

GSS recognition a step forward

After seven years of litigation, Gay Student Services has won the right to be a University-recognized student organization. On Friday the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ordered Texas A&M University to recognize GSS as a student organization.

Paranoia and astonishment probably will run rampant on campus. What? Homosexuals at Texas A&M? Never. Allow a homosexual group to meet on campus? Never.

But times have changed. The GSS — an organization of Texas A&M students who happen to be homosexual — should be recognized by the University. The University should have recognized the group years ago.

The Court of Appeals ruled Friday that: "At (the) heart of the First Amendment is the freedom to choose, even if such choice does not accord with the state's view."

The Battalion Editorial Board applauds that decision.

If Texas A&M is ever to grow beyond narrow-minded views and become free intellectually, organizations of all types must be recognized.

The University's argument that the

GSS is more social oriented, not service oriented, has never held up under scrutiny. Every organization is inherently service-oriented because it provides services — social, educational and professional — to its members.

Charges already have been made that the group is a "dating service." Other people argue that by recognizing the GSS, Texas A&M is supporting homosexuality.

Hogwash.

University recognition will simply allow the organization to hold meetings on campus and to post flyers announcing meetings. The GSS also will be able to apply for funds set aside for organizations, but organizations aren't guaranteed funds. So screams that the organization will be funded by the University are premature.

Texas A&M probably will appeal the decision, if only to save face. The case could go on indefinitely, eating up time and money. It's time for Texas A&M to face the inevitability of change and acknowledge the group's potential to benefit a segment of the University.

— The Battalion Editorial Board



Computers becoming part of American life

By BONNIE LANGFORD

You've seen the television ad. It opens with Junior's parents sending him on a train bound for college. The next scene shows the sad scholar returning home, a washout at college, all because he didn't know how to use a computer.

Another ad in magazines proclaims in loud letters: "Johnny can't program." It would be scary if the teenage Johnny couldn't do math or read English, but once again, it's traumatic because he doesn't know how to use a computer. You get the idea. Computer companies are proclaiming that the future is computers, and you had better get programming now.

Joining in the proclamations are the media. Besides the nightly news reporting about the wonderful computer innovations, more than 350 computer publications exist to tout the tales of technology. InfoWorld, a mag-

azine for micro users, gleefully reports that 75 percent of the American work force will be using computers by 1990, despite the fact that only 20 percent used computers between 1970 and 1980.

All of these proclamations are exciting people about computers. Part of the excitement can be seen in the number of people who are running out to buy computers, for Junior and for themselves. They are frightened of being left behind with this new technology.

People are stepping up and plunking down their money, and supporting three times as many computer firms as they did in the last decade — 1,566 companies existed in 1982. Word is out about the computer promised land, and everyone wants to be able to store menus, learn to read music, keep track of credit card numbers and teach their children basic math skills.

The promise list goes on and on, like a child's Christmas list. And those buying the sparkling new improved technology are like children, expecting it to end all their problems. It's going to be exciting, fun and educational.

But like innocent youngsters, too many are suckered into buying something they just don't need. Fifty percent of the people who buy personal computers worth less than \$300 don't use them, reports Link Resources, a marketing-research firm. Overall, 25 percent of people buying personal computers at any price don't use them.

The sparkling new improved technology discourages people because they don't understand it. They want the wonderful future that computers offer, but they don't have the right software for their needs, or they

haven't decided what they want the computer for.

People want the great promises of computer futures even more for their children. They want the public schools to teach Junior. And better still, teach him how to program; 70 percent of Americans polled by Associated Press said that computer literacy should become part of the high school requirements. It's so complicated, Junior better get an early start.

Yes, one day Junior will have to use a computer. The ability to use a computer will become another office skill, like using a typewriter. But how many people know how to put together a typewriter that works? Computers are going to become like typewriters — easy for anybody to use.

One mother of two college students, whom she had pushed to get a computer background, found out what the

real story was — from computers.

She was touring a museum of when she decided her feet had to rest. Several comfortable chairs were available — in front of some computer terminals. The computers were creative guides to school children to art. Each terminal had bright flashing lights that gave better of the mother. Soon she happily immersed, creating shapes, sizes and colors. She had the computer literacy she pushed her children to get. She knew FORTRAN from a computer but she was working away. When children found her, one exclaimed "Mom, you're using a computer." "Gee," she said, surprised. "Not so hard after all."

