

SMU incident: indignation, regret

Texas A&M's honor is safe at last. No longer will we, the students, have to lie sleepless at night worried by the threat that alien cheerleaders may one day step foot on sacred Kyle Field.

No, surely that will never happen again, thanks to a certain sabered soldier who at Saturday's football game proved that the students here will not tolerate such flagrant violation of our school's traditions.

Imagine the nerve of those SMU cheerleaders to dare attempt to lie down on Kyle Field and spell out S-M-U. Oh, but never fear; Sir Cadet was near.

And there was no stopping the fearless soldier, not even twice being tackled by a cheerleader. With a mighty slash of his terrible swift sword, not to mention a few harmless kicks with his flawlessly polished boot, he was quick to the rescue, defending that Aggie honor.

Where he could possibly muster up enough courage to single-handedly take on an entire cheerleading squad, I'll never know. Nevertheless, a true dueling match ensued — Sir Cadet armed with his saber, the cheerleaders with their megaphones. Yes, folks, megaphones. But, of course, Sir Cadet still won.

My only disappointment with the whole affair was the fact that two security guards and free safety Billy Cannon wrestled the duelers away from each other when the battle was only beginning.

Had it been allowed to develop into a full-scale war, I'm sure our gallant cadet would have had ample time to chop up those cheerleaders and feed them sliver by sliver to Rev. Only then would Texas



Marcy Boyce

A&M's honor have been fully restored as it was prior to the Mustang invasion. Right?

But I'm satisfied, nevertheless, with Sir Cadet's gallant efforts on our behalf. After all, under similar circumstances, others assigned the duty of protecting Kyle Field would probably have merely dragged those cheerleaders off the field by their arms.

No lashing with a sabre, no swift kicks with a boot? How mundane. We wouldn't have had the excitement of a near sparring. And assuredly, such an uneventful outcome as that would have been truly our loss, for I doubt that the event would have received such widespread media attention (including page one photos in The Houston Chronicle, The Houston Post and The Bryan-College Station Eagle).

But more importantly, had Sir Cadet not been quick enough to brandish his saber in the name of Texas A&M and Aggiedom, perhaps our school would not have again become the object of statewide ridicule, Aggie jokes would not have been perpetuated and public attention would have been focused on the successes and failures of our football team, rather than on its fans.

Editor:

I'm sitting in a friend's apartment after the Aggie-SMU game. I feel sick, in a mild way. The strange thing is that I go to SMU ... my team won. It's not real tough to figure out why I feel this way: I'm reacting to the crowd behavior at the game. Of course, when you talk about an Aggie crowd, you include the Corps.

I am fascinated by the Corps. I respect the hard work that these young men put into their training. I really wish that SMU could enjoy the spirit that the Corps promotes and preserves.

Still, the behavior of the crowd was at times just plain weird. I'm not knocking tradition: I'm talking about some things that, even endorsed by 40,000 people, remain strange.

Take for instance, the case of the Corps member assigned to keep people off the playing field, who decided that the SMU cheerleaders needed a quick lesson in Aggie tradition.

Couldn't this soldier have handled the incident a little differently? I learned that this fellow is member of an elite organization of Corps men (the Ross Volunteers). Is this the best that the Aggies have to show

us? Judging from the incidents that followed, it just might be.

As this fellow walked away, his uniform torn and wet, he gave the thumbs up sign to crowd. They gleefully responded with cheers. Gig 'em guys.

A Corps member I talked to explained the incident as just a sad case of one misguided individual, a throwback to the days of "might makes right," abusing his power and responsibility. Despite the seeming mass endorsement of the act, I believed him ... for a while.

Late in the fourth quarter, the SMU cheerleaders formed a huge pyramid in front of their cheering section. The band played, the crowd loved it. What was the Corps' response to this precarious tower of human flesh? As the cheerleaders watched in frustration, three green-clad Aggies scurried up, grabbed a megaphone and ran. The cheerleaders, their safety dependent on their ability to remain still, were slow to respond. When they did, chasing the thieves out of the stadium to get their property back, a healthy size group of Ags followed to make sure they didn't.

