

# The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

JUSTIN MCGUIRE, University Editor  
KAREN DUNN, State and National Editor  
TOM PARKS, Business Editor  
JAMIE ROSENBERG, Sports Editor  
MELANIE BLACK, Design Editor  
JULIA COON, News Editor  
EVAN EILE, Photography Editor

AMY WAJDA, University Editor  
JAMES BURROUGHS, Editorial Page Editor  
SHEILA LONG, City Editor  
CARA BONNETT, Arts and Features Editor  
LISA REICHEL, Omnibus Editor  
STEVE WILSON, News Editor  
PETE CORSON, Cartoon Editor

## Commercial questions Residents should monitor deck plans

**board opinion**

Downtown Chapel Hill has long experienced problems involving traffic and parking, almost to the point where these two issues would appear on every residents' list of major nuisances in this town. A seemingly endless trail of University students and employees and town employees pour into the downtown area every work day, and while an efficient mass transit system does a great deal to help the situation, the amount of traffic pushes the limit of downtown streets and parking lots. The impending construction of the Rosemary Street parking facility could help end the long anticipation of adequate commuter parking downtown, and the location would not spoil the appearance of the area. But recent discussion of adding commercial space to the facility is a topic which should receive heavy input from both town residents and downtown merchants.

The parking facility — to be placed on the present parking lot at the corner of Rosemary and Henderson streets as soon as December 1991 — will provide about 350 parking spaces for commuters. The deck would relieve the demand placed on the several lots located on Rosemary Street, but provisions will have to be made for the large amount of traffic flowing into the small Henderson and Rosemary Street intersection.

Adding commercial space to the area would only worsen that traffic further and add more competition to struggling downtown businesses who must fight high rent. The plan for the facility includes a plaza area on top with some room for commer-

cial development and maybe a small park to beautify the facility and the surrounding area. But the question to ask is whether such development is worth the time and money if it could potentially go unused. While the parking facility could help increase customer business downtown, it certainly will not attract customers away from Franklin Street with a few shops and a hot-dog stand. Therefore, it seems as if one of the main purposes of the facility should be to bring people back to downtown Chapel Hill for shopping, eating and enjoyment while enhancing the now stagnant business activity there.

Of course, none of the discussed development should commence at the expense of needed parking spaces, but a landscaped park area would be a great addition to the area. A small park, one that could be geared more to the community than is the University's McCorkle Place across the street, it would accent well the surrounding residential areas and provide an attraction for families visiting downtown.

This discussion of development, commercial or otherwise, brings serious questions of money into the issue. While the parking facility itself will be funded through revenue bonds, a money source for the accompanying plaza is still undecided. Town council members have not ruled out a tax increase, saying only that they want to make the area more pleasant for townspeople who might use it. This is where Chapel Hill residents must enter the picture. They must make their opinions known, as this will have a huge impact on the area, both in the way it looks and its costs. If done well, the parking facility could add a needed dimension to the community.

## Fading fast Reverse federal rules to save wetlands

This week the Bush administration forfeited an excellent opportunity to demonstrate its dedication to the protection and preservation of the American environment. The landscape of this country was filled once with beautiful wetlands and their accompanying wildlife, but these marshes are disappearing at the rate of 500,000 acres a year underneath an unending wave of industry and urban development. Less than 100 million acres of such land now remains, a relatively low amount considering the broad expanse that once existed. A federal agreement was created in November for the protection of the wetlands, but the White House altered that policy on Wednesday, placing loopholes in the so-called protection and leaving environmentalists justifiably angry.

Wetlands, including swamps and marshes, provide an important breeding ground and vital habitat for various kinds of wildlife. These areas also filter pollution from surface water sources and replenish underground water supplies. Many of the large swamps, such as the Florida Everglades and the Georgia Okefenokee, contain dense vegetation important to the atmosphere. While these two particular wetlands have federal protection, many smaller, scattered marshes, including those in North Carolina coastal areas, do not.

President Bush included the protection of wetlands among the environmental issues presented during his 1988 election campaign, but Wednesday's announcement marked a departure from his previous "no-net-loss" goal for the wetlands. The November 1989 agreement made provisions for the protection of wetland areas from the threat of development, but the

recent alteration allows exceptions to such protection and does not even require the replacement of lost land. As a result, the federal government can grant permission for the destruction of wetlands in cases it regards as necessary — usually the construction of highways and airports.