(Bonnie Langford is a senior journalism major and an assistant editor for The Battalion.)

Taxpayers shouldn't fund sexual groups

Gay Student Services won its case against Texas A&M and is now applying to become a recognized student organization of the University as per the decision of the court (see story, page 1).



Steve Thomas

And the gays deserve praise for using a more constructive method of stating their case than the laughable "Gay Supporters Wear Blue-jeans" day.

However,

No sexually-based organization should be allowed recognition by any university or college. Individual or group rights are not restricted by refusing state support to any group who wants a public relations base for its particular sexual preference.

It doesn't matter what kind of sexual methodology it happens to be; hetero, homo or otherwise. It doesn't matter if other universities (like U.T.) already have a gay organization, that doesn't make it right; let them jump off the bridge alone.

Gay rights have nothing to do with it. Homosexuality is a method of having sex, or, abstractly, is an attitude

If one group of this type is afforded the sanction of a state's educational institution, then all such organizations should receive the same privilege. The point is that none of them should be recognized by any university, especially not one that doesn't even recognize fraternities and sororities.

about who one wishes to have sex with. This is a private affair, as contrasted with something indubitably public like your sex or the color of your skin. If gays are discriminated against, they should have legal protection.

But protecting them legally and providing them a state-sanctioned forum for PR (including the use of facilities and funds derived from tax dollars) are, quite obviously, two different things.

I'm sure there are other atypically-sexual factions (the word "atypical" is used by Webster's dictionary in describing homosexuality) or other sexually-oriented groups who would like the recognition of a university or other state support in presenting their case before the public.

For instance, those who favor sex outside of marriage may feel oppressed by religious groups and legislation. Possibly a solution would be to form a club at Texas A&M: The Aggie League of Fornicators.

Or maybe people who are interested in animals sense a negative reaction from their friends and colleagues. They could merge with the GSS and form the Texas A&M Sodomy Society; or they could remain autonomous with the Order of Progressive Bestiality Beneficence.

These may sound improbable, but they illustrate the basis of the issue: a group of people who feel their ideas of sexuality are not well accepted and therefore wish to be recognized as a University organization so they can educate the public about their positive attributes.

Included in this, I'm sure, are some ideas about being supportive of member students who have difficulty adjusting to society, or possibly other adjustment problems. But the fact that their sexuality reflects on their societal interaction does not justify university recognition as a method of integrating them with their peers.

That type of state support is found elsewhere.

If one group of this type is afforded the sanction of a state's educational institution, then all such organizations should receive the same privilege. The point is that none of them should be recognized by any university, especially not one that doesn't even recognize fraternities and sororities.

Public relations for sex-based groups should be funded by someone besides the state (Joe Taxpayer). Sexual counseling for both hetero and homosexuals (and any others) is available through the university counseling service.

And that is where the state money for such things should be spent.

(Steve Thomas is a senior journalism major and a columnist for The Battalion.)

Letter: Speaking ability necessary

Editor:

Congratulations on the wise placement of Rebecca Dimeo's column (Aug. 2) on Krishnamurty Muralidhar in the editorial section of The Battalion. In the ninth paragraph of her column she openly admits her bias and thereby, we feel, the worthlessness of the article elsewhere.

Ms. Dimeo is absolutely right regarding the fact that Indians are well educated in the use of English. Their sentences can easily surpass the complexity of the language of an average student. But, their ability to communicate these well chosen words is se-

riously lacking due to their accent.

Ms. Dimeo noted that Muralidhar had to do exceedingly well in school and on the Test of English as a Foreign Language, yet these only apply to written English and do not reflect speaking ability.

In Ms. Dimeo's derisive use of the student's brash evaluation of Mr. Muralidhar, she shows that she possesses a bigotry against ineloquence — yet that is, in a way, the posture Dimeo is attacking.

To close the article, Dimeo quotes Mr. Muralidhar. He says, "I definitely

think some students have reservations about me. By the time they get out, I hope I've changed their opinions." It is unfortunate that the spoken language is used as a yardstick to measure the teaching ability of foreigners. There is no alternative; lectures are spoken. In our opinion, therefore, the university should put eloquence on equal footing with raw knowledge when hiring.

Kent Hill
Wesley Young
Joe Perry

