

Neither candidate claims outright win

KAMU-TV, Channel 15, will rebroadcast the debate in its entirety both today and Saturday at 1 p.m.

CLEVELAND — Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, locked in a contest for the presidency so close the pollsters cannot predict a winner, clashed on both style and substance in the only presidential campaign debate of 1980.

Millions of Americans watched on television Tuesday night as the Democratic president and his Republican challenger attempted to break the deadlock public opinion surveys say the election has become just one week before the Nov. 4 day of decision.

The candidates, questioned by a panel of reporters and editors, covered a wide range of subjects from inflation to women's rights, disagreeing on most but colliding most sharply on nuclear arms limitation and energy.

They ended with Carter appealing for support as a president who was in the "mainstream" of both his party and his White House predecessors, and Reagan asking the voters to decide on the basis of their answer to the question: Are you better off now than you were four years ago?

Carter left Cleveland's Convention Music Hall after the 90-minute confrontation saying he expected to win the election, and calling the debate only "very useful." But Hamilton Jordan, his deputy campaign chairman, claimed jubilantly, "We won."

Reagan did not make an outright claim to victory either, saying, "I feel very good about it." But returns from an ABC network telephone straw vote gave the former California governor an edge of about 2-to-1.

Carter was a grim attacker during much of the meeting, while Reagan retained a relaxed and usually genial style.

Odd man out in the show was independent John Anderson, who took part by having his comments included in a taped

broadcast shown by the Cable News Network from Washington.

The panel of questioners got few incisive answers as both men sought to turn their responses to reflect the themes of their campaigns. Carter came back repeatedly to his claim Reagan's opposition to the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was warning of a saber rattler, and Reagan lost no chance to remind the

audience both inflation and unemployment had soared with Carter in the White House.

"When a man who hopes to be president says take this treaty, discard it — that is a very dangerous and disturbing thing," Carter said of Reagan's opposition to the SALT II agreement. "I'm not talking of scrapping the treaty," Reagan replied.

Accusations, laughter, hissing part of Aggie debate reaction

By DEBBIE NELSON
Battalion Staff

What effect did Tuesday night's Reagan-Carter debate have on Aggies?

One group of Aggies in the Commons television room laughed their way through it.

Pre-debate comments ran like this: "Reagan's gonna win, but he's gonna die in office."

"I wanna see if Reagan's gonna come out of this with mud on his face. He probably will."

At introduction of the candidates, Carter was hissed loudly. Hisses and whoops got equal time for Reagan.

Every time Reagan rebutted a Carter allegation or criticized Democratic policy, the crowd ate it up. "Sweet Jimmy, sweat."

Carter speeches were followed by comments like, "He's beating around the bush," or "He didn't answer the question."

One Commons resident said, "Reminds me of the '76 debate. He didn't say anything then, either."

Not that Reagan didn't become the butt of several jokes

himself. When he commented, "I've seen four wars in my lifetime," a male voice from the crowd said, "Including the Civil."

Another comment on Reagan: "He's got on too much makeup."

Accusations against Carter for mud-slinging were common. But most Reagan criticisms of Carter were applauded.

"Ouch," someone said after Carter referred to a comment Reagan made "when he was a younger man."

"This is funny." Laughter was common, at nearly anything. After Barbara Walters (who got a fair amount of hissing herself) asked a question about responses to terrorism, crowd consensus was: "Neither one of them answered the question."

Howls of laughter filled the television room when Carter said he had discussed nuclear weaponry with his daughter Amy.

"I wonder what Amy said," someone said. "Maybe Amy could be President."

One male student in the corner had no opinion about Carter or Reagan. He was asleep.

Explaining the United States had been repeatedly "out-negotiated" by the Soviet Union, he said, "I'm talking about taking the treaty and going back and talking with the Russians."

The candidates painted a vastly different picture of the energy situation. Carter said he expected fuel costs to rise more; Reagan said he wasn't so sure about that.

Carter said his administration had put in place a program that would develop new energy sources for the nation and make millions of new jobs while Reagan wanted "to put all his eggs in one basket and give that basket to the oil companies."

Reagan called that a "mis-statement" of his views and said the country was "energy rich" and could develop its resources if only the government would remove obstacles such as limitations on oil drilling on the outer continental shelf and in the public lands.

Carter called Reagan's proposals for 30 percent tax reductions over three years "highly inflationary" and "ridiculous," saying the Republican would have to cut federal spending \$130 billion to finance his tax plan and balance the budget.

Reagan asked why it was inflationary to let the people keep their money rather than letting the government spend it, and contended he could cut government spending enough to increase defense spending and cut taxes and still balance the budget by 1983.