Most disturbing about this recent decision is that it followed severe objections from William Reilly, the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and Bush's chief environmental official. The White House instead decided to follow Chief of Staff John Sununu's advice for altering the agreement.

Sununu obviously has played too large a role in environmental affairs this week alone. The official's views greatly affected the president's Monday announcement to seek further study of global warming instead of taking action. Such hesitation worried not only environmentalists, but also many world officials who are concerned about this serious global threat.

The nation's wetlands are a valuable and exhaustible resource for this country. While the new federal agreement will slow the disappearance of this land, the exceptions to the protection provisions will slowly add up.

The Bush administration must realize the severity of advisers' warnings and the importance of this, and other, environmental issues facing the nation. Business interests and urban expansion are obviously of great importance to the future of this country, but definitely not at the expense of valuable land and wildlife. Now that they've reversed the wetlands policy once, let them do it again. — James Burroughs

### The wetlands disappear at the rate of 500,000 acres a year beneath a wave of industry.



## Readers' Forum

### Leaders want student input on parking deck

To the editor:  
We would like to respond to Monday's board opinion titled "Advantage alumni: Students should get share of parking." As presidents of the Residence Hall Association and the Carolina Athletic Association we have been involved with the Educational Foundation (Ram's Club) in discussing the idea of putting a parking deck on the existing Hinton James tennis courts and replacing the courts on the upper level of the deck. At this point the parking/tennis facility is just an idea — it will remain just that until the feasibility of such a project is determined, and more importantly until student opinion is solicited.

At this point in the discussion of the deck it is difficult to determine student opinion accurately because the feasibility of such a plan is still undetermined. Once the Facilities Planning Department has given us a more specific feasibility study on the idea, we will make that information available to students and wait for your response. Our organizations' only interests are to fulfill the wants and needs of the students — this is no exception. We are most definitely aware of the history of the Ram's Club's dealings with students and have been cautious since the first mention of the deck. The memory of the Alumni Center planning that surprised and outraged most students is still a fresh reminder of how vigorously we must protect student interests.

The fact that students have expressed such an interest at this early stage is a good sign and we hope that students will continue to express their candid opinions. Our job is to put students ideas into action. We will only support this project if you do.

LIZ JACKSON  
Junior  
Physical Therapy

LISA FRYE  
Junior  
History

### Martial arts clubs do not need to compete

To the editor:  
I write in response to the Feb. 2 article, "Schedule conflict spurs club merge." The article contains several instances of misinformation and misquotation. I wish to point these out and then explain the position of one party involved.

First, the article explains that Dr. Seong S. Choi (Ph.D in Physics, UNC 1987) has threatened to resign over a conflict between the Carolina Martial Arts Club (CMAC), of which he is head instructor, and C.K. Kim's Alliance. Dr. Choi's consideration of this action constitutes no threat to anyone, only a potentially terrible loss to the CMAC's members. A more correct verb would have been "considered," rather than "threatened."

In the next sentence the article reports that Dr. Choi "told" club members to join C.K. Kim's Alliance. As a member of the CMAC,

let me assure everyone that there was no order, but rather a suggestion. After exhausting all other alternatives to regain the club's time slot in the Fetzer Gym multipurpose room, Dr. Choi saw the merger as the next logical step, following the old adage "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em." However, the entire CMAC made a collective decision to join C.K. Kim's club; Dr. Choi acted only as an advisor.

Second, the article makes several misquotations of Nathan Ligo (vice president and blackbelt member of the CMAC). It attributes Mr. Ligo with the statement that C.K. Kim's Alliance is a non-profit business. Mr. Ligo in truth said the opposite — that C.K. Kim's is a for-profit business — in his telephone interview with the reporter.

The article also reads "Because Choi lives in Raleigh, the later time became an inconvenience," said Nathan Ligo. "Again Mr. Ligo was misquoted. Dr. Choi does research daily in the physics and physical education departments of UNC, so the fact that he resides in Raleigh has no importance; he is on campus anyway."

