



11-1-1972

The Fixer, November 1, 1972

Madison College Press (Free)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/fixer>

Custom Citation

The Fixer, November 1, 1972. Harrisonburg (Va.): Madison College Press (Free).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the JMU Special Collections at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Fixer, 1969-1973 by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

W H I F I X E R

NOVEMBER
1, 1972

AMNESTY DEMO

President Nixon said recently that he would never grant amnesty. Of course earlier this year at 1 of those ever so rare press conferences he said that he would be very liberal with regard to amnesty once the war was over and the POW's were home. Since I favor amnesty this leaves me with a difficult decision. Do I attack his amnesty policy as political opportunism or as another attempt to legitimize the Vietnam War?

I believe the Vietnam war was a gross mistake. There were never enough people who believed in it enough to volunteer to fight, so we had the draft. Most people who were drafted went along with the system for a multitude of reasons, belief in the justice of our cause in Vietnam was not chief among them. But they went along anyhow. Some recognized that the Vietnam cause was not worth their lives. Of those, some went to jail and others, believing that it wasn't even worth jail, left the USA.

President Nixon, David Stanton, Philip Bigler and others would have you believe that these men are villains and criminals of the worst sort. They would have you believe that these men are cowards. They would have you believe that those of us who served in Vietnam and those who were killed there would be dishonored by their return to the USA.

As a Vietnam veteran I do not feel dishonored by these men. Rather, I respect their decisions. I realize what courage means on the battlefield, but I also realize what courage is required to march to the beat of a different drum- to recognize something is wrong and to say so. When the system says "GO" it takes much courage to say "NO".

Some persons would have you believe that they can speak for those who have died in Vietnam. They can't. Neither can I. But, I know many of them- they were my friends. None of them felt Vietnam was worth one life. They had, as had I, resigned their fate to the system and were hoping for the best. They weren't concerned with winning the war- they were concerned with living out the days until they could come home. What they did on the battlefield took courage, but those acts of courage were primarily directed at helping their buddies, not destroying the "enemy". Few of us ever had the courage to stand up to the Army and our country

and say "No, this is wrong!"

When they died I went out to pick up what was left. A hand, a slab of flesh, body organs, intestines, brain pieces, bone. We put the bodies and pieces in green plastic body bags- and they went home. I cannot speak for them- I can only speculate. I don't think anyone of them would have considered his death in Vietnam as worthwhile. I wish with every grain of passion in my body that I could bring them back to this world. I wish people would realize the utter waste of their deaths- because if people would see this, it would never be allowed to happen again! We can't bring them back but we can allow those, who recognized the war for the waste it was, to

(continued on page 2)

AMNESTY REP

Since George McGovern's nomination as the Democratic Standard bearer the nation has been embroiled in a great deal of controversy regarding amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders. Mr. McGovern and the Democrats have proposed, in their platform, a sweeping and universal pardon for these individuals. Indeed, they claim that these men should be commended for their actions, because they showed the foresight to see that the Vietnam war was wrong. Fortunately President Nixon has taken a stand directly opposite to this.

Today almost all Americans agree that the Vietnam war was drawn out far too long. But the situation in regard to draft evaders has not changed. When the Selective Service issued a draft call for 100 men, that number would have to enter the service. Imagine that you or someone close to you was number 101, a man that would not be drafted under normal circumstances. If one of the draftees decided to flee the country, he was in effect, drafting you for you would become the 100th person. The quota of the Selective Service would be met with your induction. You would be forced to undergo 2 years of military service and perhaps lose your life all because 1 person decided to desert his nation in a time of need. Common sense dictates that these people do not deserve the privileges of American society. Their actions have proven that they do not want to be responsible citizens or abide by the law of the land.

(continued on page 2)

..... 2
Amnesty-Demo continued
return.

Some people still feel that Vietnam is worth dying for. Julie Nixon Eisenhower and Pat Nixon have said that they would be willing to die for President Thieu. What empty words. Mr Stanton and Mr Bigler have indicated their support of the Vietnam war. One might ask what in the hell are they doing here if they feel their country has moral and military obligations in Vietnam? But the Mr Biglers, the Mr Stantons, the Mrs Nixon and the Mrs Eisenhowers don't ever soil their hands with the dirt and blood of war. Rather, they would have the rest of you take up the sword and fight their wars. Lets put an end to this. Lets stop these people who delight in these horrible immoral wars. Lets put a man in the White House who values human life. Lets bring home our military men, our prisoners and lets grant amnesty for those who recognized this war for what it was. Lets put Richard Nixon out of our government. Let him live out his life with the ghosts of 20,000 Americans and millions of Asians to remind him that America is a nation of compassion, not one of rage.

