit external threat. If we fail to meet that challenge, our diversity, long a source of strength, will become a destructive force. Our individuality, long our most distinctive characteristic, will be the seed of our collapse. Our freedom, long our most cherished possession, will exist only in the history books.
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It Just Feels Right.
"I Have Never Been A Quitter"

Despite all his gifts, Nixon spent his whole life falling and running and falling again

By OTTO FRIEDRICH

ICHARD NIXON'S FIRST conscious memory was of falling—falling and then running. He was three years old, and his mother had taken him and his brother out riding in a horse-drawn buggy, and the horse turned a corner too fast on the way home. The boy fell out. A buggy wheel ran over his head and inflicted a deep cut. "I must have been in shock," Nixon recalled later, "but I managed to get up and run after the buggy while my mother tried to make the horse stop." The only aftereffect, Nixon said, was a scar, and that was why he combed his hair straight back instead of parting it on the side.

In a sense, Nixon spent his whole life falling and running and falling again. A symbol of the politics of anger, he was one of the most hated figures of his time, and yet he was also the only man in U.S. history ever to be elected twice as Vice President and twice as President. In the White House, he achieved many major goals: the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, restored relations with China, the first major arms agreement with the Soviet Union and much more. But he will always be remembered, as he was at his death last week at 81, as the chief perpetrator—and chief victim—of the Watergate scandal, the only President ever to resign in disgrace.

Despite all his gifts—his shrewd intelligence, his dedication and sense of public service, his mastery of political strategy—there was a quality of self-destructiveness that haunted Nixon. To an admiring aide he once acknowledged, "You continue to walk on the edge of the precipice because over the years you have become fascinated by how close to the edge you can walk without losing your balance."

He kept losing it, tumbling to great depths, then grimly climbing back. After being defeated in the presidential race of 1960 and then the California gubernatorial race of 1962, he bitterly told reporters, "You won't have Nixon to kick around anymore." Six years later, he fought his way to another Republican presidential nomination, which he spoke of as "the culmination of an impossible dream." But at his last meeting with his Cabinet in August 1974, after what seemed like the final defeat in a lifetime devoted to the idea of winning, he burst into tears. "Always remember," he said, "others may hate you, but those who hate you don't win unless you hate them—and then you destroy yourself."

From anyone else, that might have served as a public farewell, but the disgraced Nixon spent more than a dozen years in climbing once more out of the abyss and re-creating himself as an elder statesman. He wrote his memoirs in 1978, then eight more books largely devoted to international strategy. He moved to the wealthy suburb of Saddle River, New Jersey (where he stayed until 1990, moving a mile away to Park Ridge), and began giving discreet dinners for movers and shakers. President Reagan called to ask his advice. So did President Bush. In November 1989, he became the first important Ameri-
A Long Political Journey

Formative years: Poor Richard in bow tie with parents and brothers; on the Whittier football team; examining the infamous “pumpkin” film; on the Jersey Shore with Pat, his daughters and Checkers

National spotlight: Next page, the Veep candidate delivering his “Checkers” speech; snagging the Republican nomination with Ike in Chicago; debating for the White House against the well-rested Kennedy

can to make a public visit to Beijing after the massacre at Tiananmen Square.

The hallmark of Nixon’s youth had been poverty—poverty and family illness and endless work. His father, Frank, who had dropped out of school and run away from home after the fourth grade, was a combative and quarrelsome Ohisan. After running through a string of jobs, Frank moved to California in 1907, built a house in the desert-edge town of Yorba Linda and tried to grow lemons. There Frank’s pious Quaker wife Hannah gave birth on Jan. 9, 1913, to a second son. She named him Richard, after the English King Richard the Lion-Hearted, plus Milhous, her own family name. The newborn baby, an attendant nurse later recalled, had a “powerful, ringing voice.”

His mother sent him to school every day in a starched white shirt and a black bow tie, and he worked hard for his good grades. He liked to recite long poems and play the piano. One of his favorite forms of competition was debating, which he did well. Another was football. Too small and slow to make the starting team in Fullerton or Whittier High School or at Whittier College, he showed up every day for practice in the line. “We used Nixon as a punching bag,” one of his coaches recalled. “What starts the process, really,” Nixon later said of his lifelong passion for winning, “are the laughs and slights and snubs when you are a kid. But if . . . your anger is deep enough and strong enough, you learn that you can change those attitudes by excellence, personal gut performance.”

Nixon grew up in Whittier because his father had given up on citrus farming and found a new job there as an oil-field worker, then started a gas station, then expanded it into a general store. Hannah Nixon liked Whittier because it was largely a Quaker town where nobody drank or smoked or carried on. But life was not easy. All through high school, Nixon had to get up at 4 a.m. every morning and drive to the Seventh Street markets in Los Angeles to buy fresh vegetables for the family store.

When Dick Nixon was 12, his younger brother Arthur, the fourth of the five boys, complained of a headache; a month later he was dead of meningitis. Nixon wrote later that he cried every day for weeks. When Harold, the oldest son, was stricken with tuberculosis, Hannah left the rest of the family to take him to the dryer air in Prescott, Arizona. She could pay for this only by operating a clinic where other TB patients waited out their last weeks of life. In the summers Dick found jobs nearby as a janitor, a chicken plucker, a carnival Barker. After five years, Harold died. “We all grew up rather fast in those years,” Nixon recalled.

HABOLD’S ILLNESS WAS also a great financial drain. Nixon had to turn down a scholarship offer from Harvard (Yale was also interested in him) and save money by attending tiny Whittier College; Duke University Law School was just starting when it offered Nixon one of the 25 scholarships available to a class of 44. At first he lived in a $5-a-month room. Later he shared a one-room shack that had no plumbing or electricity; he shaved in the men’s room of the library. In three years at Duke, he never once went out on a date. He finished third in the class of 1937.

Nixon had shown an interest in politics since the age of six, when he began reading news of current events and talking about them with his father. When he was 11, the Teapot Dome scandal prompted him to an-
I had to win. That’s the thing you don’t understand. The important thing is to win.”

nounced to his mother, “I’ll be a lawyer they can’t bribe.” The practice of law in Whittier was hardly so inspiring. Taken into the firm of a family friend, he spent his first day dusting the books in the office library, then bungled his first case, losing all his client’s money in a real estate deal. But he persevered, began joining various clubs, making speeches. He even joined a local theater group, where he met a schoolteacher named Thelma (“Pat”) Ryan.

Driving her home from the theater, he said, “I’d like to have a date with you.”

“Oh, I’m too busy,” she replied. An orphan, she was not only working but attending classes as well. The second time Nixon drove her home, he again asked for a date, again was shrugged off. The third time it happened, Nixon said, “Someday I’m going to marry you.” It took two years of courtship before she agreed in 1940; she converted to the Quaker faith and used her own savings to buy the wedding ring.

Nixon probably would not have been content to stay in Whittier forever, but Pearl Harbor uprooted his whole generation. He knew that if he was ever to have a political career, he would have to join the armed forces. So despite the Quaker belief in pacifism, he won a commission in the Navy in June 1942. He served creditably as a supply officer in New Caledonia, then the Solomon Islands. His most remarkable activity, though, was to become a master at bluffing in stud poker. By the end of the war, he had won and saved a stake estimated at as much as $10,000. He invested half of it the following year in launching his political career.

Jerry Voorhis, a popular liberal Democrat, had won five straight elections in the 12th Congressional District east of Los Angeles, but a group of local businessmen hoped to unseat him. Nixon promised them “an aggressive and vigorous campaign.” He began working up to 20 hours a day, making speeches about his war experiences, denouncing the New Deal. When Pat gave birth to their first daughter Patricia (Tricia), Nixon was out campaigning. (Confident of re-election, he stayed home when Julie was born two years later.)

Nixon implied—falsely—that Voorhis was virtually a communist. “Remember,” said one of Nixon’s ads, “Voorhis is a former registered Socialist and his voting record in Congress is more socialist and communistic than Democratic.” This kind of smear was to become a Nixon trademark. To one of Voorhis’ supporters, Nixon later offered a very personal rationale: “Of course I knew Jerry Voorhis wasn’t a communist, but I had to win. That’s the thing you don’t understand. The important thing is to win.”

Win he did, with 56% of the vote. This was part of the end-of-the-war landslide that gave the G.O.P. control of both houses for the first time since the election following the Great Crash of 1929. Nixon asked to be put on the Education and Labor Committee, which was going to rewrite the rules of labor relations through the Taft-Hartley Act. In return, he was asked to serve on an eccentric committee that devoted its time to noisy investigations of “un-American activities.” It was to be the making of his career.

Nixon began looking for experts on communist influence in labor unions. This led him to a Maryknoll priest whose report on the subject included the fact that a TIME senior editor named Whittaker Chambers had told the FBI that he had belonged to a communist cell in Washington, and that it included Alger Hiss. It seemed incredible. A lawyer who had once clerked for Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Hiss had served as a State Department adviser at the Yalta conference, had helped organize the Unit-
The First Term

ed Nations and was being touted as perhaps its first Secretary-General.

Hiss, then president of the Carnegie Endowment, denied ever having met anyone named Whittaker Chambers. Nixon had both men summoned before the committee to confront each other. Hiss finally admitted knowing Chambers slightly under a different name. Chambers insisted that they had been "close friends... caught in a tragedy of history." But nothing could be proved until Chambers produced the "pumpkin papers," microfilms of State Department documents that he said Hiss had given him for transmission to Moscow. Hiss was convicted of perjury in January 1950, served 44 months in prison and has spent the rest of his long life denying guilt.

The Hiss case made Nixon a national figure and launched him into a run for the Senate in 1950 against Helen Gahagan Douglas, a former actress who had served six years in the House as an ardent New Dealer. Since red hunting was a national mania in these Korean War days, Douglas foolishly tried to accuse Nixon of being soft on communism, and invented the name that haunted him for the rest of his life: Tricky Dick. But when it came to mudslinging, she was up against a champion.

He called her the "pink lady" and declared that she was "pink right down to her underwear." He won by the biggest plurality of any Senate candidate that year.

Nixon had hardly begun serving in the Senate before the Republican leadership started fighting over whether the 1952 presidential nomination should go to conservative Senator Robert Taft or to the immensely popular General Dwight Eisenhower. The convention was in danger of deadlocking, in which case it might turn to California Governor Earl Warren. That was certainly Warren's plan, and all the California delegates, including Nixon, were pledged to back him. In some complicated maneuvering, though, the Eisenhower forces put forward a resolution that would give them a number of disputed Southern delegations. Nixon, who had already been soundly out as a running mate for Eisenhower, persuaded the California delegates to back this resolution, and so Eisenhower won. Warren never forgave Nixon for what he considered a betrayal.

Once nominated as Vice President, Nixon was assigned to play hatchet man on "communism and corruption" while Eisenhower remained statesmanlike. Nixon was all too eager to comply. He described Democratic nominee Adlai Stevenson as one who "holds a Ph.D. from [Secretary of State Dean] Acheson's College of Cowardly Communist Containment."

The Democrats got their revenge when the press discovered and trumpeted that Nixon had a secret slush fund of $18,000 provided by California businessmen to help finance his activities. Nixon insisted that the fund was perfectly legal and was used solely for routine political expenses, but the smell of scandal thickened. At Eisenhower's urging, Nixon went before a TV audience estimated at 58 million with an impassioned defense of his honesty.

"Pat and I have the satisfaction that every dime we've got is honestly ours," he said. The only personal present he had received was "a little cocker spaniel dog in a crate. Black-and-white spotted. And our little girl—Tricia, the six-year-old—named it Checkers. And you know, the kids love that dog." Hundreds of thousands of listeners cabled or wrote their support of Nixon, and Eisenhower settled his future by saying publicly, "You're my boy!"

Eisenhower won 55% of the vote, and the freshman Senator from California, still only 39, found himself the second youngest Vice President. He also found that a Presi-
ss, really, are the laughs when you are a kid.”

dent and Vice President rarely like each other very much, because the latter’s only real job is to wait for the former’s death. Nixon faced the great test of this uneasy relationship when Eisenhower suffered a heart attack in September 1955. It was up to Nixon to chair Cabinet meetings and generally run the White House machinery without ever seeming to covet the power that lay just beyond his fingertips. He did the job tactfully and skillfully throughout the weeks of Eisenhower’s recovery.

