

right course.

They saw the doughnut, Grassley the hole. They said the end justifies the means. Grassley said the end and the means are two different things and each must seek its own justification.

Like all politicians, Grassley believes that you'll agree with him if you just understand the facts as he sees them. Since he was so ideologically close to Reagan & Co., he thought it was a matter of understanding. If they didn't see it in the \$600 toilet seat, maybe they'd see it in the \$60 pliers.

Somewhere in there, I take it, these political soul-mates began wondering about each other's motives. A Grassley vote against the Reagan administration was interpreted as retaliation — never mind that he'd voted right nine of 10 times — that must be retaliated against.

It was a one-sided game. Grassley either awoke to it late or is against it in principle and is able to live with the principle most of the time. In any case, any contest the White House chooses to play becomes one-sided. Grassley couldn't even rage. To call attention to the pain was to call attention to the wound, and make it worse.

Grassley's support of Bob Dole in the Iowa caucuses produced a few sweet days but, in the end, there he was — arm in arm with George Bush and the people who wouldn't even give him a district attorney.

The bitter taste can't be much alleviated by the Justice Department's disclosures of its Pentagon investigations. Now, people who wouldn't even nod at him before are hanging on his every word. The very Justice Department that so scorned and demeaned him for blowing the whistle is winning political points by blowing the same whistle.

If they'd have listened to him three years ago, it would have been a Republican credit. Now, it's a debit, maybe even an election-losing debit.

You'd be angry too, and you'd have to be an actor of Reagan's caliber not to show it. I'm a little relieved, if disappointed, that Grassley isn't crowing like an old Rhode Island Red rooster.