Butch Bincock
Former Captain, US Army Infantry
.....

Amnesty*Rep continued

Furthermore, thousands of Americans have died and countless others have been wounded in S. Vietnam. Our soldiers went to Asia because they felt that they must heed their nation's call. It is ironic that the McGoverns of this nation are so quick to desecrate their sacrifice, to tread on their graves, and spit on their corpses by allowing draft evaders to re-enter this great country without penalty. How can these men allow these draft evaders to walk the same streets with our loyal veterans?

Finally, these people made a decision to leave the country knowing that the doors of America would be forever shut to them. They chose to leave family and friends to live in another country. There they found only disillusionment. They have since come to realize how great America is and now wish to return. A short time ago, however America was not good enough for them. Now they are not good enough for America.

Recent polls have shown that some 79.5% of all Americans oppose amnesty for draft evaders. Obviously, the Democrats cannot be speak-

ing for the people as McGovern claims. Indeed, by this statistic he is in direct opposition to them. On the other hand, President Nixon has listened to the voice of the majority and has refused to support any amnesty bill and has threatened to veto any such bill should one pass. Only through the reelection of President Nixon can we have a truly representative government.

Philip Bigler
.....

DOLE BEAT MCGOVERN

Sen. Robert Dole, the Republican National Chairman, says major television network should give Democratic presidential nominee George McGovern time to debate himself on the issues and rebut himself on the issues and rebut his previous positions.

Dole told a \$100 a plate fund raising dinner honoring Tennessee Sen. Howard Baker that McGovern "has jumped back and forth on practically all the issues."

McGovern's operating principle seems to be that "a moving target is harder to hit," Dole said.

It now appears, the Kansas senator said, that McGovern's campaign is not going to focus on the issues but center on "personal slanders against the president which are calculated neither to clarify the issues nor to encourage their rational discussion."

President Nixon's campaign, Dole said, has attracted millions of Democrats.

reprinted from the Richmond
News Leader
.....

Mistakes?

I found the story of the "Not Quite Campaign" very amusing. You quoted an old Nixon hand who said "McGovern makes so many mistakes that it's hard for us to get a mistake in edgewise." I think that in the past four years Richard Nixon has filled more than his quota of mistakes. In my opinion most smart Americans will vote "The Big Mistake" out of the White House on November 7.

Richard Bassler Jr. Newsweek
.....

To the reader-- some of you might be wondering why the Fixer is being published. Because of the Election the Breeze has been swamped by political articles that they couldn't print for lack of room. So the Fixer invited the two parties to send in articles that they wanted the public to read. If you have any comments (or contributions) please send them to us at 4255. Most spelling and grammatical errors are the result of an overworked typist and do not necessarily reflect on the intelligence of the writer.

The Economy:

President Nixon has taken strong action to flatten inflation and increase employment. He initiated a 90 day wage-price freeze, followed by more flexible controls, and introduced a package of tax cuts to stimulate the economy. The inflation rate has been cut in half, and the Gross National Product has expanded at a yearly rate of over 7%. Housing starts are up 42% over last year.

The Environment:

President Nixon established the E.P.A., the Environment Protection Agency, the first Federal unit ever set up to protect our quality of life. He has increased funding for environmental improvement by over 500%, and initiated a Legacy of Parks program to bring increased recreational opportunities to cities. No less than 25 separate environment bills have been proposed by him.

Young Americans:

President Nixon has signed into law the bill giving 18-year-olds the right to vote... overhauled the selective service system with the goal of establishing an all-volunteer army... and has proposed an education program that would guarantee a college education to all who qualify, and vocational education training for those who do not wish to attend college.

Vietnam:

The President has done everything in his power to bring peace to Vietnam without sacrificing the South Vietnamese in the process. He has brought home 500,000... reduced casualties by 98%... and cut spending by 2/3rds. As this is written, strong steps are being taken to get the enemy to cease its aggression and make peace.