One major function of modern Vice Presidents is to travel, and Nixon turned himself into a latter-day Marco Polo: nine trips to 61 countries. Everywhere he went, he conferred, orated, debated, press-conference. In Moscow to open a U.S. trade exhibit in 1959, Nixon got into a finger-pointing argument on communism with Soviet Party Secretary Nikita Khrushchev in the kitchen of an American model home.

To some extent, Vice Presidents’ tasks are defined by their own skills and experiences. Nixon knew more about politics than almost anyone else in Eisenhower’s Administration, so he became the G.O.P.’s chief campaigner. When Eisenhower’s second term expired, Nixon was the inevitable successor; he was nominated to run against the Democrats’ John F. Kennedy.

Eisenhower and others warned Nixon not to accept Kennedy’s challenge to a televised debate—Nixon was the Vice President, after all, and far better known than the junior Senator from Massachusetts—but Nixon took pride in his long experience as a debater. He also ignored advice to rest up for the debate and went on campaigning strenuously until the last minute. So what a record 80 million Americans saw on their TV screens was a devastating contrast. Kennedy looked fresh, tanned, vibrant; Nixon looked unshaven, baggy-eyed, surly. The era of the politics of TV imagery had begun, and the debates were a major victory for Kennedy.

The vote was incredibly close, with Kennedy winning 50.4% of the popular vote and Nixon 49.6%. He accepted the bitter defeat and returned to California. Then Nixon’s legendary political shrewdness abandoned him. He let himself be talked into running for Governor of California against the popular Edmund G. (“Pat”) Brown, and tried to imply that Brown was a dangerous leftist. It was after his crushing defeat that Nixon blew up at reporters and announced that this was his “last press conference.”

Still only 49, he decided to move to New York City and make some money by practicing corporate law. He joined a prosperous Wall Street firm, which thereafter became Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie and Alexander. But he never really retired from politics. He was just biding his time. He thought Jack Kennedy would be unbeatable in 1964, and Lyndon Johnson soon appeared almost as much so. Nixon played elder statesman, letting Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller fight for the G.O.P. nomination. Nixon stumped loyally for Goldwater, and when that campaign ended in disaster, he became the logical man to reunite the splintered party in 1968.

Following the advice of a young advertising man named H.R. Haldeman, he finally learned how to make effective use of television: not in speeches or press conferences but answering questions from “typical voters” and then carefully editing the results. If that was artificial, so in a way was the whole 1968 campaign. Democratic candidate Hubert Humphrey dared not re-
Watergate Unfolds

As pressure built, Nixon released transcripts of recorded Oval Office conversations with key aides on the day he left the presidency, far right, Nixon and his family bid farewell to the White House staff.

Nixon's first term included sweeping innovations, often surprisingly liberal. He was the first President in years to cut military spending; the first to tie Social Security increases to the cost of living. He instituted "revenue sharing" to funnel $6 billion a year in federal tax money back to the states and cities. He signed the act lowering the voting age to 18. And he benefited from Kennedy's decision to go to the moon. When Neil Armstrong landed there in 1969, Nixon somewhat vaingloriously declared that "this is the greatest week in the history of the world since the Creation."

His imaginative measures were shadowed, however, by Vietnam. Nixon, who had supported each previous escalation—

and indeed repeatedly demanded more—had campaigned on a promise to end the war "with honor," meaning no surrender and no defeat. He called for a cease-fire and negotiations, but the communists showed no interest. And while U.S. casualties continued at a rate of about 400 a month, protests against the war grew in size and violence.

To quiet antiwar demonstrators, Nixon announced that he would gradually withdraw U.S. forces, starting with 25,000 in June 1969. From now on, the war would be increasingly fought by the Vietnamese themselves. When, from their sanctuaries in Cambodia, the North Vietnamese began harassing the retreating Americans in the spring of 1970, Nixon ordered bombing raids and made a temporary "incursion" into the country. The main effect of this expansion of the war was an explosion of new antiwar outcries on college campuses.

These were fiercely contentious times, and Nixon was partly to blame for that. He had always been the fighter rather than the conciliator, and though he had millions of supporters among what he liked to call "the Silent Majority" in "middle America," the increasing conflicts in American politics made it difficult to govern at all. Nixon, as the nation learned later when it heard the Watergate tapes, brought to the White House an extraordinarily permanent anger and resentment. His staff memos were filled with furious instructions to fire people, investigate leaks and "knock off this crap."

Together with this chronic anger, the mistrustful Nixon had a passion for secrecy. He repeatedly launched military operations without telling his own Defense Secretary, Melvin Laird, and major diplomatic initiatives without telling his Secretary of State, William Rogers. All major actions went through his White House staff members, particularly National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger and Nixon's two chief domestic aides, Bob Haldeman and John Ehrlichman.

Just as he loved secrecy, Nixon hated leaks to the press (though he himself was a dedicated leaker to favored reporters). And so when he first ordered an unannounced air raid against communist bases in Cambodia in April 1969, he was furious to read about it in a Washington dispatch in the New York Times. FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover told the
President that the only way to find the leaker was to start tapping phones. When Nixon entered the White House and dismantled the elaborate tapping system that Johnson had installed, Hoover told him that the FBI, on Johnson's orders, had bugged Nixon's campaign plane. Now Nixon started down the same path, getting Attorney General John Mitchell to sign the orders for 17 taps.

When a series of secret Vietnam documents known as the Pentagon Papers began appearing in the New York Times in June 1971, Kissinger persuaded Nixon that the leaker, Daniel Ellsberg, "must be stopped at all costs." The FBI turned balky at extralegal activities, so Nixon told Ehrlichman, "Then by God, we'll do it ourselves. I want you to set up a little group right here in White House."

Thus was born the team of "plumbers." Its only known job involving Ellsberg was to break into his psychiatrist's office that September in search of evidence against him. But once such a team is created, other uses for it tend to be found. The following June, seven plumbers (five of them wearing surgical rubber gloves) were arrested during a burglary of Democratic national headquarters in the Watergate office and apartment complex.

They admitted nothing, and nobody connected them with Nixon. The White House itself was already doing its best to block any FBI investigation, but it formally denied any involvement in what press secretary Ron Ziegler dismissed as "a third-rate burglary attempt." Nobody has ever disclosed exactly what the burglars were looking for or what they found, if anything.

The Watergate burglary quickly faded from the front pages. Nixon was campaigning hard for re-election, portraying himself as a global peacemaker. In February 1972 he had reversed nearly 30 years of American policy by flying to Beijing, ending restrictions on trade with China and supporting China's entry into the U.N. In May he had signed the first arms-control agreements with Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev, placing sharp restrictions on antiballistic missiles. And although Kissinger's contracted secret negotiations with the Vietnamese communists had not yet brought a truce agreement, Nixon pulled out the last U.S. combat troops in August.

Nixon denounced Senator George McGovern that fall, capturing nearly 61% of the vote. Then, after one last spasm of bellicosity in the carpet bombing of Hanoi at Christmas, Nixon announced in January 1973, "We today have concluded an agreement to end the war and bring peace with honor to Vietnam."

But the Watergate mystery remained. In court, five of the burglars pleaded guilty in January 1973 (the other two were quickly convicted), but they still admitted nothing. Federal Judge John Sirica angrily sentenced them to long prison terms (up to 40 years) and indicated that he might reduce the punishment if they confessed more fully. One of the seven, James McCord, wrote Sirica on March 20 that "others involved in the Watergate operation were not identified during the trial." In two secret sessions with Watergate committee counsel Sam Dash, he later named three top Nixon officials: Attorney General Mitchell; Mitchell's deputy, Jeb Stuart Magruder; and White House counsel John Dean.

Caught lying—but still denying any wrongdoing—Nixon said he was ordering a new investigation of the situation. Two federal grand juries were also investigating. So was the press. Though a lot of this probing was only loosely connected to the burglary, the term Watergate began to apply to a whole series of misdeeds that seriously tainted Nixon's great election victory. Not
only did more than $100,000 donated to Nixon's campaign end up in the bank account of one of the plumbers, but the entire fund-raising operation was marked by illegalities, irregularities and deceptions. Congress decided to investigate all this too. It chose a select committee to be headed by North Carolina's folksy Senator Sam Ervin.

Two and a half weeks before the committee was scheduled to open televised hearings in May 1973, Nixon made a stunning announcement: his two chief White House aides, Haldeman and Ehrlichman, were resigning, as were Attorney General Richard Kleindienst (who had succeeded Mitchell) and White House attorney Dean. "There can be no whitewash at the White House," Nixon said.

The Senate hearings soon showed otherwise. Magruder testified that Mitchell and Dean had been deeply involved. Then the dismissed Dean took the stand in June and testified that Nixon himself had been lying, that he had known about the White House cover-up attempts since at least September 1972. He also disclosed that the White House kept hundreds of names on an "enemies list" and used tax investigations and other methods to harass them. But how could anyone prove such charges?

That question received an astonishing answer a month later when a former White House official named Alexander Butterfield almost offhandedly told the committee that Nixon had installed voice-activated recorders that secretly taped all his White House conversations.

When the Senate committee promptly demanded the tapes, Nixon refused, claiming Executive privilege. The new Attorney General, Elliot Richardson, had appointed Harvard law professor Archibald Cox as a special prosecutor on the whole case, and Cox sent a subpoena for tapes he wanted to hear. Nixon refused him too. Judge Sirica upheld Cox's demand, so Nixon resisted him in the U.S. Court of Appeals, which backed Sirica.

Nixon then offered to produce an edited summary of the tapes. When Cox rejected that idea, Nixon on Oct. 20 angrily told Richardson to fire Cox. Richardson refused and resigned instead. Nixon told Deputy Attorney General William Ruckelshaus to fire Cox; he too refused and resigned. General Alexander Haig, Haldeman's successor as White House chief of staff, finally got Solicitor General Robert Bork to do the job, and so the "Saturday Night Massacre" ended, leaving the Nixon Administration a shambles. (In the midst of all this, it was almost incidental that Vice President Spiro Agnew resigned under fire for having taken graft and that he was replaced by Michigan Congressman Gerald Ford.)

The House began on Oct. 30 to look into the possibilities of impeachment. Inside the besieged White House, Nixon raged like a trapped animal. There were unconfirmed reports that he was drinking heavily, that he couldn't sleep, that he even wandered around late at night and spoke to the paintings on the walls. To a meeting of Associated Press editors, he piteously declared, "I am not a crook."

Special prosecutor Cox had by now been replaced by a conservative Texas attorney, Leon Jaworski, who appeared no less determined to get the tapes. Still resisting inch by inch, Nixon released 1,254 pages of edited transcripts. They were a revelation of the inner workings of the Nixon White House, a sealed-off fortress where a character designated as P in the
transcripts talked endlessly and obscenely about all his enemies. "I want the most comprehensive notes on all those who tried to do us in," I said to Haldeman at one point, for example. "We have not used ... the Justice Department, but things are going to change now." The edited tapes still left uncertainties about Nixon's involvement in the Watergate cover-up, however, so Jaworski insisted on the unedited originals of 64 specific tapes, transcripts and other documents. Nixon refused. Jaworski filed suit. The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that a President cannot withold evidence in a criminal case (Mitchell, Haldeman, Ehrlichman and others were by now under indictment, and Nixon himself had been named by the grand jury as an "unindicted co-conspirator").

During all this, the House Judiciary Committee, headed by New Jersey's Democratic Congressman Peter Rodino, had been conducting hearings on impeachment. It soon decided to impeach Nixon on three counts: obstruction of justice, abuse of presidential powers and defiance of the committee's subpoenas.

Nixon meanwhile sat out in his beach house in San Clemente, California, reading a biography of Napoleon and staring at the ocean. But he had also been listening to some of the disputed tapes, and he had found one—the "smoking gun"—that threatened to destroy his whole case. It was a talk with Haldeman on June 23, 1972, a time when Nixon had long pretended to know virtually nothing about the Watergate break-in just six days earlier. This tape recorded Nixon talking with Haldeman about Mitchell's involvement, ordering a cover-up, planning to use the FBI and CIA to protect himself. For good measure, the tape also included presidential slurs on Jews, women, homosexuals, Italians and the press. The reaction to the new tape, when Nixon finally released it, was disastrous. Even conservatives like Ronald Reagan and Barry Goldwater demanded Nixon's resignation, as did G.O.P. chairman George Bush. A congressional delegation told the President he had no more than 15 votes in the Senate, about the same in the House. Shortly after, Nixon told his family, "We're going back to California." His daughters burst into tears; his wife did not.

