

Greg Porter
Editor

Joni Peters, Managing Editor
Ed Rankin, Associate Editor
Lou Bilionis, Associate Editor

Laura Scism, University Editor
Elliott Potter, City & State Editor
Chuck Alston, National Editor

Jack Greenspan, Features Editor
Jeanne Newsom, Arts Editor
Gene Upchurch, Sports Editor
Rouse Wilson, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

84th Year of Editorial Freedom

Big-time basketball in a small-time facility

Yesterday the number-two team in the nation and the number-one team in the world returned to a well-deserved reception by 6,000 loyal fans.

The Olympic champions and national runners-up also returned to a cracklebox of a gymnasium, a 'coliseum' that seats less than 10,000 fans for some of the finest basketball games in the world.

The University of North Carolina, long inscribed on the honor roll of big-time basketball programs, is still playing in a small-time facility.

The result is that many students and fans can see only a few games a year, if any at all. For big games, students have to wait all night to get a ticket. And the average fan, who does not give the Rams Club a fortune, is lucky if he gets to see Carolina play Seton Hall or some other cream puff.

And although Dean Smith is definitely doing a consistently excellent recruiting job, we are sure he has won over no high school stars with an inspiring look at expansive Carmichael.

While Carmichael is an excellent facility for its size and would be a valuable intramural and minor sports facility, it is no longer adequate to house what may well be the nation's most vibrant basketball program. Most big name basketball programs, Kentucky and UCLA, for instance, have coliseums seating over 15,000.

There is little question that UNC could fill a 20,000 seat auditorium consistently. The question is where the money will come from.

The legislature is a doubtful source. Since legislators have to look after the entire University system, they would be charged with blatant favoritism if they funded a large coliseum in Chapel Hill. Besides, the legislature is still haggling over a Research Triangle sports facility. This structure would definitely enhance the development of the area and would be an important step forward for the Triangle. But a Triangle sports arena is not the answer to UNC's problem. We agree with the Athletic Department that UNC should not stay so far from campus for its regular home games.

The answer, of course, is private contributions. The support for Carolina basketball is at an all-time high throughout North Carolina. Many a fan would be glad to contribute in the hope that he might get a ticket more easily in the future. Now is the time to collect the money for a new coliseum. Now, while the fans have basketball on their minds and in their hearts.

But, as of now, the Athletic Department has no plans to make a push for an arena. Assistant Athletic Director Moyer Smith says, "We hope to have something under way in the next five years."

There seems to be some concern on the part of many University administrators that solicitation for basketball funds will hurt the push for a larger endowment for the University as a whole. But it is obvious that the most lucrative time to collect for a basketball coliseum is now while the fans are enthusiastic. It's even possible that coliseum and endowment gifts could be tied together, using basketball as a promotional lure for general giving.

We're not so sure that solicitation for a coliseum construction fund would hurt endowment giving a great deal. But we're sure that a fine basketball program has been overlooked for too long. And we're sure that waiting any longer is the worst thing that we can do.

Dean Edwards Smith, voted the number one coach in the nation by his peers, won't be here for ever. We're eager to see the beginning of a drive for the Dean E. Smith Auditorium.

Medicaid forces parents to split to save children

Because of a quirk in the state's Medicaid law, children whose families are at least poor enough to qualify for health care cannot receive aid because their parents are married. Not only is the state denying 69,000 sick or poor children needed benefits, but also North Carolina actually is encouraging people to be on welfare.

The state now allows the children Medicaid payments if their parents are divorced, separated or disabled. But if their parents are married, they receive nothing. Low-income couples thus are often faced with a disastrous choice: either they split up, or they are forced to let their sick children go without health care.

This situation occurs because the state ties its Medicaid program for children to Aid to Families with Dependent Children, an organization which provides payments only to families where one or both parents are missing. Under federal law, however, North Carolina can include children of married couples as well as children living with only one parent.

The present system is an injustice to children in this state who deserve health care. They needlessly are excluded from benefits because their parents are married. In addition, the system forces people to go on welfare. In order to qualify himself for the money he needs for his child, a parent must go on the dole for something else.