Drugs:

The President has won agreement from Turkey to place a ban on the growing of the opium poppy... made an agreement with France to assist in battling the traffic of drugs... and stepped up arrests of pushers. He is spending six times more for rehabilitation and five times more for drug education than ever before. Combined, these actions are finally turning the tide against the drug scourge.

Foreign Policy:

President Nixon went to Moscow in May of this year where he negotiated agreements with the Soviet Union to limit development of anti-ballistic

missile systems, jointly explore space, and combat the diseases and pollution plaguing mankind. In March, he visited Peking where he made a start toward improving relations between the U.S. and the People's Republic of China. The President has called a halt to crisis diplomacy, seeking to reduce tension in such troubled areas as the Middle East.

NIXON-NO MORE THAN EVER

.....
SPEAKING OF MISTAKES...

George McGovern makes mistakes. Sometimes big mistakes. All the world knows about his mistakes. He made a mistake about Tom Eagleton. He trusted Tom to tell him everything. But he didn't, and when the truth was known George McGovern admitted his mistake. When he was having staff problems, we all knew it. We knew it because George didn't try to hide the truth.

Remember 1963? That was the year that George McGovern took a stand against Vietnam. In 1963, no one agreed with him. But George felt he had to be honest about his feelings.

Then there's Nixon. He doesn't make big mistakes. Or does he? Do you remember the firing of Walter Hickel? Remember the Bangladesh War when Nixon quietly backed pro-communist Pakistan against India? Remember Sec. of State Rogers's hushed complaints about Nixon's disuse of his

state department? Do you recall the 10 million dollars of hidden Nixon campaign funds? And then, in September, Nixon refused to back his own Consumer Protection bill. Remember Nixon's additional 4 million people on the unemployment rolls that you pay for? And finally, remember the Nixon that always preached against deficits, and then in 1971, proposed the biggest deficit in the history of the United States.

So you decide. Who makes mistakes? Nixon or McGovern? Who tells us the truth about his feelings and mistakes? Nixon or McGovern? Which one keeps silent, hoping we don't see his mistakes?

VOPE MCGOVERN on NOVEMBER 7.

There was a ... (continued from 6)

Now we are left with an alternative in George McGovern. The only things that we might say about him are that he has not been blemished by the "House Of Power". He pledges to us that he will not lie to us and cheat us. I say that he must be given an opportunity to prove that he is capable of reviving a country that has been morally bankrupted, and by maintaining the highest standards. If he fails us too then we can also kick him out.

But our energies today should be to kick ~~xxx~~ the existing corruption out the rear door and that in our value system is Nixon.

Loren Curne

.....
WELFARE

Unfortunately, during the present campaign, George McGovern has been forced time and again to defend his credibility against the incessant onslaughts of Spiro Agnew, Melvin Laird, George Schultz, and a host of other surrogate candidates running in behalf of the president; and at the same time recent government scandals (ITT, Watergate, the Milk Producers Affair, and the Great Grain Robbery) have compelled him to attack the moral integrity of the Nixon administration. In either case, he has been unable to do what he wants most to do--present his social and economic programs to the American people.

(Meanwhile back at the White House, President Nixon hides behind a well-trained staff and in his usual honest and straightforward way, refuses to answer any questions or make any statements, except to assure the American people that things are really going very well, they only seem bad, and that he really is a good guy at heart, it is only that the press won't leave him alone.)

At any rate, the issues have been sidetracked, and two of them, welfare reform and tax reform have been derailed.

No sane observer would dare to suggest that this nation's welfare program is working well. Yet the Nixon administration's response to the problem is to set up the bogey man of "lazy bums who don't want to work" and use it as a whipping boy upon which to blame the disastrous results of its own domestic economic policies. In effect they are saying, "Let's wipe out welfare and everything will be all right." But they never say anything about who is actually on welfare or why they are on welfare.

The majority of those on welfare are children. Most of them are products of broken homes, some are living in institutions, some in foster homes, some with their mothers.

The next largest group is made up of the mothers of these children. They cannot support themselves because there is no one to care for their children while they are away from home, and there is very little money to be earned working within one's home these days.

Next, there are families temporarily on assistance due to extended illness or unemployment. The fourth group is made up of the aged. Because of illness and inflation these people have lost what retirement savings they may have had. The last group is made up of the blind, the physically handicapped, and the mentally retarded. Many in this group are working, but their incomes are small and they require special services in order to stay healthy and be productive. On a national average, less than 1% of all people on welfare are cheaters.