Two days later, on Aug. 8, 1974, Nixon made his last televised statement from the White House: "I have never been a quitter. To leave office before my term is completed is abhorrent to every instinct in my body. But as President I must put the interests of America first ... Therefore, I shall resign the presidency effective at noon tomorrow." There remained then only a series of farewells. He spoke once again of winning and losing. "We think that when we suffer a defeat, that all is ended. Not true. It is only a beginning, always."

And so it was, once again, for Nixon. When he left Washington, there was a chance he might yet be prosecuted. Gerald Ford fixed that a month later by issuing a presidential pardon protecting Nixon from legal penalties for anything he had done in connection with Watergate. But Nixon's health was poor, his psychic shock obvious. An attack of phlebitis nearly killed him. He later told friends that he heard voices calling, "Richard, pull yourself back." And so he did.

His first public appearance came in 1978, and then the long, slow process of self-rehabilitation. Perhaps, in his last years, having regained a certain amount of public respect and even some grudging admiration, having acquired four grandchildren and all the comforts of leisurely wealth, Nixon finally found a little peace, finally got over that mysterious anger that had fueled his ambition throughout his long life. Perhaps.
While Clinton focuses on domestic affairs, U.S. world leadership suffers from lack of attention and too frequent back-and-forth policy switches

By GEORGE J. CHURCH

HEN HE WAS PRESIDENT, Richard Nixon, for good or ill, always sought to take charge—of his party, his country, the world. In his final book, the elder statesman sums up a lifetime of involvement in foreign affairs by admonishing his successors to do the same. “If the U.S. is to continue to lead in the world,” writes Nixon, “it will have to resolve to do so and then take those steps necessary to turn resolution into execution.”

Bill Clinton has not got the message. Now, 15 months into his term, the President seems to be approaching a kind of fault line in world affairs, where his own and his nation’s credibility is in doubt. As foreign problems crowd onto his agenda, Clinton’s responses have all too often been marked by rhetoric that is not backed up with action. The smell of failure, fairly or unfairly, is beginning to gather around his global management team, and if he slips over that ill-defined line, he might soon be written off by friends and foes alike as incapable of crafting a strong or coherent American foreign policy.

The longer Clinton remains tentative in spelling out U.S. interests, the more his ability to lead atrophies. The consensus around the globe is that in little more than a year, the President has squandered a distressing amount of the status the U.S. enjoys as the sole superpower, winner of the cold war and victor in Desert Storm. Clinton may not hear much of this face to face; diplomatic politesse precludes that. But he might be surprised if he read intelligence reports based on eavesdropping on the private conversations of foreign leaders. One U.S. official who has done so calls the criticism of leaders in Britain, France, Germany and Japan “seething.” He elaborates: “They see us as in disarray. As not leading. As having a weak foreign policy team. We’re unreliable. We make strong statements of principle about what we’ll do, and then we back down. They don’t think we have much credibility.” A senior European diplomat who has served in Washington grumbles that Clinton “reminds me of Jimmy Carter,” who lost his and America’s credibility 15-odd years ago.

These perceptions are hardly fixed or firm. Bosnia is the core of the President’s foreign policy problem; Clinton’s zigzag alternations between high-minded declarations and failure to implement them, together with the relentless horror of the war, have bled U.S. prestige more than anything else. The steady drumbeat of criticism from pundits and the foreign policy establishment could turn to cheers if his latest bombing initiative in Bosnia marks the beginning, at long last, of a clear and forceful U.S. policy toward that tortured country. But if this improvisation, like so many before it, leads only to further muddle, the President cannot count on getting many more opportunities to prove he does know how to lead.

As before in Bosnia, a change in U.S. policy was preceded by a new round of human suffering, grisly television reports and editorial-page outrage at the Administra-
tion's failure to act. On Thursday, after three weeks of carnage in Gorazde, one of six so-called "safe areas" for Bosnian Muslims, Clinton called for a substantial expansion of NATO's military role in the war. On Friday NATO issued a new ultimatum: the Serbs must stop firing on the city immediately, and they had until Saturday night to pull back their troops and weapons 1.9 miles and let in U.N. humanitarian teams to succor Gorazde's sick, wounded and starving. If the Serbs refused, NATO planes would bomb and strafe any Serb targets, including ammunition dumps and fuel depots as well as weapons, within a 12.5-mile perimeter. That extended to Gorazde and the five other havens the concepts of an ultimatum and an exclusion zone that had some, though not complete, success in easing the siege of Sarajevo. But the threat also opened the way for the creeping military involvement that many Americans dread.

First results were inconclusive. The Serbs broke yet another cease-fire and continued shelling Gorazde. But the barrage lightened enough to cause NATO to hold off on air strikes in hopes it would stop entirely. U.N. observers reported seeing Serb troops pulling back from the town late Saturday.

Clinton may have grasped the lesson put pithily by Michael Mandelbaum of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "If you're not going to pull the trigger, don't point the gun." But it is by no means certain a corner has been turned. If air strikes do finally begin, they might not be even militarily, let alone politically, effective. Bombing runs may not be able to put out of action the Serbs' most effective weapons: easily moved mortars. And even if actual strikes or the threat of them stop the Serbs' Gorazde offensive, what is the next move? There are many places outside the six safe havens that Serb forces could then try to seize.

When minority leader Bob Dole asked the Senate to approve lifting the U.N. embargo on weapons shipments to the Bosnian government, an idea Clinton has frequently endorsed, the White House pressured Dole into backing off because most of the allies are opposed. The President expressed interest in a Russian proposal for a summit conference on Bosnia, which could prompt a settlement—but such a settlement could amount to a capitulation.

It is not just Bosnia that is undermining the world's only remaining superpower. The fallout from Clinton's uncertain performance is everywhere.

HAITI. The Administration's inability to devise any strategy for returning freely elected President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power, while a trade embargo impoverishes the populace, without dislodging the renegade government, has earned the contempt of both sides. From his exile in Washington, Aristide last week denounced Clinton's policy of picking up would-be refugees at sea and sending them back as "racist" and a signal that American leaders "don't care." Six members of Congress got themselves arrested on the White House lawn for protesting the refugee policy. The Administration had earlier said it would ask the U.N. to tighten the embargo. And it allowed some 400 Haitian fugitives to land in Florida—though officials insisted this was a special case, not a reversal of policy. Washington has started looking for a new special envoy to replace Lawrence Pezzullo, whom Aristide's backers distrust. None of these moves was likely either to satisfy Aristide or to impress the military thugs who ousted him in a 1991 coup. They refer to Clinton by a variety of snarling names, of which only farceur (comedian) is printable.

NORTH KOREA. The Administration is in a tough spot because the perils of using force against Kim Il Sung's nuclear-development program are too high to be reasonable, and even economic sanctions may not work, since China might veto any U.N. move to impose them. Though Clinton once spoke of destroying the country's society if it built and used atomic bombs, the U.S. has been lurching between confrontation and negotiation for 14 months. And as in other situations, the Administration has been unclear, possibly even to itself, on what its ultimate goal is. Should it try to keep North Korea from developing any nuclear weapons at all, as Clinton once insisted? Or should it aim only to keep Pyongyang from becoming a "significant" nuclear power, as Secretary of Defense William Perry later said—which might imply that one or two A-bombs would be...
O.K.? The big danger is that having dodged one deadline after another for opening its nuclear facilities to inspection, Kim's regime will conclude that it can keep delaying until it is able to announce that it has a nuclear arsenal and to dare the world to do anything about it.

**Somalia.** When the U.N. branded warlord Mohammed Farrah Aidid a criminal it intended to arrest, American troops spearheaded the effort to seize him. But when his forces killed 18 U.S. service members last October, Clinton announced that all American troops would go home within six months. Shortly thereafter, the U.S. provided a jet to fly Aidid to a meeting of clan chiefs trying to cobble together a new regime. The flip-flops angered Italy, which also had troops in Somalia. "The U.S. didn't know how to calibrate the use of force," says Italian Defense Minister Fabio Fabbri. "They used too little in the beginning, when there were 30,000 troops there and all they did was give out food. Later, they used too much. It's in trying to get rid of Aidid. That brought the Somalis themselves into the battle, turning a humanitarian mission into urban warfare." With U.S. combat forces gone, gun battles among warring clans raged around Mogadishu late last week, threatening to plunge the country back into anarchy.

**China.** The Administration is unable to decide which of three conflicting goals to stress most: pressing Beijing to stop jailing dissidents and making products with what amounts to prison slave labor; retaining China as a major trade partner and market for American goods and investment; getting the Chinese to help change North Korean direction on nuclear weapons. Contradictory demands have only confused and infuriated Beijing and made Clinton's own decision June 3 on whether to continue most-favored-nation trade treatment for China more difficult.

Clinton has had his successes. The Administration long ranked policy on Russia as No. 1, but that is turning questionable:

---

**Should the U.S. sell arms to the Bosnian Muslims or remain neutral?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELL ARMS</th>
<th>REMAIN NEUTRAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boris Yeltsin's progress toward building a free-market democracy seems stymied, and Moscow is no longer a reliable U.S. partner in diplomacy—witness its on-and-off support of the Bosnian Serbs. Less ambiguous are Clinton's victories in winning ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement to create a U.S.-Canada-Mexico common market, and the pledge by the 119 members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to lower trade barriers worldwide. Those reflect a presidential focus on economic policy, international as well as domestic, so intense as to prompt Uwe Nerlich, deputy director of the Institute for Policy and Security in Germany, to grumble that Clinton's foreign policy seems mainly to be "a national export policy."

Without a doubt, the first post-cold war President has an exceptionally difficult job navigating the new global currents. But many critics question whether Clinton has really tried to construct his own coherent approach to the world. Richard Lugar, probably the Republican Senator best informed on foreign affairs, identifies what may turn out to be a fatal void. "There is not an idea on the part of the President that there are overriding principles that are important," he says. "And the President does not envision himself as the leader of the free world."

The same kind of talk comes from U.S. foreign policy professionals in and outside the Administration. Says a distinguished career diplomat serving abroad: "This Administration seems incapable of even asking the questions, much less providing the answers. It is difficult to point to anything where they have genuinely developed a policy, as opposed to a set of changing positions."

Paul Goble, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, phrases the same criticism as a blunt question: "If we're the last remaining superpower, why do we act like a banana republic?"

The central problem, agree most observers, is Bill Clinton himself. "Character has become destiny," muses a former State Department official. His weaknesses, strengths, proclivities "are defining the international order. Domestic renewal is his passion, and he cannot see much political imperative to change. Says Lee Hamilton, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee: "He came out of the 1992 campaign with at least one lesson seared on his brain—that the American people want him to focus on domestic affairs." An occasional exception proves the rule: Clinton is now revising his policy on Haiti partly because it is becoming a domestic issue, important to the black voters who gave him indispensable support in the election.

Determinedly immersed in domestic issues, the White House frequently displays a don't-bother-me attitude toward foreign affairs. Clinton was not even aware that the U.N. had decided to issue what

---

**"Just a series of ad hoc responses trying to get past the press questions of the day."**

—WILLIAM ODOM, former head of the National Security Agency

---
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A President need not immerse himself in the details of foreign policy to conduct successfully. But one who does not then requires a strong team to run things, and Clinton does not have. Secretary of St. Warren Christopher and Lake are intelligent, hard-working and well informed, neither is exactly a take-charge guy. Pe "has tried to step into the vacuum, but has made some impolitic statements that clashed embarrassingly with evolve policy.

If anything, the group is a bit too alert and agreeable. Christopher and Lake as veterans of the Carter Administration remember all too well how its foreign policy was almost paralyzed by the rivalry between National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. They have vowed not to repeat that experience and have succeeded—but at a heavy price. Too often they let political develop into fuzzy agreements rather than vigorously thrashing out alternative policies for the President's decision.

