

Foul shooting insures Heel victory

by Mark Whicker
Sports Editor

CHARLOTTEVILLE, Va.—Carolina didn't exactly sneak into Charlottesville Saturday afternoon.

The undefeated Virginia Cavaliers had all the traps set. All 8,250 seats were filled in University Hall, there were signs galore (one said "UCLA—the Virginia of the West") and Gov. Linwood Holton received an orange U.Va. blazer and was made an honorary citizen of Cavalier country.

But somehow the third-ranked Tar Heels soft-pedaled out of Charlottesville with an 85-79 victory, and they did it with one of the most basic, yet unnoticed, basketball skills—foul shooting.

Carolina hit 20 of 29 free throw opportunities in the second half, Kim Huband making all 10 of his foul shots, to escape with the victory after Virginia battled the Tar Heels evenly throughout 32 minutes.

In doing so, Carolina took the conference lead with a 2-0 conference

record and 11-1 overall. Virginia is now 4-1 and 12-1.

The critical surge came after Virginia's Jim Hobgood put the Cavs ahead 60-58 with 10 minutes left. Bill Chamberlain hit a foul shot and Huband converted four in a row for a three-point lead.

Barry Parkhill, who led the Wahooos with 24, hit a baseline jumper. Three minutes later, he hit another from 15 feet.

But in between, Carolina upped its edge to 70-62 on two baskets by Bobby Jones and a foul shot by Robert McAdoo.

After Parkhill's second jumper, he fouled Huband who hit two more shots. Then Steve Previs drove in for two layups and Huband hit still another foul shot for a 77-64 lead with 3:28 to go.

Much to Dean Smith's disappointment, Carolina could not wrap up the victory. Hobgood, Tim Rash, Bob McKeag and Scott McCandlish all connected in the next two minutes to bring Virginia within six at 79-73, and then Hobgood sank both ends of a one-and-one with 39 seconds left.

But George Karl, returning from an injured ankle, hit four foul shots and Huband two more to ice the win.

Carolina had 10 more points at the line than Virginia—the difference in the game since the Wahooos hit 30 of 69 shots and Carolina 28 of 49. The Cavaliers maintained later that better shooting in the first half (they had a 41.9 percentage while UNC was shooting 55.6) would have given them a big lead at intermission.

Virginia was getting the shots in the

first half because Carolina was playing giveaway. The Tar Heels made a lot of early turnovers after jumping to a 14-7 lead, but Virginia took its time in drawing even.

The halftime tally was 39-37 in favor of UNC, chiefly because of two backcourt steals by Huband and Previs and a steal and layup by Chamberlain.

This was a team, however, that averages a 49.5 percentage. For the game, they hit 43.5. And the guards were

shooting in the first half because Parkhill was in foul trouble early.

The leading actors in the drama were McAdoo, Huband and Parkhill.

McAdoo had 18 points and 10 rebounds, wowing the fans with one drive that went the length of the floor. He burned McCandlish throughout the game.

Parkhill's multiple skills were dimmed in the first half. He only scored seven points and had three fouls. But he was hot in the second half and ended with a nine-for-19 field goal percentage.

And there was the quiet Huband, keeping Parkhill away from the basket, dropping foul shots easily, handling the ball expertly. He got 18 points and missed only two shots the entire afternoon.

Chamberlain contributed 13 with nine rebounds, and Previs scored 10.

For Virginia, Hobgood scored 16 with eight rebounds, and Rash scored 11.

Carolina hosts Wake Forest Wednesday night.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Vol. 80, No. 86

Monday, January 17, 1972

Founded February 23, 1893

Tuition residency clause declared unconstitutional

by Evans Witt
Staff Writer

A Superior Court ruling handed down Saturday declared unconstitutional the University regulation forcing students to drop out of school to establish in-state residency for tuition purposes.

Lamb received notice of the judge's decision Saturday.

Braswell judged the sections of the residency regulations unconstitutional on two grounds. The refusal of the Residency Status Committee to hold a hearing on their cases was a denial of equal protection of the law, Braswell said. The discrimination in favor of women was also ruled unconstitutional on the

certain appeal of the ruling by the University.

The suit was filed in Wake County Superior Court in Raleigh by two UNC Law School graduates, Anthony B. Lamb and Kenneth Glusman. Lamb, a Carrboro resident and Glusman, who now lives in Fayetteville, argued the case last Monday.

Lamb received notice of the judge's decision Saturday.

Braswell judged the sections of the residency regulations unconstitutional on two grounds. The refusal of the Residency Status Committee to hold a hearing on their cases was a denial of equal protection of the law, Braswell said. The discrimination in favor of women was also ruled unconstitutional on the

basis of the equal protection clause.

