



"You know, I think I'm in agreement with you. Playing a good game, winning a moral victory, showing your courage, and that sort of thing is okay, but winning is better."

OPINION

Rampaging idiots

Not idiots, perhaps, but foolish people. And their foolishness may kill somebody. The problem has been here since the two-wheeler first began competing with the four-wheeler. It's not an even match. Bicyclists can lose, especially when they foolishly ride without any lights after sundown. Bicyclists know to look for cars, and they usually do. Automobile drivers, cruising the scene with their stereos on, can easily miss bicyclists in broad daylight. So what happens when a cyclist rides without proper lights or reflectors at night? Sometimes something very tragic.

Vote None-of-the-Above

A man in Louisiana gives us hope. His name is None-of-the-Above. Until a court changed it earlier this month, it was L.D. Knox. NOTA, as he's sometimes called, has filed a lawsuit to block the state's primary unless his new name appears on the ballot for governor. It's doubtful this ploy will work. All his other efforts — noble as they are — have been blocked. Although he has repeatedly said he does not want the job, NOTA says he does want voters to be able to reject all other candidates by voting for "none of the above." Sometimes we'd like to do just that.

the small society by Brickman



THE BATTALION

USPS 045 360

LETTERS POLICY

Letters to the editor should not exceed 300 words and are subject to being cut to that length or less if longer. The editorial staff reserves the right to edit such letters and does not guarantee to publish any letter. Each letter must be signed, show the address of the writer and list a telephone number for verification.

Address correspondence to Letters to the Editor, The Battalion, Room 216, Reed McDonald Building, College Station, Texas 77843.

Represented nationally by National Educational Advertising Services, Inc., New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles.

The Battalion is published Monday through Friday from September through May except during exam and holiday periods and the summer, when it is published on Tuesday through Thursday.

Mail subscriptions are \$16.75 per semester, \$33.25 per school year, \$35.00 per full year. Advertising rates furnished on request. Address: The Battalion, Room 216, Reed McDonald Building, College Station, Texas 77843. United Press International is entitled exclusively to the use for reproduction of all news dispatches credited to it. Rights of reproduction of all other matter herein reserved. Second-Class postage paid at College Station, TX 77843.

Opinions expressed in The Battalion are those of the editor or of the writer of the article and are not necessarily those of the University administration or the Board of

MEMBER

Texas Press Association Southwest Journalism Congress

- Editor Liz Newlin
Managing Editor Andy Williams
Asst. Managing Editor Dillard Stone
News Editors Karen Cornelison and Michelle Burrows
Sports Editor Sean Petty
City Editor Roy Bragg
Campus Editor Keith Taylor
Focus Editors Beth Calhoun and Doug Graham
Staff Writers Meril Edwards, Diane Blake, Louie Arthur, Richard Oliver, Mark Patterson, Carolyn Blosser, Kurt Allen
Photo Editor Lee Roy Leschper Jr.
Photographers Lynn Blanco, Clay Cockerill, Sam Stroder, Ken Herrera
Cartoonist Doug Graham

Regents. The Battalion is a non-profit, self-supporting enterprise operated by students as a university and community newspaper. Editorial policy is determined by the editor.

DICK WEST Remedy for Congress pay-raise dilemma is to let each man set his own salary

By DICK WEST
United Press International
WASHINGTON — No other conflict in government is quite as exciting as the spectacle of Congress wrestling with itself over whether to raise its own pay. It's got everything. Action. Drama. Intrigue. Suspense. And most of all, a rich tapestry of schizophrenia. They're up! They're down! They're upside down! They're beside themselves! What a struggle! As one congressman, explaining his position of the pay issue, told me: "If you are talking about an increase that helps us cope with the ravages of inflation, that partially compensates for the long, grueling hours we spend looking after the national interest and that tends to attract

more able candidates into congressional races, I'm for it. "But if you are talking about an increase that drains more precious resources from the hard-pressed private sector into the already bloated government, that imposes fresh burdens on the downtrodden taxpayer and further insulates Congress from the country's economic vicissitudes, I'm against it." This helps explain why, during one stretch of soulsearching, the House wrote a 7 percent pay increase into a bill, then defeated the bill itself, then voted to reconsider the rejection, and then, upon reconsideration, rejected it again. For classification purposes, members of Congress may be said to fall into three groups:

- 1. Those who feel the raise is well deserved and are prepared to take political risks to get it.
2. Those who feel the raise is well deserved but are not prepared to take political risks to get it.
3. Those who feel the raise is well deserved and hope to profit politically by opposing it.

The solution, I believe, is to let each senator and representative to fix his own pay scale. I realize a certain number of members would immediately raise their pay by more than the amount recommended in the plan. But just as many, if not more, would opt for no raise at all. And a fearful, few might actually cut their own pay. Thus, from the taxpayer's view, the new system would just about even. What it would accomplish is to give a congressman's right not to pay Congress engaging in a battle over the pay issue, it would be even against himself.



