

The Daily Tar Heel

90th year of editorial freedom

JOHN DRESCHER, Editor

ANN PETERS, Managing Editor

KERRY DE ROCHI, Associate Editor
RACHEL PERRY, University Editor
ALAN CHAPPEL, City Editor
JIM WRINN, State and National Editor
LINDA ROBERTSON, Sports Editor
AL STEELE, Photography Editor

KEN MINGIS, Associate Editor
ELAINE MCCLATCHEY, Projects Editor
LYNN PEITHMAN, News Editor
SUSAN HUDSON, Features Editor
NISSEN RITTER, Arts Editor
TERESA CURRY, Spotlight Editor

Town and gown

In any college town there is potential for conflicts between the town and the university. If the university doubles in size in a decade, that potential for conflict becomes even larger. In a five-part series this week on growth in Chapel Hill, *The Daily Tar Heel* has examined the past, present and future relationships between the town of Chapel Hill and the University.

That relationship is a good one. Only in few college towns does the university community and the town operate so well together. Although there have been problems in the past, generally the University and the town have worked together in reaching decisions that satisfy both sides.

The largest problem between the University and Chapel Hill has involved the tremendous growth of UNC. In 1960 UNC had 8,000 students; now it has 20,000. Every expansion of the University means more demand on the town for necessities like housing, transportation and water. The quick growth of UNC has been especially difficult because of the village atmosphere of Chapel Hill. Some residents who remember the days when the University had half as many students resent the school's expansion and consider the growth an intrusion into their lives and a destroyer of Chapel Hill's quaint atmosphere.

Most residents, however, have accepted the University's growth and its effect on the town. Ironically, it is the town that is growing—not the University. While UNC's population leveled off in 1970, the town has continued to expand, largely because of the Research Triangle Park. Chapel Hill is in the center of one of the largest growth areas in the United States and those who expect the town not to grow are not being realistic.

With that expansion will come the expected growing pains. It will take careful, long-term planning to keep Chapel Hill's unique combination of quiet village and bustling community. While the University is not growing as fast as it once was, it's still important for the town and University to maintain a healthy relationship. The town would not be as special without the University—but it's also important to remember the University would not be as special without the town.

Anti-war drums

Last Sunday about 40 students and local residents marched across campus to protest the Reagan administration's support of the military junta in El Salvador. Carrying placards, the group chanted, "No draft, no war, U.S. out of El Salvador."

While not the large-scale protest of the early 1970s, the march was a positive sign that students are waking up to the foreign policy of the Reagan administration. For the past two weeks, five student groups have banded together around tables in the Pit to drum support for the protest, distribute leaflets and sell buttons and bumper stickers. On Saturday a busload of students will travel to Pope Park in Fayetteville for an educational benefit expected to be attended by about 3,000 people.

This kind of activism, with its emphasis on education, is needed to show the federal government that there are citizens who care about this country's foreign policy and that they deserve to be heard. The protesters are concerned with what they consider unwarranted U.S. intervention in El Salvador. Indeed, U.S. military and economic aid to El Salvador has failed. Killing continues, with U.S. aid serving to prop a dictatorship in constant battle with revolutionaries.

The Salvadoran conflict and U.S. involvement have been likened to the Vietnam conflict of the 1960s. There are, however, some important differences, especially the United States' proximity to El Salvador and what effect that could have on this country. Regardless of the similarities and differences between the two situations, it's important for us to be aware of what's occurring in El Salvador.

In the early years of the Vietnam war, few people were aware of the amount of U.S. involvement until full-scale war had begun and draft notices had been served. It appears now that people nationwide have begun to keep a close eye on the administration.

The participants in Saturday's march in Fayetteville are doing their part to increase awareness of a foreign policy that needs to be re-evaluated. Unlike 20 years ago, when an entire nation sat back as the United States became involved in Vietnam, it is refreshing to see students interested in U.S. foreign policy.

Reagan, Watt discover the joy of politics

By JONATHAN TALCOTT

President Reagan this week decided to take a new approach in his search for stability in Latin America: if you can't beat 'em, buy 'em. In a speech delivered Wednesday to the Organization of

\$91.5 billion deficit much to the chagrin of his once ardent conservative supporters. Reagan is finally having to face the reality resulting from the rhetoric of his campaign.

