

The Daily Tar Heel

Serving the students and the University community since 1893

Sold out

The ERA debate between Betty Frieden and Phyllis Schlafly Monday night has been sold out. The debate is being sponsored by the Carolina Forum and the Association for Women Students.

Fair and cold

Fair and cold today with a high near 40. The low tonight will dip into the teens and there is no chance of rain.

Volume 88, Issue 9184

Wednesday, February 4, 1981 Chapel Hill, North Carolina

News/Sports/Arts 933-0248
Business/Advertising 933-1163

Heels lose in overtime to unbeaten Virginia

By DAVID POOLE
Sports Editor

Before Virginia's 80-79 overtime victory over North Carolina Tuesday night, the Cavaliers had won only once in Carmichael Auditorium since World War II.

It took something close to a basketball version of World War III for Virginia to get a victory in Chapel Hill as the undefeated and No. 1 ranked Cavs caught and overtook the Tar Heels with a furious second half rally and some key plays in the overtime.

Virginia's biggest weapons were 7-foot-4 center Ralph Sampson and guard Jeff Lamp, but a free throw by Terry Gates was the winning margin. Sampson and Lamp combined for 53 points, with Lamp scoring the last 10 Virginia points of regulation.

"There's not much I can say to add to what you saw out there," Virginia coach Terry Holland said. "Our kids just refused to lose."

"Give our guys credit for coming back in overtime after losing the lead in regulation," Dean Smith said. "And give Virginia credit for coming back. They are a great basketball team. That was a great basketball game between two great basketball teams."

Turnovers, missed free throws and some tough Virginia defense spelled doom for Carolina down the stretch of the intense game, in which there were two near-brawls and a lot of contact both on and away from the ball.

The Cavaliers are now 19-0 overall and 9-0 in the Atlantic Coast Conference. Carolina fell to 16-5 overall, 7-2 in the ACC.

The Tar Heels lost despite 29 points after halftime by Al Wood, who finished with 33. Carolina led for most of the game and was up by as many as 16. In fact, it was after the Tar Heels had gone

ahead 51-35 on a scoop layout by Mike Pepper with 11:53 left that Virginia began its comeback.

The Cavaliers took the momentum away with a pressure defense that forced 12 turnovers from Carolina after the Tar Heels had enjoyed a 33-27 halftime lead.

Virginia cut the lead down to 56-47 when Bobby Stokes made a layup after a steal with 7:40 left. A Wood jumper made it 58-49 but Stokes and Othell Wilson scored for Virginia to pull them within seven. A Lee Raker jumper cut it to five.

The score was 62-57 before Lamp hit a baseline jumper and a three-point play on a layup to tie the score 62-62 — the first time the Cavaliers had been even since it was 17-17 with 9:12 left in the first half.

James Worthy gave Carolina the lead with 32 seconds left when his shot was ruled good on a Sampson goaltending. But Lamp was there again and knocked in another jumper from the baseline to tie it with eight seconds left.

Jimmy Black took a 30-footer just before the buzzer, but the shot rimmed out and the game went into overtime.

Sampson took control in the overtime. The towering center, who had kept Virginia in the game for the first 30 minutes, scored 8 points in the period before fouling out with 34 seconds left. Virginia led by 6 points in the overtime at 77-71 before the Tar Heels staged a comeback of their own.

Doherty hit two free throws and Worthy hit a jumper after a steal that made the score 77-75. Othell Wilson made both ends of a one-and-one opportunity with 16 seconds left, but Wood's jumper with 6 seconds left brought the Tar Heels back to within 2 points.

See HEELS on page 5



Virginia's Ralph Sampson battles Sam Perkins for a rebound ...despite Al Wood's 33 points, Heels lost 80-79

Council OKs Chapel Thrill in close vote

By KERRY DEROGHI
Staff Writer

The proposal for a 1981 Chapel Thrill Concert was approved Tuesday by the Campus Governing Council.

In a 11-7-1 vote, the council approved an \$115,800 appropriation from the General Surplus fund for the April 25 concert.

"CGC Finance Chairperson Dianne Hubbard (District 9), said at the meeting that she supported the concert because of the number of students it reached.

"If the concert is successful, it enables Student Government to provide an activity for the students," Hubbard said.

Members of the council, however, disagreed on whether the concert was worth risking the dollars it might lose. CGC member Wayne Rackoff (District 1) said he did not favor the concert because of its financial risk and because the concert has been funded outside of the regular budgetary process.

