

JEFF HIGDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor  
MARK STINNEFORD, Associate Editor  
BEN PERKOWSKI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor  
VANCE TREFETHEN, State and National Editor  
MELANIE WELLS, City Editor  
DAN TILLMAN, Business Editor  
LYNN DAVIS, News Editor

FRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor  
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor  
SHARON SHERIDAN, Features Editor  
JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

# The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

## Bend with the wind

Charles Kuralt is to be our graduation speaker, and that's good news. His appearance breaks certain barriers — most notably the University's strong tendency to shy away from inviting off-campus personalities to speak at May commencement. While we neither expect nor desire this to become a trend, we are extremely pleased by the flexibility displayed in the choice of Kuralt.

It means we're not in a rut. For at least the last dozen years, "tradition" has demanded that graduation speakers be either honorary degree recipients or faculty members. This being a university rich with professors who are also good speakers, the tradition has sufficed. But UNC students, not feeling quite up to snuff with those colleges that bring in movie stars and U.S. Presidents for their graduations, began itching for a little attention.

Thing is, big-time speakers charge fees upwards of \$10,000.

Besides, the professors and holders of honorary doctorates did OK; the University has plenty of excellent orators to choose from. And, bowing to commencement planners and sleepy spectators — one gets that way sitting in Kenan Stadium under a hot May sun — they were good about keeping their talks short. (Ask a University administrator who's been around and he'll tell you that

most non-UNC famous folks who've spoken here droned on and on.)

No matter, said the senior class officers, who were bent on some sort of celebrity. So they went to Chancellor Fordham, and together the group struck upon bringing in one of UNC's many famous alumni.

Charles Kuralt came in No. 1 on the list. He'd served as editor of *The Daily Tar Heel* and gone on to become a famous correspondent with CBS News. He didn't require an honorary degree or a hefty fee. And, of course, he's known to be a most engaging speaker.

Everybody happy. It's ironic that, given the success senior class officers had picking a speaker of their choice, the speakers for the '86 and '87 graduations are practically written in stone. A tradition that "transcends" all, says Chancellor Fordham, is one of inviting the governor to address commencement during his second year in office. It's relatively safe to say, too, that UNC President Bill Friday's successor will address the 1987 graduates.

Oh, well. At least we've seen that tradition can be flexible. As Dean Donald Boulton puts it, "Why can't our trend be to have a variety (of graduation speakers)?" Indeed, it makes sense that seniors have a say in the choice, and that they be able to go outside or inside the University for their speaker.

## Avoiding the quick fix

There's an interesting movement afoot concerning a bill before Congress, the kind editorialists and political commentators love. It's the type of issue that allows these critics to call the politicians political and unthinking, and say things like "political courage is a commodity in short supply on Capitol Hill." The bill would authorize physicians to prescribe heroin for hospital patients "for relief of intractable pain due to terminal cancer." The issue is why the U.S. House of Representatives overwhelmingly shot it down.

The "political courage" quote comes from James J. Kilpatrick, a syndicated columnist, who says heroin, "the most effective painkiller ever discovered," should be used for the intractable pain cancer patients must suffer; except Congress won't go for it because they're political wimps. Bet you're on Kilpatrick's side, huh? Sounds like congressmen won't allow heroin because they're afraid to be seen as "pro-heroin" or "pro-dangerous drug."

If you're still unsure, consider that approximately 8,000 Americans will die in agony this year after suffering the incredible pain of terminal cancer. It's a persuasive, if unpleasant, statistic.

However, as much as we hate to go against the we're-smarter-than-they-are temptation (the lifeblood of any editorial page), we believe Congress has made a wise move by passing on this quick-fix solution.

If heroin was the only drug that could do the job, then the answer would be grudgingly simple. The benefits of reducing these patients' pain would outweigh the dangerous potential of a heroin addiction — not to mention the hazards of having heroin around the hospital.

But there are safer drugs that can do the job; the problem is the skill required in prescribing these drugs. Both the director of UNC's Cancer Research Center and a physician who works closely with terminal cancer patients at N.C. Memorial Hospital agree that very effective analgesics already exist, and that the problem is prescribing the most effective combination of treatment and dosages.

So rather than going to an unnecessarily dangerous drug, the answer is making sure doctors are properly trained and equipped (with the best drugs) to eliminate this unbearable pain, while research continues for a more permanent answer.