George McGovern has called for a minimum of \$2400 per year for a family of four, plus enough food stamps to raise their effective income to \$4000 per year, the level established for health and decency by the US Government. Does this mean he is guaranteeing every person in the USA \$1000, as Mr. Nixon TV commercials suggest? Or that he will put one out of every two Americans on welfare? Hogwash!

Furthermore, McGovern wishes to expand Medicare to include medications for the elderly, one of their greatest expenses, child care centers and job training programs for mothers who wish to work, and most of them do because they can earn much more than their welfare payments, and to expand early childhood learning programs to aid in breaking the poverty and welfare cycles.

These programs will attack the heart of the welfare problem, not simply act as a superficial balm to soothe our emotions.

In the issue of welfare reform George McGovern's proposals have been carefully thought through and clearly defined. He has presented them for public debate. Mr. Nixon has presented little or nothing. George McGovern's programs are clearly designed to give the less fortunate citizen a fair stake and the average citizen a fair shake.

Todd R. Weiss

.....
WOMEN'S FRIENDS
READER'S SERVICE
P.O. BOX 1111
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10001
.....

..... 5

Woman's Rights

"The first priority for government is to ensure for all Americans their rights," said Senator George McGovern, Presidential candidate for the Democratic party. McGovern was specifically speaking of the discrimination against women and restoring women's rights to them. Because McGovern feels that this discrimination is morally wrong and socially wasteful he cosponsored the Equal Employment Opportunity Enforcement Act. McGovern's involvement in securing equal rights for women has not been only something of the past. Just recently at the Democratic National Convention McGovern used his authority as chairman of the Democratic Party Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection to achieve equal representation for women at that convention. As women were poorly represented on the Illinois slates, he insisted that they be changed so that the delegates pledged to him included 44% women. Most of his delegations were 50% women.

And if elected President McGovern is equally determined to include women in his administration by appointing women to the Cabinet, as Agency and Bureau heads and at all levels of the Federal government. McGovern plans to choose for his first appointment to the Supreme Court, a woman, to send a woman ambassador to the United Nations, and to appoint a Special Assistant to the President for Women's Rights. McGovern also seeks to establish an independent Woman Employment Administration to promote the interests of working women in all fields.

McGovern states that the pattern of women doing 80% of the work in political campaigns, providing 50% of the vote, having 13% of the voice in choosing the Presidential nominee, holding 1% of the seats in Congress, and getting only postscript credit for their efforts must end.

If elected McGovern will end this discrimination against women. The choice is yours, but if you believe the premise that our Democratic Society is established on, that is that all are created equal, there is no other choice but to elect McGovern as President.

Judy Bentley

Believable?

Is George McGovern believable when he tells us what he would do if elected? (A prospect which is fortunately very remote)? Are we able to believe anything the man has said? I suggest we cannot. Look at his duplicity throughout the years.

George McGovern began speaking out against the war in Vietnam as early as 1963, yet he voted for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1962, voted not to repeal it in 1966, and voted increased appropriations to Vietnam in 1967 and 1970. Now that seems to be rather inconsistent.

Mr. McGovern also said he would never commit US troops to war without a declaration of war, yet when asked what he would do if Israel were in serious danger of being overrun he said he would send troops, if necessary, to save Israel. That is wonderful loyalty to a friendly nation and I'm sure that we all approve but here also we notice a slight change.

Mr. McGovern agitated for, spoke in favor of and supported the 18 year old vote. Again we give him thanks, even if it wasn't his legislation, but again we have cause to wonder. He said 18 year olds were intelligent and concerned enough to vote yet when he found out they weren't all voting for him he said those against him were so "mixed up they don't know which end is up". It does seem as though this inconsistency is becoming a trend.

Mr McGovern is now able, without the least hesitation, to give a definite and lasting maybe to any question asked of him. He can also claim quite correctly that he can change opinions faster than almost anybody else, except maybe for the people that advise him, if anyone does. Mr McGovern has demonstrated this remarkable talent, over a wide range of topics, on a number of occasions. Name any topic such as Vietnam, bussing, tax reform, economy, amnesty, unilateral military intervention, or any thing else he has mentioned in relation to politics and rest assured, Mr McGovern has been on both sides of it. Is this so he can look at it better with both of his faces?

