

Ferraro selection tainted by process

For the first time in American history, the presidential candidate of one of the major parties has chosen a woman as his running mate.

It was disclosed this morning that Rep. Geraldine Ferraro of New York will be Walter Mondale's choice for the vice presidential nomination, ending weeks of bickering about possible candidates.

But Ferraro's choice was somewhat tainted by the three-ring-circus atmosphere Mondale gave the selection procedure.

Historically, vice presidential selections have been low-key, but Mondale's candidates have been interviewed amid extensive publicity. His all-too-obvious pandering to women, blacks and other minority groups was obnoxious.

Mondale's attempts to choose a vice-presidential candidate that would help him get votes is understandable — it's part of the process. But the choice also must be based on a person's qualifications, in the event that a president should die or become incapacitated.

Ferraro probably meets those requirements.

And what of those not chosen? Listing potential candidates may have adverse effects on those who weren't selected — if only because they have been rejected publicly.

We expect the presidential race to be a circus — that's part of the political process. But it's a sad state of affairs when choosing a vice president becomes a circus all by itself.

— The Battalion Editorial Board



Tuition increases should be fully considered

Once again, the attempt to raise tuition has failed. The concern of the college students of Texas and our ability to act in time was underestimated.



Johnny Hatch

As most of you know, Gov. Mark White called a Special Session to deal with Public Elementary and Secondary Education in Texas, including teacher pay increases. One of the methods proposed

to fund these educational reforms was going to be an increase in college tuition.

The decrease in oil revenues, for the state, has caused a problem in funding these educational reforms. One solution to the problem came from Rep. Gary Thompson of Abilene, who tried to increase tuition in Texas (as he has attempted to do the last two sessions!).

Thanks go to Gov. Mark White, Rep. Wilhelmina Delco of Austin and Rep. Neeley Lewis of Bryan, all of whom opposed the bill because stu-

dents had not been given time to testify.

Although Rodney Schlosser, the University of Texas student body president, and I were the only students to testify against the tuition increase, we expressed the feeling of all students by saying that a tuition increase is something that could not be dealt with overnight, and that the state legislature should wait until January to discuss the issue. The delay is needed to study the possible impact of the increase on the students.

To give you an idea of the impact, here are some figures. It is claimed

that students pay 3.7 percent of the cost of tuition (not counting fees). We pay \$4 per credit hour and the state pays \$104 per hour — a total of \$108 per hour. The bill would increase the amount we pay 2 percent every year until the amount reaches 15 percent. (From 3.7 percent in 1984 to 5.7 percent in 1985 to 15 percent in approximately five years.) Resident students taking a 15 hour course load now pay \$120 a year in tuition. By 1990 they would pay \$486 a year (\$16 per hour) in tuition. These figures do not account for inflation. The final total could very possibly be even higher.

There are many students who cannot afford a 405 percent increase in tuition.

This is just one of the issues that affect you as students. I challenge each one of you to take the time to become a registered voter and let your State Representative and Senators know you care about what happens in Austin. Let us not be underestimated again!

Johnny Hatch is a junior business administration major and the director of the Legislative Study Group at Texas A&M.

Stockyard image disappears from political scene

By DICK WEST
Columnist for
United Press International

WASHINGTON — One factor apparent to everyone as the Democratic and Republican conventions draw near is the decline of the cow as a force in American political life.

There was a time when that noble beast not only give us milk for our corn flakes, leather for our shoes and horns in which to keep our powder dry.

The cow also was responsible for most of the municipal auditoriums big enough to hold a national gathering of major party candidates and delegates.

I remember a convention in Chicago when the workspace assigned to the press consisted of indoor cattle stalls next to the Stockyards arena where the delegates were choosing "the next president of the United States" — or a reasonably accurate facsimile.

The copy we wrote was never heaped as high as the stuff the politicians were piling up next door. Yet, it was obvious the cow and the political

Representatives of virtually every race, color, creed and sex known to the civilized world have been mentioned as possible vice presidential candidates. Discounting Gary Hart's western boots, few if any cowboys were on Mondale's list of visitors, however.

convention had a meaningful relationship.

Time was when a party assembly in San Francisco would have taken place in the Cow Palace. No more. The Democrats are meeting next week in something called the Muscone Center.

Even in Dallas, scene of the Republican National Convention in August, the hall has no cattle connection. The site is known simply as the Convention Center.

Namewise, San Francisco and Dallas might as well be hosts to the Vegetarian Party.

If convention halls in Texas, of all places, have no bovine tie-in, what chance does a cowboy have in national politics?

Judging from Walter Mondale's search for a vice presidential running mate, very little.

Since the end of the presidential primary season, the likely Democratic nominee has interviewed members of just about any political minority you might name — save one.

Representatives of virtually every race, color, creed and sex known to the civilized world have been mentioned as possible vice presidential candidates. Discounting Gary Hart's western boots, few if any cowboys were on Mondale's list of visitors, however.

It wasn't always that way. Voters old enough to remember Will Rogers will recall a time when cowboys were mentioned

for the top job, not just second place on the ticket.

The ebbing of the cow's political influence can be attributed, I believe, to the deterioration of the western movie in our society.

Roy Rogers? Gene Autry? Surely the record will show they were every bit as competent as film actors as President Reagan.

