programs, a debate summarized in a recent article for *The Fletcher Forum* by U.S.I.A. career officer Louis Roth. In 1953 Robert Stozier, a dean at the University of Chicago, asked Congress to keep education and politics separate: "If the program is to be pursued in the adventuresome American tradition that ideas and learning are the source of our material greatness, then we must conduct it free from contradictory political pressure and conduct it as an educational enterprise." As far as AmParts is concerned, that mission has been compromised under both the Carter and Reagan Administrations. The selection of participants should be made by a panel of career officers and scholars whose focus is on diversity and quality rather than on politics, partisanship, or propaganda.

JONATHAN ROSENBLUM

An experiment that worked, sort of.

LABOR'S LESSONS

AT NINE O'CLOCK on the evening of June 5—the night Walter Mondale locked up the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination—Mondale Campaign Manager Bob Beckel clambered onto the podium at the Town and Campus Inn in West Orange, New Jersey, to claim victory in that day's primary. "We won tonight because we had the support of those people who want a nuclear freeze," Beckel told the silent crowd. "We won because we had the support of those people who want the E.R.A. ratified." More silence. "And we won because we had the support of organized labor"—at which the room burst into cheers. On Fritz Mondale's triumphant night, as so many other times during the campaign, labor was there for their candidate—labor and nobody else.

The irony is that for the first time since Vietnam split the liberal-labor bloc apart, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. has been trying not to go it alone. The Kirkland era has seen the federation abandon much of the political suspiciousness—centrist sectarianism, it might be called—that characterized George Meany's tenure. And yet, in its institutional composition, Mondale's campaign has resembled nothing more than the 1968 campaign of Hubert Humphrey. Now, as then, labor was the field operation. "Mondale's an A.F.L.-C.I.O. production," says the political director of one county federation in a tone less gleeful than appalled. "Without labor, he'd have gone the way of John Glenn."

Certainly the A.F.L.-C.I.O. endorsement meant that even at his nadir, Mondale retained a solid base of support. By any measure, labor played a key role in Mondale's victories in Iowa, Alabama, Michigan, Illinois, New York, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, New Jersey, and even Texas. In state after state, Mondale's union household vote has run 5 to 10 percent higher than his support from all voters paid an hourly wage. Nationally, union household voters have comprised 33 percent of the Democratic primary electorate, even though they constitute only 30 percent of registered party members. Moreover, according to a *New York Times* composite of exit polls, they gave Mondale a 45-to-31 edge over Gary Hart. Demonstrably, the unions have been doing something right.

And some things wrong. Mondale lost the labor vote in New England and barely broke even in California. Nowhere have the unions turned out large numbers of volunteers; Walter Mondale's campaign is comprised chiefly of union staff and "paid volunteers" from labor's ranks. In part, of course, the problem is Mondale; but the problem is labor, too.

No one should have expected otherwise. The very intent of labor's involvement in the 1984 campaign is precisely to arrest its alarming decline. For today's unions, politics looks like the last arena in which they can reverse the losses they have suffered across the bargaining table, in representation elections, in court decisions, and, more broadly, in public esteem and membership support. Yet the clearest lesson that emerges from the unions' plunge into primary politics is that every problem they entered this arena to alleviate has pursued them into politics as well. Far from solving labor's problems, the 1984 campaign has underscored what labor needs to do: empower its members, democratize its procedures, rebuild its image. In four distinct ways, the need for these changes was underscored along the 1984 primary campaign trail.

THE LIMITS OF SOLIDARITY POLITICS: If nothing else, labor's campaign for Walter Mondale provided the definitive answer to the question of whether members will vote for a candidate chiefly to help their unions. They won't.

The peculiarly themeless campaign Mondale waged in the period before the Hart challenge left labor with little direction for its own campaign. What emerged was a campaign that stressed both narrow union issues and the broadest labor issue of all: solidarity. "The way I used to sell it," says Nancy Shier, AFSCME's political director in Illinois, "was, 'Labor is on the line. The labor movement is under attack and has decided to fight back on the political front.' And I hardly talked at all about Mondale. This went over with the leadership, but it doesn't work with the rank and file. We didn't have anything to say to the members that worked until we started campaigning against Hart."

But when Gary Hart began attacking union leaders, the instinctive response of at least some of them was to try even harder to rally the members in defense of the institution. "United we stand, Divided we fall," the president of the Massachusetts A.F.L.-C.I.O. proclaimed in a last-minute mailing to his membership, which proceeded to vote for Hart. "We must let the leaders of our government know that the labor movement is alive and well and dedicated to preserving hard-won gains inherited from those

posed by Reagan's staff and served up in a two-hour private session at Blair House, was a modest list of spending reductions and tax increases totaling about $16 billion for the coming fiscal year—and representing what Reagan called a "down payment" on much larger spending cuts that will be necessary if the $180 billion deficit projected for 1985 is to be tamed. In fact, the $180 billion projection already assumed a $16 billion down payment—which led Sen. Daniel Inouye of Hawaii to say he would not be party to just "a nickel-and-dime affair."