In an attempt to improve their dis press, two senior White House officials a foreign policy aide called in correspondents to put a bright spin on the President's performance last week. Clinton, said one official, "has been steady in his leadership in making slow progress, but real progress on Bosnia. "It's important to pay attention to the President's rhetoric," said another. "He did not say the point of the bomb in to guarantee the safety of those enclave He was not trying to make that argument But, the same official added, "we are in strategy that this will enhance the safety the safe areas. "That superfine distinct seems aimed mainly at securing Russian break the deadlock, but not to settle the situation.

Lake, "happy today" about the muscular approach to Bosnia, defends embattled boss. He points out that a bit of progress in that country has come from U.S. initiatives: the NATO resolution last August against Sarajevo's strangulation, the no-fly zone, the air drops, the cease-fire agreement and the new term. Still, he says, "It's unbelievable to me that we have made progress that no one would have predicted two months ago, through a lot of hard work by the President."
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Lake, "happy today" about the muscular approach to Bosnia, defends embattled boss. He points out that a bit of progress in that country has come from U.S. initiatives: the NATO resolution last August against Sarajevo's strangulation, the no-fly zone, the air drops, the cease-fire agreement and the new term. Still, he says, "It's unbelievable to me that we have made progress that no one would have predicted two months ago, through a lot of hard work by the President."

---

If you think you might have to withdraw a ship [from Haiti], you don't send it."

—PAUL Goble, senior associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

Does the U.S. have a great deal at stake in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

master—is by now a drearily familiar problem with Clinton's foreign policy, which often seems improvised day to day. "It's just a series of ad hoc responses trying to get past the press questions of the day," says William Odom, former head of the National Security Agency, the Pentagon's electronic-snooping arm. And the reason is simple: the President will not devote the time and attention necessary to map out a steady and consistent foreign policy. Stung by such criticism, aides have taken to tallying a list of "substantive presidential involvement" in foreign policy: more than 50 phone calls, meetings and briefings from April to 21; and conversations with foreign leaders 153 since the beginning of his Administration.

Clinton has the intelligence to conduct an effective foreign policy, and he did not come to the presidency unfamiliar with the world. He studied at the George-town School of Foreign Service and later at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, and was on the staff of J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is a quick study, and when he does focus—as when preparing to meet for- eign leaders, for which he crams like a stu- dent facing a tough exam—can be quite im- pressive. But he rarely does focus that way. He gets a 15-minute intelligence briefing about 8:45 a.m. and confers on international problems with National Security Adviser Tony Lake and Vice President Al Gore a bit later. By 9 or 9:30 a.m., he has spent 30 minutes or so on foreign policy. Except in times of crisis, he is often through for the day.

---

**How would you describe President Clinton's handling of foreign policy:**

- **Compassionate** 69
- **Intelligent** 60
- **Inconsistente** 59
- **Indecisive** 56
- **Confused** 51
- **Effective** 40
- **Bold** 33

---

56
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Gorazde, which was a setback, and the critics start saying again, "Clinton isn't engaged with foreign policy. It's ridiculous."

Such positive thinking is generally shared by those people whose opinion Clinton values most: the American voters. Poll after poll shows majorities consistently think Clinton is doing a presentable job in international affairs. Tired of the burdens of world leadership after two generations of cold war, many citizens think the best foreign policy is one that keeps U.S. soldiers, sailors and flyers at home and does not cost much money. And if Clinton often treats international affairs as an unwelcome distraction from health-care reform, crime and other domestic problems—well, so do most of the people who elected him.

In another way Clinton is fortunate: it might be said, and not entirely facetiously, that the time is ripe for an ineffective foreign policy. The U.S. is more secure from attack than it has been in decades, and its margin for error is vastly greater than it was in the days when thousands of Soviet and American nuclear warheads were ready to be fired within minutes. At the same time, though, framing a coherent policy is much more difficult than when every problem could be viewed in the organizing framework of the cold war. And in foreign policy, as in other activities, success breeds success—and vice versa.

Says a U.S. ambassador: "As long as people know the U.S. is engaged and reliable, they are unlikely to do foolish things. It's reassuring and restraining. And this serves our national interests because stability and peace make our economy and trade prosper." Conversely, a senior Administration official admits the American backbone in Somalia probably emboldened the Haitian military to defy the U.S., and it would be surprising if Kim Il-Sung were not watching Bosnia for clues as to how far he can go. Moreover, another Administration official warns, for all the American public's current indifference, "foreign policy could undermine this presidency." Clinton may not score many points with a foreign policy promoting international peace and prosperity; voters will greet it with a yawn. But they may not readily forgive a fumbling response to a crisis that poses a serious threat to American interests, and Clinton has given little indication that he knows how to handle one.

---

**Has the U.S. lost power and influence in the world?**

**YES** 58%  
**NO** 39%

---

**THE POLITICAL INTEREST**

Michael Kramer

**Keep China Trade**

BILL CLINTON, ADDICTED TO COMPROMISE, IS AGAIN CLOSE TO FOOLISHLY SPLITTING THE DIFFERENCE ON A CRUCIAL FOREIGN POLICY ISSUE. THE QUESTION THIS TIME IS WHETHER THE U.S. SHOULD CONTINUE OR RETARD THE GROWING TWO-WAY TRADE BETWEEN AMERICA AND CHINA. BY JUNE 3, THE PRESIDENT MUST DECIDE TO EXTEND OR REVOKE BEIJING'S MOST-FAVORED-NATION TRADING STATUS.

The tug between ideals and interests has produced a mush of mixed signals since Clinton took office. After saying before he was elected that he would deny MFN to China, Clinton continued the policy last May, but only conditionally. He threatened a cutoff this spring if Beijing's human-rights record failed to demonstrate "overall significant progress." It hasn't. Now, says House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman Lee Hamilton, Clinton "can't renew MFN unless he lies."

Clinton faces four choices. He can revoke MFN, affirm America's moral principles and cripple Chinese-American commerce, which last year totaled almost $40 billion. Gone in the process would probably be any chance of enticing Beijing's help in rolling back North Korea's nuclear-weapons program. Gone too would be approximately 200,000 high-paying U.S. export jobs, which is why Treasury, Commerce and White House economic officials favor retaining MFN.

A second course would distinguish between goods produced by private and state-run enterprises. Privately made Chinese products would enjoy MFN; the rest wouldn't. "Sounds good, but it's hard to see it working," says Michel Oksenberg, who was Jimmy Carter's top China hand. "The Chinese have an infinite genius for changing labels. And what would happen to the investments of those U.S. firms involved in joint ventures only partially owned by the state, or to products made privately with components supplied by government concerns?"

A third option would extend MFN with less rigorous trip wires. "Perhaps human rights could be a general condition rather than one that's filled with specific conditions," said Secretary of State Warren Christopher on March 13. Any compromise, he added, could "move the relationship to a new and more significant level." And a more hypocritical one as well.

Clinton's best bet would be to decouple the trade and human-rights issues entirely. Taiwan and South Korea prove that political liberalization follows prosperity. As a vibrant economy creates a robust middle class, ordinary citizens increasingly seek to influence government actions, pressure that even authoritarians must eventually accommodate. Revoking MFN would restrain China's economic growth, thus causing democracy's prospects to suffer.

Decoupling the issues, in fact, could increase Clinton's ability to criticize Beijing's internal policies (especially after Deng Xiaoping dies, when spasms of chaos and repression may occur as a struggle for power ensues). Free from fear that bashing Beijing would reignite the MFN debate, the President could openly embrace China's dissidents and encourage U.S. firms to voluntarily tie their China business to improved human-rights practices, as many American companies did when apartheid flourished in South Africa. If conditions so worsened that punitive actions were called for, the U.S. could champion cutbacks in international lending; China is currently the leading recipient of World Bank loans.

Above all, decoupling would obviate the need to lie. A forthright admission that a policy isn't working can project leadership and gain credibility for those who call it squarely. The choice is not whether the U.S. should isolate China, but which one. The goal is to avoid perpetuating an ineffectual linkage that could isolate America from China.
SOUTH AFRICA

AT THE DAWN

In the first democratic, all-race elections, the black majority is
F LIBERATION
taking control of its own country after more than 300 years

His broad, beaming grin is one of his trademarks, but Nelson Mandela thinks it makes him look silly. At 75 and soon to achieve his lifelong dream, he feels he must project a more dignified image. But his struggle to restrain the smiles failed last week as Zulu Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi finally agreed to end his Inkatha Freedom Party's boycott of the country's first all-race parliamentary elections. The agreement, said a jubilant Mandela, "is a leap forward for peace."

As the date of liberation approached over the past few weeks, the curse of violence grew across the land. It looked as if hundreds of thousands of black South Africans would be too frightened to exercise their hard-won right to vote—and the country might dissolve into full-scale rebellion, shattering hopes of building a just nation. More than 20,000 citizens have died in the past 10 years, most of them in the rivalry between Inkatha and Mandela's African National Congress.

Then, only seven days before the polls were to open, the Zulu leader suddenly announced he had "decided to make compromises to avoid a great deal more bloodshed and carnage." Buthelezi dropped his demand for an autonomous province that he could dominate and settled for constitutional recognition of the Zulu kingdom.

As exhilaration displaced fury and violence ebbed, most of the nation's 22.7 million eligible voters—16.2 million of them blacks enfranchised for the first time—are expected to turn out at the polls. The African National Congress will surely win, and when the votes are tallied this week, the black majority National Assembly will convene in Cape Town to name Mandela President.

The nation's metamorphosis also brought journalists onto the front lines. In the past year more than 100 have been attacked, and five have died. Last week photographer Ken Oosterbroek was killed and Greg Marinovich was wounded during a gun battle near Johannesburg. James Nachtwey, who has spent the past 10 weeks braving the unrest for Time, helped Marinovich to safety. Undeterred, Nachtwey returned to taking the pictures that capture South Africa's violent birth of freedom.
BATTLE'S END  During the struggle for freedom, senseless slaughter became a commonplace on the route between Johannesburg and its black twin city of Soweto. When a commuter who was simply trying to go to work was shot down—in police parlance, by persons unknown—he was left lying on the platform.

ON THE LINE  One of Mandela's urgent tasks will be reform of the police force, which was designed to be the enforcer of apartheid. These officers-in-training will be expected to reassure edgy South Africans by providing security for all races.

WHITE HOPE  Even if President F.W. de Klerk wins enough support from worried black, mixed-race and Indian voters to make him Deputy President, the man who brought the country to the brink of change will have little say over its future.
REBIRTH
In one of the injustices for which South Africa was notorious, these blacks were forced off their tribal land in Transvaal province 27 years ago. Now, as blacks and whites seek reconciliation, their petition to return has been approved, and they have begun putting their houses and lives back together.

OLD GUARD
While many whites are bracing themselves for the inevitable, a hard core of right-wingers are demanding a racially pure state of their own. Well armed and unrepentant, they remain a canker at the heart of the nation.

TRIBAL PRIDE
Zulu warriors loyal to Chief Buthelezi and their King have been battling the A.N.C. for a decade. They may have joined the election process, but they will fight to retain as much autonomy as they can wrest from their rivals.
RELIGION

Battle of The Future Buddhas

Two different boys claim to be the reincarnated master of a popular school of Buddhism

CHOSEN: Ugen Thinley, the 17th Karmapa

THE CLAIMANT: Tenzin Chentse

By DAVID VAN BIEMA

THE PRIZE IS A CROWN, ABOUT EIGHT inches high, said to be woven from the hair of holy women. The stakes: assets worth $1.2 billion and the reverence of up to a million followers. The alleged weapons: forgery, lies and murder. The contenders? Two little boys, 8 and 10.

To many Westerners, the most familiar figure in contemporary Buddhism is the Dalai Lama, the point man for Tibet's aspirations to escape Chinese control. But among American Buddhists, his Gelugpa teachings are equaled in popularity by those of the related Kagyu Karma, or Black Hat, sect. Hence the consternation—"a lot of confusion and pain," says Terry Sullivan, spokeswoman for Karma Triyana Dharma Chakra Monastery in Woodstock, New York—that is spreading in American Buddhist circles over an ugly and odd battle for the Black Hat leadership.

