

GEORGE SHADROU, Editor

DINITA JAMES, Managing Editor  
BRAD KUTROW, Associate Editor  
THOMAS JESSIMAN, Associate EditorMARTHA WAGGONER, News Editor  
PAM KELLEY, University Editor  
ANNE-MARIE DOWNEY, City Editor  
JIM HUMMEL, State and National EditorBILL FIELDS, Sports Editor  
MARK MURRELL, Features Editor  
LAURA ELLIOTT, Arts Editor  
ANDY JAMES, Photography Editor  
MELANIE SILL, Weekender Editor

# The Daily Tar Heel

88th year of editorial freedom

## Further outrage

Something very scary is happening in Waco, Texas. Almost two weeks ago, three student editors of the Baylor Lariat, Baylor University's student newspaper, were fired for refusing to submit to administrative control of the editorial content of the newspaper.

—from the editorial "One law, one mind" (DTH, March 17)

Although it is almost difficult to believe, the situation at Baylor has become even scarier since our March 17 editorial. Last week university officials took away the scholarships of the two junior editors who had been fired, and told them to finish their education somewhere else.

The whole incident in Baylor is the result of *Playboy* magazine wanting to photograph Baylor coeds in the buff for a feature in next September's issue called "Girls of the Southwest Conference." Baylor president Abner McCall declared that any woman identified as a Baylor student in the issue would face prompt disciplinary action and possible expulsion. When the *Lariat* condemned McCall's move in a number of editorials, McCall instituted a publications board of administrators to censor the newspaper. Of course when the paper's editors, a senior and two juniors, attempted to criticize McCall they were fired.

Firing the editors casts a poor light on McCall as a fair and wise president, but his stripping the scholarships from the two juniors is more than just deplorable, it is outrageous and ridiculously petty. Granted Baylor is a deeply religious institution—its 9,500 students must take at least two religion courses and cannot bring any liquor onto campus—and granted McCall is well within his legal rights to seize control of the paper because the protections of the First Amendment do not apply to a private school. Still his action is remarkably myopic.

Almost as amazing as McCall's policies has been the widespread apathy of the students at Baylor. Although 300 students marched in two peaceful and virtually ineffective demonstrations the vast majority of the students have backed McCall. For some reason life goes on as always in Waco, Texas.

Surprisingly, two journalism professors have shown more concern for the spirit of free press by resigning in protest of the university's action. Donald Williams, one of the professors said bluntly, "I think this is utterly contemptible." Furthermore, he suggested that all journalism students transfer out of the department.

Unfortunately his voice probably will fall on deaf ears. Charges that McCall has a moral obligation to permit a free press have had little effect on McCall or the Baylor students. In fact, McCall complains that the press which rallies behind the expelled editors is merely "pimping for *Playboy*." Indeed because of the controversy generated before *Playboy*'s recent feature on "The Girls of the Ivy League," the issue was one of the biggest sellers in *Playboy* history. But really, if anyone is pimping for *Playboy* and stirring up the controversy it is not the press it is McCall himself. His expulsion of the editors went far beyond any reasonable punishment.

The events of this whole affair antagonize all those people who believe in the principles of free press upheld in this country over the past 200 years; the Baylor students and those who quietly accept this outrage warrant the harshest criticism and the disdain of us all.

## Ralph steals books

Ralph is reading a reference book and needs some of the material for an assignment. He starts to take notes, but decides there is too much material. He knows that he cannot check out a reference book; and he has no money for the photocopies. He shrewdly deduces that he has but few alternatives—and rips out the pertinent pages.

Ralph may not know it, but he is committing an Honor Code violation. Defacing or stealing library books is a punishable crime. The pertinent passage in the Honor Code states that "expulsion or suspension, or lesser sanctions" may result from the theft of or damage to a library book. And a conviction, regardless of the penalty, stays on your record for five years.

Libraries provide an essential service at a university, which makes the continued abuse of their services irrational. Several years ago the cost of replacing the stolen books at UNC led to the introduction of a door check system, but even this is too expensive to be instituted in smaller libraries such as the chemistry library. Books continue to trickle out, costing money and time for replacement. However, replacing some of the old or rare books in Wilson Library is impossible.