The argument against broadening this system of welfare is the price tag. The Department of Human Resources has estimated that the Medicaid bill for 69,000 additional children would be \$129 million a year. Opponents of broadening the program say the General Assembly would never approve the \$8 million increase that the state would have to pay.

But it would appear, however, that bringing children of intact families into the Medicaid program would not change costs that extensively. Many families denied benefits now split up and get aid anyway.

The Medicaid program obviously needs broadening to include children of intact families. Maintaining the program only causes unnecessary grief for both the parents who are forced to separate to save their children and the children who are left out in the cold.

The Daily Tar Heel

publishes Monday through Friday during the academic year. Offices are at the Student Union Building, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone numbers: 933-0245, 0246, 0252.

The individual—a wasted source of power

By CHARLIE SCHEELER

And so it came to pass that in the waning stages of the 20th century, after over a millennium of desperate and relentless progress, man's march towards the golden gates of the good life ground to a halt. For man, in his single-minded quest for an economic utopia of abundance, finally had sacrificed his environment to the extent that Earth could no longer satisfy man's gluttonous appetite. Even more important, man had sacrificed his individuality in this hell-bent sprint for affluence. And man saw that there were still millions without food, without education, without hope; and he saw that their ranks would not be decreased. And it was not good.

It does not appear likely that we are condemned to endure a new Dark Age as a penalty for our past transgressions, but undeniably the days of mass producing Tonka toys and fluorescent Barbie dolls to bolster the economy have vanished. Gone forever are the times when Robert McNamara and his amoralistic eggheads could feed a million numbers into a computer to determine if a war with a small Southeast Asian country would sufficiently decrease unemployment.

Man has played this numbers game not only in economics, but in physics, chemistry and all sciences, and thus far he has lost the game. Through some incredibly esoteric calculations, he has conquered polio, but he has no idea what to do about depression. Man can develop a theory of relativity and measure the distances to places he cannot see, but he cannot develop or measure or define far more important concepts like fulfillment or happiness. Clearly, man

has found no arithmetic solution to the good life.

All this does not mean that we should dismiss Einstein as a superfluous freak or ritualistically detonate a Texas Instruments warehouse at dawn. But the time has come to realize that the welfare of nations, the validity of scientific theories, and the quality of life cannot always be measured in depersonalized quantifiable terms.

There are other cultures in the world that virtually are unknown to us because they have never mass-produced gas-eating hunks of steel or seriously played our numbers game. In the 1960s, a young anthropologist named Carlos Castaneda studied one of these cultures, the Yaqui Indians. This group had never seen fit to develop the B1 bomber because they had found sources of nearly unfathomable power in the inner strength and will of the individual. As Castaneda documented, just because this power cannot be evaluated in megatons of TNT does not mean it is any less potent.

The Yaquis are not alone in their realization of inner power. Eastern man has long been able to perform acts which defy Western scientific logic. Indian swamis have, under Western scientific supervision, stopped their heartbeats for 20 seconds at a time. And even a small, unheralded university in Durham, N.C. has initiated a program which studies parapsychology. The time has come to realize that just because a man does something that cannot be counted, that doesn't mean it doesn't count.

It would appear, then, that although Western man has done a masterful job of harnessing horses, steam, wind, oil and atoms, he thus far has been incredibly

wasteful in developing his most limitless source of power, the powers of the individual. But it is imperative that we do not let the individual become overwhelmed and tramped by the technocracy we have built.

Although we can force a peace upon the world, we cannot make peace with ourselves. Every day, tens of millions of Americans knock down Valium to fend off reality. Rather than expose our children to this horrid reality, we program them to sit passively in front of a fantasy box for hours a day while their creative processes are slowly sapped away. And no computer, no linear program with umpteen variables can solve this problem. The major problems of the 20th century have shifted from quantitative to qualitative. And so, the answers to these problems will not be found in Arab oil fields or IBM memory banks but must come from ourselves.

In depending upon the ABMs, the B1s, and the H-bombs for power, we have let ourselves become weak. For in the great military-industrial complex that is America, it has become all too easy for the individual to become depressed, disillusioned and dependent. Yet it is the power of the individual that is needed to get us out of the mess we're in. If the individual cannot be self-reliant, ultimately society cannot be self-reliant. Man can no longer allow himself to be swallowed by the monster he has created. For when once again one man can make a difference, it will make one hell of a difference.