The candidates did considerable bragging. Carter brought up his role in the Egyptian-Israeli peace and the increase of nine million jobs while he was in the White House. Reagan spoke highly of his record as two-term governor of California and said his credentials as a working man were demonstrated by the fact he had been the president of his union (the Screen Actors Guild) for six terms.

And each also made statements that had to be taken on faith. Reagan said he had talked to unemployed black teen-agers who told him that they couldn't get jobs because of the federal minimum wage. Carter said his teen-aged daughter Amy had told him that nuclear weapons control was the most important problem in the world.

THE BATTALION

Serving the Texas A&M University community

Vol. 74 No. 43
14 Pages

Wednesday, October 29, 1980
College Station, Texas

USPS 045 360
Phone (845)-2611

The Weather

Yesterday	Today
High	64
Low	39
Rain	0.00 inches
	High
	Low
	Humidity
	Chance of rain

Selling alcohol in MSC: prospect raises doubts

By NANCY ANDERSEN
Battalion Staff

Should beer be sold in the MSC Basement?

The student senate is considering this issue through the Basement Competitiveness Resolution. If passed, the bill requests that permission be granted for the MSC Basement Committee to apply for a permit to sell beer on weekends.

The Texas A&M University System Board of Regents would have to grant permission to apply for a license to sell alcohol since it would be a System policy change, Bissey said.

"The purpose of the bill is not to create another Dixie Chicken on campus," said Jeff Bissey, student services committee campus policies coordinator. Instead, the bill seeks to make the Basement more competitive with similar off-campus establishments by supplementing the entertainment.

Mike Huebner, Basement Committee director of public relations, said, "The consensus of the committee officers is that it would be a good idea to apply, so we could have the option of serving beer."

"Whether or not it (the permit to sell beer) is used would be up to the discretion of the committee and the performers," he said.

Some performers, like the Shake Russell Band, enjoy performing in the Basement because they don't have to compete with the clanking of beer bottles, Huebner said.

Col. Thomas Parsons, director of security and traffic, said he does not want alcohol sold on campus.

"I have two basic oppositions from two standpoints — as a policeman and as a former student," he said. "As a policeman I can see where it would cause difficulties at some time."

"There's no need for it on campus. There are sufficient places off-campus if you want a cocktail or whatever."

As a former student, Parsons said, "It's not appropriate to turn the MSC into a speakeasy. It's still a memorial, to me."

As far as potential problems, Bissey called other universities for some general information about selling alcohol on campus, and those schools with pubs said there weren't any security problems.

These schools — the University of Texas, the University of Houston, Rice University and North Texas State University — said generally, their pubs had good atmosphere and were financially successful, Bissey said.

Texas A&M System policy allows alcohol only in leased rooms

or rented areas, such as the suites in Kyle Field, or in on-campus housing.

Due to the touchy nature of this bill, Bissey said, the student services committee took a non-partisan attitude when the bill was researched.

Some of the pros they found, Bissey said, were:

- It would make Texas A&M appear more progressive.
- It would modify tradition.
- It would not change any Basement entertainment policies since beer would be limited to certain performances.

- Since the Basement capacity is about 200, the size would not induce heavy drinking and rowdiness.
- The Basement has a separate entrance and Corps of Cadet members are not required to wear uniforms there, making it seem less a part of the MSC.

- It would allow a trial to see if a student pub would work.
- Some of the cons, Bissey said, were:
- It would be incompatible with the memorial nature of the MSC.

- It could create security problems, like fighting and disorderly conduct.
- It would bring in outside control through the Alcohol Beverage Commission.

- It could bring in more outside entertainment which could eliminate local talent.
- It could make the Basement a social center instead of an entertainment center.

- It might hurt Texas A&M's conservative reputation.

Eric Langford, Student Government vice president for student services, said the bill has been held in committee to give senators a chance to look at it and get in touch with their constituents' feelings.

"We held this to get student response before we take action," he said.

If the bill does pass the senate and the regents, the Basement Committee will have to apply to the ABC for a license to sell beer. This process involves paying a \$50-per-year fee, passing some basic requirements, filing forms with the county clerk and a public hearing.

A county judge holds the hearing, and anyone has the right to protest the issuing of a license. If approved, the applicant must pay the fees to the county tax assessor and then the Bryan ABC district office would send off to Austin for the license.



Staff photo by Jeff Kerber

Precision

Kurt Buck, a graduate student from Bryan, puts the final touches on a bread board he made in the MSC Craft Shop. Open to all students, the craft shop offers many activities for those with a creative drive.

'Nobody' as president safe election choice?

United Press International
AUSTIN, — Wavy Gravy, wearing a clown suit, worked a crowd of 500 into a passionate fervor for Nobody for President.

