Mail Call

Non-regs 'tolerate' Corps runs

I address this letter to Corps Commander Poling and all others in command of the Corps of Cadets, for they seem to misunderstand our arguments concerning their unit runs.

While it may be true that most runs occur before 6:30 a.m., the simple fact that they occur often at other times during the day is cause for concern. Except for the late night and early morning hours, the main campus commonly has moderate to heavy vehicle traffic. To say that these runs cause "little interference with traffic" is absurd! Poling, you apparently have never noticed the problems unit runs cause. First of all, more often than not the units have at least 50 members and occasionally more than one unit will run together. More importantly, it is not just a matter of a "few seconds" at an intersection. Because the Corps members run down the middle of the street, traffic problems arise at consecutive intersections and on numerous adjacent streets. That "few seconds" can and does cause serious congestion for minutes! This is not to mention the numerous scheduling problems encountered by the shuttle buses as a result of the congestion.

If the above argument does not sound convincing enough, consider this: Would you and your cadets, or would you not, be upset to encounter a stream of vehicles approaching you on the sidewalk while you were in a hurry to make some destination? It is likely that you would have a reaction similar to that of the 37,000 non-regs and numerous faculty and staff when we find streams of cadets running in the

streets while we hurry to our destinations.

If the Corps of Cadets truly wishes to show consideration and understanding, an alternative to running in the streets of main campus should be found. For instance, the units could conduct their drill practice on the jogging track, at Kyle Field, or at Research Park. Of course, to get to any of these locations, sidewalks should be used. Also, if the entire Corps must run together, at least wait until the weekend, when there are fewer vehicles on campus and no bus or class schedules with which to interfere. As for our consideration and understanding, Poling, we have never been given a choice in this matter. We have only tolerated the situation.

Chris McNees '91 accompanied by 12 signatures

Complainers didn't see movie

By the sounds of it, those contemplating about the "X-rated" movie shown by Aggie Cinema's International Film Series, didn't see the movie. Yes, it was graphic in detail at times, but viewers were forewarned. So what? The complainers, who probably didn't see the film, appear to be obsessed with what appeared on the screen rather than the context, content and meaning of the film. Many people may have gone to the film because it was "X-rated." If that is what they went for, I don't think they saw what they expected. To me, the film showed, in rather striking terms, some of the complex difficulties occurring in relationships between men and women (from an Italian viewpoint).

We live in a very complex age where interaction with other cultures, for some people more than others, occurs on a daily basis. We cannot afford to close ourselves off from other cultural expressions. Wells doesn't seem to care about other cultural perspectives and seems to advocate shutting ourselves off from different viewpoints and ideas. If you want to live in a purely moralistic state, try Iran, where extremely conservative Koranic law prevails. I also wouldn't advise Wells to travel to many European beaches, especially in southern France, where nudity is commonplace.

Those who disagreed with the movie expressed their freedom of choice by not seeing it, and exercised their freedom of speech in The Battalion. I happen to disagree with them, which is my right, and support the showing of the film. I think the graphic scenes helped express the emotions and meanings presented by the film. I think most students have good enough judgment to make a decision on the issue simply by attending or not attending such events.

Peter Warnock Graduate student

Sounds like censorship to me

After reading Monday's Mail Call, I was disgusted at the hypocracy in Fred Well's following statement about the film of the Aggie Cinema: "I am not trying to 'censor' something from someone . . . if society does not set standards, people will not know where the boundaries are." Well, Fred, it sure sounds like censorship to me, and like they say: If it looks like a duck and walks like a duck, it must be a duck.

First of all, Aggie Cinema warned viewers of this "oh so controversial" film's content — which is more than what is said about the "Nightmare on Elm Street" movies. In other words, the film committee didn't hunt people down with guns and force them to view this movie. Instead, they chose to forewarn movie patrons, and in turn, people decided for themselves whether or not they wanted to view the movie.

I didn't get a chance to see the movie, but to get to my point, I'm glad I live in a country where I have the opportunity to make up my own mind for myself. In case you didn't know, in this country democracy has majority rule, but the

right of the minority is also secured.

Now if you believe society is too morally decadent then that's your right. But do not force standards that you consider to be "moral" on me. I do believe there should be standards because we as a country don't need murderers and rapists rampant, but your idea of morals is censorship. If sex was as offensive as you feel, half the population or more wouldn't exist for fear of these sins of the flesh. Also, what kind of analogy is there between speeding laws and moral standards? Does society need carnal cops writing tickets for those removing too much clothing in front of their partner? If that's the case, you're going to have to make the nation into a prison state. It's this thought process that explains why over half the states have sodomy laws.

If you are so concerned about achieving "moral purity," then let's return to a puritan state and lock people up for fornication under carnal knowledge and burn heretics and witches. If you feel the need for censorship, go to the USSR and see if you like not being able to express the opinion you did. I think you need to appreciate the right to bitch before you start bitching.

