The Real Hillary Factor

By Deborah Tannen

WASHINGTON, D.C. — While I was a guest on a radio talk show discussing how women's and men's differing conversational styles could lead to misunderstandings, a man called to say that he and his wife got along very well because they agreed there could be only one boss in the house and he was it.

The host responded that she did not see why anyone had to be boss: relationships are, after all, partnerships; with partners share equally in resources and rights.

When she was done, pleased with her self-evident rightness and clarity of her statement, she took another call. It was from a man, who said: "That's what's wrong with you women. You want to dominate us."

She replied: "Excuse me for a moment. I'm going to scream." She then, right into the microphone: long, high-pitched and wordless. It was a scream of frustration and bewilderment. It was a scream about the Hillary Factor.

The Hillary Factor, when the phrase was coined, referred to the question: Will Hillary Clinton help or hinder her husband's chances?

Deborah Tannen, author of "You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation," is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

The Sky Is Not the Limit

By Daniel M. Kasper

BOSTON — The British Government is pressing the Bush Administration to approve a $750 million investment by British Airways in USAir.

By using the proposal as leverage to secure the elimination of British trade barriers, the Administration can build on last month's open-skies agreement with the Netherlands and establish a strong foundation for a truly global and competitive airline industry — where airlines, not governments, determine the routes served, the costs offered and the rates charged.

But approving the British investment without obtaining major changes in the existing air services agreement would reward British protectionism.

Foreign airlines should open their routes to the United States in return for U.S. approval of the plan to significant concessions by Britain. This gives the impression that our Government is not serious about overhauling the existing aviation agreement. As a result, Britain has offered little.

The proposed investment by British Airways would allow the combined airlines to fly throughout the U.S. and to many cities in Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean. Overall, British Airways-USAir would have more than 12,000 markets open worldwide — considerably more than any U.S. airline alone has access to.

Under the existing U.S.-Britain aviation agreement, American carriers for a U.S. airline to acquire a European carrier. Under European Community rules, the European airline would lose its status as a "community carrier" and thus its access to the internal European market. Since certain features of the British proposal cannot be approved without changes in U.S. law, the Administration could offer to propose such alterations in exchange for community concessions. That approach would give Britain a continued incentive to press for liberalization in Europe.

Such a compromise of U.S. economic interests is neither necessary nor desirable. USAir's survival does not depend on the British investment. A strong balance sheet, a talented new management team and recent wage concessions from its employees have revived its fortunes.

Similarly, competing efforts by Air Canada, Mexicana, SAS and Lufthansa