The oldest of Tibetan Buddhism's four allied schools, Kagyu Karma was the first to adopt reincarnation as a means of choosing its leader, called the Karmapa. The process is not always peaceful; over the centuries, warring factions have sponsored dueling candidates, igniting bloody battles.

The current feud began in a Chicago cancer ward, with the 1981 death of a man named Ranjung Rigpe Dorje. After the 1950 occupation of Tibet by the People's Republic of China, Rigpe, the 16th Karmapa, had established a thriving exile community and engineered the school's current Western popularity. Yet he appeared to have left one task undone: the penning of the traditional poem that would help his followers find his reincarnated self—and thus the next Karmapa.

For eight years, followers frantically scoured the sect's treasure house and monastery in Rumtek, India, for clues; pressure mounted on the four high lamas acting as interim regents. Finally, a regent named Tai Situ had a brainstorm. For 13 years, he had kept a prayer amulet given to him by the late leader, which he had never opened. Now, he says, "it suddenly struck me, the message could be here!" And lo, it was; and conversely specific too: the child would be found "to the north in the east of a land of snow [Tibet]; A country where divine thunder spontaneously blazes [wordplay indicating a town]; In a beautiful nomad's place with the sign of a cow; The method [father] is Dondrub and the wisdom [mother] is Lolaga."

A group formed to find the child was delayed when its leader, another regent, died in the crash of his new BMW in East Bengal. But in 1992 emissaries to the Tibetan district of Lhathok located an apple-cheeked, appropriately aged boy named Ugen Thinley, son of a shepherd named Dondup and his wife Lolaga. Local lamas reported that at his birth rainbows had appeared and conch shells sounded, and a bird alighted on his father's tent and "sang a beautiful song." The joyous news was faxed to the Dalai Lama, who affirmed the choice with his own prophetic dreams.

But there were other, darker omens. A 15th century Black Hat prediction warned of a time of troubles between Karmapas Nos. 16 and 17; and that too came to pass. The nephew of the late leader, regent Kunzig Shamar, had long jostled for power with his colleagues. Shamar announced that the letter from his uncle was a forgery. At a meeting in Rumtek to resolve the matter, he arrived accompanied by a squadron of Indian guards in military array. Several people were injured in the ensuing riot.

In September 1992 Ugen Thinley officially enthroned as the 17th Karmapa Tibet's Tsurphu Monastery. But in Delhi in March a defiant Shamar unseats his own choice for the job: a bespectacled 10-year-old named Tenzin Chentse, whose parents he said were Tibetan refugees enfronement. Shamar announced, "we will take place by year's end."

HIS WELCOMING CEREMONY FOR new contender, however, turned into a melee, and the boy spent next few weeks under the guns of 300 monks and 400 combat-ready E pens from a militant Buddhist school run by a Danish ex-boxer. Meanwhile, outside, the side has hinted darkly that the other have engineered the fatal 1992 car crash in which each claimed the other may be a impostor. In that the Chinese. Shamar says of his rival, "Tai Situ is degenerate, and the people around him are like, why ... like g sters." Members of the opposing side like to point out that the name of the next regent is an anagram of the name of the 16th Karmapa, who died in 1981. But the choice is up to the Dalai Lama, who has affirmed the choice with his own prophetic dreams. The outcome of this issue will be spiritual leader said nothing to the Dalai Lama about this; he believed that the Dalai Lama would make the final decision. Shamar has already been expelled from the Karmapa school. The dispute has caused divisions within the Tibetan community. The battle of the future Buddhas is far from over.
THE WHITE HOUSE

Open and Unflappable
In a historic briefing on the Clintons’ finances, the First Lady discloses little but wins warm reviews

By MICHAEL DUFFY WASHINGTON

W H I T E L I L L E S P E R F U M E D T H E A I R outside the State Dining Room last Friday afternoon as Hillary Rodham Clinton walked in, sat down in a shiny wooden armchair under a portrait of a pensive Abraham Lincoln and asked, “Are we ready?”

Ready? By the time it was suddenly announced at noon that she would hold a genuine press conference later in the day, most reporters had been waiting 3½ months to fire questions at the First Lady about Whitewater. What happened was a riveting hour and 12 minutes in which the First Lady appeared to be open, candid, and above all unflappable. While she provided little new information on the tangled Arkansas land deal or her controversial commodity trades, the real message was her attitude and her poise. The confiding tone and relaxed body language, which was seen live on four networks, immediately drew approving reviews.

A cathartic, get-it-all-out press conference had been under consideration for weeks but was on hold until “Hillary really felt it was time,” said a senior official. Then, on Thursday, the Los Angeles Times reported that her approval rating had dropped since January from 56% to 44%—a damaging shift. Thus the session was more or less spontaneous; Mrs. Clinton discussed the idea with her husband only the night before.

Still, she was well prepared. When she could, the First Lady referred to the failed land deal not as Whitewater but as “north Arkansas.” She called on nearly every reporter, but answered their questions carefully and selectively. She rarely strayed from her original defense of Whitewater, that the deal simply “lost money,” and mounted a new defense for her speculation in cattle futures: “I don’t think you’ll ever find anything that my husband or I said that in any way undermines what is the heart and soul of the American economy, which is risk taking and investing in the future.”

Mrs. Clinton was the most forthcoming about her relationship with Jim Blair, a lawyer for Tyson Foods, who placed most of her commodity trades during her brief speculation with cattle futures in 1978-80. Blair, she explained, came to her with what she said was “a great opportunity to make money.” Mrs. Clinton admitted that she relied heavily on Blair, an active commodities trader, when she turned a $1,000 investment into a $105,000 profit. “I relied primarily on his advice,” she said, “because he really spent an enormous time studying the market.” If Mrs. Clinton was worried about the perception of a sweetheart deal between herself and someone who represented the largest agribusiness in Arkansas while her husband was Governor, she didn’t show. “He and his wife are among our very best friends,” she explained.

On other subjects, she gave no ground. When she was asked about the mysterious first day of cattle-futures trading, when she turned a $1,000 investment into a still unexplained $5,300 profit, she said, “I do not remember any of those details.” And she twice professed ignorance about the generous way Whitewater partner Jim McDougal absorbed most of the losses from the land deal despite an agreement to split profits and losses on a fifty-fifty basis with the Clintons. “We did whatever he asked us,” she said.

Mrs. Clinton seemed to deliberately back away from her earlier description of the Whitewater controversy as a conspiracy fueled by Republicans and other political opponents. And the First Lady was at her most concise when she admitted that much of the confusion about Whitewater is “really a result of our inexperience in Washington.” For months, she had been trying to maintain a “zone of privacy” around her family because, she said, she had been reared by her parents to ignore the judgments of others because “you have to live with yourself.” That has led her, the First Lady added, “to perhaps be less understanding than I needed to of both the press and the public’s interest, as well as right, to know things about my husband and me.” Then she added, “I feel, after resisting for a long time, I’ve been rezoned.”

Yet her most disarming observation came near the end, when she suggested that she and her husband were merely “transition figures” in the White House. The attacks on her, she implied, were attacks on her influence in the White House. “We don’t fit easily into a lot of our pre-existing categories. And I think that, having been independent, having made decisions, it’s a little difficult for us as a country, maybe, to make the transition of having a woman like many of the women in this room, sitting in this house. So I think the standards and to some extent the expectations and the demands have changed, and I’m trying to find my way through it and trying to figure out how best to be true to myself and how to fulfill my responsibilities to my husband and my daughter and the country.”

With lines like that, it’s a wonder she waited so long to deliver them. —With reporting by Nina Burleigh and James Carney/Washington
Let's Get Motivated

A hot road show delivers a gospel of success. But is it religion or commerce?

**By RICHARD REEVES**

The band was called allegiance, and it was playing a number with a chirpy message of personal renewal:

*This is for all the lonely people, thinking life has passed them by. Don't give up until you drink from the silver cup and ride that highway in the sky.*

At 7 o'clock on a rainy morning in San Francisco, hundreds of people were running across the parking lots of the Cow Palace in the pursuit of happiness. This was the fourth of 41 stops scheduled so far for Success 1994, a road show featuring the best-known former cookware and computer salesmen in the country, famous athletes, more famous preachers, military heroes, the Governor of New York and three-count 'em, three—former Presidents of the U.S.

Where are they now? Ronald Reagan, George Bush, Gerald Ford, Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, Norman Schwarzkopf, Tom Landry, Bart Starr, Roger Staubach, Mike Ditka, Marilyn Quayle and Ruth [Mrs. Norman Vincent] Peale? On the success road along with Mario Cuomo, Larry King, Willard Scott, Paul Harvey, the Rev. Robert Schuller and Zig Ziglar. The show grew in marquee power when it moved on to Dallas last month with six starters on the motivational dream team—Bush, Schwarzkopf, Staubach, Schuller, Peale and Ziglar—talking to 16,500 people who had paid from $49 to $225 to be in Reunion Arena for eight hours of all-American self-improvement. "No matter what your line of work, President of the United States or running a business," Bush told them, "character does matter." Schwarzkopf added that it was "a thing called 'character' that described General George Patton and Dr. Albert Schweitzer, Mother Teresa and Margaret Thatcher."

Success 1994 is part revival meeting. *The Music Man* and medicine show and all uplift, with dialogue inspired by the Bible, *Poor Richard's Almanac*, Calvinism, common sense and Horatio Alger. The show has already been to Seattle, San Jose, Washington, San Francisco, Anaheim, San Diego, Phoenix, Houston and Columbia. Coming up: Cleveland, Youngstown, Akron, Richmond, Sarasota, Rochester, Chicago . . .

At the San Francisco seminar, which drew 6,000 customers, I paid $110 extra (regular price: $49) for what I was assured would be an "awesome" seat up front in the arena and a 7 a.m. breakfast with Zig Ziglar, a former pots-and-pans salesman billed as "America's No. 1 Motivational Speaker." Over doughnuts and coffee with 300 other "VIPs," I nodded and laughed along with everyone else at stories of his hard-scrabble boyhood in Yazoo City, Mississippi, where his mother said motivational things like this: "You're going to have to lick that calf over again. That job might be all right for some boys. But you're not most boys. You can do better."

The definition of success, said Ziglar, 68, is "getting many of the things money can buy—and all the things money can't buy. Money can buy you a mattress, but you can't buy a good night's sleep." I had come thinking Success 1994 would be about dollar signs—and Ziglar recycled the old line, "Anyone who says he's not interested in money will lie about other things"—but I was wrong. Success 1994 is essentially a secular religion preached by believing Christians. The recurrent theme: Money has no value without happiness and love.

In the main hall in San Francisco, the crowd was thick with employees from AT&T. Corporations buy about 40% of Success' tickets, mostly to reward good work or to perk up salesmen and saleswomen suffering from syndromes called "fear of closing" and "cold-call reluctance."

The first speaker was Dave Dravecky, the San Francisco Giants pitcher who came
back from cancer surgery on his throwing arm to win a game before the arm broke like a twig in his second comeback start. A videotape of that last game had most of the crowd crying, then cheering the big and earnest one-armed man onstage. "When You Can't Come Back" was his title, and he talked about God and Jesus, telling some awkward jokes with punch lines like, "She is the wind beneath my wing...singer, not plural, get it?" Another video introduced Mary Lou Retton, reminding the crowd of the spunky kid from West Virginia who in 1984 became, against all odds, the first American woman to win an individual Olympic gold medal in gymnastics. "For me," she said, "the word team stands for Together Everyone Achieves More."

"I am in the life-changing business," said Ziglar as he came on. "Failure is an event—it is not a person," he said. He attacked "mental B.O." and "stinking thinking" and "people who think denial is a river in Egypt." Of freedom, he said, "Take the train off the tracks and it's free—but it can't go anywhere." He dazzled them with statistics: 72% of the students in Who's Who Among American High School Students are virgins; immigrants have four times as much chance to become millionaires as native-born Americans. "Listen to this," he said; "67% of all golf strokes are made within 60 yds. of the hole, but if you go out and watch golfers practice, I guarantee you they will spend 80% of their time concentrating on shots longer than 60 yds. The least effective people spend their time on actions that are not productive but which they are most comfortable doing."

