

# Opinion

## The Battalion

(USPS 045 360)  
 Member of  
 Texas Press Association  
 Southwest Journalism Conference  
**The Battalion Editorial Board**  
 Cathie Anderson, Editor  
 Kirsten Dietz, Managing Editor  
 Loren Steffy, Opinion Page Editor  
 Frank Smith, City Editor  
 Sue Krenek, News Editor  
 Ken Sury, Sports Editor

**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 Battalion are those of 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 Journalism.  
 The Battalion is published Monday through Friday during Texas A&M regular semesters, except for holiday and examination periods.  
 Mail subscriptions are \$17.44 per semester, \$34.62 per school year and \$96.44 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.  
 POSTMASTER: Send address changes to The Battalion, 216 Reed McDonald, Texas A&M University, College Station TX 77843.

## Proof in a bottle

Henry Cisneros, San Antonio mayor and a member of the Texas A&M Board of Regents, took a drug test Monday to set an example for his city's employees — particularly police officers — who are encouraged to submit to similar tests. So what?

City Councilman Ed Harrington, who took a drug test with Cisneros, said he felt compelled to take the test, saying city leaders should be willing to undergo the same procedures they expect their employees to undergo. Many San Antonio employees already are tested before they are hired.

But Cisneros' one-of-the-guys grandstand maneuver is as superfluous as when President Reagan submitted to a drug test. He, too, said he was setting an example.

But such actions encourage only those people who are certain their drug tests will turn out negative to grab a vial and head for the restroom.

People who fear positive results will not be reassured and even may be turned off. Instead of being "one of the guys," both Reagan and Cisneros become "holier than thou."

Drug users don't need to have proof that their superiors are clean. They need to know that they will not be ostracized because of their condition. Although this point has been stressed by public officials, actions like Reagan's and Cisneros' only negate such positive points of this war against drugs.

But does this mean that *everyone* who refuses to take a drug test is guilty? Of course not. Some people merely resent having their most-personal privacy invaded.

Hollow actions by the mayor won't have an effect on his city's drug problem. Instead of making city employees prove they are drug-free, Cisneros should stress that workers who come forward and request help will receive it and focus on rehabilitative programs.

Cisneros may have shown his support by filling up a bottle, but his anti-drug efforts are running on empty.

## Questions unanswered by blind 'enlightenment'

In a recent guest column, heterosexual spokesman Mike Foadre enlightened us with his interpretation of the summer events. However, there are some questions he should consider before he blinds any more people with his enlightenment.

**Marco Roberts**  
 Guest Columnist

First of all, Foadre mentioned by name someone who died of AIDS last semester and seemed to express sympathy. It so happens that this person was my friend, and it was my understanding that the family wished to be discreet about the nature of his death. Many of his relatives still did not know he died of AIDS. Why did Foadre feel the need to use his name? Did he consider how the family might feel? Where's his Christian compassion? What are we to think of his sympathy?

Foadre recalled how innocent and benevolent the "Sexual Dark Ages" were. Does he remember how women were considered property of men, and it was legal for a man to rape his wife? Does he remember that child abuse went unreported because there were no laws against it?

Foadre says that he is happy Jerry Falwell won a suit against Larry Flynt. Does he know about another suit that was filed against Falwell as a result of remarks he made about another church? (Falwell denied making these remarks, even though audio tapes were produced that proved he did.) Does Foadre know all the courts up to the California Superior Court ruled against Falwell, and yet he refuses to pay the award to the plaintiff as ordered by the courts?

How does Foadre feel about the historical fact that, in the 1960s, Falwell denounced many of the Rev. Martin Luther King's civil rights efforts? What is his reaction to Falwell's claim that many Americans do not oppose apartheid and that the media is misrepresenting American sentiment?

While we're at it, in a previous letter to the editor (April 16), Foadre reported a "99 percent divorce rate" among "gay marriages." I would like to know where gay couples report these "marriages," let alone their "divorces?"

In his first guest column (the last Battalion issue of the spring semester),

Foadre said he opposed gay rights out of "love" for homosexuals who needed to be saved, and it was only homosexual itself he opposed.

But in a previous letter to the editor he said that the idea of a homosexual expressing patriotism was enough to want to make him throw-up "considering the source." Why should this be so if he opposes only homosexuality, not the homosexual as a person?

Moving on, how does he feel about the fact that the A&M Christian Fellowship (now the Great Commission Students) was caught illicitly distributing fliers titled "The Myth of the '80s" in the spring of 1984? It was later proven that these fliers contained numerous false claims and misquotes, all of which resulted in a distorted and unfavorable representation of gay people. Copies of these fliers are still available along with a list of "mistakes." How would he justify this?

Judging by Foadre's collection of statements, he seems to consider himself an authority on the interpretation of the Bible. I would like to know if the Bible is to be taken literally or not, or is there an index in the back which tells us which parts to take literally and which not? The Bible says in Genesis chapter one, that the sky is actually a dome, on the other side of which there is water. Is this true? Who did Adam and Eve's children procreate with? And just why does an all-powerful God need human government to get his message across?

If Foadre's truth is so self-evident, then why does he oppose the presentation of opposing points of view (such as literature that is pro-choice or pro-gay rights?) What is the spiritual purpose of joining people to follow moral codes they don't believe in?

I have many more questions, but you get the picture. I realize this is an invitation for Foadre to write another column, but these questions need to be addressed. Furthermore, I believe Foadre owes the family of my friend an apology. My friend never supported Foadre's views, and I don't see why Foadre had to use his name now that he is dead.

