

opinion

Presidential signals stronger

by Donald A. Davis
United Press International

WASHINGTON — For a man who won't say whether he will seek reelection, President Reagan is running a pretty good campaign.

The president maintains in public that he cannot reveal his decision about a second term at this time because it would risk making him ineffective either as a lame duck or a man putting what might be perceived as a political spin on his decisions.

Even so, his top aides are not taking any chance that the arena will not be ready if he chooses to seek another four years in the White House. The past few weeks have been filled with examples of how a noncampaign can be orchestrated.

In a brief Houston trip, Reagan singled out a possible Democratic foe — former Vice President Walter Mondale — for some verbal shots. He criticized remarks by "former Vice President Malaise" and said he got a valentine that he thought came from Mondale because it had a "bleeding heart." It was the first time Reagan had openly spoken against any contender.

Back in Washington, he stumbled on some answers in an interview with reporters and the Washington Post reported the performance was confused and rambling. That drew quick angry retorts from White House aides sensitive that such stories portrayed the president as being less than lucid. Such a description

could be lethal to anyone seeking office, and particularly to someone of Reagan's age.

On Thursday, Reagan flew west on what amounted to a campaign swing through three states.

When he got off of Air Force One in San Antonio, the president veered sharply from the normal arrival procedure where he waves to a clutch of television cameras, gets immediately into his limousine and rushes off to whatever appearance is scheduled.

This time, a U.S. Air Force brass band was waiting in welcome, breaking into "Hail to the Chief" as he walked down a corridor formed by beretwearing members of an honor guard. Moments later, he was working a crowd of several hundred Air Force dependents, shaking hands and kissing at least two babies while cameras clicked away.

An aide said that it was felt in White House councils that appropriate advantage had not been taken of the normal honors due a president — particularly when such things as flags and cheering crowds create excellent television footage.

In a downtown plaza a short time after the dramatic arrival, Reagan courted the Hispanic vote by making a speech to mark the Cinco de Mayo holiday and by having his photo taken eating Mexican food.

Next came Phoenix, and Reagan

speaking out against gun control — one of his favorite topics — before the National Rifle Association. He was interrupted more than 30 times by applause as he deftly gave the audience a hard line on why guns are good.

In nearby Sun City, a posh retirement community, Reagan made a pitch for the support of the elderly, talking about Social Security and his own age of 72.

On Saturday, from California, the president dedicated his five-minute radio show to American motherhood with an address on "Mother's Day."

Finally, a speech in Ashland, Ohio, was a recital of Reagan's conservative beliefs — everything from the dangers of big government to the "failure" of such "social spending schemes" as food stamps.

The president smoothly touched base with conservatives who might be worried that he is too willing to make a deal with liberals to get his legislative programs passed. Aides portrayed it as "vintage Reagan."

Within the White House, Reagan may be getting conflicting advice, but chief of staff James Baker said recently that "all of us who work with him on a day-to-day basis are firmly convinced that he will run."

"We don't think there's a lot of doubt there and we're sending those kind of signals," said Baker.

The signals are getting stronger every week.



Ex-quarterback calls soccer 'socialist' game

by Steve Gerstel
United Press International

WASHINGTON — Jack Kemp, the aging jock, knew in a split second he had pulled a real bonehead play.

Kemp, a 13-year pro quarterback and once American Football League player of the year, is now a congressman from upstate New York and a darling of the right-wing.

So it was proper — both as a congressman and a former football star — that Kemp should participate in the debate on a resolution urging that the next World Cup soccer championships be awarded the United States.

Kemp would have been better off watching some old Buffalo Bills game films.

He began his remarks by conceding he was speaking with "tongue in cheek," but wound up with foot in mouth.

Never known for his humor, Kemp tried to make the distinction between North American football and the British association football (futbol, in Spanish), which is called soccer in the United States.

"Football is football, soccer is soccer," Kemp declared. "Soccer does not have a quarterback, only football has a quarterback."

So what. Football doesn't have a goalie. He then went on to say that the "Super Bowl is becoming in the world equal to the World Cup, and some of us think it will surpass it."

The truth is that interest in the Super Bowl is limited to the United States, Canada, Japan and some expatriates in other countries. The World Cup, which comes only every four years, has teams from European, African, Latin American and Asian countries. And it draws worldwide attention.

Unwilling to quit, Kemp expressed concern that the resolution, which uses the word football rather than soccer or futbol, might confuse "all of those" boys and girls.

Then, Kemp really waded in. "I think it is important for all those

young out there, who some day may play real football, where you throw the ball and run with it and put it in hands, a distinction should be made. Football is democratic, capitalism, as soccer is a European socialist."

It was at this moment — just as he about declared all those kids all over country un-American — that Kemp medicalized he should have stayed in the room.

