

The Daily Tar Heel

96th year of editorial freedom

JEAN LUTES, Editor

KAREN BELL, News Editor

MATT BIVENS, Associate Editor

KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor

JON K. RUST, Managing Editor

WILL LINGO, City Editor

KELLY RHODES, Arts Editor

CATHY MCHUGH, Omnibus Editor

SHELLEY ERBLAND, Design Editor

KAARIN TISUE, News Editor

LAURA PEARLMAN, Associate Editor

KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor

WILLIAM TAGGART, State and National Editor

DAVE GLENN, Sports Editor

LEIGH ANN McDONALD, Features Editor

BRIAN FOLEY, Photography Editor

KELLY THOMPSON, Design Editor

University needs to shift gears

Paying more and getting less — no intelligent person would accept such a deal, but that's exactly what the chancellor's ad hoc committee on parking has offered students.

■ The chancellor has a proposal on his desk that calls for a trial parking program that would allow free parking on North Campus after 7 p.m. for faculty and staff who frequently work late. Everyone else would have to pay \$2 to park on North Campus at night.

It means students — you know, the ones who do silly things like drive to the library at night — would have to pay \$2 to park anywhere near the main libraries on campus. Two dollars every time a student who lives off-campus needs to look up a source in Davis Library or check a quiz file in the Undergrad. Hefty price to pay for being a conscientious student, don't you think?

■ The chancellor's committee on parking also wants to eliminate 350 student parking spaces. And students are already slated to lose hundreds of spaces on South Campus when construction of the Craige parking deck begins this fall.

The committee says limited central campus parking is hurting the University's ability to attract and retain faculty and staff. "Reducing the number of spaces used by resident students will help improve the situation," the proposal states.

Do they mean prospective faculty members are saying no to Chapel Hill

In search of a snack bar . . .

There's an old quote from Robert Burns about how the best laid plans of mice and men oft go astray. Proof positive of these words of wisdom can be found in the latest addition to the Marriott food trust on campus — the Union Station.

It's a great idea: a convenient location that stays open late at night and accepts meal cards. What more could a hungry, hurried student want? The food in the Union Station is even pretty good — sandwiches (they even have my favorite, peanut butter and jelly on whole wheat bread) and salads and those soft cookies that make coming to campus worthwhile. But no one can find any of these exotic delicacies without a compass to navigate the floor plan.

Is this what students waited for all last semester? Is this why construction workers were sequestered behind plastic bags and tape that read "Beware Asbestos"? Who designed the Union Station — because he or she didn't have a very tight grasp on the term "efficiency."

The layout of the place renders its well-intended purpose useless. No obvious traffic pattern exists, and the unwitting student could easily find himself wandering in what is surely the smallest labyrinthine structure in the

because they won't be able to park right outside their offices? Are the academic stars of the next decade saying, "Okay, okay, I've heard enough about the low salaries, the dismal benefits and the lack of a sabbatical policy at UNC. Let's get down to the nitty-gritty: Where will my parking space be?" If administrators want to slash student parking, they can certainly come up with a better excuse.

■ The committee also suggests charging all students a \$25 annual transportation fee to improve the campus shuttle system. This may be the most worthwhile proposal of all — if administrators get their way, it seems like no students will park within three miles on their classes or the library. We'll need shuttles.

The safety of students who must park at night should also be considered. Faculty are inconvenienced when they have to park far away, but most go home around nightfall. Students, in contrast, often stay on campus to study and participate in extracurricular activities. Denying them parking near central campus could cause safety problems, especially for women.

No administrators will comment on the proposals until two public information sessions are held — on Feb. 10 at 3 p.m. in the Old Clinic Auditorium and Feb. 13 at 3:30 p.m. in 100 Hamilton. Mark your calendars. — Jean Lutes

Western Hemisphere.

Traffic problems aside, the Union Station also presents a textbook example of wasted space. Almost half of the floor space is devoted to counters where students can stand up and eat. With a television lounge filled with chairs and tables right next door, the counters could have been left out in favor of a larger area for the food and drink selection.

If Marriott opened the Union Station to increase revenue, its officials were on the right track. The Station fills a gaping hole in the food service on campus; the crowds who flock there between classes attest to that fact. Unfortunately, those same crowds get clogged in between the drink machines and the nifty wall, which seems big enough to house a nuclear fallout shelter. Often students will leave the Station without a muffin or a soda because the food is simply too difficult to reach safely. And if people are leaving without everything they want, Marriott isn't reaping the full financial benefits of its most recent expansion.