## The Bottom Line

Daytime TV heartthrob Phil Donahue is not one to shy away from controversy, but things apparently got too hot even for him during the taping of the *Donahue* show Monday. Seven audience members fainted and an unusually flustered Phil cleared the studio.

No, Phil wasn't discussing deviant sexual practices of aliens or mate abuse by pets. It wasn't the day's topic that had Phil's audience swooning, it was a stuck thermostat at the RCA Building in New York, where the show was being taped.

A spokesman for the syndicated program said the fainting victims apparently had little or no breakfast and were dressed warmly because of the cold outside. The studio, by comparison, was suffering a heat wave, with temperatures in the 70s.

The victims began fainting as Donahue was going through his traditional routine of flying down the aisles — arms flying, hair all mussed and glasses slipping down his nose — taking questions from the audience. As one woman asked a question about elderly homosexuals, she complained of feeling faint and collapsed. Always one to think on his feet, Phil called for a commercial. But when the show began again, six more people fainted, repeatedly interrupting the taping. Donahue finally asked the audience to leave, and he explained what happened to home viewers as a camera panned the empty seats.

Donahue, saying he didn't mind lighting a fire under his audience, admitted that making them pass out was too much.

### Closing the defense umbrella

The military services have shown a

dangerous tendency toward "civilianization" in recent years. "Mess halls" have been dubbed "dining facilities" and "barracks" are now known as "dormitories." Slick recruiting ads invite prospects not to tie knots or shoot machine guns but to learn valuable, technical skills that will earn them big bucks once they get back into the civilian world.

The top Army brass apparently has had enough of the life of leisure that has replaced traditional military rigor and discipline. You're welcome to be all that you can be, they say, but leave the sissy rain gear at home. John O. Marsh Jr., secretary of the Army, and Gen. John A. Wickham Jr., Army chief of staff, announced last week that men in uniform would not be allowed to carry umbrellas.

The Army Clothing and Equipment Board, obviously lulled into complacency by too much comfort, indicated that it might be time to issue umbrellas to the troops. But, according to an unidentified official, Marsh and Wickham "feel the image of Army officers walking around with umbrellas is somehow intrinsically unilitary."

Maybe they have a point. If there's a bear in the woods, he's not likely to be put off by a nation whose soldiers tote an accessory that's a close relative of the parasol. Imagine what would have happened if Douglas MacArthur walked ashore with an umbrella. Instead of rallying around him, the Philippine people likely would have fallen down laughing.

The Army's decision does not sit well with everybody. One officer said he felt silly "getting rain down my neck when the guy next to me is carrying an umbrella." Still, better to suffer a little drizzle than drown under a red tide.

And that's the bottom line.

# The Vigilante: Justice, not vengeance

By MARK STINNEFORD

If Bernard Goetz had pulled off his subway "heroics" a few months earlier, it is conceivable that he would have been named *Time* magazine's Man of the Year. Since the day in late December that Goetz shot four youths on a New York subway, the public outpouring has grown into a tidal wave of support.

It turns out that the adulation may be a little bit misplaced. Goetz reportedly told police he never felt threatened by the four youths who approached him on the subway and asked him for money, and his claim of self defense is considerably weakened by the fact that he shot two of the young men in the back.

There are far better heroes than Goetz for those of us thirsting for justice from a criminal justice system that has little of it to offer. Consider the 81-year-old man who shot and killed a would-be mugger in a Beverly Hills park on New Year's Eve. Or the 68-year-old Chicago man who just last week shot and killed a knife-wielding man who attempted to rob him on the street. Police declined to press charges in both cases.

If the two old men had not been prepared to defend themselves, they would have become anonymous statistics, and their attackers — if they had been caught at all — would soon be out terrorizing law-abiding citizens again. Is it sick to take some satisfaction in the fact that the attackers got the kind of justice they would never have received from the courts?

Psychiatrists, politicians and liberal editorial writers have equated the support for Goetz with some sort of public sickness. While Goetz's actions may not have been justified, the public reaction doesn't indicate a society thirsty for blood, but one expressing justified fear and anger because its people don't feel safe in the streets, on a public subway or even in their homes.

Whether he was in danger or not, Goetz has become a hero because Americans can identify with his alleged plight. It is easy for us to

imagine being harassed on a subway by weapon-carrying youths, and it is natural for us to want to fight back in such a situation. It is easy to understand the near deification of Goetz by New Yorkers, when 14,000 felonies are committed on their subway system each year. The police are helpless to combat the terrorism, a fact pointed out by a recent civil court ruling that New York transit police could not be held responsible for their failure to prevent a rape on the subway.