"I do not think I want to leave the record," Kemp said, indicating he would revise his remarks in the Congressional Record, a privilege granted members of the House and Senate.

To his credit, Kemp let the comment stand. Perhaps, he feared an instant replay.

Although Kemp was ready to drop the subject, Rep. Gerry Studds, D-Mass., not.

He confessed "confusion," but stumbled into the debate while Kemp speaking and wanted to know if this the same World Cup championship. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger an ardent fan, was seeking for the United States.

Assured both Kissinger and former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance of pushing the proposal, Studds felt astonishment that these two would try to "bring a socialist game to the United States."

Rep. Trent Lott, R-Miss., who apparently was not listening, in his speech attributed the "socialist" remark to Studds.

Not so, Studds said.

"Not only was that not my characterization, I was expressing my abject belief that the gentleman from New York had defined football as, what did he call it, 'democratic capitalism,' and so which is, of course, an older sport which we stole the European word for 'socialism.'"

"I found that a challenging intellectual concept and that is why I was reticent to it again," Studds said.

It was not Kemp's finest outing.



CONFIDENTIALLY... AFTER THIS EXPERIENCE, I'VE HAD IT WITH BEING A SURROGATE MOTHER...

Time to look at campaign financing

by Clay F. Richards
United Press International

WASHINGTON — More than \$1 billion was spent on American elections in 1980, about twice what they cost in 1976.

Herbert Alexander, head of the Citizens Research Foundation, which makes the definitive study of campaign finance costs every four years, estimates the 1982 elections, even without the president on the ballot, probably cost \$1 billion.

But he says that sum is not a big expense to elect public officials from dog catcher to president.

It is roughly the same amount of money as the legal fees and related costs of the recent IBM and AT&T antitrust suits; the same as the combined annual advertising budgets of Procter & Gamble and Sears, Roebuck & Co., and less the estimated bets made on the Super Bowl.

What is of greater concern is where the money comes from.

Uncle Sam is biggest contributor to political campaigns. In 1980, the government spent about \$100 million in matching funds for presidential primary candidates, financing the Democratic and Republican national conventions and all the

expenses of the presidential candidates in the general election.

One would think that political parties would be the next biggest contributors, and up until 1980, that was the case. But for the first time in 1980, political action committees spent more than the parties.

PACs spent a total of \$95 million, while state, local and national political parties combined spent \$89 million.

Groups like Common Cause have declared PAC money evil and issue frequent reports tying contributions by these special interest groups to the voting records of the members of Congress who get the money.

But the evil is not necessarily PAC money. The evil is that we spent more money gambling on a football game than electing public officials; that political parties do not spend more money on elections.

Part of the problem is the election reform laws enacted in the wake of Watergate. In 1974, Congress was concerned about millionaires who were seen as buying influence with staggering individual contributions.

PACs were just getting started 10 years ago. So Congress said special interests could contribute up to \$5,000

each to a campaign while an individual could give only \$1,000.

It's time for Congress to re-examine those limits, along with the restrictions on what can be given to and given by political parties. The cost of political advertising and travel — the two main expenses of any campaign — have risen drastically since 1974 and the old contribution limits are no longer realistic.

As Alexander says: "A better method of off-setting the development of PACs without unduly restricting their growth or limiting their contributions would be to increase the \$1,000 individual contribution limit to \$5,000 and repeal the \$25,000 overall contribution limit for individuals" to all campaigns in an election year.

"This approach not only would compensate for the damaging effect of inflation on the ability of individuals to participate financially in political campaigns; it also would begin to counterbalance PAC contributions and reduce financial pressures on candidates by providing them alternatives to PAC donations.

"At the same time it would respect the right of interest groups to organize and to seek to influence the political process."

The Battalion

USPS 045 360

Member of
Texas Press Association
Southwest Journalism Conference

Editor Hope E. Paasch
City Editor Kelley Smith
Sports Editor John Wagner
News Editors Daran Bishop, Brian Boyer,
Beverly Hamilton, Tammy Jones
Staff Writers Scott Griffin, Robert
McGlohon, Angel Stokes,
Joe Tindel
Copy editors Kathleen Hart, Tracey Taylor
Cartoonist Scott McCullar
Photographers Brenda Davidson, Eric Lee,
Barry Papke, Peter Rocha

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 courses 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 too long. 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 telephone number of the writer.
Columns and guest editorials also are welcome, but are not subject to the same length constraints as letters. Address all inquiries and correspondence to: The Battalion, 216 Reed McDonald, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, or phone (409) 845-2611.

The Battalion is published Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday during both Texas A&M regular sessions, 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 created by it. Rights of reproduction of all other matter reserved.

Second class postage paid at College Station, TX 77843.