"If you remember the saying, 'April Showers bring May flowers'; what you are doing is flipping a coin for \$46,000 and that's only if there's a 50/50 chance of rain," Rackoff said. "We are talking about a social expenditure which is something everyone on the council would have cringed at if it had been brought up at the budget process last year."

Last year's concert, which was held over a two-day period had an estimated loss of \$9,000. Because of last year's losses, the CGC established the Chapel Thrill Review committee to study the possibility of holding a concert this year.

The committee recommended to the council in November that a concert be held. The proposal was referred to the Finance Committee. The committee reached a tie vote on the concert and sent the bill to the full council.

CGC Minority Representative Bernard Bell said he could not support the concert partly because it was an entertainment expenditure that appealed only to white students.

"Unless blacks and whites could be equally satisfied then the money should not be spent at all," Bell said. "The council ought to consider being totally fair and if that can't be done then scratch the whole thing."

Rackoff agreed with Bell that the council should recognize the rights of people on campus who might not want the concert.

"When it rains and we have to raise the fees it's going to be on your heads, because I'm voting against this thing," Rackoff said. "American democracy was not based on only rights of the majority but also based on the recognition of minority rights."

CGC member Betsy Jordan, also chairman of the Chapel Thrill Review Committee, disagreed and said she supported the concert because it was something that affected more students.

"The whole student body may not attend Chapel Thrill, but the whole student body does not use all of the student organizations," Jordan said. "This is a chance to take something to them that is very visible."

Because of the financial risks, the council approved an amendment requiring the Chairman of the Chapel Thrill Committee to appear before the full council before signing any contract with a band. This motion puts a freeze on all money except funds appropriated for office supplies, postage, telephone, travel and the costs of tickets. The amendment has given the council the right to cancel the concert at any time and at a loss of approximately \$1,300.

Because of the uncertainty of the bands, Rackoff said he supported the amendment as a way for the council to cut losses if a suitable band were not contracted.

"Dammit, if you, the council, are willing to put this money on the line from the general surplus, then you've (Chapel Thrill committee members) got to be willing to come in here and talk on the program for five minutes and get the hands up or the hands down," Rackoff said.

Chapel Thrill Committee Chairman Bert Johnson, however, disagreed because he said the bands might want a direct answer and would sign somewhere else if they were told to wait.

Johnson said the committee had just begun to look at different bands, and hoped to hear from Santana and Jefferson Starship today.

Study reveals percentages of minority aid

By ROANN BISHOP
Staff Writer

Though black students at UNC compose only 7.9 percent of the student body, they received 11 percent (or \$838,404) of the total amount of financial aid awarded in 1980, according to a December report.

The report is compiled annually through the UNC Institute of Research for the Office of Civil Rights, a national organization.

More than 12,700 UNC students received financial assistance in 1980, amounting to \$41,777,561. Black students made up 1,465 of this figure while 11,034 white students received aid totaling \$34,799,110.

The aid awarded came from state, federal, private and institutional sources covering athletic and academic scholarships, grants, loans, work-study programs and teaching assistantships.

"More minority students receive aid in the student body in proportion to the number of white students

because of their less favorable economic backgrounds," Eleanor Morris, director of student aid, said.

Tim R. Sanford, UNC associate director of institutional research and chief compiler of the annual financial aid report to the Civil Rights Office, held the same view.

"Blacks receive equal, if not more, aid than white students because of their generally lower socioeconomic levels," Sanford said. "This is not preferential treatment. Whites on this campus come from more affluent families and tend to need less financial support."

However, Hayden B. Renwick, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, took a different view of the matter.

Renwick said that while financial aid funding from the federal government seemed equal and adequate, funding from private sources at the state and local levels were unequally distributed between black and white students on campus.

"The federal funding is in reasonably adequate proportions between blacks and whites," Renwick said. "But once you get outside the realm of the federal government you can see a distinct difference in the dollar amounts between blacks and whites."

Under the categories of student employment and tuition waivers on the report, the figures appeared unbalanced. In 1980, UNC student employment numbered 531 blacks or 6.9 percent of the student body, while the number of whites employed by the University was almost 7,000 or 90.6 percent of the student body.

Thus, blacks received \$869,643 (or 5.3 percent) of the total salary supplied by institutional employment, while whites received \$14,934,643 (or 91.2 percent) of the total work dollars.

Institutional employment is controlled through a variety of offices and departments on campus and includes teaching assistantships, library and hospital jobs.

See AID on page 2

Groups debate abortion issue; Helms' amendment questioned

By BETSY RUSSELL
Staff Writer

In response to Sen. Jesse Helms' proposed Human Life Amendment which would ban abortion, pro- and anti-abortion forces, including local groups, have organized and plan to lobby in Washington to express their concerns.

