

# Rich Republicans, poor Democrats

by Steve Gerstel  
United Press International

WASHINGTON — Democrats, despite signal successes in the elections, are deeply concerned about their inability to even keep up with the Republicans in the vital area of fund-raising.

The Democrats made sizable gains in the House, added a parcel of new governors and held the GOP to a dead heat in the Senate although Republicans raised and spent much more.

The House Democratic Study Group, after sifting through the financial records at the Federal Elections Commission, found the outlook bleak.

The Study Group found that "the dollar gap between the two parties widened substantially, both in total receipts and in the amount of financial help the parties provided their House and Senate candidates."

The comparison between the Democrats' and Republican three party committees — national, Senate and congressional — lends no encouragement.

The GOP party committees outraised their Democratic counterparts \$180.4 million to \$27.4 million — an astounding \$153 million. Both parties raised more than in the past but the gap widened, from \$109 million in 1980 and \$47 million in 1978.

The Study Group said that in terms of financial help to candidates, "the bottom line in campaign fund-raising," the disparity is worse for Democrats.

The party gap more than doubled, growing from \$6 million in 1978 to \$15.4 million in 1982.

And as fund-raising begins for the 1984 elections, the Republicans are in much, much better shape.

The GOP starts out the year with a \$8.5 million surplus and \$2.2 in debts, for a net seed money of \$6.3 million.

The Democrats, on the other hand, have only \$876,000 on hand and \$3.1 million in debts, for a net minus of \$2.2 million.

Fund-raising efforts may be prove even more difficult this year and next for the Democrats as the multitude of pres-

idential candidates siphon off potential money.

One of them, Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., is considered superb at raising political money and for the last two years conducted a one-man foray for Democratic megabucks. His adroitness is shown by the fact that he already has qualified for federal matching funds for his presidential campaign.

But he's not the only one plumbing the same source. There's former Vice President Walter Mondale, Sens. Ernest Hollings, Gary Hart and John Glenn, former Florida Gov. Reubin Askew and maybe Rep. Morris Udall.

Republicans have no such problem. If President Reagan seeks a second term, he will not be seriously challenged.

But even if Reagan steps down, there remains all sorts of Republican money around the country — recession or no recession.

In a bow to the GOP, the Study Group says: "The growing money gap between the parties is due to the phenomenal effectiveness of the Republican fund-raising machine rather than to failure on the part of the Democratic fund-raisers."

The Study Group pointed out that the Democrats raised \$8.5 million more in 1981-82 than in 1979-80 but Republicans increased their haul \$52.3 million.

"Thus, the persistently widening dollar gap raises serious questions as to whether it will be possible, as has been hoped, to significantly reduce the difference over the next decade — if ever," the Study Group concluded.

But in the very next sentence, the Study Group showed the reason why the gap cannot be narrowed and puts into question the Democrats' hope that the difference could grow smaller by the end of the decade.

The Study Group said that the Republican committees have nearly 4 million contributors and growing while the Democrats have 300,000. And if history is a guide, the Republicans have the richer donors.



# Space Can we neglect programs

In 1957, the Soviet Union placed Sputnik in orbit. Sputnik was not a remarkable technological achievement but its existence so shocked the United States that they launched the largest peaceful venture in U.S. history based solely on the advancement of technology. Twelve years later, the U.S. placed the first man on the moon.

when we have released a billion dollar burden? The answer is simple. The space program was never a burden, it was an investment; an investment that never failed to produce a profit. And yet this investment has been withdrawn by our recent legislatures on the advice of economic advisers.

NASA's main goal was the development of the Space Shuttle, a project only a minor part of NASA's plan for space colonization.

In 1957, someone realized the space program would not only benefit science, it would also produce a profit. That person or group of persons was able to convince the legislature of this and for 12 years the space program brought uncountable scientific advancements to the United States, including automated quality control procedures, superconducting and semiconducting electronic materials, Teflon, firefighting methods, medical instruments and communication systems. All of these advancements produced revenue.

Neither of these groups can be expected to understand research at the level necessary for ventures outside Earth's atmosphere but they are expected to understand the basics of economics. A profit cannot be made without investment. New technology produces profit but it needs money to keep it producing. The space program has consistently produced new technology, it has consistently applied this technology to marketable developments and it has consistently produced a profit directly to the U.S. government through exports and indirectly through private enterprise.

Then, in 1975, the House of Science and Technology allocated \$750 million "to lay the foundation for advanced projects, such as manned orbital colonies." These plans collapsed.

The country developed high technology and sold it throughout the world. In 1969, our chief export was technology. We improved the world's standard of living and made a profit. We also came to a greater understanding of the Earth and its many systems. We increased the amount of time our race could survive on the Earth while working towards independence from the confines of a fragile planet that cannot support us forever.

Ignoring this, current legislatures have reduced the space program to less than 1 percent of the national budget.

Would a space colony or park have proved profitable to the economy? The space program's record of success said yes. Congressional records in 1971 and 1975 said no. What budget cuts we may never know.