Human nature being what it is, as long as there are libraries there will be thefts. And as the security measures become more rigorous, students employ more ingenuity to cope. One cannot help but speculate what would come of such diligent thought being directed toward more legitimate activity. Unfortunately, the urge for petty pilferage often proves too strong.

In addition to the strictures levied by the Honor Code for the theft or destruction of books, there are more profound consequences. Books have long been considered sacrosanct by the erudite; as the compilation of concepts, they represent more than their tangible worth. There can be no good reason for their theft or destruction; the only excuse can be laziness or maleficence.

## The Bottom Line

### Beer signs banned

For many baseball fans, America's favorite past time just isn't the same without a few cool beers to while away the innings. But the North Carolina Board of Alcohol Control doesn't see things that way.

The ABC board decided this week that professional baseball franchises in North Carolina's wet counties cannot advertise alcoholic beverages at the ball park.

That means that billboards advertising beer on outfield fences are prohibited. Ads in the program and even time on a play-by-play broadcast may not be sold to advertise alcoholic beverages.

Clubs with a license to sell beer may sell it, but only small signs (not to exceed 600 square inches) can be displayed and those can only be posted at the point of sale.

Baseball clubs are upset because the new policy, which is actually a decision to more strictly enforce existing regulations that have been largely ignored in the past, will cost them money. The revenue many minor league teams bring in from advertising is often the difference between a profit and a loss for the year.

The Asheville Tourists, a team in the Class A South Atlantic League, says it will lose \$3,150 while the Greensboro Hornets estimate losses of \$3,500.

The scoreboard at Charlotte's Griffith Park was lit with beer insignias. After the ruling, those signs were removed. The total loss to the Charlotte O's of the Class AA Southern League?

\$8,000.

That's the bottom line.

# Tender memories of a baseball aficionado

By DAVID POOLE

I am very sorry that the major league baseball season is opening under the cloud of a player's strike come May, but the fact that the season is opening thrills me no end.

There are a lot of people who think watching a baseball game is dull. Not me. I'd crawl 500 miles through barbed wire in the middle of a snowstorm just to watch two junior high teams play. I think baseball is great, and major league baseball is the pinnacle.

My love for the game goes back to the first job I ever had. When I was 13, I worked as an official scorer for a little league in my hometown. Boy, was I happy; I was going to get paid to watch baseball.

Now, if you've never seen baseball as played by boys age 10 to 12 years old, you've never lived. The average score is 19-11 and there are 300 walks in a single game. I scored a game once where a pitcher gave up 16 runs in three innings on only two hits. He walked 21 men. His team lost 22-2.

Anyway, I'd sit there from 5 p.m. to about 10:30 or 11 and watch these pre-pubescent kids play for days. The umpire would be off to doze off, but I'd be watching every play like I was scoring the seventh game of the World Series.

By the time I got to high school, it was clear to me that I was not cut out to be a baseball player. For one thing, I

couldn't hit. I can be clocked in the 40-yard dash with a calendar and if I ever dove for a ground ball I'd look more like a beached whale than Brooks Robinson.

So, I settled for the next best thing. I kept score. Hey, it got me out of one heck of a lot of sixth period chemistry classes. I rode enough broken-down buses to towns like Icard and Clemmons and Marion to satisfy any normal person's appetite. Not mine.

*By the time I got to high school, it was clear to me that I was not cut out to be a baseball player. For one thing, I couldn't hit. I can be clocked in the 40-yard dash with a calendar and if I ever dove for a ground ball I'd look more like a beached whale than Brooks Robinson.*

The only (well, maybe one of several) bad thing about living in Gastonia is that there is no major league baseball anywhere close. Atlanta is four hours down Interstate-85, and the jury is still out on whether the Braves play major league baseball. We have to settle for watching the big guys on the tube.

But that isn't all that bad. Once you learn to ignore the Cosells and Gowdys of this world, The Game of the

Week can quickly become a highlight of your life.

It's a shame that the present problems between the players and owners might wreck the season all together. If no new basic agreement can be reached before May 22, the players say they will walk out.