During his run for the presidency, Reagan promised a delightful menu of ideas to a delighted country: a strong defense, a personal tax cut and a ba-

THE WEEK IN REVIEW

American States, Reagan promised to send \$770 million in military and economic aid to Caribbean and Central American governments. The Caribbean Basin Initiative as the program has been termed would increase trade ties between the U.S. and developing countries through special tariffs and tax incentives to U.S. businessmen willing to invest south of the border. Some might say Reagan has changed his tone from aggressive to passive. Don't worry, included in the package is more than \$80 million in military aid for guess who: El Salvador.

Budget Baking

While Reagan was trying to make amends with his Latin American constituency, his supporters at home continued to fret about his budget proposal. Reagan's proposed 1983 fiscal year budget contains no less than a

lanced budget. Once in the kitchen the chef seems to have found out what the joy of cooking really means. Meals cannot be prepared as rapidly as one would like. Apparently, he expects the American people to wait until beyond 1985 to have their tasty dessert of a balanced budget. But Congressmen pushed on by their hungry constituencies have not been content to sit in the dining room and wait patiently while the chef spoils their meal.

Reagan said last week that his critics could "put up or shut up" and many have chosen the former. Tennessee Senator Howard Baker possibly in line for a chef's job himself one of these years, suggested a surtax on personal income be enacted to cover the deficit. Sen. Peter Domenici, R-N.M., offered a compromise bill that would cut defense spending drastically. These and many other suggestions have been offered up in the dining halls of Congress in the

past week. For his part, the chef has decided to watch others slave over a hot stove while he relaxes with some Salvadoran pineapple juice and his famous jelly beans.

Baked Alaska

Too bad Secretary of the Interior James Watt cannot join the President at the White House for a few jelly beans. Watt is too busy trying to eat up wilderness land along with his voracious corporate cohorts. Watt tried to offer an olive branch of peace to his environmentalist enemies by proposing to extend the legislation that bars develop-

ment of wilderness lands by mining and oil drilling interests. According to Watt's critics, his olive branch should better be termed a "Trojan Horse." The extension would also allow corporations more time to apply for leases to the lands. Without Watt's extension, the lands could have been closed off to developers for good as early as 1984. Now corporations can continue to dream of baked Alaska and other wilderness delicacies until 2003.

Smoke-filled Rooms

Many people who own land in North Carolina might have wished that they

owned wilderness instead when the Surgeon General came out this week with his report on the effects of smoking. Tobacco growers did not rejoice when they heard Surgeon General Dr. C. Everett Koop says that "Cigarette smoking is clearly identified as the chief preventable cause of death in our society." Dr. Koop made his comments in conjunction with the release of a report that linked cigarette smoking more strongly than ever with cancer.

The report said studies showed smoking not only promoted cancer of the lung, larynx and esophagus, but it also contributed to development of bladder, kidney and pancreatic cancer as well. Dr. Koop went on to say that 30 percent of all cancer deaths could be attributed to smoking. The Tobacco Institute had little to say in defense of its product. Officials simply said that the study's findings were "debatable" and not "entirely conclusive."

Facts?

In Atlanta, Wayne B. Williams offered a little stronger defense against the allegations brought against him. The man who is accused of killing two black youths took the stand in his own defense this week. "I haven't killed anybody," the defendant said. Williams

also denied being a homosexual or being prejudiced against poor blacks.

Fiction

Another fact and fiction drama hit the front page of *The New York Times* this week. *The Times* revealed that it had unknowingly printed a piece of short fiction, not a piece of investigative journalism in the *Time's Sunday Magazine*. Of course, there was some truth to the feature story about a young journalist's travels with the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. The writer Christopher Jones had conducted one or two interviews with Cambodian guerrillas two years ago but he had not traveled extensively with revolutionaries in recent months. As a matter of fact, the only traveling he did for the article was in social circles in a Spanish Mediterranean resort town. Combining his imagination with a few quotes from Andre Malraux's novel on Cambodia, *The Royal Way*, he created a story exciting enough for the *Times* to buy. What with both *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* printing fiction in the past year, the reader does not know who will be trying to pass off a false story on him next.

Jonathan Talcott, a sophomore history and English major from Litchfield, Conn., is an editorial assistant for *The Daily Tar Heel*.

Courtrooms at gunpoint

By KERRY DE ROCHI

On Dec. 10, 1981, Horace Wilkerson borrowed his mother's car keys so he could drive to the Guilford County Courthouse in Greensboro.