Finally, as I walked to my car, a fellow recognizing my SMU window sticker drove up and rolled down his window.

"I just want to apologize for the incident that went on today," he began.

Fine, I thought, rational thought infiltrate the A&M campus, just not Kyle Field.

Suddenly though, his tone shifted. "It's only because we've got the best in the world. I've seen A&M-SMU since I was 10 years old, and I just want to tell you, SMU has a lot to learn about fans."

In an uncalled-for flippant answer, he said, "Like what?"

He said, "Just because you're a school, you think you can do anything. SMU needs to just shove it up there."

Ignoring the subject-verb agreement problems, I thanked him for his opinion.

"Yeah," he said, and speed off. I wanted to ask if the pretty co-ed sitting to him shared his feelings.

Sure, maybe SMU does have some problems, but I think you should learn a few things about being good.

But did this weekend's visit to Aggie give us any kind of example to follow?

Pete Smith
SMU journalism student

Qualifications of speakers are considered carefully

Editor:

MSC Political Forum is always happy to answer questions concerning the policies about our programming and speakers. We do not take our job lightly as we examine the qualifications of our speakers thoroughly.

First, let me outline our selection criteria, before commenting on our selection of Katherine Brady. This criteria includes:

1. Current relevance of the subject
2. Prestige and reputation of the speaker
3. Attendance draw of the speaker
4. Speaker association with the topic
5. Educational value of the program
6. Cost of the program

The weight of these concerns varies with the program.

As for the ERA debate between Phyllis Schlafly and Katherine Brady, we felt this was a timely subject and deserved the attention of the Texas A&M University community. Phyllis Schlafly was an obvious choice to present the anti-ERA position and we had hoped to secure Gloria Steinem to present the pro-ERA position. Due to Steinem's reluctance to appear with Schlafly, we were forced to find an alternate speaker. As a non-partisan organization, we felt both sides of this issue should be aired simultaneously. Therefore, after several

Reader's Forum

possibilities such as Bella Abzug, Karen DeCrow, Eleanor Smeal, and Sissy Farenthold fell through, Katherine Brady was brought to our attention by Tom Neilsen, a booking agent for Epstein, Winthrop International Limited. Although being familiar with Brady as an author, we were concerned with her qualifications to speak on the topic of ERA. We asked Neilsen to supply us with names of colleges and universities where Brady had spoken previously. We then contacted the programming committees of those schools and inquired about the presentations Brady had made. Each school's committee spoke highly of Brady's speaking abilities and presentation. Whitman College in Washington, D.C. was so impressed with Brady that when planning a debate on abortion they specifically placed Brady in a debate with Schlafly. Several members of the committee had also

seen Brady on the Phil Donahue Show were impressed.

We recognized that in the debate last Tuesday Brady was overshadowed by Schlafly. We also recognize that during the passage of the ERA may have been side was not adequately presented. We regret that the debaters were not as well matched as we had hoped they would be; however, we feel that even in light of this, we brought the issue of the Equal Rights Amendment to approximately 1000 students, faculty, and staff members and students of the Bryan-College Station community. In addition to those attending many tuned in to the debate which broadcast live on KAMU. We feel that those in the audience were able to differentiate between problems in debating a real issue.

We urge anyone interested in MSC Political Forum or those having suggestions for future speakers to contact us at 845-1515 drop by Rm. 216 MSC, Student Progress Office. We were glad Holly Haines brought our attention to many others who questioned concerning the debate. We sincerely hope this has clarified those questions.

A. Wayne Baker
Chairman, MSC Political Forum

It's your turn

Student criticizes site of University Press building

Editor:

I am writing this letter to inform all concerned Aggies of a little known fact that, if nothing is done, could affect us all.

"They" (Administration? Board of Regents?) are planning to construct a new University Press building. This probably

arouses no great interest in most of us. What does concern us is where they want put this building. As of now, they plan to build it on Duncan Field. That's right Ags, Duncan Field could then no longer be used for Bonfire. Bonfire would then be moved, probably off the main campus.