The regulations voided by Braswell's actions are listed in the "Undergraduate Bulletin" as follows:

"3) A person is eligible for in-state tuition if he has maintained a continuous domicile in North Carolina for the six months next preceding the date of enrollment or re-enrollment, exclusive of any time spent in attendance at any institution of higher education.

"4) Married students. The legal residency of a wife follows that of her husband, except that a woman currently enrolled as an in-state student in an institution of higher education may continue even though she marries a non-resident."

The decision struck down the clause of paragraph three which disallows any time spent in school toward the required months of residency.

Since the court suit began, the N.C. General Assembly changed the required residency period from six to 12 months. The change in the required length of residence does not change the effect of the suit, although the question of who is effected by the 12 month rule is still moot.

According to Lamb, several court decisions have established the validity of a required length of time to be spent to establish residency. However, Lamb said, the Supreme Court has struck down a number of regulations similar to UNC's concerning time spent in school.

Lamb said he established residency in North Carolina by paying state taxes, registering to vote and registering his automobile here. His appeals through the Residency Status Committee, the chancellor, the University president's office and the trustees were all denied.

The portion of the regulations concerning a spouse's residence was also struck down by Braswell as clearly unconstitutional.

Saying the notion that a wife's residency follows her husband's is simply a legacy from common law, Braswell enjoined the University from any practices which discriminate on the basis of this regulation.

Lamb said the Residency Status Committee would often grant hearing to women on the basis of their marriage. But the committee refused to give Lamb a full hearing in which to present the facts of his case, he said.

The question of the constitutionality of charging a different tuition for in-state and out-of-state students was not an issue in the case, Lamb said.

This case is the first to be decided in a series of court challenges to the current tuition structure at the University. A class action has been filed in Greensboro by the N.C. Civil Liberties Union on the tuition differential.

DTH needs people

The Daily Tar Heel is interested in hiring students for jobs in news and features reporting. Anyone interested should please come by the DTH office, Student Union, between 9 a.m. and 2 p.m. Wednesday, Jan. 20.



UNC student Terry Brown is all wrapped up for the winter weather which has finally arrived in Chapel Hill. The thermometer registered a low of a brisk 11 degrees Sunday. (Staff photo by Johnny Lindahl)

Flu not here yet; shots available

by Ellen Gilliam
Staff Writer

The rumored winter flu epidemic has not yet hit the UNC campus and there is little valid reason to believe it will, according to Dr. James A. Taylor, director of the UNC Student Health Service.

Although a few cases of a flu-like disease have been reported in Chapel Hill and at the UNC infirmary, elaborate virus studies would be required to determine

whether these cases are flu, Taylor said Friday.

The infirmary is taking mild precautions in case the reported cases are flu, he said. Several hundred doses of flu vaccine are available from the Student Health Service and students with chronic lung disorders, heart or kidney diseases or diabetes are advised to take the vaccine.

The vaccine is available without charge during infirmary office hours, 9 a.m. to noon and 2 to 5 p.m. daily except Saturday and Sunday.

"We are taking an inventory of our drug supply and stocking up on X-ray film in case we are faced with a large number of flu patients," Taylor said.

The Student Health Service has also engaged in preliminary planning for the care of dorm students in case the infirmary should be overcrowded with patients during a flu outbreak.

According to Taylor, flu symptoms include head and body ache, sore throat, cough and fever. These symptoms differ from cold symptoms in that the flu

patient usually does not have a runny nose or nasal congestion.

Indications are that if a flu epidemic comes, it may be the Hong Kong flu, Taylor said.

"According to the Public Health Department, the Hong Kong flu recycles itself every two to four years," Taylor said.

When a new virus hits, as it did several years ago in the form of the Hong Kong flu, those who had the disease before may still be immune, Taylor said.

"Also, those who have had a flu

vaccine containing the Hong Kong strain within the past couple of years may still be immune," he said. "In that case, a shot now would serve as a booster."

A vaccine after flu hits is ineffective, Taylor said, because a month to six weeks is required to build an immunity. The current flu outbreak is scheduled to hit in three or four weeks, he said.

"We hate to create panic about a possible epidemic, though, because at this time we have no conclusive evidence that there will be a large outbreak," Taylor said.

UNC football: part one

Are UNC football players abused?

(Editor's Note: The following list is the first in a series of five articles by former UNC football player George Simpson. The series was originally published in the Winston-Salem Journal and is being reprinted here in a slightly amended version.)

by George Simpson
Special to the DTH

Three months ago in Chapel Hill a young man named Billy Arnold collapsed on the football practice field mortally suffering from heat stroke. He died two weeks later to the shock of his teammates and to the outrage of some of his former teammates. Public outcry demanded an investigation of the events surrounding Arnold's death; events mysteriously shrouded in secrecy by the sports information office.

When the committee of university officials made public their findings following an extensive investigation into Arnold's death, most people seemed somewhat satisfied and the issue was closed. Most people... not everyone. A committee of former UNC football players under the leadership of former All-ACC standout Bill Richardson protested the absolution granted the football department by the investigative committee.