Students will continue to use the Union Station because of the convenient location and food selection, but maybe next time the food service officials build a new snack shop, they'll hire a sensible architect to design it. — Laura Pearlman

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Louis Bissette, Sandy Dimsdale, Mary Jo Dunnington and David Starnes.

Assistant Editors: Jenny Cloninger and Justin McGuire, university; Felisa Neuringer, managing; Myra Miller, features; Cara Bonnet, arts; Andrew Podolasky, Chris Spencer and Jay Reed, sports; David Minton, photography.

News: Lynn Ainsworth, Crandall Anderson, Kari Barlow, John Bakht, Crystal Bernstein, James Benton, Tammy Blackard, Charles Brittain, James Burroughs, Sarah Cagle, Brenda Campbell, James Coblin, Daniel Conover, Staci Cox, L.D. Curle, Blake Dickinson, Karen Dunn, Erik Flippo, Laura Francis, Lynn Goswick, Susan Holdselaw, Jessica Lanning, Tracy Lawson, Dana Clinton Lumsden, Helle Nielson, Glenn O'Neal, Tom Parks, Dana Primm, Elizabeth Sherrod, Nicole Skalski, Thom Solomon, Will Spears, Larry Stone, Laura Taylor, Kathryn Tovo, Amy Wajda, Sandy Wall, Leslie Wilson, Jennifer Wing and Nancy Wykle.

Sports: Mike Berardino, senior writer; Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, John Bland, Robert D'Aruda, Scott Gold, Doug Hoogervorst, Bethany Litton, Brendan Matthews, Jamie Rosenberg, Natalie Seckick, Dave Surowiecki, Lisa Swicegood and Eric Waggon.

Features: David Abernathy, Cheryl Allen, Craig Allen, Jackie Douglas, Jackie Greenberg, Hart Miles, Cheryl Pond, Leigh Pressley and Ellen Thornton.

Arts: Randy Basinger, Clark Benbow, Beth Buffington, Ashley Campbell, Andrew Lawler, Julie Olson and Jessica Yates.

Photography: Steven Exum, David Foster, Becky Kirkland and Dave Surowiecki.

Copy Editors: James Benton, Michelle Casale, Yvette Cook, Julia Coon, Erik Flippo, Joy Golden, Bert Hackney, Susan Holdselaw, Anne Isenhower, Gary Johnson, Janet McGuire, Angelia Poteat and Steve Wilson.

Editorial Assistants: Mark Chilton, Jill Doss, and Anne Isenhower. Amy Dickinson, letter typist.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Adam Cohen, Pete Corson, Bryan Donnell, Trey Entwistle, David Estoye, Greg Humphreys and Mike Sutton.

Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, classified manager; Chrissy Mennitt, advertising manager; Sabrina Goodson, business manager; Dawn Dunning, Beth Harding, Sarah Hoskins, Amy McGuire, Maureen McIntyre, Denise Neely, Tina Perry, Pam Strickland, Amanda Tilley and Joyce Wiley, display advertising representatives; Leisa Hawley, creative director; Dan Raasch, marketing director; Stephanie Chesson, Alicia Cole, Genevieve Halkent, Camille Philyaw, Tammy Sheldon and Angela Spivey, classified advertising representatives; Jeff Carlson, office manager and Allison Ashworth, secretary.

Subscriptions: Ken Murphy, manager.

Distribution: David Econopoulou, manager; Newton Carpenter, assistant.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn, managers; Anita Bentley, Stephanie Locklear and Leslie Sapp, assistants.

Printing: The Village Companies.

Readers' Forum

Choose abortion before over-population

Marguerite Arnold

Guest Writer

I think I should start this rebuttal to Lisa Stockman's ("Definition of 'life' not open for debate," Jan. 27) interesting article by stating a few basic points. The population of the world at this moment is a little over five billion people. Only 130 odd years ago, it had reached one billion people for the first time. That means that the population of the earth has grown by a factor of five in the last 130 years. Not only that, but at the present rate of world growth, 1.7 percent, the population of the world will double yet again in approximately 40 years.

Yeah, yeah, so what, right? What does this have to do with abortion, and the right to life? Very simply, it has a great deal to do with not only the right to life, but the quality of it. Personally, I do not want to live in a world of 10 billion people when I am 60 years old. Perhaps this is a selfish thing, but I think the world has enough problems dealing with five billion *homo sapiens* at one time, let alone twice that number. I also do not like the thought that even as our ardent right-to-lifers demonstrate that abortion is evil and we should all just adopt, there are millions of people starving to death in countries less fortunate than our own, and where, I might point out, adoption is not a remote possibility.