This issue is a highly emotional one for

many people (including myself), but common sense also rejects the practicality of placing this building on Duncan field.

First of all, it is a matter of convenience. Duncan Field is an ideal size for both the construction and the burning of Bonfire. More importantly though, thousands of Ags work on Bonfire each year. Many of these students couldn't work as much if they had to get to the stack. A shortage of manpower has been problem in recent years, moving the stack off campus would only compound this problem.

The absorption of Duncan Field would also affect its other uses. During the spring and summer months it doubles as a site for both intramurals and Corps activities.

Secondly, this new University Press building is not a classroom building, therefore it doesn't have to be located on the

main campus. The Texas A&M system has enough land in the immediate vicinity that another site could easily be chosen.

We students, all 35,000 of us, are Texas A&M University. If we all join together in opposition to the proposed construction on Duncan Field BEFORE plans are finalized, then our voices cannot be ignored.

Sherry Howell '84

Pranks not funny

Editor:

Halloween is a fun and break-loose, get-crazy time. But for several girls who ventured through a haunted "dorm" on Wednesday night, the "fun" ended on the

fourth floor. The perverts on this floor wing know what I am referring to. Things like this happen all the time. What are the victims supposed to do? I'm infuriated. It's a shame that a handful of guys had to destroy a good time. Nothing like this has ever happened to me before and I resent being exploited or even harassed. These guys think that I don't deserve respect. My feelings were hurt. My thought was to keep quiet and forget it. The idea of treatment like this from a "dorm" upsets me more. All the girls who went to this dorm "haunted" house supported these guys, deserve an apology from the fourth floor wing responsible for this type of disrespect.

Sandra McCaulley

Editor's note: This letter was accompanied by four other signatures.

By Scott McCullough

THE BATTALION

USPS 045 360 MEMBER
Texas Press Association
Southwest Journalism Congress

Editor: Angelique Copeland
Managing Editor: Marcy Boyce
City Editor: Jane G. Brust
Asst. City Editor: Kathy O'Connell
Photo Editor: Dave Einsel
Sports Editor: Ritchie Priddy
Focus Editor: Cathy Saathoff
Asst. Focus Editor: Debbie Nelson
News Editors: Phyllis Henderson, Bernie Fette, Belinda McCoy, Diana Sulzenfuss

Staff: Frank L. Christlieb, Randy Clements, Gaye Denley, Nancy Floeck, Tim Foarde, Colette Hutchings, Daniel Puckett, Denise Richter, Mary Jo Rummel, Rick Stolle, Nancy Weatherley, Barbie Woelfel
Cartoonist: Scott McCullough
Graphic Artist: Richard DeLeon Jr.
Photographers: Brian Tate, Daniel Sanders, Colin Valentine

EDITORIAL POLICY
The Battalion is a non-profit, self-supporting newspaper operated as a community service to Texas A&M University and Bryan-College Station. Opinions expressed in The Battalion are those of the editor or the author, and do not necessarily represent the opinions of Texas A&M University administrators or faculty members, or of the Board of Regents.
The Battalion also serves as a laboratory newspaper for students in reporting, editing and photography classes within the Department of Communications.
Questions or comments concerning any editorial matter should be directed to the editor.

LETTERS POLICY
Letters to the Editor should not exceed 300 words in length, and are subject to being cut if they are longer. The editorial staff reserves the right to edit letters for style and length, but will make every effort to maintain the author's intent. Each letter must also be signed, show the address and phone number of the writer.
Columns and guest editorials are also welcome, and are not subject to the same length constraints as letters. Address all inquiries and correspondence to: Editor, The Battalion, 216 Reed McDonald, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.
The Battalion is published daily during Texas A&M's fall and spring semesters, except for holiday and examination periods. Mail subscriptions are \$16.75 per semester, \$33.25 per school year and \$35 per full year. Advertising rates furnished on request.
Our address: The Battalion, 216 Reed McDonald Building, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 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.

Warped