The Committee of Concerned Athletes

See related story, p. 5

was composed of former players who had, for one reason or another, quit the team before completion of their eligibility with the exception of Richardson, who had completed his eligibility last year as he was elected captain of the Peach Bowl Team by his teammates.

They accused the investigative committee of contradictions in their report with the implication that a new, more impartial committee should reinvestigate the Arnold incident. But what was equally serious but seemed to get less attention was the accusation by the Concerned Athletes that the UNC football coaches had mentally and physically abused their players. About 10 of the former players presented case histories at an October press conference at the Union giving examples of how the coaching staff had mentally or physically abused them. Usually the reason they had quit the team was a direct result of some form of abuse.

The press and the public turned to the football team for confirmation or refutation of the Concerned Athlete's charges. Richardson had said that he was

receiving support from many present UNC players, but no one on the team came forward to publicly support the Concerned Athletes. The controversy culminated in the issuance of a statement to the press by the football team confirming their support of Coach Dooley and his football program at the University. Further, when Richardson held a press conference later that same October week, Coach Dooley, the rest of his staff and the entire football team dressed in full playing gear marched en masse into the meeting. Dooley proceeded to try to discredit Richardson and his committee. Several members of the team derided Richardson and told him to stay out of team affairs. Richardson kept his composure and repeated his committee's platform. As Richardson began to fire questions at Dooley, the UNC head coach removed the team from the meeting and went to practice.

Once again Richardson said he was receiving verbal support from several team members, but the issue died down and now seems all but forgotten.

Was the Committee of Concerned Athletes telling the truth? Have players been abused mentally and physically under Dooley's reign? The UNC players have provided the answer in a survey conducted during the last two weeks of the regular season. I gave out some 70

six-page questionnaires to the present varsity football team and received 44 back completed. The questions examined the social, academic and physical aspects of playing football at Carolina. Question number 44 reads: Do you think any player has ever been mistreated by the coaches (i.e.: "been run-off," abused, etc.)? The players' response: 32 Yes and 6 No with 6 No answers. The next question asked for examples and here are some of the responses:

"Once, my freshman year (a player) was really pushed, in one-on-one blocking, sprints and extra one-on-one and sprints after practice during summer ball. (The player) was lazy but I disagree with what they did to him."

Wrote a second player in his anonymous response:

"Coaches got on certain guys more than is fair." Says a North Carolina senior:

"(Players) are used as scrimmage fodder, subjected to extremely sarcastic and derogatory language, more than necessary, told to play when sick or hurt, especially reserves."

Here's one personal witness:

"The example I mentioned earlier about being ill and in the hospital for five days and then asked to practice in full gear only two days after. Being awfully weak I was again and again abused for not

going full out and then I felt I was blacklisted from then on because of 'not putting out.'"

It is a common belief among UNC football players that some of them are "run off" by the coaches. This means a coach will be particularly hard on a single player, giving him extra work to do resulting in extra physical punishment. In this way, the coaches hope to discourage the player into quitting the team. Several of the Concerned Athletes said they were victims of this cruel practice. Present team members confirmed this:

"Pressure is applied to someone that the coaches feel is a recruiting mistake. Continual harsh practice to dishearten the player."

Another player confirmed a Concerned Athlete had been "run-off": "(The player) was personally degraded for his lack of athletic ability."

How are players "run off"? Said one: "Run-off, physically punished, mentally demoralized." Another wrote: "Verbal abuse mostly. Some coaches give the player the 'cold shoulder' and won't speak to him unless it's to tell him to get a haircut. Some coaches always pick certain players to participate in their 'shit drills.'"

It probably depends on your point of view as to whether you think "verbal and mental abuse" is merely a form of

motivational coaching or is in fact abusive. The coaches at UNC are just like anywhere else—they're in the business to win and often they get so emotionally charged-up trying to extract a winning performance out of a player that they tend to forget they are dealing with sensitive individuals every bit as "human" and emotional as men who don't play football. When asked in the survey what players do not like in a coach the overwhelming response centered around "a coach who intimidates his players, one that is dishonest or authoritarian or a coach who has no insight into his player's personality." Also mentioned were coaches who "have no appreciation for players as individuals or are narrow-minded, sarcastic or stubborn."

And when the survey asked would the players go to the coaches to discuss a personal problem the players who responded were split 23 yes, 19 no and 2 maybe. Asked why not they said "I don't feel close to them" or "They aren't interested in my problems or me as an individual." Six players said, "I can't trust the coaches."

Obviously there is a breakdown somewhere, but that is incidental to the fact that former and present players feel they are indeed subject to verbal, mental

See UNC football, p. 5

Weather

TODAY: sunny and cold; highs in the low 30s, lows in the teens; 20 percent chance of precipitation.