For too long, we've allowed criminals open season on responsible citizens. If some thugs want to deprive us of the things we've earned through hard work, the police have long advised us to give in peacefully. These are the same police who have

By KAREN YOUNGBLOOD

The recent shootings of four teenage boys in a New York City subway train has left one hospitalized and comatose and the confessed assailant, Bernhard Goetz, a national hero. The incident left many questions in the minds of people, particularly the question of whether Goetz is an innocent would-be mugging victim who was trying to protect himself, or an angry vigilante out to clean the streets of would-be criminals.

Evidence now seems to point to the latter. Although the boys were found with sharpened screwdrivers in their pockets, and all had past

the attitude that threatens our system of justice the most. If public sentiment had its way, Goetz would be a free man tomorrow. Fortunately for society, however, Goetz must stand trial like any other person charged with shooting someone else. Hopefully, he will also be convicted.

Whenever we make excuses for vigilantes, we invite chaos to destroy any semblance of order ever present. Vigilantes are not to be confused with people who defend themselves in a potentially harmful situation. Rather, vigilantes are people who have such little faith in the law that they decide to take care of the law themselves. These so-called "citizens" are more dangerous than actual criminals; not only are they out stalking the streets, they hurt our already wavering laws even more.

The public approval of Goetz comes from a long-suffering society dissatisfied by "turnstile" justice where offenders walk away scot-free and where plea-bargaining is the norm. While these feelings of helplessness with the law and the courts can't be blamed, this still does not justify resorting to vigilante warfare as a means to combat crime in our streets. By taking the law into their own hands, people impede, rather than help, the actual process of justice. We cannot hope to remain a civilized society if we allow people to hunt down alleged criminals everytime someone decides the law isn't doing a good enough job.

Vigilantes only fertilize the seeds of discontent and dissent within our country. By condoning vigilante action, we are tearing down the foundations of justice on which our nation is based. In a time where it seems as though there is no justice, we need to support and uphold the laws that exist, not break more by blowing away every person who we feel looks suspicious. Let's start by recognizing criminals for who they are — Goetz and his kind, who are doing no favors for society.

Karen Youngblood, a sophomore journalism and English major from Durham, is an editorial writer for *The Daily Tar Heel*.



New York City subway token?

no real way to prevent us from being mugged, raped or from suffering other violent crimes. Is it a wonder crime flourishes under such conditions?

There are those who will tell you not to take a weapon onto the subway, that the answer lies in making the criminal justice system better. Try talking about reform when a goon sticks a gun or knife in your face. Until the system is improved, your ability to defend yourself may be the best way to protect your property or even your life.

Mark Stinneford, a senior journalism major from Raleigh, is associate editor of *The Daily Tar Heel*.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Advertisers' job to sell products, not set morals

To the editor:  
After reading Laurence Thomas's column ("Television, profits and moral progress," Jan. 22), I can see that Thomas does not have a clear understanding of the TV industry. Television's function is to sell its audience to advertisers. It is a business like any other. Is Thomas really so shocked to discover that "companies are out to make money and not make the world a better place to live in?"  
Thomas certainly does not give

much credit to television's viewing audience. Unlike Thomas, I do not believe that we are what we watch, or that we take our moral cues and form our social values from television. On the contrary, advertisers tend to stay within the guidelines set by their audience. The argument that such a bold and controversial step would be profitable for advertisers is implausible. If one night we saw a commercial involving two members of different ethnic groups in an intimate situation, would we

all go to class the next day, money and date books in hand, beaming from the revelation that our dating prospects were now twice as good? I think not. At best, the audience might be shocked into remembering a product name. At worst, the advertiser would lose a large portion of the viewing audience. An advertiser who would take this kind of risk probably would not see much profit.

Of course the issue here is not the rightness or wrongness of inter-

ethnic dating; this is a very personal issue. The fact remains that our society does not accept this practice, and therefore it will be some time before we see this in advertising.

Before Thomas continues his commentary on the moral responsibility of "companies," I suggest that he abandon his intellectual snobbery long enough to gain an understanding of the role of TV advertisers.