Charlie Scheeler is a junior accounting major from Katmandu, Nepal.

letters to the editor

Thank you, Tar Heels, you're still first

To the editor:

As one of many followers of Carolina basketball this year, I would like to express my sincere and deep appreciation to Coach Smith, the members of our great basketball team and everyone else concerned with the team effort. It's really been a great year. We love you all. But in particular, the seniors deserve our recognition and praise.

One more thing, I'd rather go to Carolina than win a basketball game—GO HEELS. The Carolina spirit is No. 1.

Hugh Goodman
308 Lewis

To the editor:

Joining thousands of loyal Tar Heel fans, Rev. Manuel Wortman and I went to Carmichael for the welcome home celebration Tuesday. Shouts of "We're No. 1" echoed throughout the afternoon. The sign of the raised first finger signaled the same sentiment. Now to a literalist, all of this might have been confusing. He or she may have wondered if any of us had watched the previous night's game. There is a clear, understandable explanation for those with "eyes to see and ears to hear."

To us, the Tar Heels are No. 1. They represent what being a winner is all about.

They are No. 1 in their team effort and determination to play their best. This doesn't change even when a player is having an off night.

They are No. 1 in the manner in which they represented UNC. They showed character in victory or defeat. When they lost to Marquette, there was no excuse-making, blaming or scapegoating, only open sadness and honest tears.

They are No. 1 in courage for all the times they were down and came back. The team showed courage by its victories over pain, injury and personal disappointment. They were winners even when they lost a game.

They are No. 1 in the affections of all their supporters. The players of this team have been personal examples of sportsmen.

So while we hope to win the whole thing some day, to my mind this 1977 team is still No. 1. Tuesday was a united effort to salute them and their fine achievement.

Rev. Stan Smith
Aldersgate UNC

To the editor:

The season-long love affair we have carried on with our team doesn't end simply after the final game. Thank you, Heels, for everything you have given all of us.

Kate Urquhart
213 1/2 McCauley St.

To the editor:

Dear Tar Heels:
We are saddened to see the dream end, but thank you for bringing us so close. You are a great basketball team. We will not forget you.

The Boys from EOWYK
249-252 Craige

Remove bumper stickers

To the editor:

I am happy to learn that the Sigma Nus have overcome the need for sleep. Perhaps they can devote their new-found time to constructive projects, such as removing bumper stickers that deface public property.

Bart McMillan
Craige Underground

Indian culture misrepresented

To the editor:

After reading the article (March 29) concerning the Kola Pow-Wow held in Raleigh this past weekend, I felt that a response was needed as there were a number of errors and misconceptions in the article which need to be corrected.

First, it was rather obvious to me that Ms. Arsdale did not bother to talk to anyone concerned with the Pow-Wow about what was going on. Had she done so, she might at least have avoided some of the more technical errors she made, such as calling head singer Roscoe Conklin a Comanche instead of a Ponca (and then misspelling

Ponca when she did get around to using it).

She might have found out that our Pow-Wow was not "unique in that whites as well as Indians participated in the festivities", as there are few, if any, Pow-Wows to my knowledge that are closed to non-Indians. She also might have learned that the majority of Indians at the Pow-Wow were from right down in eastern North Carolina, from the Lumbee and Haliwa tribes. Maybe it just sounds more romantic to talk about Indians from Oklahoma than from North Carolina, but some of us feel otherwise.

She also might have found out, if she had bothered to talk to them, that the white traders who were there are not people who make their money exploiting Indian people. I am personally acquainted with two of the

three white traders who were there and can truthfully say that they are highly respected by the Indian people with whom they work and are highly knowledgeable about Indian culture.

The article continues to perpetuate the myth that Indian culture is static and has not changed in the past hundred years. We are expected to act certain ways and do certain things or risk being labeled "un-Indian." We are told in the article that the Indian fry bread was not authentic because a deep-fryer was used to cook it. We are told that because the head singer for the Gourd Dance chose to sing in English instead of Ponca for a few verses that the dance and song are not authentic. This seems very unfair to me. Your Anglo-American culture has stolen

and borrowed customs and traditions from almost every conceivable source, and no one worries about this. But if our culture, or any other, borrows something from you, we are accused of no longer being real Indians.

