



MARGULIES  
© 1991 THE RECORD  
NEW JERSEY

## EDITORIALS

Editorials expressed in The Battalion are those of the editorial board and do not necessarily represent the opinions of Texas A&M administrators, faculty or the Board of Regents.

### Battalion endorses Stephen Ruth

The Battalion endorses Stephen Ruth for Texas A&M Student Body President.

His experience within Student Government, and his commitment to the University led us to this decision.

Ruth's involvement in the Corps of Cadets, Ross Volunteers, Student Government and Class Council make him the best representative of this diverse student body.

All three candidates impressed us with their ideas, and we hope they will collaborate after the elections making sure all the students' needs are met.

The Battalion Editorial Board

## MAIL CALL

The Battalion is interested in hearing from its readers and welcomes all letters to the editor. Please include name, classification, address and phone number on all letters. The editor reserves the right to edit letters for style and length. Because of limited space, shorter letters have a better chance of appearing. There is, however, no guarantee letters will appear. Letters may be brought to 216 Reed McDonald or sent to Campus Mail Stop 1111.

### What is a feminist?

EDITOR:

Imagine an article by a white columnist telling African-American activists what they should want. The basic proposal of this article is "stop your complaining and learn to appreciate what you have."

The way in which Truesdale misinterpreted the bra burners in his article perfectly illustrates the way in which he has misunderstood the feminist movement as a whole. Truesdale patronizingly assures us that "no matter what they verbalized," he knows what these women meant, and that they were completely wrong. The logic here reminds me of men who believe that it doesn't matter if a woman says "no" because that's not really what she means.

Despite Truesdale's magically obtained knowledge of what their actions were saying — that their bodies were as good as male bodies — what these women thought they were saying was quite different.

You see Tim, for centuries, women's bodies, like their minds and activities, have been forced to conform to an abstracted and unnatural standard to be considered acceptable.

This standard can be not only uncomfortable (bras, hose), but also damaging (high heels, waist-constraining devices). What these women were saying, both in their action and in what they verbalized, was that woman is beautiful in her natural state.

Truesdale has missed the point of feminism. Much more than trying to negotiate in a world which they did not have an equal role in creating, feminist women are refusing to conform to a definition of themselves and their roles which they did not create.

Our culture has, for thousands of years, completely defined a woman in terms of her relations with a man, as if she had no inherent worth of her own.

Feminists are intent on breaking up those false limitations on the aspirations and abilities of half the human race.

A true feminist does not devalue those women (or men) who devote their time and energy to the improvement of future generations.

The belief that feminists look down their noses at mothers who choose to maximize their positive effect on their children over maximizing their income has not been promoted by feminists, but by those who wish to undermine the feminist movement by alienating many women from it.

Rather, feminism seeks to offer a woman the ability to choose her roles instead of having them prescribed for her.

Maybe I need to take another logic class, but I fail to see how feminists emphasizing equal pay for equal work "proves they now advocate a system of determining worth based on income."

It seems to me evidence that they intend to stop unjustifiable discrimination against male-created values such as aggression and materialism, as was evidenced by their lack of support for recent military actions.

But whether our sisters choose to or must earn wages in the present system, it is and must be the purpose of feminists to stop material discrimination against them.

Cara Shannon Clark '89

### Is the death penalty wrong?

EDITOR:

I write this letter in regard to the recent reader's opinion by Michael Worsham: "Ask yourself: Does death stop death?" I hope I can help Michael open his eyes a bit.

First, I would like to talk about his implications about the views of our President. He implied that because Bush condemned the use of the death penalty, as used by Iraq, he might be changing his views. Did it ever dawn on you that he might have felt the killings were senseless and unjustified? Of course, we all know that Iraq would only use the death penalty after a fair jury trial — yeah, right.

Next, Worsham claims that the death penalty discriminates against non-whites, the poor and even the mentally handicapped. I suppose you think sickle-cell anemia "discriminates" against black people. Do you think maybe the majority of the people who commit these heinous crimes, which have a just calling for the death penalty, comes from these poor, "discriminated-against" groups.

Maybe your solution would be to come up with some kind of quota. For every black on death row, we get a white or for every "mentally handicapped" (the good old insanity plea), we kill a genius. It seems like the same group of people always screaming for equal rights are quick to label themselves when it is time to pay their dues to society.

Last, I would like to comment on the death penalty being extremely expensive. This fact cannot be argued, but does that make the death penalty wrong or does it call for a major overhaul in our court system? As a Texan, I am proud of our tough legal system because we are the leader in putting hardened criminals "to rest."

As for the upcoming march (for the abolition of the death penalty), I expect it to consist of thugs and future thugs. It will be these liberals who will continue to fight for the rights of the criminals in America. Michael (and the rest of you confused liberals), open your eyes and realize that the rights awarded to the honest, law-abiding citizens of America should not be retained should you stray from the law. I thank The Battalion for the forum.