I hope that doesn't happen. You have to be a real fan to follow baseball in April and May when the games don't seem to mean a darn thing. Only a true purist knows that a 14-1 loss in May can lose a team a pennant just as easily as a 3-2 loss on closing day.

Baseball season is something a whole lot of people ignore until August. Then the casual fan begins to get interested. They might not have that luxury this season, because the players could be well into unemployment by that time of the year.

I don't know all the intricacies of the negotiations. I know the players have got to make a living, but the owners deserve an even break, too. I'm not all that sure I even care who is right. I just want to be able to sit down in my living room, turn the air conditioner wide open, lean back in a comfortable recliner and watch the big leaguers go at it.

To me, the second and third most beautiful words in the English language (behind "Yes") are "Play Ball!"

David Poole, a junior journalism major from Gastonia is assistant sports editor for The Daily Tar Heel.

## letters to the editor

# Men prefer well-developed mind to cute face

To the editor:

In "Appearance important to women's status," (DTH, April 4) a Carolina coed defended the women who attended "Campus '80 Makeover." The writer expressed concern over the enormous importance our society places on physical appearance. She proceeded to explain how men and women learn at an early age to measure their success by the "Cover Girl appearance" of their partners and "winning the admiration of onlooking men." I could not agree more with the first point, but her definition of success is questionable. I realize that this definition may have been a "tongue-in-cheek" critique of our superficial society, but the fact is that this definition is valid for a large number of people.

I agree that physical appearance is important to a certain extent. But there is quite a difference between making one's self over and being well groomed. Unfortunately, not everyone is endowed with physical features that will put them on the cover of a current fashion magazine. So for these people who are not, I suggest more time developing other areas of life and less time in front of the make-up mirror. Believe it or not, I do not think men base their success on the beauty of their mates. Most men would prefer a well-developed mind behind a "cute" face to an empty space covered by a make-up covered face. A perfect example of a "successful" marriage is the beautiful Bo Derek who looks to her husband for an answer when asked a question. I would bet money it ends in divorce. If people spent more time being themselves than trying to be someone they are not, I'm sure life would be more of a success.

Jim Ellis

### "Windows" protest

To the editor:

Your story on "Windows," "Violence in film provokes protest," (DTH, March 24) neglected the most serious grounds for protest against that film. In this movie, a deranged woman hires an ugly cab driver to assault another woman.

The major grounds for protest are two-fold: the film falsely suggests that cab drivers are unattractive and mentally unbalanced men who will do anything, however brutal, for enough money, and it implies that a big city cab in the daytime may be unsafe for timid women with speech impediments. Nowhere in this film are taxi drivers represented as real persons with real feelings and needs and rights and stuff.

Jane Hemphill

### Aborted debate

To the editor:

Last month Carolina Students for Life challenged the National Abortion Rights Action League to a debate on abortion scheduled to take place on March 20. But in a last minute withdrawal, the pro-

abortion speaker refused to participate since the pro-life representative insisted on showing slides of aborted babies. The slides revealed the mangled bodies of little human beings with distinguishable features, not blobs of plasma. If such graphic evidence against abortion is only a "cheap appeal to emotion" as NARAL claimed it was, then the slides could only have helped the pro-abortion case. The pro-abortion speaker's absence indicated that he was afraid of more than just an emotional appeal.

Abortion kills. Abortion advocates want to keep this fact undercover, which is why they are reluctant to debate the issue. They fear discussion of abortion will further fuel the right-to-life movement's political successes: already 17 states have called a Constitutional Convention for the Human Life Amendment.

Pro-abortionists accuse us of being anti-feminist while they claim to be working for women's rights. If this is true then how do they account for a NARAL fundraiser being hosted by the *Playboy* Foundation in Illinois last year? *Playboy*, the symbol of male chauvinism, has directly contributed substantially to many pro-abortion organizations and claims partial responsibility for the 1973 Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion. Pro-lifers are not trying to

deprive women of a right in fighting abortion; we feel that abortion hurts both the mother and her unborn child. We try to help women with problem pregnancies by supporting Birthchoice agencies which provide alternatives to abortion.