I know that most "pro-lifers" don't think about such trivial details. It doesn't matter anyway, as the *United States* doesn't have a population problem, right? Well, I'm not so sure about that either. I do know that we have a great number of people who fall between the cracks as we so euphemistically call it when income level does not meet subsistence requirements. Do they cry out that these poor people are not being adopted too, or bother to mention that many ethnic babies put up

for adoption are not adopted because of their skin color and have the unenviable position of growing up in a home.

I would also point out that I am not "pro-abortion." I'm not sure you can find many people who will say they are. Prevention is the better part of valor. I do not think, however, that abortion is, as you so dramatically stated, murder. Your pat description of the beginnings of life is not quite accurate. That statement that life begins at conception, is categorically untrue. Since the sperm and egg are most definitely alive in the biological sense, life begins when one's mother's eggs are first formulated (females are born with all the eggs they will ever produce) and when the father's sperm are formed in the scrotum. However, if by your cavalier description of life starting when the heart begins to beat you mean that the individual is formed within the womb, then this claim is also untrue. The heart starts to beat even before the brain, from where all emotions and reasons emanate, has formed.

We are not sure when "the individual" truly begins. This is something that society, for its own good, must determine. Saving "a life" for the sake of putting that child on a respirator for the rest of its life is not a very humane thing to do, nor is it very humane to let the child be born to a mother who will either abandon it because she cannot or will not care for it, or watch her child starve to death before her eyes.

This leads me to my final point and one

that you illustrate quite well when you contradict yourself. Yes, there are a great deal of lives at stake, but it is the lives of the living that I think are far more important than those who have yet to be born. Yes, the quality of life is rapidly deteriorating, but why do you think this? Quite simply, there are not enough resources to go around. In other words, there are too many people already living for the earth's environment to sustain.

It has been speculated that the number of people who could live on this earth at the current American standard of living is only 1/2 billion. We currently have, as I stated before, 10 times that many. While I do not advocate mass murder, nor living with the waste produced by our "throw-away society," I think that we have a problem of enormous import on our hands. While abortion certainly is not the answer to this problem, it is certainly a means of controlling population. Birth control, in any of its various forms, and there are many, is obviously the best answer. However, until we are able to control the exploding world population, abortion remains an end to a means.

Yes, I am pro-life in the sense that I want the quality of life of those already populating this precious jewel, spaceship Earth, to improve. Realistically however, I realize that it will not until we solve the problem of over-population and environmental abuse that we are currently inflicting upon our planet and upon ourselves. And you can take that all the way to the Bushes, with their big, happy family.

Marguerite Arnold is a senior international studies major from Chapel Hill.

CGLA is no joke

To the editor:

Oh, please, Mr. Sisson, win the Student Body President election and defund that "secret group," the CGLA! I'm sure then, that all "promotion of acts that are illegal," such as flyers depicting homosexuality, will stop, and all gays and lesbians will turn straight and thank you for bringing them up to par as true citizens. I know that then the vigorous recruiting of heterosexuals to turn gay will finally come to an end. And who wants to be a part of their "secret group" anyway? By the way, I'm an education major; I'd like to talk to you sometime about getting into Delta Sigma Pi. Finally, with the money each of us saves, we'll be able to buy a couple of beers when we graduate.

But one thing would be regrettable if we defunded the CGLA and had homosexuality wiped out for good: people like you and I would have no one to laugh at. What would we do? Hey, I know — we could go to work on getting students kicked out of school who have ever gotten a DWI or DUI. After all, drinking and driving's against the law, too.

ALICE LUTMAN
Junior
Education

A stately lesson for UNC

To the editor:

With the news of N.C. State's new basketball arena, which guarantees its students half of the 25,000 planned seats, I could not help thinking to myself, "Couldn't we have done that?" I find it embarrassing that we here at UNC cannot manage to handle the same affair ourselves while our less refined neighbors to the east have come up with a plan so simple and fair for both the students and the private contributors. Their proposal obviously took into account the state of our seating policy, and

AFTER AN EXTENSIVE SEARCH, AN OBLIVIOUS JURY HAS BEEN FOUND.



noted that a much better way could be found. Had our student body been consulted on the building of the so-called Student Activities Center, I believe that the result would have been different.