J. Rogers '91

Metcalf unjustly rewarded

After many years of watching fine traditions die at Texas A&M, the school has finally managed to make me mad. Shelby Metcalf is the epitome of Aggie character. This gentleman has earned the respect, gratitude and friendship of students, players and alumni for many years. His outspoken nature is consistent with his integrity.

Metcalf's dedication to Texas A&M should not have been rewarded with dismissal. He should be reinstated immedi-

ately.

I urge the association to be outspoken in this matter. Shelby deserves our support.

Thomas B. White '83

Abortion opinion was distorted

Your article in the Jan. 23 issue was insulting to me and probably many others, pro-life or pro-choice. This is a university newspaper. You are writing articles for people who like to read an intelligent argument and to decide their beliefs on a logical basis. They do not appreciate a simple-minded, namecalling generalization, even in an opinion column. In the first place, your stereotypical image of a pro-lifer is grossly distorted. It is the equivalent of describing all pro-abortionists as sexually irresponsible, sociopathic, atheistic savages. Did I make you want to convert to being a pro-lifer by making such an inflammatory accusation? The very thing that you accuse the pro-lifers of is something of which you are guilty — intolerance of others' opinions. Your response is to viciously attack the people who have an opposing opinion.

In the second place, what is the "danger?" Is the danger that people might have to accept responsibility for the decisions or choices they make? Are you saying that people in general are not intelligent enough to make use of the various methods of birth control available? I have news for you: Being against abortion does not also mean being against birth control education. With the exception of a relatively few cases, the woman has control over her body. She has the choice of sex or abstinence and of whether or not to use birth control. Does she have the right to end another human being's life just because she does not want to take responsibility

for her own actions?

Third and finally, there is no need to even bring religion into the argument. (It is better that way since people tend to tailor religion to suit their fancies anyway.) We, the people of the United States, decided that murder was unacceptable. To get away from calling abortion murder, people come up with rationalizations, such as the argument that life does not begin at fertilization. They define life as beginning at some time convenient for their own piece of mind without offering any

I do not mind that people have different opinions, but I do mind when people distort the opposing opinion. They must not feel very confident about the basis for their own beliefs. Worst of all, they are only hampering the possibility of enlightenment for all sides of the issue and promoting intolerance of other's views. Now that IS dangerous.

Karen Wade Grad student



The Invasion of

Right or Wrong?

An analysis of Gen. Noriega's fall from power by

Dr. Jonathan Brown

of the Institute for Latin American Studies

Thursday, February 1, 1990 7:30 p.m., 301 Rudder

> Free Admission Reception to Follow



From Safety Pins to Supercolliders:

Since 1790, the Patent and Trademark Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce has fostered American ingenuity by encouraging the invention of new technology. Whether it's the patent for a simple everyday device or the patent for a technological breakthrough that changes the way we look at the world, the Patent and Trademark Office is the beginning of all great American inventions.

Attend our group presentation Thursday, February 1 6:00-8:00 PM Room 214, Anderson Hall

You'll learn about the following exciting opportunities in our Arlington, VA headquarters:

ENGINEERS

Applicants from all engineering disciplines will be considered, though specific training in the following areas is preferred:

Electrical & Electronic Engineers You'll help judge the patentability of inven-

tions in such areas as photography, illumination, radio, television, data processing systems and many other ground-breaking areas. BSEE and MSEE candidates preferred.

Mechanical Engineers

You'll assist with the patentability judging of inventions in such areas as aeronautics, motor vehicles, tools, surgery, internal combustion engines, and many other exciting areas. BSME and MSME candidates preferred.

Chemical Engineers

Take part in the patentability judging of inventions in such areas as petroleum chemistry,

metallurgy, plastics, fuels, medicines, molecular biology, and many other important areas. BSChE and MSChE candidates preferred.

SCIENTISTS

Opportunities for BS, MS, and PhD graduates are available in the following fields:

Chemists, Biologists, Microbiologists & Related Scientists

You'll serve as an Examiner for inventions relating to chemical or biotechnological products or processes, including state-of-the-art discoveries in new compounds, formulations, or life forms. Biological scientists will examine inventions involving recombinant DNA, cell biology, immunology, and other areas. Physicists

You'll help judge the patentability of inventions in such areas as semiconductor physics, radiant energy, atomic and nuclear physics, lasers, and other breakthrough technologies.

Discover why we're the patented force behind American creativity. And find out how you can help put ideas to work for America . . . and your career. Come to our group presentation on February 1 from 6:00-8:00 PM in Room 214, Anderson Hall and learn about our outstanding career ladder and other one-of-a-kind benefits. If you're unable to attend, please call us toll-free at 800-368-3064 or send your resume right away to: Manager, College Relations, Office of Per-

sonnel, Patent and Trademark Office, 1CPK, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20231. An equal opportunity employer. U.S. citizenship required.