Chris Kremer  
Carolina Students for Life  
Chapel Hill

### Quality apartments

To the editor:

The letter "Tenants disappointed with quality of repairs," (DTH, April 3) gave a false impression regarding the quality of maintenance in Berkshire Manor Gardens. I have lived there for almost two years and have had nothing but satisfaction in this matter.

The management is reasonably flexible and willing to work with the tenant when unusual situations occur. Repairs are of good quality and prompt—on two occasions my request for service was acted upon within ten minutes. Overall, this is the most effective management of any apartment complex I have lived in.

Steven A. Warner

# Presidential primary system needs change

By C. STAFFORD SMITH

The only predictable aspect of the 1980 Presidential election thus far has been the abject failure of anyone to make accurate predictions. However, sometimes the practices of men in the media are a fair indication of the way the coin will land, and those who are not reconciled to another four years of Jimmy Carter are, for the most part, practicing sentences which include "President Reagan," as in "President Reagan today announced the blockading of Cuba and the commencement of World War III."

How is it that the electorate seems threatened with a choice in November between the "extraordinarily inept" Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, the born-again Goldwater who once said "California has no business subsidizing intellectual curiosity?" What would be the chances of a candidate running against the party nominees?

There are many highly capable governors, businessmen and congressmen who might be running, but the system of election favors the uncommitted man who is able to devote all his time to getting his act together. Carter has the benefit here of incumbency, while Reagan has not held office for several years and has been campaigning since 1976.

Time for organization is the key if one is to raise the maximum \$17.6 million allowed by federal legislation via contributions of \$1,000 or less. Furthermore it is only the well-organized candidate who is able to garner delegates to the party national convention, such are the vagaries of primary delegate-selection.

Of the many primary systems, winner-take-all is clearly the least democratic. A law-suit is presently contesting the constitutionality of the California process, where in a three-way race it would be quite

possible for a candidate with 35 percent of the vote to take all 168 Republican delegates.

Other systems are not necessarily much better. In North Carolina the delegates are only required to vote on a proportional basis on the first ballot. Thereafter they may vote individually in whichever way they choose regardless of the primary vote. Thus there is a very real chance that a highly-organized candidate might sweep a vast majority of the delegates at the sparsely-attended precinct meetings with no more than a few supporters at each. This advantage would then be transmitted upwards through the district and state levels to the national convention, so that a candidate with no more than 5 percent on the first ballot could conceivably win the second against a man who had received 49 percent of the popular vote.



Assuming that the choice offered to the electorate as a result of the two conventions did turn out to be only the better of two evils, what would be wrong with a third-party or independent candidate?

Sadly, the odds are stacked against him. For starters, the filing dates for presidential candidates have already passed in two states, Ohio and Maryland.

Meanwhile, the nominees of the two parties can expect to receive \$29.5 million each in federal campaign funds, yet an independent will get nothing. If he eventually does receive 5 percent of the vote cast he will be eligible for refunds after the election, but meanwhile he is restricted to the same federal laws that do not allow individual donations in excess of \$1,000.

Thus to all intents and purposes the president is selected by the time the party nominations draw to a close. Only two states of major significance have voted for a third-party candidate since 1860: Pennsylvania and Michigan for Theodore Roosevelt in 1912.

In the name of democracy, there are several steps we might take to alter the process of electing a president. The delegates to the conventions should be selected in a purely proportional manner, by law. Once there, they should be the candidate's to dispense with as he sees fit, for the voters will then know that their vote is not only for Candidate X, but, in the eventuality of his dropping out, for the man whom X would support.

Next, the filing deadlines for all states should be after the end of the convention process, allowing all candidates time to acquire sufficient signatures to be placed upon the ballot.

Finally, federal campaign funding should not be restricted to the party nominees. Anyone who is able to gather a set number of signatures in each state should be eligible for the same sum as all the others.

Perhaps the primary process is necessary in order that the candidates be exposed to the scrutiny of the hypercritical press for a reasonable period of time. However, in the name of democracy, how can we exclude the candidacies of able men and women who do not fit precisely the somewhat irrelevant party stereotypes?

Clive Stafford Smith is a junior political science and American studies major from Cambridge, England.