Moreover, both are still prominent in American life — Rogers in a fast food chain and Autry as the owner of a major league baseball team. And certainly age would be no problem. Yet neither can match Reagan's political accomplishments.

The answer may be that they were singing cowboys, whereas Reagan never warbled a note in the silver screen. Or was it a case of rising meat prices?

Whatever the reason, the political fortunes of the cow definitely have tumbled in the past few decades. Mondale's only concession to the ranch vote has been to ask, "Where's the beef?"

Letting Reagan be Reagan in campaign

By DAVID S. BRODER
Columnist for
The Washington Post Writers Group

DETROIT — The most publicized debate in American politics concerns Walter Mondale's choice of a running mate. But the most significant debate is probably the one taking place backstage at the White House about the kind of a race President Reagan should run this fall.

Four years ago, when Reagan was here accepting the Republican nomination, there was no such debate. He was leading President Jimmy Carter in the polls and conceivably could have coasted in on the wave of a public disillusionment with the incumbent administration.

But Reagan had been talking issues for 16 years on the national stage and, on the eve of his most important campaign, he was not about to muzzle his beliefs.

As a result of his determination, the platform his supporters wrote not only condemned the "failures" of the Democrats but laid out the programs Reagan proposed to substitute. Reagan ran on that platform, and during the fall campaign told voters across the country that if they put him in the White House with a supportive Congress, he would put those programs into effect.

They heard him and believed him, and when the returns came in, Reagan had won as close to a mandate as the American political system can produce. The stage was set for the policy revolution in taxes, domestic spending and defense that went whistling through Congress in the first eight months of 1981.

With Reagan approaching another campaign and once again in the lead, there are those in the White House and his campaign organization who see the possibility of using 1984 as another mandating election.

They see the opportunity for Reagan to set forth his second-term agenda, to campaign on it, and to recreate the conditions that could make 1985 as productive a year on Capitol Hill from his point of view as 1981 was.

This time, however, there is no unanimity on the proposition. The counter-argument is that Reagan can win — and perhaps even win their distaste for what happened in the "Carter-Mondale years."

An advocate of the "bold approach" to the election said recently that he and others are "trying to suppress the inclination to run a no-risk, Rose Garden campaign." These "hawks" want two debates with Mondale, not just one. They want the President "to tip

his hand on his second-term economic plan, starting with his acceptance speech." And they want him to "campaign as hard for Republicans in Congress as he did in 1980," in hopes of maintaining most of the present Republican majority in the Senate and regaining most of the 26 House seats lost in 1982.

But when I put these exact propositions to one of the President's most influential political and policy advisers the other day, he treated each one as if it was a leftover firecracker that might blow up in his face.

"There will be a debate," he said, "but it's too early to get into a debate about debates... We could be 10 points behind in October and need another debate... But the main thing is to be flexible."

As for the President "tipping his hand" on his second-term plans, he said, "I think we'll talk in general principles." Those who argue that Reagan should advance a specific tax-reform and tax-simplification plan, he said, forget that the 1980 tax program (of across-the-board rate cuts for three years) was "a simple idea that could be grasped by Joe Sixpack." The implication was that whatever emerges from the Treasury and White House this time as "tax simplification" will be too complex for the voters to understand.

As for Reagan using his personal political capital to try and restore working control of the House and hold down Republican losses in the Senate, this adviser seemed skeptical. He talked about the habit of ticket-splitting and the odds against several incumbent Republican senators.

The man who said these things has impeccable political credentials and has earned the President's confidence. But if his cautionary advice is followed, instead of the aggressive strategy others in the campaign are recommending, the country certainly — and the President probably — will be the loser.

Reagan did not become President by avoiding risks. He is a politician with strong convictions and large designs, not a seeker of the status quo.

He may win reelection without giving Americans a look at his second-term plans. But he and his party cannot win a mandate that way.

A debate on the second-term plan is what the country deserves. It is also what Reagan's record entitles voters to expect from him. He has always been emphatic in his beliefs, and pragmatic in his practices. When it comes to the campaign, the best we can hope for is that his handlers let Reagan be Reagan.

The Battalion
USPS 045 360

Member of
Texas Press Association
Southwest Journalism Conference

The Battalion Editorial Board

Rebecca Zimmermann, Editor
Bill Robinson, Editorial Page Editor
Shelley Hoekstra, City Editor
Kathleen Hart, News Editor
Travis Tingle, Sports Editor

The Battalion Staff

Assistant City Editor.....Robin Black
Assistant News Editor.....Dena Brown,
Brigid Brockman, Bonnie Langford
Staff Writers.....Ed Alanis,
Kari Fluegel, Bob McGlohon,
Sarah Oates,
Karen Bloch,
Copy Writers.....Cindy Davis,
Copy Editor.....Tracie Holub
Photographers.....Peter Rocha,
Eric Evan Lee

Editorial Policy

The Battalion is a non-profit, self-supporting newspaper operated as a community service to Texas A&M and Bryan-College Station.

Opinions expressed in the Editorial Board or the author, and do not necessarily represent the opinions of Texas A&M administrators, faculty or 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.

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.

Letters Policy

Letters to the Editor should not exceed 300 words in length. 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 be signed and must include the address and telephone number of the writer.

The Battalion is published Monday through Friday during Texas A&M regular 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.
Second class postage paid at College Station, TX 77843.