Ziglar has been doing this and writing best-selling books with titles like See You.at the Top for more than 30 years. He gets paid $30,000 up front for each appearance on the Success circuit, quite a bit less than half of what Reagan and Schwarzkopf collect. But he commanded the Cow Palace for 2½ hours with only a 15-min. break to sell his tapes, both audio and video. How to Stay Motivated was $169.95, Courtship After Marriage was $60. "The whole shootin' match, value $2,515," could be had for $995.

Ziglar was followed by the Success tour's organizer, Peter Lowe, 35, the son of Canadian missionaries. Lowe, small and red-haired, looked like the teenager Ron Howard once played on Happy Days as he gave an hour and 15 minutes of tips on "Success Skills." No Zig, Ziglar, he comes across as a mechanical model of the older man, finally zeroing in on fear—a word he defined as "False Evidence Appearing Real"—as the reason for business failure.

Lowe was direct about religion, saying the way to change a life is to stand up straight and say, "Lord Jesus, I need you. I want you to be No. 1 in my life." Not everyone has been content with the heavily Christian content. At Success 1993 in Phoenix, Arizona, where 7,000 customers had come to hear speakers including Reagan, there were strong objections from the advertising staff of the state's Jewish News, who had come as a company-sponsored group. They took Lowe's standard offer to return their money if they were offended.

Even so, the Phoenix seminar was the one that really put the Success series, which had played 19 dates to smaller audiences in 1992, on the big-time motivational circuit. The key was persuading the former President to appear. After Reagan, Lowe said, it was easy to get Bush and Ford and the generals. Next he has targeted Margaret Thatcher, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Johnny Cash, who fit into his plans to move the Success seminars from auditoriums to
stadiums next year, then from one day apiece to week-long crusades in the Billy Graham style and then from America to the world. (Lowe operates through a nonprofit corporation in Tampa, paying himself a salary of $28,000 a year.)

Former President Ford, who is 80 now, was next to last on the San Francisco program. Looking sturdy as ever, he gave about the same speech he gave on the road in 1976, still saying, "A government big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take from you everything you have." The crowd was polite but obviously bored as Ford went on about the federal deficit. They had come for something else. This was not about Washington; it was about them, each of them. Some are practically addicts, trying one motivational session or program after another—individuals desperate for more control over their own lives. Each one wants more money, more power, more love, more happiness, more esteem or self-esteem.

"There's a big need out there for something positive," said the woman sitting next to me, Gail Marshall, who turned out to be a newspaper editor looking for inspiration rather than a story. "I need it to get away from the cynicism in our business." More typical testimony came from Rita Landemer, a real estate sales manager: "People are hungry for ways to improve. I go to one of these motivational seminars at least once a year. It's a way of pressing my reset button."

Right! It all seemed harmless enough. Ziglar's dynamic, common-sense advice really came down to ... making lists! He tells people how to set goals and write them down every day. He did a riff on the way most of us make lists for the things we have to get done the last day of work before vacation. Do that every day, he said. "You were born to win. But to be a winner you must plan to win, expect to win."

Later, thinking about it outside in the rain, I knew most of us who were there were not going to win, and Ziglar knows that. So do the AT&T executives who sent their San Francisco people to Success 1994 on the same day the company announced that 15,000 jobs in its long-distance-service unit would be eliminated in the next two years. The No. 1 motivator planted an idea for losers too: It's your own fault; don't blame the system; don't blame the boss—work harder and pray more. "It's not money or power," Peter Lowe said when we talked after the Cow Palace was empty and still again, rejecting whatever cynicism I had brought to the seminar. "People want love, happiness and peace. What we're doing is not 'Get rich quick.' It's moral and spiritual; this lays a foundation for a new life."

He's probably right. What bothered me was that so many people there wanted a new life, any new life. But that's what America has always been about, isn't it?}

---

**PUBLIC EYE**

by Margaret Carlson

**Seeing Stars over Kelso**

The press of other business was about to draw the curtain over the part Admiral Frank Kelso played in the disgrace known as Tailhook. There would be no prosecutions. It was a done deal in the Senate to whisk Kelso off to a four-star retirement at full pay as if nothing untoward had happened on his watch. Then an astonishing thing occurred. Two of the most venerable forces in Washington—the Pentagon and the Senate Armed Services Committee—were confronted by one of the newest: seven women Senators. And for a moment the militarists were forced to regroup. Kelso's supporters had to launch a sudden offensive to squeeze out a 54-43 victory. By saying, "Not so fast," and impeding the old-boy network, the women, and the 36 men who joined them, rallied around that rarely observed principle: accountability. Still, they lost.

Tailhook is one more sorry example of the practice of concealing that mistakes were made without punishing those who made them. A Navy judge found that Kelso was on the third floor of the Las Vegas Hilton when women—not just Top Gun groupies but also 15 female officers—were assaulted. The judge accused Kelso of lying about his presence there and of trying to manipulate the investigation to shield himself. A Pentagon inspector-general report found otherwise, but Kelso decided against a further inquiry to sort out the discrepancies in favor of stepping down two months early. He bargained for a statement of praise from the Secretary of the Navy, who earlier had urged him to resign for a "failure of leadership."

The Senate would then vote him a four-star retirement rather than two stars, and full pension, $84,340 a year, vs. $67,467.

A lopsided Senate vote in Kelso's favor would have been the expected end of it. Instead, a bipartisan group of women forced a daylong debate. Those who tried to defend the admiral were reduced to praise for a solid 36-year career—minus Tailhook and logie. Republican Senator Ted Stevens of Arkansas asked his female colleagues to "remember that [Kelso is] a father of two young women who are very sensitive of their father's role in this matter"—whatever that meant. John Warner of Virginia worried about the hardship Kelso's wife would bear if he were to get $17,000 a year less. Sam Nunn got tangled up in sailing analogies—Kelso's opponents were putting him in a rowboat and tying an anchor to his leg and saying he "should have been down on the bottom of the ship"—and concluded that the Senate should not take two stars away from Kelso because it would set a different standard. But that was exactly what Kelso's opponents were hoping for.

Just the contemplation of punishment for Kelso was sufficient for his supporters to insist that he had suffered enough. One reason for the surprising lack of sympathy in the U.S. for the American student Michael Fay after he was sentenced to be caned in Singapore is the increasing recognition that Americans have too much compassion and too little accountability. Our usual way would be to understand the root causes for Fay's vandalism spree—his attention-deficit disorder and the breakup of his parents' marriage—and send him on his way. From top to bottom, American society is soaked with the sense that with enough explaining, a good lawyer and the pressing of the right buttons of guilt and victimology, there is a way out of most things. The most heinous acts get a round of applause on the talk-show circuit, as if confession were a substitute for contrition. Forgiveness has its place, but so does retribution. There's a way well short of lashing an American abroad to restore the notion that acts have consequences, and it could have started in the Senate with two fewer stars for Admiral Kelso.
TECHNOLOGY

Your Chips or Your Life!

Gunmen invade glossy laboratories and make off
with microprocessors in a new global crime wave

By JOHN GREENWALD

They are the soul of the personal computer and worth more than their weight in gold or cocaine. Small wonder then that these tiny, high-tech chips have become the latest target of the international crime set. A few tales from the cyberfront in Greenock, Scotland, three knife-wielding masked men overwhelmed a factory guard last month and stole $3.7 million worth of chips and related computer parts; in Fremont, California, burglars disarmed a security system and made off with more than $1.5 million of chips and computer equipment in a January warehouse heist. And outside Portland, Oregon, five gunmen bound and gagged 12 workers at a semiconductor plant last fall and fled with $2 million worth of chips.

The idea of stickups inside some of the world’s glossy, high-tech laboratories and computer warehouses is a bit incongruous, unless one considers that computer chips are a robber’s dream—very precious (up to $900 for the newest models) and easy to conceal (the size of matchbooks when sealed inside their cases). And these days they are in high demand: the worldwide market for personal computers grew 8%, to $68 billion, in 1983. The main target of thieves is the Intel 486 chip that powers most IBM PC and IBM-compatible machines; such chips are now in more than one-quarter of the world’s 110 million personal computers. Also coveted is the newer and faster Intel Pentium chip, which the Santa Clara, California-based company recently developed to run the latest generation of IBM PCs. In all, thieves last year ripped off up to $40 million worth of chips from California’s Silicon Valley, according to the FBI.

So concerned is the agency that earlier this year it opened a high-tech-crime office with a dozen agents in San Jose, California, to clamp down on chip thefts. Among other things, the agents have found a rising threat of heat-related violence. “We’re seeing more weapons being used,” says special agent Rick Smith. In one stickup a robber put his gun to a chip retailer’s head and pulled the trigger, but the weapon failed to fire. “No one’s been killed yet,” Smith says, “but it’s going to happen.”

Many robberies are the work of gangs of Chinese or Vietnamese immigrants with ties to shady electronics brokers in the U.S. and Asia who purchase the stolen chips. The gangs first appeared on a small scale in 1987, when they began preying on mom-and-pop Asian distributors based in Silicon Valley. “It’s been a real progression,” says Santa Clara police sergeant Mark Kerby. “Now they’re no longer just robbing Asians. They’re robbing everybody.”

Unlike rare jewels, chips have had the advantage of being untraceable, so they can be quickly unloaded on gray and black markets. “Computer components are fast becoming the dope of the ‘90s because they’re so easy to get rid of,” says Kerby. In Silicon Valley thieves typically sell batches of chips for 50% of their market value, so the brokers they work with pay about $250 for an Intel 486 chip that might otherwise cost up to $500. The chip may change hands a dozen or more times within 72 hours, with each transaction pushing up the value. All that leaves an unsuspecting computer maker to purchase the chip at its regular price and install it in his product. “Then John Q. Public walks into a computer store, and he can’t tell whether it’s a legitimate chip or if it started out in a crook’s pocket,” says Sergeant Jim McMahon, who heads a four-member San Jose Police Department task force that focuses on high-tech crime.

What the consumer doesn’t know can hurt him because he could wind up with a computer chip that failed a quality-control test but still reached the market. This is less likely to happen to purchasers of big-name computers such as Apple, IBM or Compaq, however, since major companies either make their own chips or purchase them straight from the manufacturer.

Recent sting operations have slowed the Silicon Valley heists a bit but have shown few signs of stopping them. In campaigns with code names such as “Operation Gray Chip” and “Winter Sting,” law-enforcement officers rounded up 43 suspects in January, including 13 who were caught while trying to steal more than $1 million worth of computer parts from an electronics warehouse. Officers seized a total of $2 million worth of chips and other computer equipment, together with nylon masks, duct tape, ropes, gloves, walkie-talkies and five loaded guns. But while 20 suspects were swiftly tried and convicted, most face sentences of no more than six months to a year in jail and could soon be on the street again.

To discourage theft on a worldwide basis, Intel last month began etching serial numbers on its Pentium chips, and will do the same with its 486 line this summer. That will enable the company and law-enforcement officials to trace the chips to their source, and thus could make stolen goods harder to fence. With the numbers in place, Intel hopes its hottest products will avoid becoming hot chips. Reported by Barry Hillenbrand/London and David S. Jackson/ San Francisco
Seeking the Wild

Little known outside of Australia, Arthur Boyd is a world-class painter

By ROBERT HUGHES

T'S NOT LIKELY THAT MANY AMERICANS will see the retrospective of the work of the Australian artist Arthur Boyd, which opened March 20 at the National Gallery of Victoria in Melbourne after an earlier run in Sydney. More's the pity: Boyd is 73 now, the evidence on his life's work is in, and his show suggests—no, insists—that he deserves to be seen as one of the West's major living painters. And yet, outside Australia (and London, to some degree) his work remains persistently unknown. The bibliography at the end of the catalog tells its own story: no American or European critic seems to have written on Boyd; no museum outside Australia has ever shown his work in depth—and even in Australia this is his first retrospective in three decades.

The case of Boyd is doubly peculiar if you consider the kind of art that was in vogue right through the 1980s: Neoexpressionism. Boyd's trouble was premature Neoexpressionism. His early paintings are fiercer and more abandoned in their imagery than almost anything produced in Germany, and anything at all from America, during the '80s—the cries of a visionary that didn't have the faintest hope of being heard outside his antipodean isolation, but that mattered a great deal to a tiny coterie of like-minded artists in Melbourne.

