

MAYBE IT'S SAFER HERE, COMRADE;
ALL WE GOT IS GUERRILLAS.



OPINION

Clements says 'no' to

Sooner or later, someone is going to have to make it very clear to Gov. Bill Clements that he cannot run the state's executive office in the manner he ran his oil company. But whoever that someone is, he can expect to receive no help from the Austin district attorney.

Clements met with the regents of Texas Southern University, a state-supported college in Houston, on Jan. 30 to discuss certain irregularities found recently in the Houston college's financial records.

Apparently, the governor decided these irregularities are not for public scrutiny. Despite the protests of Austin news representatives, Clements held the meeting behind closed doors in flagrant violation of the state's open records act.

Several news organizations filed protests with Austin district attorney Ronald Earle the next day. But on Friday, Earle finally announced he has no intention of pursuing the matter. He said that, while the state open meetings law does mandate that meetings among regents are to be held publicly, it doesn't specify the same for meetings between the board and another body, such as the governor.

In other words, Earle has chosen to ignore the intent of the law and to favor a quirk in the wording of the law. Again, justice stumbles.

Sometime soon, the public will have to stop viewing battles over open government as existing only between the government and the press.

In such cases, the government isn't saying "no" to only the reporters; it is telling the public, "This is none of your business."

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 Tuesdays through Thursdays.

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

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

THE BATTALION
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

VIEWPOINT

MONDAY
FEBRUARY 25, 1980

Reagan, Brown give California touch to presidential election

By DAVID S. BRODER

The members of the Milford Junior Chamber of Commerce did what no one else had managed to do in the last two presidential campaigns. They created a forum where uniquely durable candidates, the governor of California and the former governor of California, could be seen and heard in sequence.

Watching Ronald Reagan and Jerry Brown speak from the same platform to the same crowd on a Saturday afternoon gave some fascinating insights into what has made these two men — both so easily ridiculed — so hard to dislodge from the presidential picture.

Reagan began running for President in 1968 and is still at it 12 years later. Brown started in 1976 and only a fool would assume that he will not be around as a candidate in 1988.

What is it that has enabled these two men to play such a prominent political role over such a span of time, when so few others have managed it even once?

There are some easy answers, but they do not help much. California is a big, politically important state. Sure. But so are

New York and Pennsylvania and Illinois, and when was the last time their governors played serious presidential politics?

Reagan and Brown are both good-looking, well-spoken men, but the political world is full of people equally blessed in visage and voice who never make it into the ranks of the presidential hopefuls.

You get closer to the answer when you note that both Reagan and Brown have a gift for simplifying — some would say oversimplifying — governmental complexities and presenting their proposals in understandable, non-bureaucratic language.

That talent was on display here and is the main reason the two Californians drew enthusiastic responses with their quite different messages.

The Reagan speech was an almost word-for-word reversion to the basic speech of his 1976 campaign. Forgotten since his Iowa upset at the hands of George Bush are all the promises campaign manager John Sears made about the 1980-model Reagan being a man with fresh approaches to the emerging challenges of a new decade.

The folks in Milford heard, as so many had heard in 1976, about the "welfare queen" in Chicago who was getting be-

nefits under 127 different names. They were told, once again, that the forms the federal government requires are numberous enough "to cover Washington, D.C., 25 layers thick — and that's not a bad idea."

It was Reagan as before, turning billions of dollars of federal programs back to the states and cities. It was the Reagan of yore, asserting that his experience with the "hostile Democratic legislature" in California had taught him that "if you can't make them see the light, you can sure make them feel the heat."

Reagan came here to repeat his 1976 speech — the one that brought him within a few votes of defeating the incumbent Republican President. Jerry Brown came here to rehearse his 1984 speech, the one that he hopes will bring him the presidency in that year. Nobody ever accused Brown of being dumb, and he knows he's the odd-man-out in the 1980 Carter-Kennedy contest.

But he also knows the country is in big trouble — the kind of trouble that no President is likely to be able to cure in four years. Alone in the presidential field, he is talking about the decline of America's

technological and industrial base. He is proposing a reexamination of relationships among business, labor, and government in order to sustain the position of the United States in the economy.

Brown is talking about fundamentalism. A Reagan was doing when he began a dozen years ago about the danger of an in an expansively bureaucratic government.

You understand, seeing the two men 69 and other 41 — that what he believes in the validity of their own beliefs, they are ready to wait — or the voters — to vindicate their beliefs, even if that takes a long time.

That vindication has not yet come. Reagan, and it may never come. Brown. But they don't know that. Because they harbor doubts about their parties' kind of California presence which has much to live in the political culture years past, and, very likely, will do so for years to come.

(c) 1980, The Washington Post



LETTERS

Protecting human life is important

Editor:
The International Year of the Child has recently expired, yet after all the efforts to give children their so-called "rights," no national effort has been made to give the primary right of life to the unborn child. The unborn child is the most vulnerable of all people; he must be totally dependent upon the body of his mother until he is given birth. He is at once the responsibility of society and a hope of society. He must be protected; human life is the most valuable resource of any nation.

But what if society does not think that he is valuable? What if his mother does not want to have children at the time of his conception? What if tests show that he will be born handicapped? What if his life will be shortened by consuming, painful disease?

The core issue is this: Does human life have intrinsic worth? Are human beings actually "endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and pursuit of happiness"? If this statement is

true, then it cannot be applied conditionally. A human being, because he is a creation and is in the image of God, has infinite worth. His worth is not based upon his possible contribution to society, his mother's attitude toward carrying him during her pregnancy, his health, or any other arbitrary factor. Because he is human, he is entitled to the opportunity to life.

We oppose both federally-funded, and legalized abortion. No matter what difficulties exist, protecting human life is the highest calling of law in society.

Scott Travis '80
Tim
Richard

Batt bricks

Editor:
The Batt editor catches a lot of letters. I think it ought to be congratulated for earning them. The sports section is looking good lately. It is nice to see more than one story. Now there are more than one sport. Good work.
David

By Doug Graham

THOTZ