Mr McGovern must be sincere, otherwise he couldn't be so confused and if he is, by some quirk of fate, elected, you can bet that he will balk you 1000%.

Who is slinging Mud on Whom?

One of the things most often said about this campaign is that the Demo's do nothing but sling mud on poor Nixon and say nothing about their own candidate. But the truth of the matter is contrary to what the Republicans say. Nixonites never say Mr. Nixon this or that, it always is Mr. McGovern this or that (negatively of course). Also they mouth of generalities, quotes taken out of context and don't even have the slightest idea of what

Mr. McGovern's stand on the issues really is (they prefer to have you think that he doesn't know himself where he stands). I suppose the main reason they can't stand up and defend their candidate is he is hidden away in the White House, refusing to debate (though he did send some questions to McGovern to answer while McGovern was on a talk show.). We can talk about the blunders of McGovern and how he has changed his views on some issues. We can't do the same with Nixon because it is difficult to find out what he is planning to do. In 1968 he had a secret plan to end the war (which he never revealed & obviously didn't use) and now he says he has a secret plan to improve the economy. Why all the secrets? Are we children that the government can play suspense games with us and keep us amused with surprises? It appears that this is so because we degrade a man for speaking out and admitting his mistakes and yet admire another for saying nothing.

.....Patricia Gaustad.....

There Was a Crooked Man...

In a short number of days it will be all over. I refer of course to the contest for the 'House of Power'. We, the American people, must decide very soon which of the 2 major candidates for the office of President will be allowed to occupy and probably refurbish once again, the White House.

I urge all of us to take 10 unhassled minutes to seriously consider what "it's" all about. I realize that to ask you to look deeply into your conscience for answers to questions such as "What is America?" and "What is truth?", is asking a hell of a lot. But I propose that if these questions, that are demanding answers, go unanswered, then our status as self-determining distinctive personalities in life must be reevaluated. It seems that anybody who considers himself to be of importance, at least within and family, would be more than determined to see that the values he supposes to be right, be indeed the best. 'Honesty', 'truth', 'love', 'patriotism', are but a few of society's offerings that can demand from an individual greater sacrifices. It is only fair then that standards that common men must abide by be applied not just to one man but to the greater masses.

If, after careful scrutiny of our value judgements, it is felt that we, indeed, have valid standards who do we look toward for guidance in maintaining them? I don't think I am being too presumptuous when I say that the occupants of the White House should be our standard bearers. The standard is not only the flag, but also those things

that are called good and right for the American people.

This is why this election is so damned important. We must analyze each candidate as a potential 'Carrier of the Faith'. The faith in ourselves and in each other as a decent and vital people, capable of striving for the greater glory of a better society.

Let us now take a look at the two candidates for President of the United States. First of all we have Richard Nixon. Can we look at him honestly and say "He has tried to make the Supreme Court a body that dispenses justice for all, regardless of race or income status? Or has he tried to create a judicial unbalance in favor of regional or sectional interests? Can we look at him and say "He has employed men who are beyond moral reproach and suitable to advise him of the country's needs?" Or has he surrounded himself with criminal elements that have financial and other vested interests in his position? Can you look at him and say "He has been open and credible in his public administration" or has there been an incredible display of low grade politics that has dealt a heavy hand to 20,000 young American men?

If we, the American people have serious values, and feel that they are of paramount importance in our quest for a better human existence; if we, as distinct human beings, believe that truth, honesty, justice, goodness, and public morality are the highest human goals, then we cannot reelect Richard Nixon to the Presidency of the United States. He has compromised his integrity and the public's confidence in him during the past four years. He has chalked up a score that includes: 10,000 illegally arrested young people, Washington Post and New York Times, censorship, Haynesworth and Carswell, ITT, secret campaign funds, 2 members of his personnel staff indicted on criminal charges, veto of domestic related bills dealing with Education, Social Security, day care centers, Hospitals, Legislation for special boons to Lockheed, almost dismissing charges against a convicted 1st-degree murderer, wage and price freezes with no restrictions on special products thus maintaining high level inflation, Watergate, a wheat deal that dealt a heavy blow to the taxpayer and small farmer and of course a political settlement of the Vietnam War just a week or so away from election day.

Can we call him open, honest, credible? Can he be allowed to carry the banner that calls for "liberty, truth, and justice for all"? I beg to God and to the humanity in all of us to reject Richard Nixon once and for all. (+ 4)