When the 21-year-old arrived in the district courtroom, Judge Joseph John began to question him. He asked Wilkerson why he had not been paying the \$25 a week child-support payments to Sherry Diane Abram of Greensboro.

About 30 people crowded the courtroom. Wilkerson walked to within 10 feet of the judge. He pulled out a concealed homemade gun and shot himself in the abdomen.

After two hours of surgery, his condition was stable. He would recover.

* * *

On Feb. 20, 1982, a jury of seven women and five men found Ralph Edward Thomas, 37, of Greensboro guilty of rape. Thomas was on trial in the Guilford County Superior Court for sexually assaulting the 11-year-old daughter of the woman he had been living with.

As 15 spectators looked on, Superior Court Judge William Helms sentenced Thomas to life imprisonment. Five seconds later, Thomas shot himself in the head with a .22-caliber pistol he had smuggled into the courtroom.

He died shortly after being rushed to Moses Cone Memorial Hospital.

* * *

Nearly three months separated these unrelated incidents. Yet, they both ended with the same scene—a tragic shooting the result of a glaring slip in courtroom security. Guilford County District Attorney Michael Schlosser has said the violent shootings were a part of an alarming trend. It is a trend which has concerned court officials statewide, and has forced

jurors to judge testimony while looking over their shoulders for the next bullet.

"We cannot expect that the next time a juror, witness or district attorney will not be the target or won't be caught in the line of fire," Schlosser said.

"If two people can do it, anyone can do it," Jim Wicker, a reporter for the *Greensboro Daily News/Record* said. Wicker had been called to the scene Feb. 20 by reports of the shooting. "Next time they might shoot someone else before themselves. There are a lot of kooks out there."

Under North Carolina law, judges can request people entering the courtroom be searched for weapons. Less than two years earlier, in the same courtroom as the Thomas incident, a judge decided just that. Using metal detectors from the Greensboro/High Point/Winston-Salem Regional airport, the court officials screened people entering courtroom 3C for the trial of six Klansmen and Nazis charged in the shooting deaths of five communist worker party members.

No one can guess why, since that trial, two courtroom shootings have occurred in the same courthouse while the rest of the state seems immune to the problem. But any justice official would agree the danger of such incidents exists in every courtroom, at every trial. Because of this danger, an 11-member commission in Greensboro has been formed to study possible solutions.

Schlosser has suggested he would like to see legislation passed in the N.C. General Assembly that would make concealed weapons in the courthouse a felony offense. The law now says persons found guilty of carrying illegal weapons in the courtroom could receive a maximum of six months in jail. As a felony offense, the sentence would require a 5- to 10-year stint in prison.

In the future, tougher laws may help lessen the problem, but given the time it would take to push such legislation through the general assembly, a more realistic and ready solution is mandated.



And certainly, one might consider whether a stiff jail sentence would have been in the forefront of Wilkerson's mind as he reached for his gun, or in Thomas' as he clasped the cold revolver.

Another solution, one which would make any taxpayer shudder, would be the installation of metal detectors at the door of every courtroom. Then, when a trial began, each lawyer, defendant, spectator and judge would be checked for weapons. The cost of such a plan would be prohibitive. In the Guilford Courthouse alone, about seven to 10 courtrooms are in session each day. And in addition to the price of the detectors, taxpayers would also have to provide the money to pay the deputies who would have to stand watch over the entire proceedings.

Adding the security equipment may be the only real solution. No one likes the

mess of the metal trappings and flashing lights of detectors, but the machines would effectively uncover any hidden weapons. As the Greensboro Commission members begin to study the alternative, they must keep in mind the continual threat found in lax courtroom security and that public safety cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Unfortunately, most security problems are not realized until after a tragic incident. In Greensboro last week, a man killed himself in the courtroom. Officials statewide now must ensure that the incident is not soon forgotten.

As Wicker added, "It may never happen again; but then it may happen tomorrow."

Kerry DeRochi, a junior journalism and English major from Greensboro, is associate editor for *The Daily Tar Heel*.

Letters to the editor

Service first, uniforms second

To the editor:

I'd like to respond to a letter written by John L.S. Hickey to the Feb. 24 edition of *The Daily Tar Heel*. I feel that as a part-time bus driver and, in fact, one that has not been active in the anti-uniform campaign, I may have a perspective of some interest to Mr. Hickey.