Stephani Geurin  
Carrboro

### Is inequality profitable?

To the editor:  
There are two observations I would like to make regarding Laurence Thomas' column ("Television, profits and progress," Jan. 22).  
The first is simply that while Thomas advocates the production of inter-ethnic commercials as a moral advancement, he casually uses the term "black shows," which seems to undermine his argument. What, pray tell, does he mean by "black shows?" It seems that an associate professor of philosophy would be careful to define his terms. Did Thomas mean to imply that something about television is legitimately segregated?  
My second observation concerns the "moral opprobriousness" of those companies who do not make inter-ethnic commercials. I agree with Thomas, but would like to go

a bit further in identifying exactly what this "opprobriousness" is. It may be that the reasons for not producing inter-ethnic commercials consciously or unconsciously involve long-term self-interest. Many respected minds have seen a connection between preservation of social inequality and the continuation of the so-called free market economic system. When a company fails to act (to promote equality) in such an obviously self-interested way, I propose that we look deeper, into basic beliefs, assumptions and the nature of our economy, then into simple lack of intelligence or prudence for an explanation. The perpetuation of social inequality may serve as a long-term investment for these companies.

Jesse Thompson  
Chapel Hill

### Say no to coat hangers

To the editor:  
I would like to address this letter to everyone that thinks abortion should be illegal.  
I would like to ask you a very important question. Which is worse, to allow the death of one person, or to allow the death of two?  
If abortion is outlawed, it will not stop. It will simply be performed illegally with coat hangers and other such "sterile" devices. Before the legalization of abortion, women died or were seriously injured every year due to "back-alley" abortions. Did they "deserve it" because they

tried to kill their child? Does a 15-year-old child, who's scared to death of what will happen to her if her parents find out, deserve to bleed to death from a back-alley abortion?  
I would like you to think of a female friend you have. One that you care about. One that believes there should be a choice. I want you to picture that friend dying, bleeding to death somewhere, with no one to help her. And then I want you to tell me that's moral.

Natasha McLaurin  
Chapel Hill

### Hadley's achievement unreported by 'DTH'

To the editor:  
On Dec. 16, 1984, Robyn Hadley was selected as a Rhodes Scholar, an award which is recognized by many as the ultimate academic achievement. Robyn's selection brings recognition to the University and to the state of North Carolina. Her selection was reported in *The Washington Post*, *The New York*

*Times*, *The Los Angeles Times* and in a television interview on WRAL. *The Daily Tar Heel* prides itself in reporting issues that are important both nationally and locally. Why has the *DTH* not recognized her achievement? We realize that the award was announced over vacation and that may be the excuse for the lack of reporting. However, when

we see sporting events that occurred during this same time reported in the *DTH*, we wonder what the *DTH* has as their criterion for reporting. Maurice DeBerry, A. Hudnut, F. Tax  
Chapel Hill

Editor's Note: Hadley, unable to keep an appointment with a DTH reporter earlier this week, has rescheduled for Monday.



### Berger wakes up campus

To the editor:  
Doug Berger has been our always active, often controversial Campus Governing Council representative from the law school for the past year. As a candidate for that office, he sparked the interest of students normally apathetic about Student Government by advocating strong positions on issues important to us, such as minority rights, education on Central America, divestment and funding for Student Legal Services. We support Berger's candidacy for student body president because we feel that under his leadership Student Government will have a major impact on campus life.  
In the past year, Berger helped transform UNC politics by forcing reluctant Student Government bureaucrats to act on constitutional funding referenda for the Black Student Movement, SLS and WXYC; by trying to block the mandatory meal plan; and by the Nicaragua invasion bill. Without his input, it is unlikely that the student

body president election would be focused on the administration's handling of the mandatory meal plan, nor would we have the opportunity to contribute in a significant way in minority recruitment at UNC by voting for BSM constitutional funding. Just as importantly, Doug has convinced students and CGC members alike that Student Government does have a constructive role to play in domestic and foreign policy issues that affect our lives.

Above all, Doug stands for the revival of popular democracy at UNC. A Berger administration means that students control Student Government and Student Government asserts a right to shape UNC with the administration, even if drastic action is required, such as a boycott to oppose the mandatory meal plan.

Elect Doug Berger student body president.

David E. Webb  
Richard P. Nordson  
Chapel Hill

### The last word on abortion

To the editor:  
Why is it that the most vocal right-to-lifers on this campus are not the women whom it would affect?

Targa Anjing  
Chapel Hill