Today, the National Organization for Women (NOW) is sponsoring a Women's Rights Lobby Day to urge members of Congress to stop the proposed amendment which Helms introduced two weeks ago. Thousands are expected to gather on Capitol Hill to show their opposition.

Two weeks ago, 50,000 people participated in a "March for Life" in Washington to lobby for the passage of the proposed amendment.

On that same day, Helms and Rep. Robert Dornan (R-Ca) introduced the controversial Human Life Amendment which would reverse the U.S. Supreme Court's 1973 abortion ruling.

The amendment states that "the paramount right to life is invested in each human being from the moment of fertilization without regard to age, health or condition of dependency."

In order for the amendment to be ratified, Congress must approve it by a two-thirds vote and three-fourths of the state legislatures must ratify it.

Helms also introduced a Human Life Statute which would allow state legislatures to ban abortions. It also would forbid state financial support of abortions through direct funds or contributions to state medical facilities.

Carl Anderson, Helms' legislative assistant, gave no reason why Helms has proposed the amendment at this time.

"Senator Helms just decided to propose it early in the session," Anderson said. "He has proposed this amendment at the beginning of each session since 1973."

"The whole point of this constitutional amendment is to allow North Carolina to do what it could do before the Court acted in 1973," he said.

But many groups would prefer that abortion laws remain unchanged. Kathi Moon, a spokesperson for the Chapel Hill chapter of the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL),

said, "The so-called Human Life Amendment is, I think, the greatest danger to human freedom that's currently on the horizon in the United States." She said the amendment was "very vague and general."

"Futher, the amendment is not a civil rights action.... They're trying to impose their religious beliefs on everyone else in the country," she said. "When life begins is strictly a religious issue."

Ray Warren, publicity chairman for Carolina Students for Life, said he viewed this amendment as a civil rights issue. He said the amendment would restrict an individual's freedom in some ways.

"There is no such thing as a civil rights law that doesn't restrict choice in some way," he said. "Choice is a meaningless term outside of the context in which it is used. As a civil rights group, we don't recognize the choice to take innocent human lives as one accorded to people in a civilized society. Also, the legalization has prompted more people to have abortions," he said.

He emphasized that Carolina Students for Life and Helms felt that the rights of the unborn could not be bargained in any way.

Miriam Sifkin, legislature chairperson, of the local chapter of NOW, said this was "an issue at the very basis of a woman's freedom. Many men and women feel it's an infringement on an individual's freedom," she said.

Karen Mulhauser, executive NARAL director, has denounced the proposed amendment as an intrusion into individuals' and families' rights.

The National Organization for Women has charged that the amendment would prohibit such birth control methods as intrauterine devices (IUDs) and most birth control pills because they work after the egg has been fertilized.

Anderson said the amendment would outlaw birth control devices. "This is because no one constitutional amendment is self-enforcing," he said. "Every constitutional amendment



Sen. Jesse Helms



Dianne Beckman goes over course material with Marie Griffin ...teaching suspicious students provides challenges for teaching assistants

Despite student concern

TAs gain experience in class

By JONATHAN SMYLYE
Staff Writer

It's the first day of class and a group of freshmen anxiously await their initiation into college academic life. They whisper to one another wondering about the great minds they might encounter. A young man with disheveled hair and clothes, and wearing glasses walks into the class. At first the students do not even notice him, expecting him to take his place with the rest of the class. They are startled, however, when he steps at the podium in front of the class and speaks. "Hi, I'm Bert Belminder. I'm your TA."

This type of episode is not uncommon during the first days of class. Everyone wonders how a "mere" TA can teach college students. Many students spend the rest of their college careers blaming TAs for their academic woes.

"It's hard to have confidence in their (TAs) knowledge when they are so close to your age," said Dianne Hubbard, a senior English major.

One student, who preferred to remain anonymous, said "I dislike having to pay to be used as a guinea pig."

The attitude of many students is that TAs do not understand course material as well as professors. However, there are several University teaching assistants

and professors who disagree. "I consider TAs as colleagues of mine," said Dr. Arthur Benavie, an economics professor. "I get as much from them as they do from me." Benavie said his TAs help improve material presentation since they have an inside track on what the students respond to most effectively.

Although the validity of a TA's subject knowledge might be questioned, the combination of professors' guidance and a strict weeding out process are attempts to eliminate any problems.

See TEACHING on page 2

See ABORTION on page 2