John Staton '93

## Buckle up Recent accident shows value of safety belts

Many of you read in Monday's Battalion about a doctoral student, Debbie Wilks, who was hit by a train while driving home on Friday night.

What damage from a train weighing hundreds of tons will do to an S-10 pickup weighing a few hundred pounds became glaringly apparent when her brother (my roommate) showed up at our house yesterday with what was left of her truck in tow.

It never ceases to amaze me how much punishment the human body can absorb and manage to recover from. Debbie still is unconscious and suffering from a head wound and a number of broken bones, but the prognosis for a full recovery is encouraging.

It still is depressing to know that the worry on the faces of her husband and family could largely have been avoided had she taken the time to buckle her seatbelt. Even though her truck was hit by a train, the driver's side of the cab is almost completely intact, proving that a vehicle can take more punishment than one might imagine and maintain its structural integrity.

What really sets my mind in gear is the fact that Debbie is the third of my friends who has been involved in a serious auto accident in the last five years. She's the third one to have received a closed head wound and been unconscious for a long period of time. And she's the third one to be ticketed for not wearing a seatbelt.

All three would have been bruised up a bit in their wrecks, but the head wounds and serious damage would almost certainly have been prevented by safety restraints. Both my other friends were fortunate enough to have survived and recovered from their wounds over a period of time, but the worry and high medical costs were very preventable.

They all had one thing in common,



Larry Cox  
Columnist

and that is that they all had an excuse why they didn't buckle up.

Everybody has an excuse. Fashion-conscious people don't want to buckle up because their clothes will get wrinkled. Big breasted or portly people don't want to buckle up because of the obvious obstacles. Then there are the free-spirited rebel types who "ain't gonna let the government tell me what to do" or risk looking uncool.

Okay, fine. Don't buckle up because the law tells you to. I agree, it's a governmental intrusion into your private life. But do it anyway, because the damn things work.

They might not be the most comfortable things in the world, but they certainly can save your loved ones the agony of receiving a 2 a.m. phone call from a state trooper or an emergency room clerk. They also are infinitely more comfortable than neck braces, catheter tubes and scores of other unmentionable medical procedures which are inflicted upon hospital patients.

I could quote statistics until I dropped dead from exhaustion, and it wouldn't change anyone's mind about seat belt usage. I just wish I could haul that bashed pickup to campus and let everyone look at it for a few days.

Better yet, everyone should spend time in a hospital emergency room, watching accident victims come in.

If you won't buckle up for your loved ones, do it for yourself because a little inconvenience is more desirable than a life spent injured or paralyzed or worse. Like the commercial says — buckle up for safety.

Larry Cox is a graduate student in range science.

## the itch

by Nito



### The Battalion

(USPS 045 360)

Member of  
Texas Press Association  
Southwest Journalism Conference

### The Battalion Editorial Board

- Lisa Ann Robertson,  
Editor — 845-2647
- Kathy Cox,  
Managing Editor — 845-2647
- Jennifer Jeffus,  
Opinion Page Editor — 845-3314
- Chris Vaughn,  
City Editor — 845-3316
- Keith Sartin,  
Richard Tijerina,  
News Editors — 845-2665
- Alan Lehmann,  
Sports Editor — 845-2688
- Fredrick D. Joe,  
Art Director — 845-3312
- Kristin North,  
Life Style Editor — 845-3313

### 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 is published daily, except Saturday, Sunday, holidays, exam periods, and when school is not in session during fall and spring semesters; publication is Tuesday through Friday during the summer session.

Mail subscriptions are \$20 per semester, \$40 per school year and \$50 per full year; 845-2611. Advertising rates furnished on request: 845-2696.

Our address: The Battalion, 216 Reed McDonald, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-1111.

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.

Wednes  
G  
Mus  
sha  
in c  
T  
Pope Joh  
was 25 ar  
soon-to-t  
movie at  
His mu  
only reas  
him. Mel  
gift.  
Born w  
Melendez  
playing w  
"I saw  
tuning hi  
home to t  
guitar," M  
just mess  
(playing v  
and I've k  
Now, th  
one Texas  
students a  
Tony perf  
8 p.m. Th  
Theater.  
Dennis  
psycholog  
for Melen  
because o  
Melendez  
"Because  
his wife, I  
wedding,  
since I me  
MA  
Ann  
Thu  
Fr  
So  
Ist pla  
Prerequisi  
Math 151  
calculus th  
COROLI  
When in  
best tas  
surely ge  
FOLLOW  
Where qu  
In addition  
now avail  
Tuesday  
TRY I  
Special  
3:00  
Choice  
Soup E  
Steak  
1. Sweet  
2. Sweet  
3. Sweet  
4. Pepp  
5. Twice  
\*Soup no