This commitment to extreme emotion—combined with a lyrical sense of Australian landscape, whose appearance in art Boyd played a large role in re-creating, and an enthusiasm for allegory and biblical narrative resembling Samuel Palmer's—suffused his work for the next 30 years. Naturally, this made Boyd seem provincial, against the dominant currents of international abstract art. The came the '80s, and with them a figurative revival—conducted, for the most part, l
shallow rhetorical artists, media-hypnotized Americans and hot-n-heavy Germans. But Boyd, unlike Georg Baselitz and other cultural sausage-makers, didn’t have ministries and art magazines pushing his work while a worldwide dealer and museum network pulled it. He never got on the Postmodernist menu.

So much the worse for the menu. It’s hard to see this show without reflecting that Boyd may turn out to have been the major artist that, with the single exception of Anselm Kiefer, ‘80s Neoexpressionism never had. Is everything of his on the same level? By no means: curator Barry Pearce has edited Boyd’s long and effusive output sharply, and even so there are some real clinkers among the more recent work. Yet one remains convinced of a deep, solid achievement, not only in painting but also in sculpture—for some of Boyd’s ceramic work is truly remarkable—and printmaking.

Nobody could call it avant-gardist; but so what? What counts is its integrity and depth of feeling. It is, to use a more or less obsolete word, extremely earnest, not least in its relation to tradition. Boyd seems never to have felt the Oedipal hostility to the past that garbled the rhetoric of Modernism. He didn’t think of art as a weapon against paternal authority, because he grew up in an extremely nurturing family, a sort of artists’ guild presided over by his grandfather, a painter, and his father, the potter Merric Boyd. (The only way to rebel against such a clan would have been to join a law firm.)

Boyd’s sense of art as a kind of tribal wisdom, an inheritance ceaselessly modified, extended into his dealings with the larger tradition that geography prevented him from joining. He knew the Old Masters only at second hand: reproductions of Bruegel and Bosch, Rembrandt and Tintoretto in the Melbourne Public Library, and in the National Gallery of Victoria some of William Blake’s original watercolor illustrations for Dante’s Divina Comedy. All this predisposed him to narrative. Sometimes the stories in his paintings are explicit—illustrations of the Bible, for instance, into which Boyd (like Blake) injected his own obsessions.

The vision of love as vulnerable, menaced by authority, entered his work early—and was fixed there, apparently, by an alarming moment when the Australian military police burst in on him and his future wife Yvonne after he went AWOL from army camp. It finds its most complete form in Boyd’s painting of Adam and Eve, 1947–48, their bodies like a pair of white tubers, embracing in an Eden that is also the Australian bush, while a huge patriarchal angel glares inquisitively at them from behind a tree and a curly horned ram—the libido in Boyd’s iconography—stares back.

It’s difficult for a contemporary American to imagine the lack of information about art that was the common lot of any artist who wanted to be “modern” in Australia a half-century ago. German Expressionism was known only through a pitiful smattering of black-and-white reproductions, messages in a bottle from a Europe that seemed almost inconceivably distant—14,000 miles away and shrouded in another kind of cultural space. But when the sources of advanced style are meager, as they were in Australia in the ‘40s, beautiful deformities can arise—if there’s enough naked psychic pressure behind them to compensate, at least in part, for a thin diet of other art.

Almost from the start, once he had got past his adolescent prevaricating exercises in Impressionist landscape, Boyd let his fear and yearning run with startling freedom. “Seek those images/That constitute the Wild”: Blake’s exhortation was seldom better fulfilled by a young artist than it was by Boyd. In paintings like _The Gargoyles, 1944_, the Melbourne beach suburb of St. Kilda, where he lived, became a theater of freaks and demonic hybrids, as real in its way as Mikhail Bul- gakov’s fantastic Moscow, because grounded in memory. Thus the blond cripple in _The Gargoyles_ is a fellow artist who had polio; and of Boyd’s recurrent images, a person walking (or copulating) with an animal like a wheelbarrow, was based on the sight of a woman walking her ancient dog along St. Kilda beach, holding up its paralyzed hind legs. One felt he believed in his images (or at least entertained their possibility) as wholeheartedly as medieval artists believed in imps and sirens.

Boyd would tend, in later life, to work in narrative series. In his homeland, probably the best known of them is a set of paintings mostly from 1937–38, done after visiting the squallid aboriginal encampments in central Australia made for people exiled within their own country and between two cultures. Known as the Love, Marriage and Death of a Half-Caste series, these Chagall-like images may be flawed by sentimentality but they
Disenchanting Kingdom
A pyrotechnic Beauty and the Beast, with actors who are just cartoonish instead of cartoons, launches Disney on Broadway

By WILLIAM A. HENRY III

The greatest of all Disney magic is the magic of copyright. More remarkable than Mickey or Dumbo or any other creation, pre- or post-Walt, has been the company's success in exploiting established franchises and accumulating new ones. Perhaps the most cunning Disney trick is to take fairy tales in the public domain and reinvent them as corporate property. A billion-dollar example is Beauty and the Beast, which has metamorphosed from a bedtime story known to every child into a megahit animated film (and an even bigger hit on video), a sound track, a theme-park attraction, an ice show, a lunch-box and T-shirt decoration and, as of last week, a Broadway musical. Actually, not just a Broadway musical but the costliest and most complex ever, not to mention maybe the most vapid, shallow and, yes, cartoonish.

At its campy, shameless best, the Broadway Beauty brings to mind Busby Berkeley movies, Radio City Music Hall spectacles, the Ziegfeld Follies and Fourth of July at Disney World. You may be amused, you may be appalled, but you cannot fail to be agape. The one thing this riot of color and noise does not bring to mind is the modern Broadway musical, which can delight in scenery and special effects but is most concerned with evoking emotion and telling a story.

Only briefly does Beauty become affecting, when Belle and her captor, a prince transformed into a sort of buffalo, fumblingly get to know each other. Terrence Mann finds coltsih gawkiness in a lumbering leviathan and suggests a new reason why the myth has endured. When the beast stops snoring and growsling and starts thinking of cleanliness and manners, he evokes the civilizing process boys go through in adolescence as they discover girls. Mostly, though, the characters seem even simpler when played by actors than when they did as cartoons. The costumes that help them resemble a candelabrum or a clock also render them slow and clunky. Maybe that is why, despite a barrage of whizbangery, the show is sluggish.

Whether Disney spent $12 million mounting Beauty, as its moguls claim, or a more beastly $20 million, as some theater insiders assert, it has bet big on its belief in a vast untapped stage audience yearning for family entertainment—even in the honky-tonk heart of Manhattan, even at a $65 top-ticket price, even at a 10:30 p.m. curtain-call time, when much of the target audience should be in bed. So far, business has been good. The day after Beauty opened, it set an all-time Broadway record for a single day's ticket sales: $603,494, vs. the $548,460 racked up in 1995 by The Who's Tommy. By week's end the advance sales exceeded $1 million. Nevertheless, last week chairman Michael Eisner floated the notion of starting evening shows at 7:30 instead of 8. Aides pointed out pitfalls: there may be a lot of latecomers, and the schedule change might imply that Beauty is not for grownups. Regardless of when it plays, 2½ hours is a long time for children to sit still. Adults may be squirming too.

Disney says this is only Phase 1. Next it will invest $6 million in a government-subsidized renovation of a theater on 42nd Street, symbolically sanitizing the porn district, to mount stage versions of other cartoons. Broadway can only welcome any attempt to install theatergoing in the young—and, of course, hope Disney makes the next show better.
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PROTO-GRUNGE: Bakewell, Dorf and Hard Dead

**Cinema Beat**

Recipe for a special musical biopic: be rebel, die young

By **RICHARD CORLISS**

The pungent cinematic spillage from the early death of any rock star—of Buddy Holly or Ritchie Valens, Jim Morrison or Sid Vicious—may be the movie made from his life. Producers paw through old press clippings, take a quick snort of the current zeitgeist, tuck a note of mytical tragedy and voilà, a tale for our time with a hit sound track guaranteed.

This is a low business, exploiting a musician's notoriety and an audience's star lust. It has reached a nadir of sorts with Backbeat, a homoerotic paeon to Stuart Sutcliffe (Stephen Dorff), the fifth Beatle. Or maybe the sixth, if you count pre-Ringo drummer Pete Best and leave out George Martin and Murray the K. Stu, a budding picker and middling bassist, may seem a long shot for rock immortality. He died at 22, months before the group, which he had earlier quit, cut its first record. But according to Backbeat, Stu was the dreamboat heart of the combo and John Lennon (Ian Hart) was its soul. Paul McCartney (Gary Bakewell) and George Harrison (Chris O'Neil) only whined and pursed, respectively, while Lennon and Sutcliffe did the heavy lifting. John, you see, was Liverpool's own young angel and young creator of this proto-punk, ur-grunge band (don't you love revisionism?). And Stu, preening moody, was John's closet love god—before a brain tumor drove Stu mad and killed him, thus establishing his credentials as a rock Rimbaud.

**Backbeat** has an attractive cast and a passionate rock-'n'-roll score (played by some top young musicians). But with its attention to the posturings of Lennon and the unenthusiastic Stu, the movie succumbs to the post-Madonna notion that pop success is all a matter of attitude. That's so misguided. If you have any doubt, listen to the songs.
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A Masterwork Suppressed

A bold and poignant Chinese film is banned in its homeland

By RICHARD CORLISS

When bad things happen to good people: this is a dominant theme of literature and "drama through the ages, from the Book of Job to Dostoevsky novels to most soap operas and TV movies. It is also the story line of the Chinese film The Blue Kite—and the story behind the suppression of this bold, masterly film.

Tian Zhihong's film opens in 1953, with the marriage of lovely Chen Shujian (Lu Leping), a schoolteacher, and gentle Lin Shaolong (Pu Quanxin), a librarian. The two believe they have much to celebrate: their warm love, to be sure, but also the dawn of a true People's Republic. Their political ardor can't last; what begins in naive hope is crushed against the great wall of Maoist reality.

The couple have a son, Tietou (played by three children in the 15-year course of the narrative), and all seems well. But shortly thereafter, the family begins its run of exemplary bad luck—everything rotted that could have happened to anyone in the plague years of Maoist China seems to happen to them.

During the rectification movement of 1957, when citizens were urged to "let a hundred schools of thought contend," a colleague of Shaolong's innocently implicates him in criticism of their work conditions, and when the official policy reverses back to thought control, Shaolong is banished to a labor camp, later to be killed by a falling tree. Tietou's uncle is going blind, and Uncle's girlfriend, star of an army theater troupe, is sent to jail because she refuses an order to have sex with political leaders. Shujian's second husband (Li Xuejian) dies from a liver ailment aggravated by the rampant malnutrition of the early '60s. And during the spiteful frenzy of the Cultural Revolution, Shujian's third husband (Guo Baochang) is humiliatingly beaten by the righteous Red Guard. What is worse than young American rebels without a cause? Young Chinese cadres with one.

Cataloged like this, the plot may sound like little more than antic-agit-prop. And indeed The Blue Kite is by far the most ecoriating depiction in Chinese film of Mao's ravages. But at its heart is about domestic dreams, about a hope for better days that flies above the characters as brightly and vulnerably as Tietou's favorite blue kite. The rhythms of this family—the meals and arguments, the worries about money and the sweet moments when a put-upon mom finds bliss playing with her bright child—are homely observed and beautifully played. In Lu, Tian found one of those perfect faces from which emotion rises spontaneously, acutely and eloquently.

But to Chinese authorities, The Blue Kite was nothing more than an incendiary insult. They approved the script but, when Tian diverged from it, refused to let him edit his film; it languished for a year and was completed abroad by others working from the director's screenplay and notes. The film was banned in China, and last month Tian and six other prominent directors were forbidden to make films in their homeland.

So Tian must feel kinship with the beleaguered brood in The Blue Kite. It is now the challenge of the world film community to see that he is not silenced because he told the truth.
Give Yourself A Lifetime Achievement

The Lincoln Town Car is such an appropriate reward for your lifetime of accomplishment, you might even consider an acceptance speech. The Town Car certainly gives you plenty to talk about, beginning with the traditional
spaciousness of its interior. You could go on about Lincoln's commitment to safety technology that includes standard ABS brakes and dual air bags. And you'll never run out of compliments for its proliferation of elegant appointments. Finally, you might praise the powerful V-8 engine, and the smoothness of that legendary quiet ride.