The address was so stirring — it was obvious Nobody cares — that one man stepped forward and said: "I've never voted for anybody, but this year I'm going to vote for nobody."

Curtis Spangler, Nobody's campaign manager, went on to explain Nobody knows how to dispose of nuclear waste, Nobody has brought peace, Nobody fed the hungry and the destitute and Nobody keeps all his campaign promises.

The campaign is financed by the sale of bumper stickers, T-shirts and campaign buttons. It is the second campaign for Nobody.

Nobody actually won in 1976, said Spangler, although Jimmy Carter was permitted to take office. Spangler says only 40 percent of eligible Americans voted, leaving 60 percent voting for Nobody.

Gravy asked the crowd: "Who was president before George Washington?" "Nobody!" came the response.

"Who honored the treaties with the Indians?" "Nobody!"

"Who will free the hostages?" "Nobody!"

"Who do you want to run your life?"

Iran doesn't want hostages 'forever'

United Press International
Iran's legislators, back from a one-day pause for a religious holiday, went behind closed doors today to discuss the American hostages who have been held four days short of a year.

Three more hours of debate apparently brought the Iranian Majlis, or parliament, no closer to a decision than three earlier secret sessions did. Members took a half-hour break, then resumed — at 3 a.m., EST.

Tehran Radio said Tuesday a U.S. confession of "crimes" in support of the late shah of Iran is part of the non-negotiable demands for the release of the American hostages.

But the radio said Iran does not intend to hold the 52 captives "forever" and denied a deal has been struck to free the hostages in a possible swap for spare military parts.

The hostages, now in their 361st day of captivity, were seized last Nov. 4.

Iran's parliament debated the fate of the 52 American hostages for the fourth time today, but adjourned the secret sessions with no announced decision on whether to free the captives held just four days short of a year.

A spokesman for the parliament's secretariat told UPI in London by telephone an "open session" of the Majlis, or parliament, would be held Thursday.

The hostage issue was expected to be on the agenda then, the spokesman said.

But no announcement was made and no statement issued after today's secret debate, which lasted more than five hours but covered other issues besides Iran's "conditions" for releasing the hostages, now in their 361st day of captivity.

The 200-odd deputies of Iran's parliament debated the hostage issue Sunday and in two sessions Monday, then adjourned for a day for a Moslem religious festival.

Tehran Radio said Tuesday a U.S. confession of "crimes" in support of the late shah of Iran is part of the non-negotiable demands for the release of the American hostages.

But the radio said Iran does not intend to hold the 52 captives "forever," and denied a deal has been struck to free the hostages in a possible swap for spare military parts.

The Majlis, which is charged with deciding the fate of the captives, has had before it since Sunday the report of a seven-man commission studying the issue.

Its protracted debate has produced no reported decision.

Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini met the legislators on the occasion of the Shiite holiday Eid-Eghadir, but did not mention the hostages, restricting himself to a religious ceremony of the holiday, which commemorates the nomination by Prophet Mohammad of his successor.

Khomeini also did not mention the hostages during a speech to the nation later, French reports said. But the Iranian strongman attacked the United States and the Soviet Union for their "bestial appetite."

The only mention of the hostages to emerge from Tehran Tuesday was from Tehran Radio, which said the nation "never intended to keep the hostages in Iran forever."

But it said the Americans will be released only after the "United States admits its crimes and faults" and meets Iran's other four conditions laid down by Khomeini.

"These conditions are non-negotiable," the radio report monitored in London said.

When reports about an admission of so-called past misdeeds surfaced earlier this fall, Washington said it was prepared to talk about it but not to make any apology.

A West German television report from Tehran Tuesday said Iran was demanding a fifth condition prior to a two-stage release of the Americans — three hours on American television to explain its position. But Iran's parliamentary commission denied the report almost at once and called it utter fiction. The U.S. State Department termed it "100 per cent rumor."

Tehran Radio also denied that Iranian Prime Minister Mohammed Ali Rajai had made any deal that would release the Americans in exchange for spare parts to help Iran carry on the war against Iraq.

The French newspaper Le Monde, reporting on the intricacies of the hostage politics, said a majority of parliament and Iran's leaders favored the hostages' release, but a hardline group of 87 of the 200-odd parliamentary deputies was still fighting efforts to set them free.

The United States said Monday a piecemeal release of the 52 Americans would be "unacceptable" and warned Iran of "grave consequences" if any of the captives were tried as spies.

State Department spokesman John Trattner would not be pinned down on any movement toward the hostages' release, saying only, "We note the various reports from Tehran and we are in the position of waiting to see what happens."