Kennedy challenge could upset Carter's leadership

Sen. Edward Kennedy's virtual announcement that he will seek the 1980 Democratic presidential nomination could undercut President Carter's authority for up to 16 months, especially in foreign affairs. The reason is that Kennedy is widely perceived as capable of beating Carter. And that belief could cause leaders in Washington and foreign capitals to view the president as a lame duck and to brush aside his initiatives. None of this is meant in criticism of Kennedy. He has a right to run for president. Indeed he was brought up to believe that the office was family property, to be

handed down from one Kennedy to another at the proper time. Also, it isn't the Massachusetts senator's fault that Carter is in deep political trouble, with the polls saying only 30 percent of the public thinks he is doing a good job. With the same polls showing Kennedy running 2-1 ahead of the president, it is too much to expect a political animal to stay out of the race. That would be like lions refusing to eat Christians in the Coliseum. Sadly, with Kennedy's challenge looming, the president will find it next to impossible to concentrate on the nation's business. He and particularly his hyper-

political advisers will be worrying about Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary when the White House should be attending to inflation, recession and Soviet combat troops in Cuba. It is easy to imagine shrewd characters such as, say, Leonid Brezhnev, Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin saying to themselves, "Why should I make a painful concession to Carter when in a year or so I can deal with his successor?" Developments could save the country from top-level paralysis. Carter could pick up in the polls, causing Kennedy to decide not to run. Or Carter could win the early primaries, shedding his lame duck appear-

ance and establishing himself as a politician and foreign leader have with seriously. The chances of either coming to leave to readers to judge. But gloomy possibility that Washington will be without effective leadership until inauguration Day, 1981, we look with Great Britain and Canada. Both held national elections and replaced top leaders in only four to six weeks. Clearly this country has something learn from our British and Canadian cousins. Scripps-Howard Newspapers

LETTERS One A&M student has trouble bragging about his school to an interested friend

Editor: The past weekend, while visiting home, I was talking to a good friend of mine. He had a slightly more than casual interest in my going to A&M, and was asking me a few questions about school. "Say, Bob, how's school?" he asked. "It's great, man!" I replied automatically. "Classes are OK, huh? Pretty small?" Pause . . . "No, not really — around 150 or 200 people in most of them." "Oh, I see. Well I guess you can get lots of personal help from the instructor if you need it." Longer pause. "Well, no; they're kind of hard to get to . . . But I get by alright." "Yea. Well, how's campus? Get around OK?" Still longer pause. "No, it's really large. About a half mile between some of my classes." By now I'm thinking about having to park way over on the other side of the railroad tracks, or the miles of lines I have to stand in, and praying he won't ask me about that. He didn't. "Well I guess there are just loads of good-looking babes!" he said with a twinkle in his eye. Terribly long pause. "Come to think of it, there are few, but A&M only has 35 percent women." Now it's his turn to pause. Momentarily, "Well, I guess you've got a football game on Saturday afternoon to look forward to, right there, and everything." I'm beginning to turn green. "Well, Roger, they're working on the stadium, and we have to drive to Houston." I slid back in my chair, wanting to hide under the tablecloth. We sat there, looking at each other, me wondering what was

coming next, and him painfully thinking of something more to say. Presently — "Say, Bob?" "Yes, Roger." "Why do you go to A&M?" "They have the top engineering school, and the people are very friendly." — Bob Lawson, '82 — Bob Bandas, '82

Science, theology

Editor: It is hard to believe that there are still ideas floating around which are uninhibited by logic, rationality, reason, and good common sense. I refer to the idea in general and the editorial specifically (Sept. 24) that says an "intelligent creator" explains the phenomenon of life. Does saying "God did it!" explain abso-

lutely anything? To those hopelessly enmeshed in theological mythomania it is the only explanation needed, but for those who wish to do a little research to seek answers founded on evidence and sound argumentation it simply is not enough. The days of explaining earthquakes, disease, mental aberrations, atmospheric disturbances and other purely natural phenomena by the supernatural are declining. They have been declining ever since the day man refused to let ignorant priests think for him. As human knowledge increases, the gods' sphere of influence decreases. We would be called fools if we were to say God, or the plethora of other gods, causes lightning, cellular lysis, car wrecks, and bad test scores. So why should the phenomenon of life be any different in necessitating a supernatural explanation? It is only because life is a mystery, and

theology breeds like rabbits on mystical, rational, logical, scientific explanation of the theologian out of a job. Saying "God did it!" is simply no explanation at all. Not only is it devoid of meaning, but it's like inventing a mystery, explain a mystery. It brings us no closer to an answer than saying "evil spirits of disease." It is the lazy-person's way of solving a problem. Those who want the evidence evolution theory can examine thousands of books and journals in the library classified under the Library of Congress call letters "QH." It may take a lifetime to finish them all. Those who want the "scientific evidence" for special creation can take five minutes to read the entirety of the religion section of the library, and the appropriate LC call letters "BS." — John McCulloch

THOTZ by Doug Graham