Today, our space program is in serious trouble. Recent budget cuts have cancelled a planned mission to study Halley's comet. An industrial park in space supported by lunar materials has been rejected. Plans for a solar powered satellite that would supply about as much power as the Grand Coulee Dam are in serious trouble. The benefits of the space program are being sacrificed to support a weakening economy. Because of this our chief export is now agriculture. However, our economy is still weakening.

The profits produced by the space program were not enough to overcome the lack of understanding, and thereby lack of confidence, in space technology. Industrialization and colonization outside of Earth's atmosphere is viewed by our nation's leaders as nothing more than fantasy. In 1969, however, the Space Task Group, chaired by Spiro Agnew, announced plans to land men on Mars. Included in these plans were a 100-man space base, orbiting lunar stations, a station on the lunar surface, a reusable space shuttle and a manned expedition to Mars tentatively scheduled for the mid-1980s.

Our nation's leaders are neglecting our space program even though it can benefit the United States economically and scientifically. There is another reason for rejuvinating the space program. We know that the Soviet Union has plans for colonizing the moon as well as a budget that supports these plans. We also know that the Soviet Union established a military foothold on the moon, and have the capability of destroying a satellite presently in Earth orbit. The Soviet Union currently views this as a threat to national security since it endangers worldwide communication and scientific research.

Why has our economy not responded

successfully into space and benefit economically and scientifically. In 1971,

the choice is ultimately ours.

Doug Dalglish is a freshman engineering major from San Antonio.

# 'Bonzonomics' booming

by Dick West  
United Press International

WASHINGTON — Call it, if you must, "Bonzonomics."

But if "supply side" measures don't end the recession soon, it may be necessary to try something on the simian side.

equipped with a prehensile tail enabling it to swing from trees. The result would be cheaper parking that help revive the auto industry, the mulating the entire economy.

Unlike "Reaganomics," named for the human half of the famous 1951 Hollywood collaboration, "Bonzonomics" is booming.

Here are a few programs that might be considered:

Video game — Bonzo cartoon swings across top of screen of coconuts. Players try to zap the Bonzo before they hit the ground. Extra awarded for zapping Bonzo. One of each quarter collected would reduce the budget deficit.

Ever since Ronald Reagan got into politics, the commercialization of his chimpanzee co-star has prospered accordingly.

Bonzo smoke detectors — As you may be aware, the original chimp who appeared on the silver screen with our chief executive died in an animal dormitory fire in 1952.

So what could be a more appropriate than to imprint the new Bonzo cartoon on smoke detectors? Only instead of sounding conventional alarm signals, this model would emit monkey chatter.

Last year, Reagan's second in the White House, the sale of posters featuring the heroes of "Bedtime for Bonzo" topped the 100,000 mark. Bonzo T-shirts and bumper stickers also were selling like Smurfs. And now comes word that a Bonzo cartoon character is being introduced.

Created by Bill Rechin, who also draws the "Crock" comic strip, it will appear on greeting cards, knapsacks, lunch boxes and the like.

Bonzo stamps — Supplementing the food stamp program, stamps imprinted with the Bonzo cartoon and issued by welfare agencies could be traded in at supermarkets for bunches of bananas. Would greatly strengthen the economic "safety net" as long as nobody slipped on the peelings.

I'm not suggesting a switch to "Bonzonomics" would be a sure-fire prescription

for a more appropriate than to imprint the new Bonzo cartoon on smoke detectors? Only instead of sounding conventional alarm signals, this model would emit monkey chatter.

Bonzo stamps — Supplementing the food stamp program, stamps imprinted with the Bonzo cartoon and issued by welfare agencies could be traded in at supermarkets for bunches of bananas. Would greatly strengthen the economic "safety net" as long as nobody slipped on the peelings.

Bonzo mobile — Built to compete with Japanese imports, this auto would be

Just form a Bonzo political committee (BONPAC), and the legislation will be forthcoming.

## Slouch By Jim Earle

"That's it? I come to you, an experienced upperclassman, in all seriousness and ask you how I can make good grades, and all you can come up with is 'study?'"

### The Battalion

USPS 045 360  
Member of Texas Press Association  
Southwest Journalism Conference

Editor: Diana Sultenfuss  
Managing Editor: Gary Barker  
Associate Editor: Denise Richter  
City Editor: Hope E. Paasch  
Assistant City Editor: Beverly Hamilton  
Sports Editor: John Wagner  
Entertainment Editor: Colette Hutchings  
Assistant Entertainment Editor: Diane Yount  
News Editors: Jennifer Carr, Elaine Engstrom, Johna Jo Maurer, Jan Werner, Rebecca Zimmermann  
Staff Writers: Maureen Carmody, Frank Christlieb, Patrice Koranek, John Lopez, Robert McGlohon, Ann Ramsbottom, Kim Schmidt, Patti Schwierzke, Angel Stokes, Tracey Taylor, Joe Tindel  
Copy editors: Daran Bishop, Jan Swaner, Chris Thayer  
Cartoonist: Scott McCullar  
Graphic Artist: Pam Starasinic  
Photographers: David Fisher, Jorge Casari, Ronald W. Emerson, Octavio Garcia, Rob Johnston, Irene Mees

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 and 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, or phone (713) 845-2611.

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.