While we struggle with our seating problems over the next several months, let us be reminded of the NCSU example. Students can have the equal seating they deserve. I hope that we can work out our problem in a similar fashion.

Congratulations, N.C. State students. This is one victory that you can have over our basketball program.

LOUIS LAMAR
Junior
Political science/English

Let's tawk stereotypes

To the editor:

I would like to address David Surowiecki's Jan. 31 article on gymnast Kristin Bilotta, a senior from New Jersey. The article rightly compliments Bilotta but then proceeds to obnoxiously put down "Jersey girls." I am a native Jerseyan, and I resent being outwardly insulted by the stereotype that

I'm supposed to be "loud, outspoken and rude." Believe it or not, this stereotype does not fit girls statewide. Maybe you should imply that all Southern girls are "dumb blondes, y'all." New Jerseyans may "tawk" or act a little differently, but then again who can sing or perform better in concert than The Boss?

AMY FISHMAN
Sophomore
Accounting

Long live the debate

To the editor: I knew that something was wrong before I even realized the content of Lisa Stockman's essay entitled "Definition of 'life' not open for debate" (Jan. 27). The title alone made me cringe. Abortion itself is only an issue, but the way that Ms. Stockman expressed her opinion on abortion implied something more important: an attitude. Ms. Stockman's attitude said to me: "I know what is exactly true about an abstract idea, and I don't care what you think." It is fine with me if Ms. Stockman does not care what I think, but she is wrong to say that "life" is not "open for debate" because I disagree with her definition of life, and that makes it open for debate. I am

not going to list my reasons for why I think that abortion should remain legal because they are not new, like Ms. Stockman's anti-abortion arguments are not new. I only want to say that I think "debate" is a wonderful thing, no matter what the issue is. It is through debate that truth is found. However, in this case I think that debate on the definition of life can only approach the truth, which will have to be good enough until God tells us exactly what life is.

DAVID SPANJER
Junior
Accounting

Culture doesn't mean yoghurt

To the editor: I am always happy to grab a little bit of culture with the DTH front page quotation.

However, the authors should be properly quoted. Indeed, the major philosopher of the 16th century is Michel de Montaigne and not Michel de Montagne (I don't know this person). You can find this quotation in his "Essays."

Being a well-rounded person is not an easy task!

SONIA ABECASSIS
Graduate
Romance languages

Liberal arts shunned by Career Planning

Dereck Daschke

Guest Writer

Marcia Harris of University Career Planning and Placement Services (UCPPS), by advising students not to support the introduction of minors at UNC and to take more business classes instead sadly reinforces the disturbing notion that business is all there is in the "real world" and that even liberal arts must, in the end, concede to a more pragmatic outlook, so college students might as well begin tailoring their investigations to fit the corporate cut.

While I certainly can say nothing against making one's record as attractive as possible to prospective employers, I think Ms. Harris narrow-mindedly ignores the needs of the many thousands of non-business-oriented students on this campus and the benefits for business majors in having the minor option. First, if a person of any major wants to expand outside his or her field, the options are few. Either 1) double major, and take on at least another two semesters worth of work, or 2) forget it because one major is enough of a pain. One could, of course, claim additional coursework as a "secondary

concentration," and have the double pleasure of not gaining official recognition for it and of getting to explain to an interviewer that it is legitimate. Ms. Harris states that this system is more "flexible" than working for a minor. From personal experience, I know it is not, having had to do major replanning to incorporate a religion major, including changing from a B.S. in psychology to a B.A. because the University will not let a person double major with a B.S. degree.

Ms. Harris also suggests that "students planning to enter the business world" should take more business-related courses, which makes perfect sense. But she goes on to suggest that students should press for more of these courses instead of for a minor program. Which would serve more students? The broader, more rewarding minor option, which could be implemented

in any field and which would be recognized by the University. Consider also a business major who has outside interests. Is he going to take more business courses for fun? Maybe there are some who would like to add some diversity to their pragmatism.

"Rarely is the effort and narrowness of a double major (or a minor) required or even appreciated by an employer," claims Ms. Harris. Maybe I am just unwilling to accept harsh, cold reality and don my three-piece suit, but I must doubt that statement. A double major (or a minor) shows a broad education and broad talent, as well as hard work and organization. These virtues cannot go unnoticed by an employer. Besides, I say to the UCPPS: maybe a student or two would like to do something for him or her once, while there is the chance, and not for some future, faceless tyrant employer. Were not the liberal arts once learning for the sake of learning?

Dereck Daschke is a junior psychology/religion major from Basking Ridge, N.J.