However, I did not write this letter to teach a course in Indian culture. I wrote it to say that we in the Carolina Indian Circle would have liked maybe just a little more objective writing about the Pow-Wow and less sentimental stuff about why the "tall, proud Indian on the environmental commercial was crying".

Forest Hazel
Past Administrative Chief
Carolina Indian Circle
516 Ehringhaus



Save Our Children: 'unbiased' or anti-gay?

To the editor:

Where did Joel Roberts (March 30) get his "unbiased" information about Anita Bryant and Co.? The fact is that Ms. Bryant believes that being gay is o.k. so long as she doesn't see it, hear about it, or, for that matter, know about it. Bryant not only wants to keep homosexuals out of the schools—where neither atheists nor KKK members are banned by law—but also out of rights to housing and employment of any kind.

Ms. Bryant's main worry is what she calls "recruitment." She says that because gays "can't reproduce" (as if gays were born without reproductive organs), they must recruit to keep their ranks large. Stop a moment, and consider how easily you might be recruited into homosexual behavior, feelings and attitudes. These last two are important. Is a female child who is sexually molested by an adult male, who takes advantage of her ignorance of sexual matters, converted to believe that pursuing sexual encounters for physical pleasure is a viable lifestyle? With regard to recruitment alone, have the Shakers taken over the world with their beliefs?

Stop again, and consider how much your sexuality defines you as a whole person. Out of all the preferences, attitudes and feelings we develop, sexual and affectional preferences are perhaps the least

affected by the persons we have encountered as teachers. Consider the number of people with affectional and sexual preference for their own sex who came through a heterosexually defined school system and education. (Yes, there are many homosexuals in school systems throughout the United States, but you seldom hear of them because this has little to do with their jobs and because of people like Anita Bryant and Joel Roberts who seem to feel that same-sex affectional preferences define one's whole being.)

Joel Roberts thinks he is being unbiased. Would it also be unbiased to say that a number of "well-meaning" white parents do not want their children taught by black teachers or exposed to black people; and they, therefore, have the right to try to ban blacks from public classrooms, housing and employment? Certainly "beliefs are hard to suppress," but Mr. Roberts seems to think he has suppressed his when others cannot and that he can stand "unbiased" as he watches certain basic human rights collapse before an onslaught of some homophobic orange squeezers who seem to have no faith in their children's ability to make their own decisions.

Emily Seelbinder
Chapel Hill

To the editor:

Joel Roberts' response (March 30) to my letter concerning Anita Bryant's anti-gay rights activities contains a subtle bias I feel compelled to point out. Characterizing Ms. Bryant as just a mother worried over her children's well-being, Roberts writes, "Ms. Bryant, like any concerned parent, only wants what she thinks is best for her children." He later adds, "...beliefs are hard to suppress in a classroom, where they would influence small children." I couldn't agree more.

The point here is that no one condemns heterosexual teachers for (unconsciously) influencing their pupils to "become" straight, but let a gay teacher in the classroom and one immediately hears

protestations of "unnatural influence." If children had positive role models, both gay and non-gay, available to them in school and throughout their lives they would grow up with a more secure sense of their own sexuality, whatever that may be, than did the young adults of today.

Ms. Bryant has made it clear she does not want her children to have this opportunity. Her current campaign is directed at depriving your and my children as well; a bigoted and ill-guided effort I, for one, resent.

Gary Parks
Department of Art

To the editor:

I haven't followed Anita Bryant's situation very closely, and I don't know all the trouble she is having, but I do know that I admire her for her crusade against the homosexual community in Dade County. She stayed out of this issue as long as she felt it was possible, but finally it came time for her to intrude. I believe she is concerned for all the children in Dade County, not just her own. I'm not sure if Gary Parks (March 28) knows all the consequences of her situation either. I get tired of hearing about gay

rights at this University. Instead of talking about all the rights of homosexuals, I think that people have the right to avoid these gay movements, and I consider this latter right as a civil right of mine. I don't plan to fight Anita Bryant and Save Our Children, Inc.; instead, I support their actions 100 per cent.

Rick Berth
115 Lewis