

Opinion

Fashion update: Muffy and Suzi are wearing bows!

A lot of people are worried about their lives being infiltrated by various alien and damaging forces. Some people are afraid that communists are infiltrating our country. Some people are afraid that secular humanists are infiltrating our schools. Some people are afraid that AIDS is infiltrating our blood supply. Some people are afraid that fluoride is infiltrating our water supply. Some people are afraid that Joe Barton and Jim Bakker are actually the same person. (Ever notice that they look alike, have ugly wives and always seem to be wanting more money for dumb causes like Star Wars, Contras and sending missionaries to California?)



Karl Pallmeyer

All that aside, there has been an infiltration on the Texas A&M campus. No, it's not teapigs or hippies or birds that crap on the sidewalk. It's something worse. It's something that comes from the lowest reaches of fashion hell. It's the BOWHEADS.

Their distinguishing characteristics are denim skirts, too much makeup, mopeds, high-pitched squeals of laughter, silver shoes, silver jewelry, silver purses and — you can't miss it — big ugly bows on their heads.

You see them all over campus and especially in the Blocker Building, where they attend classes such as BANA 217,

Accounting 209, Yuppie Science 374 and Husband Finding 403B. If you go to any trendy place like Zephyrs or the Rox-Z you won't be able to throw a Corona bottle without hitting at least four of them and getting beer all over the Greek letters on their sweatshirts. If you're stupid enough to go to a mall, you'll see more bowheads per shoe store than you'll hear bad songs per hour on a local radio station.

I have never understood women's fashions, but since I like looking at women, I can't help but notice what they're wearing. I never understood why women a few years ago felt they had to wear those gold metal belts that Wonder Woman used to keep her star-spangled bloomers from falling down. I never understood why women felt they had to take every necklace they owned and twist them into one big necklace. I never understood why women felt they had to wear shoes made out of the same plastic used in the baskets that burger joints use to hold french fries and onion rings.

Today, I don't understand why some women feel they have to wear earrings the size of hubcaps. I don't understand why some women feel they have to roll up the legs of their sweatsuit pants to just under the knee. I don't understand why some women feel they have to carry a purse that looks like it's been wrapped in Reynolds Wrap and is ready to go into the oven next to the baked potatoes.

For some reason, silver seems to be in this year. It's in the purses, the jewelry, the bows and the shoes. It's in everything, except for my pocket. Silver jew-

elry has never been uncommon, but what's the deal with silver shoes?

I saw a commercial for Marilyn Monroe shoes on TV the other day. I guess many women admire Marilyn Monroe's movies and would like to wear shoes associated with her. But where did the silver shoes come from? Was there some movie hero who wore silver shoes? I can't think of one except for the Tin Woodsman in "The Wizard of Oz."

What possessed hundreds of supposedly intelligent college women to wear the same type of bows that they used to wear to Sunday school when they were nine years old? Are those shiny black-patten-leather shoes also going to make a comeback? How about training bras?

All kidding aside, the bows are useful. I have compiled a list of five uses for bows and bowheads.

1. Kites: It used to be fun to take your date out to a park and fly a kite. Now, if you're dating a bowhead, you don't have to buy a kite. Just tie a string to your date and watch her fly.
2. Airfoils: The type of women who wear bows were not always called bowheads. They used to be called airfoils in the days before bows. The bows help make these women more aerodynamic.
3. Fans: Get two bowheads together and start them talking — it's not that hard to do. The movements of their heads and bows will start the air circulating in even the most stuffy room. It's economical, too.
4. Satellite Dishes: Why spend money

on expensive satellite dishes when you can just get a bowhead to stand on your roof. Find a bowhead wearing one of those huge, silver bows and you'll be able to pick up signals from every TV satellite in orbit. The only trouble is that bowheads tend to be partial to "Dynasty" and "General Hospital."

5. Oral Sex: I have a good use for

bows during oral sex, but I can't give you any details since this is a family newspaper.

The bowheads are here, but thank the way fashions change, they won't be here for long.

Karl Pallmeyer is a journalism graduate and a columnist for The Battalion.



Mail Call

Who is the wise man and who is the fool?

John D. Seldenrust '87
Rita Ornelas '87

Jesus the ticket to heaven?

EDITOR:

May I present a mainline Christian perspective for John Spessard's consideration? First, I am a Catholic. Second, this is not a definitive reply; 2,000 years of human richness and scholarly learning is not condensable.

All mainline Christians believe the Bible must be taken as a whole. As you know, it does contain some contradictions, but consider this. If I were to point to a constellation, you could either look to the sky, seeing stars or look at my finger, limiting your perception. The important question, "To what does the Bible point?" is best answered with the help of serious scripture scholars.

Concerning salvation, God reconciled himself to all through Jesus. Salvation is a gift, not bought but freely given to all. Our task is not to limit God's giving but to receive and to respond. We respond to God's love every time we desire and attempt to do good. Neither knowledge of Jesus nor an explicitly expressed faith in him is a prerequisite for salvation. The only necessity is our best response to God's love. Indeed, we could imagine our loving God saving all people.

I invite Spessard to take a hard look at mainline Christianity. If, after he knows our theology, he maintains his convictions, I rejoice with him. However, if he does not seek, he violates his own claims to free thinking by being selective in the topics he considers. Peace.