'Slick': Then the Democrats raised the ante. In a letter to White House chief of staff James A. Baker III, House Majority Leader Jim Wright insisted that the administration specify substantial cuts in the Pentagon budget before the negotiators meet again. That new demand, an administration official said, was "a very slick proposal" to put Reagan on the defensive. If the president refused to dicker on defense, some said, the blame for failing to curb the deficit would begin to fall on him instead of Congress. It also threatened to revive the divisions within the Reagan team. "Besides the president and Cap Weinberger," the administration official said, "nobody in the administration believes the full [military] buildup is necessary."

The political maneuvering seemed certain to continue—and though that may mean the solution to the deficit will be delayed, it could also revive the debate on Reaganomics, the budget and the role of government itself. And that, after all, is just what a presidential campaign should be.

TOM MORGANTHAU with GLORIA BORGER and RICH THOMAS in Washington

USIA: Waiving a Red, White and Blacklist

It hardly ranked with the blacklists of the 1950s, but officials of the United States Information Agency did admit last week that they had compiled a list of don't-invites for their program of overseas speakers. The two-page list included former CBS News anchorman Walter Cronkite, economist John Kenneth Galbraith, feminist Betty Friedan and 81 others, largely Democrats and liberals—most of whom never asked to speak and didn't know they'd been banned.

USIA sources told The Washington Post that top officials had rejected so many potential speakers on ideological grounds in recent years that staffers simply began putting their names on a list to avoid proposing them again. "It was like a fraternity," one former official said. "Anyone from a nonconservative persuasion was 'bonged'." The agency's acting deputy director, Leslie Lenkowsky, said he had ordered the list destroyed. Whether any of those who had been on it will now receive speaking invitations from the USIA remains to be seen.

Nixon: The Long Climb Back

For anyone who knows the man and his Lazarus-like qualities, it was only a matter of time. In the first hours following the news of Yuri Andropov's death, his name flitted briefly through countless conversations, an oddly comforting reminder of more stable times for the superpowers. Nixon. *He* would know how to approach the Russians. Then the familiar profile appeared on television, and there was the former president discoursing on U.S.-Soviet relations and the importance of the Soviet prime minister's funeral. In fact, Nixon won't be part of the official American delegation. But the speculation that he might, and TV coverage of his opinion on the matter, were two more indications that nearly 10 years after leaving the White House in disgrace, Richard Nixon is well on his way back to respectability. And with a co-op board's approval last week of his plan to move back into New York City, Nixon will soon intensify his ceaseless quest for acceptance as a foreign-policy elder statesman.

Gordon Williamson—Orlando Sentinel

Nixon in Orlando: Now, more than ever

Since coming east from his Elba Pacifica in San Clemente four years ago, the ex-president has cast off his gloomy shadow. He began entertaining more, both at home (a $1 million estate in Saddle River, N.J., which he can now sell at a tidy profit) and in his favorite Manhattan restaurants (21, Le Cirque, La Grenouille). And he has traveled to 18 nations, including China, meeting with foreign leaders at every opportunity. They have returned the compliment: Chinese Prime Minister Zhao Ziyang made a special visit to Nixon's office when he visited New York last month. All that personal diplomacy has helped keep Nixon well versed in foreign affairs. Testifying in private before the Kissinger commission on Central America last year, Nixon, without a single note, "showed a dazzling mastery of the detail and concept of foreign-policy problems," one Democrat recalled.

Only a few years ago it was hard to find anyone saying anything nice about Nixon, at least for the record. Now a certain nostalgia has developed, particularly for his foreign policy. His warm receptions in foreign capitals are increasingly echoed at home—and not just among Watergate-weary Republicans who cheer the occasional fund-raising speeches Nixon now delivers. After he sent out advance copies of "Real Peace," the most recent of his three books on foreign policy, a visitor named George McGovern came calling. "He has a better feel for détente between the two superpowers than any president since Roosevelt," said McGovern, trounced by Nixon in the 1972 presidential election but trying again this year.

Disney World: Nixon's return to Manhattan will bring him closer to admiring foreign-policy intellectuals and bring his wife, Pat, closer to her doctors. (She suffered a second, mild stroke last fall.) Whatever their physical problems—his consist of little more than an occasional flare-up of phlebitis—both were able to enjoy a trip last week with daughters Tricia and Julie and their three grandchildren to Walt Disney World in Orlando, Fla., scene of Nixon's famous "I am not a crook" speech.

Memories like that may prevent the full rehabilitation of Nixon, 71, at least for now. "He ought to confess the wrongdoing," says former North Carolina Sen. Sam Ervin, who chaired the Senate Watergate Committee. "He has never repented," says Judge John Sirica. Some critics resent the $69,000 pension and $325,000 in office expenses granted Nixon, who has parlayed shrewd real-estate deals into a personal fortune. In 1981 the Nixons sold their house on Manhattan's East Side to the Syrian government—reportedly for nearly $1.6 million more than they paid for it two years earlier. For their new apartment at Park Avenue and 72nd Street they paid $1.8 million—without the help of a mortgage and without yet having sold their New Jersey property.

There was brief opposition to the sale among co-op residents led by Jacob Kaplan, a 92-year-old liberal philanthropist. But