And every Lincoln is backed by the Lincoln Commitment, a comprehensive ownership benefits program that includes 24-hour Roadside Service Assistance.

So deliver that acceptance speech if you like. And please...try to keep it under three minutes.
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MetLife
Simpsons Forever!
The most satisfying show on television celebrates its 100th episode with its characters’ wit, love and desperation intact

By RICHARD CORLISS

Ten reasons the Simpsons are America’s ideal family:

1) They stick with one another through thin and thin. Father Homer, mother Marge, 10-year-old Bart, eight-year-old Lisa and baby Maggie seem to be a typical sitcom family—the Honeymooners with kids, the Flintstones in suburbia—with typically outlandish dilemmas to face and resolve each week. But there the similarity ends. Since it sprung in 1989 from cartoon spots on The Tracey Ullman Show, The Simpsons has proved uniquely dense and witty. And thanks to top writers, directors and actors in the care of creator Matt Groening and comedy veteran Jim Brooks, it has stayed that way. As it celebrates its 100th episode this week—"That’s 800 episodes in sitcom years," says Groening of the six months’ production time for each show—The Simpsons can celebrate more: its status as TV’s most satisfying program.

2) For a family of underachievers, the Simpsons have achieved quite a bit. In 1989, Homer was a monorail conductor and a baseball mascot; he won a Grammy (for Outstanding Soul, Spoken Word or Barbershop Album) and survived eating a deadly blowfish. Marge sang Blanche Dubois in the musical O Streetcar! Lisa created her own talking doll, mastered the saxophone and the Talmud, was a Junior Miss Springfield, uncovered political corruption and saved the Republic. Bart adopted an elephant, fell down a well and was rescued by Sting, and was tried for murdering Principal Skinner. Maggie had her first word voiced for her by Elizabeth Taylor.

3) There’s life beyond Bart. The scam was the show’s first star; his ripostes ("Eat my shorts") became T-shirt slogans. Bart is still the richest Simpsons character, but the purview has expanded to include all of Springfield, with 50 or so comic figures, from the Kwak-E-Mart’s Apu Nahasapeemapetil to the Kennedyesque Mayor Quimby to Krusty the Clown and his sadistic cartoon cohorts Itchy & Scratchy—a wonderfully congested cosmos each week.

4) Homer isn’t bright, but he loves his brood. The poor patriarch is so dull witted that he probably couldn’t count to 16 if he used all his fingers and his toes. But he is a faithful husband, and if he often derides his kids, he will do anything—go skateboarding off a cliff, defy his boss, buy Lisa a pony—if the tots scream loud enough and if Marge gives him a lecture.

5) They have famous friends. Guest voices on the show have included Bob Hope, Michelle Pfeiffer, Ringo Starr, Johnny Carson, Darryl Strawberry, Aerosmith, Bette Midler, Michael Jackson and Dustin Hoffman. "For some reason," says Groening, "a lot of Hollywood big shots are curious to see how they’d be drawn with bulging eyes and no chin."

6) They are excellent role models. True story: a few years ago, a 10-year-old successfully performed the Heimlich maneuver on his choking brother after seeing it illustrated on The Simpsons.

7) They’re smart. Well, anyway, their writers are. "There are jokes you won’t get," says Groening, "unless you’ve actually attended a few classes in college." Lit 101 will teach you that Lisa’s poetry is inspired by Allen Ginsberg’s and that the prison number (24601) worn variously by Marge, Principal Skinner and Sideshow Bob is Jean Valjean’s in Les Misérables. It also helps if you know old movies. Simpsons plots have plundered King Kong, Citizen Kane, Thelma & Louise, Cape Fear and the entire Hitchcock oeuvre. "If you steal from a black-and-white film," Brooks told the writers, "it’s an homage."

8) They’re reliable. "Animated characters don’t get busted," says Groening, "and they don’t get old." Maggie hasn’t aged a day. Homer can’t get much fatter or baldier. Marge’s bouffant will always look like a neatly trimmed blue wig. Bart frets about graduating from fourth grade, but fate and good ratings will keep him there for life.

Lisa, the poor stranded sensitive intellectual, will never escape Springfield.

9) After all these years, they can still surprise you. Part of the fun of watching is trying to figure out what the main plot line will be; the first few minutes of any episode are so packed with comic detail that the story could go in any of a dozen directions. This is one show whose writers seem to have too many good ideas.

10) They have heart. One of Brooks’ cardinal rules: Let’s not be afraid of emotion. The strongest episodes are those (like "Lisa’s Substitute," "Homer Alone," "Like Father, Like Clown" and the need to these in this other frazzled clan. A viewer can feel awe at the show’s cascading wit and still purr at the sweet, deep sentiment. Hall, Simpsons! May you live another 100 episodes at the same apex of quality. —Reported by David E. Thigpen/New York
Have you ever seen an heirloom when it was new?

There are certain possessions that you know will be dear to you always, from the moment you purchase or receive them. A classic piece of furniture. Fine jewelry. An exquisite Swiss timepiece. To this list of treasured belongings may we add a writing instrument from the new Cross Townsend Collection. Each writing instrument in the collection inherits the Cross legacy for exceptional craftsmanship and, of course, carries an unquestioned lifetime mechanical guarantee. These are writing instruments to be cherished for generations. Cross Townsend writing instruments draw on a Cross design first seen nearly seventy years ago. A unique combination of Art Deco styling and advanced writing technology, the collection offers a choice of traditional and contemporary finishes, including titanium, polished lacquers, and 10 and 18 karat gold filled. And four writing instrument models suit a variety of writing preferences: fountain pen, rolling ball pen, ball-point pen, and 0.5mm pencil.

The Cross Townsend Collection. A dramatic wide-diameter interpretation of the classic Cross silhouette.

The Cross Townsend Collection. From $55 to $275. Now awaiting your review at fine gift stores and stationers nationwide.

SHOWN ABOVE: THE CROSS TOWNSEND FOUNTAIN PEN AND BALL-POINT PEN IN 18 KARAT GOLD FILLED WITH 22 KARAT GOLD ELECTROPLATED APPOINTMENTS.
Whoof! There He Isn’t

Bid farewell to the fist roller. On the air since 1989, TV talk-show host ARSENIO HALL has decided to raise a white flag in the late-night wars. In recent months, ratings for the Arsenio Hall Show have dipped to half those of Late Night with David Letterman and the Tonight Show. Hall, known for his all-too-ingratiating manner with guests—including Louis Farrakhan—called the move “the most complicated decision of my life.”

SEEN & HEARD

Ace Ventura, Pet Detective, where are you? Buckingham Palace has announced that Prince Charles lost his dog, Pooh, during a walk at Balmoral, the royal family’s estate in Scotland. The prince is offering an unspecified reward for information leading to Pooh’s return.

Despite a new ordinance forbidding smoking in Cincinnati’s Riverfront Stadium, irrepresible Reds owner Marge Schott defiantly lit up through four games at the start of the season. She said she didn’t care if anyone complained, but since city officials have warned her to stop, Schott has complied with the ban. Now she clutches her cigarettes during the games.

Like many veejays on MTV before him, Adam Curry has decided to pursue bigger dreams. Without alerting his bosses, Curry announced on air last week that he was quitting to participate in “the digital revolution.” In the age of 500-channel and interactive TV, he said, he could no longer justify “introducing Bovis and Butt-head.”

Will Their Smiles Slay?

With lines like “There’s a word for you ladies, but it’s seldom used outside of a kennel,” The Women, George Cukor’s 1939 film about wicked socialites and the husbands who cheat on them, represented the height of brittle Hollywood wit. Given the film’s cynicism, it’s hard to imagine the eternally vulnerable JULIA ROBERTS and the eternally chipper MEG RYAN starring in a remake, but that’s just what they hope to do. In their hands, they say, the movie will be about “how we live with our emancipation.” They add, “We love that these women could slay with a word.”
ESSAY

James Walsh

The Whipping Boy

Should anyone much care whether an American boy living overseas gets six vicious thracocks on his backside? So much has been argued, rejoined and rehashed about the case of Michael Fay, an 18-year-old convicted of vandalism and sentenced to a caning in Singapore, that an otherwise sorry little episode has shaded into a certified international incident, complete with intercessions by the U.S. head of state. An affair that sometimes sounds—on editorial pages—equivalent to the abduction of Helen of Troy has outraged American libertarians even as it has animated a general debate about morality East and West and the proper functioning of U.S. law and order. The Trojan War this is not; the wooden horse is in America’s citadel.

Which, to all appearances, is what Singapore wanted. The question of whether anyone should care about Michael Fay is idle: though Singapore officials profess shock at the attention his case has drawn, they know Americans care deeply about the many sides of this issue. Does a teenager convicted of spraying cars with easily removable paint deserve half a dozen powerful strokes on the buttocks with a sopping-wet bamboo staff? At what point does swift, sure punishment become torture? By what moral authority can America, with its high rates of lawlessness and license, preach to a safe society about human rights? Isn’t the shipshape and affluent little city-state molded by Lee Kuan Yew a model of civic virtues?

Not quite the game of Twenty Questions, but close enough. The caning sentence has fascinated many Americans who had never heard of Singapore and perhaps could not tell Southeast Asia from Sweden on a map. It has concentrated minds wonderfully on an already lively domestic debate over what constitutes a due balance between individual and majority rights. Too bad Michael Fay has become a fulcrum for this discussion. Not only does he seem destined to be humiliated and immobilized by an instrument of ordeal, but the use of Singapore as a standard for judging any other society, let alone the cacophonous U.S., is fairly worthless.

To begin with, Singapore is an offshore republic that tightly limits immigration. Imagine crime-ridden Los Angeles, to which Singapore is sometimes contrasted, with hardly any inflow of the hard-luck, often desperate fortune seekers who flock to big cities. Imagine in the same way Jakarta or Shanghai. Beyond that, Singapore began its life as a British colony designed to serve as a shipping, administrative and financial center. Today it is a highly skilled society without the urban sprawl and rural poverty that afflict larger nations. An analogue might be Manhattan incorporated as a republic between the Battery and 96th Street, with its own flag, armed forces and immigration controls.

Even without its government’s disciplinary measures, Singapore more than plausibly would be much the same as it is now. An academic commonplace today is that the major factor determining social peace and prosperity is culture—a sense of common identity, tradition and values. The house that Lee built is 76% ethnic Chinese, a people with one of the most self-disciplined cultures in the world. Prizing family, learning and hard work, overseas Chinese have prospered wherever they have settled. Heavily Chinese Hong Kong is, granted, a somewhat messier place than Singapore. But without social engineering or the flogging of vandals, Hong Kong is still very safe and quite rich. Its crime rate: 1,522 reported offenses for every 100,000 people in 1992. Singapore’s was 1,507.

And America’s? Don’t ask. Unlike Singapore, though, the U.S. today is a nation in search of a common culture, trying to be a universal society that assimilates the traditions of people from all over the world. Efforts to safeguard minority as well as individual rights have produced, as Lee charges, a gridlock in the justice system. America is not the pandemonium portrayed in the shock-addicted mass media. But its troubles stem more from the decay of family life than from any government failures. Few societies can afford to look on complacently. As travel eases and cultures intermix, the American experience is becoming the world’s.

Singaporeans have every right to be proud of their achievements. Does that justify Michael Fay’s sentence? A letter writer to the New York Times advised that “six of the best,” as he suffered at an English public (that is, private) school, might cure all that ails American youth. Comparing Fay’s sentence to a headmaster’s paddling is fatuous—but then, as John Updike once noted, old boys of Eton and Harrow can often “mistake a sports car for a woman or a birch rod for a mother’s kiss.” The pain from flaying with wet rattan, as it is done in Singapore, can knock a prisoner out cold.

The circumstances of this affair—evidently no Singaporean has ever been punished under the Vandalism Act for defacing private property—suggest that Singapore has used Fay as an unwilling point man in a growing quarrel between East and West about human rights. Several large Asian countries, China among them, argue that the U.S. has no business criticizing their own, equally legitimate values. But Japan stresses majority rights too. So does Hong Kong. Neither is watering its economic miracle with the blood from a bamboo cane.
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