Albert Babin '90

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 classification, address and telephone number of the writer.

Farmers Write!

Cutting into America's future

During the 1984 election, an overwhelming majority of students on the Texas A&M campus cast their votes for President Ronald Reagan. Republicans still heavily outnumber Democrats on this campus. But while students are supporting Reagan, Reagan definitely is not supporting students.

Kirsten Dietz
Guest Columnist

Reagan's proposed budget for fiscal year 1988 is considered by the National Education Association to be the most anti-education budget to date. If the administration's reductions are enacted, the level of federal education assistance would be lower than when Reagan took office six years ago.

This year, the Department of Education's budget is \$19.5 billion. Unless stopped by Congress, the administration will cut \$5.5 billion, or 28 percent, from the fiscal year 1988 budget.

The picture is particularly grim for higher education, as more than half of the proposed cuts will be in student assistance programs. Pell Grants will be cut by \$1.2 billion, barring an estimated 900,000 lower-income students from the program. The Guaranteed Student Loan program will be cut by \$1.8 billion.

However, while federal assistance is being cut, Secretary of Education William Bennett admits that the cost of college has risen 85 percent faster than the inflation rate in the last five years.

So where can college students turn if the federal government is not willing to help? Additional state support is not an option in many states, including Texas, as we discovered the hard way when higher education budgets were cut as the price of oil plummeted.

As a solution, Bennett advocates a shift from student grants to student loans because, he says, "The person who benefits from higher education should pay the cost." Realistically, this alternative is unworkable. Recent studies show that the prospect of becoming increasingly indebted discourages low income and minority students from seeking post-second-

ary education.

Too often students are seen as whining about the cost of higher education. But they are not the only ones who oppose these slights by the federal government. A recent Washington Post-ABC News Poll shows that 46 percent of the American people thought federal spending for student aid should be increased, 39 percent thought it should remain at its current level and 14 percent said it should be decreased.

Is all the fuss worth it? Why should we care if disadvantaged or minority students cannot afford extra schooling? The most important reason is that a college education nearly doubles an individual's earning power, allowing them to contribute more to the nation's economic system, instead of depending on it. This is something the administration should understand.

The increasing importance of education after high school is further stressed by a Carnegie Foundation panel of leading educators and industrialists. After a lengthy study, the panel concluded: "Twelve years of formal schooling will increasingly be insufficient for our citizens. In the future, almost everyone will need some form of post-high school education if they are to remain empowered, economically productive, and civically prepared."

Worse than Reagan's desire to cut funding is that Bennett does not protest these proposed cuts. Instead, despite the strong support for continued higher education funding, he says it is "not my style" to object to the figures from the Office of Management and Budget. He seems to pride himself on never asking for increases on education department accounts.

As secretary of education, Bennett's job is to work in the best interests of the nation's education system and its students. As president of the country, Reagan should be concerned with the same thing. Both would do well to remember that, in the long run, it's not how much an education costs, but what it's worth.

Kirsten Dietz is a senior journalism major and a congressional intern in Washington D.C.

What's to lose?

EDITOR:

We would like to address John Spessard's short-sighted and unjustifiably rude letter entitled "Christian Vomit" (Tuesday's *Battalion*).

By experience and investigation, we have found that the Bible embodies truth. It is for this reason that we believe in the Bible's central message: a person's sin can be nullified only by accepting Jesus Christ and his death on the cross. Surely, each of us would admit that we've sinned; Christ's offer is to forgive that sin — it's a simple message. Now, should we reject what we are convinced is true simply because we can't explain every facet of the Bible? Certainly, scientists don't reject physics, math or chemistry because they don't completely understand them. Regardless of what we don't understand, we do understand the Bible's claim to absolute truth. Therefore, we accept it. In John 6, Jesus stated that eternal life is found only through himself. Many who heard this thought it to be "a difficult statement" to accept and departed. Jesus then asked his disciples if they wanted to leave also. Peter's classic response was, "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have words of eternal life. And we have believed and have come to know that you are the holy one of God."

Our response to the few things we might not understand is identical. Consider our alternative. Should we degenerate to that explanation of life we had before we received Christ as our savior — one which says we exist by chance and that life lacks ultimate purpose? We should hardly think so. This is Spessard's alternative.

Spessard, consider our difference in belief toward the Bible in the light of eternity. If, for the sake of discussion, you are right and we are wrong — then neither you nor we are any better or worse for it. However, if we are right and it is you who are wrong — we'll experience the gloriousness of Heaven and you, sadly enough, will experience the depths of Hell.

WHAT IS THE BIG QUESTION OF THE HUMAN RACE?



The Battalion

(USPS 045 360)

Member of
Texas Press Association
Southwest Journalism Conference

The Battalion Editorial Board

Loren Steffy, Editor
Marybeth Rohsner, Managing Editor
Mike Sullivan, Opinion Page Editor
Jens Koepke, City Editor
Jeanne Isenberg, Sue Krenek, News Editors
Homer Jacobs, Sports Editor
Tom Ownbey, Photo 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 \$36.44 per full year. Advertising rates furnished on request.

Our address: The Battalion, 216 Reed McDonald, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4111.

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 77843-4111.