**Marco Roberts is a senior political science major and editor of the underground paper, The Scannapican.**



## U.S. shouldn't participate in Aggie Soviets' 'spy-for-a-spy' game



Mark Ude

The Soviets are at it again. Nicholas Daniloff officially was charged with espionage Sunday, which has a penalty of seven to 15 years — or death. This serious accusation follows the possession of top-secret maps and photos "discovered" by KGB agents after being accepted by Daniloff as newspaper clippings — in other words, a classical frame-up in the recognizable spirit of the Soviet Union.

The trumped-up charge is nothing new. The assemblage of foreign journalists is forever wary of set-ups by the KGB and usually follows certain guidelines in avoiding such pitfalls. Daniloff's mistake was that he didn't look at the newspaper clippings he received. He also went alone, which leads to the axiom that there's safety in numbers. Being a prominent U.S. News & World Report correspondent who almost was finished with his tour targeted Daniloff for entanglement. His ability to speak Russian, his aggressive method of reporting and his unusually large number of Soviet contacts did not help him to blend in with the "regular" journalistic crowd.

This will be the first time an American has faced a Soviet court on spy charges since Francis Gary Powers in the U-2 incident of 1960. This attempt by the Soviets is an understood ploy to counter the United States' charge of espionage against Soviet U.N. employee Gennadiy Zakharov, a sort of hostage game to pressure a trade of "suspected spies." There are even ideas that this event is being used by the KGB to cater

The idea of trading Daniloff for Zakharov is out of the question. This would provide the Soviets unlimited propaganda to do the West, along with putting Daniloff in the same category as Zakharov.

to Politburo hardliners and do away with any chance for a summit later this year.

The seriousness of this event again reminds the Free World of the grim realities of life behind the Iron Curtain. Soviet officials are not accustomed to the inquisitiveness of Western journalists and do not appreciate the uncovering of problems within their system of advanced socialism. Even General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's openness in offering information to the West has not eased the oppressive totalitarian society and its ability to engage in entrapment, harassment, arrest, denunciation and expulsion of undesirables.

This is reminiscent of the tragic murder of Maj. Arthur D. Nicholson, who was shot in East Germany in March 1985, after entering a "sensitive" area. His accompanying aides were prevented from administering first aid, while the major bled to death. Nor should we ignore the downing of Korean Airlines flight 007, which innocently was thought to be an RC 135, one of the U.S. Air Force's reconnaissance planes. You know, if we light up our reconnaissance planes like Christmas trees, I wonder what type of lights are going to be on our new Stealth bombers?

Regardless of the plottings of Soviet politics, the question remains on what to do about our American colleague in Moscow's Lefortovo Prison. The idea of trading Daniloff for Zakharov is out of

the question. This would provide the Soviets unlimited propaganda to do the West, along with putting Daniloff in the same category as Zakharov. It also would make the Soviets think that whenever one of their bumbles and is caught, all they do is arrest a journalist of the other country and to trade in a fair way could arrest one of their Izvestia-ists, but that would only lead to a hostage race to see who could trade the greater number of newspapers to trade for spies.

The only practical solution was for the State Department to dig, refuse to fall for this amateurish tempt to spring the Soviets' Unlimited spy.

Once the Soviets realize that they not blackmail the United States rendering Zakharov, a second and important question is brought to At what point do we draw the line of our citizens abroad peacefully allow an American locked away illegally without press we allow other nations to jail one of our citizen, what about two Americans? Or a dozen? 50? And what is the response? The president has hinted this latest Soviet action will risk dazing international relations global event will it take to cause concern or alarm?

**Mark Ude is a senior geography major and a columnist for The Battalion.**

## Mail Call

### The real thing

EDITOR:

My husband graduated from Texas A&M in 1967 and needless to say we are looking forward to the Aggies showing Louisiana State University how to play football!

We are also looking forward to seeing the fighting Texas Aggie Band at halftime. LSU prides themselves on their band and we feel they need to see the real thing!

Please tell the yell leaders that we may be outnumbered in bodies at the game but not in spirit — we'll do our best to make A&M proud and help Coach Jackie Sherrill and his team to another winning season!

Gig'em Aggies!

John and Sheila Eeds

### Thanks for taking the time

EDITOR:

Let's talk about Mike Foadre and his wonderful "While you were out..." column, shall we?

Golly, a lot of interesting things happened around A&M while we were gone. We sure are glad Foadre took time away from his busy agenda of setting the world straight to tell us all about it.

We didn't know that in the "sexual dark ages" we didn't have to worry about rape. Gosh, it's amazing to discover that child abuse didn't exist back then either. Wow, we sure are glad Foadre lived back then so he could tell us all about it.

And his sentimental farewell to a local AIDS victim really warmed our hearts.

Oh, of course! Down with anything not preaching the gospel. Did Foadre get to see any of "The Human Animal"? Or was he too busy knocking on people's doors that night?

And where's the whole story about that lawsuit? And what about an unbiased report about Jim Mattox? What are these?

Well, there's one good thing, though. The best thing about guest columnists is that you don't have to invite them back.

Mark Nair '88  
 Ken Womack '88  
 Jerry Horan '87

Letters to the editor should not exceed 300 words in length. The staff reserves the right to edit letters for style and length, but will every effort to maintain the author's intent. Each letter must be signed and must include the address and telephone number of the writer.