Mr. Hickey suggests that the protesting drivers are using the cost of the uniforms as a "red herring." I wonder in what light Mr. Hickey regards the cost of uniforms when, at the same time, reductions in service are being considered due to budget cutbacks. It seems a peculiar logic to suggest that while we have enough money for uniforms, we don't (or won't) have enough to run the bus system as we do now. Red herring? Something does smell fishy but I doubt it is the red herring Mr. Hickey suggests.

Mr. Hickey also says that "the only bus drivers I have seen soliciting signatures around town invariably wore beards, leather cowboy hats, and grubby jeans...." Although there have been others soliciting signatures, Mr. Hickey here describes a driver I know. His name is Caspar. I suppose that may come as somewhat of a shock to Mr. Hickey, but Caspar is regarded by the drivers and management of the bus system as an outstanding driver; he's safe, courteous, and on time. He considers himself to be a professional driver and strives to do his job well. Interestingly, he does this without the benefit of a uniform.

Now, what criteria do you want to stress, Mr. Hickey? Would you prefer to have Caspar deliver you to work safely and on time with his leather cowboy hat and long hair flowing or would you prefer a uniformed bus driver?

Mr. Hickey might also be interested in knowing that many of us who drive buses wear other hats too: Caspar—though I've never seen him without his cowboy hat—is a musician; I'm a student. Why should we be uniform

or uniformed? Why should we be just one thing or be labeled as such?

Mr. Hickey suggests we are "at liberty... to take jobs which require no uniforms." Interestingly, that's what this job has been until now. Beyond that, however, the implication of what Mr. Hickey says is that labor should really have no say in the running of an enterprise; if we don't like it, we should simply leave.

Recent business management research indicates that one reason Japanese corporations have been so productive and successful is to the involvement of labor in production planning and decision making. Japanese management apparently discovered something quite astonishing: the workers actually know something about their jobs. If I have one criticism of the upper levels of management of the town bus system it is their unwillingness to hear drivers out on this and other issues.

Bob Godding, the transportation director, was quoted in *The Chapel Hill Newspaper* as saying that the question of uniforms for drivers was an "administrative decision" and not subject to the "democratic process." This is an unfortunate and even foolish dichotomization. Administrative decision making does not necessarily preclude involvement and communication with others. Yet there has been little of that between staff and drivers in this decision. Bob Godding might be surprised that we too know something about our jobs.

Mr. Hickey further suggests that "the fact that many drivers wear exemplary dress makes me feel that drivers are not as a whole opposed to uniforms." How's that? Maybe we just prefer to wear exemplary dress. It hardly suggests we want to wear uniforms.

I don't think that this is the "latest trendy fad." But I'll grant that Mr. Hickey has a point in wondering why we've not complained about Burger King, police, firemen's and basketball team uniforms. As a matter of fact, a number of us are readying a proposal suggesting

that when Duke plays here on Saturday we dispense with uniforms and play them shirts and skins.

Paul Benjamin
Chapel Hill

Sobering Thoughts

To the editor:

In response to Phillip Carriker's letter of Feb. 23 concerning the proposal to raise North Carolina's drinking age, I would like to present some relevant statistics. In 1981, Chapel Hill police arrested 302 drivers involved in accidents while driving under the influence of alcohol. In 1980, 82,930 drivers were arrested for DUI of whom 41 percent were age 25 or under and of whom 6 percent were age 18 or under.

During this same year 16 percent of reported automobile accidents were known to be alcohol-related, and another 5 percent were suspected of being alcohol caused. Most of these accidents were not victims. Out of the 22,917 known alcohol related accidents 414 people were killed and 19,075 were injured—a ratio of .85 injuries to every accident. Alcohol-suspected accidents claimed another 567 lives.

Obviously, drinking and driving is a serious threat to anyone on the road. I agree with Mr. Carriker that society must "get its problems out in the open," but apparently efforts through education in the schools and in the media have not done enough. Certainly, no one wants to see privileges taken away from those under 21, but recent examples from states which have increased the legal drinking age to 21 prove that this measure is a way to decrease alcohol-related deaths on the road—in some cases by 25 percent. We as young drinkers and drivers have a choice: to stop mixing alcohol with driving and change these statistics, or pay the price—the price for being the largest and most visible category of drunken drivers.

Wendy Walters
Chapel Hill



U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—1982