Dr. Choi's discouragement stems from Rick Saterlee's (assistant intramural-recreational director) unethical decision, followed by no correction on the part of Mr. Saterlee or his superiors. The decision forced a larger number of students, led by a better-qualified instructor (fifth-degree blackbelt compared to first), with a nine-year tradition of educating UNC students out of a work-out location it had held since Fetzer

Gymnasium's opening. I also point out that the CMAC is a self-governed institution — by the student, of the students, for the students. C.K. Kim's Alliance operates with outside influence from a central office in New York and a local one in Greensboro.

Along with the unfairness of the decision, it disturbs Dr. Choi that two clubs practicing the same martial art, Korean Tae Kwon Do, now exist in conflict. The situation does not comply with the Martial Way Dr. Choi teaches his students; this is why Dr. Choi considers resignation and re-location.

The CMAC offered from the beginning to share the room with C.K. Kim's Alliance, but the new club refused. Mr. Saterlee told Dr. Choi on Jan. 30 that sharing the room would not be possible because of safety reasons (too crowded). Mr. Saterlee had not done his homework. Several years ago, the CMAC shared this same room with a club twice the size of C.K. Kim's; not then, nor ever has there been an accident.

In a Feb. 5 meeting, all members present of both clubs agreed to share the room, the solution offered by the CMAC in the first place. This mix-up has been at least momentarily resolved, and only after the students' decision. I am relieved that the assistant IM-REC director's poor decision has not cost the CMAC members Dr. Choi's immeasurable guidance.

EDDIE KIRBY  
Sophomore  
Economics

## Pro-choice view not unlike Nazis'

Michael Evans  
Guest Writer

To the editor:  
Several years ago when the search was on for Josef Mengele, the former Nazi physician who not only killed people in concentration camps but also performed medical experiments on them, I was impressed by the fact that according to those who knew him after the war that at no time did he ever believe that what he had done was wrong — only that others had made him stop doing it. According to Mengele, the Jewish people were fair game for subjection to torture or death based on his belief that they were "worthless lives." This mentality, the rationalization that choosing to kill presumed inferior or sub-human beings of a particular type is justified because they are considered unequal to humans by the scientific and legal establishments (and so possess insufficient worth as to preclude their extinction), deeply disturbs me because today in 1990 it is an unavailing precept in the argument of the pro-choice advocate.

I will agree with those who advocate the unrestricted legal right to abortion that unwanted pregnancy is a potentially traumatic experience. Yes, there are health risks. Yes, an unwanted child may be unloved or abused. Yes, pregnancy may result in social or familial ostracism, disrupted schooling or even poverty for the mother and child. But until we as a society decide to stamp out child abuse, illiteracy or poverty by killing *en masse* people already living in these situations, then we should likewise be compelled to seek alternatives to abortion in attempting to prevent these prevalent human problems. If abortion is performed for the sake of reducing legitimate maternal suffering, or if an aborted fetus is better off not existing than to be subjected to these conditions later as a child; then why do we not presently kill children who are already abused or living in poverty? Should not their suffering also be reduced? Would not they also be better off not existing? And would not we be left with fewer social problems, lower rates of poverty, less abuse and less suffering?

Of course, this is exactly what Josef Mengele was trying to achieve in his country. By seeking to rid his nation of a problem through extinguishing "worthless lives," the welfare of German society would in his estimation automatically rise — and at an acceptable cost to those who were forced to die for this politically and socially acceptable solution. Today in 1990 the same argument is made with regard to

resolving the issue of unwanted pregnancy through abortion on demand; that is, a human fetus is not considered to be of sufficient worth to merit its legal protection, as the emotional or economic needs of the mother (and/or father) outweigh the complete life value of the yet-to-be-born fetus.

In order to justify this position, the pro-choice advocate must therefore conclusively maintain beyond a shadow of a doubt that abortion does not take human life *per se*, or else he or she is forced to concede that a valuable living creature may in fact be legally killed by another who possesses the inalienable constitutional right to do so through the mere exercise of will, or "choice" if for no other reason. And even the notorious Dr. Josef Mengele would never have admitted to doing that, as it was the taking of "worthless lives" which went on in Germany (with, like abortion in the United States today, the complicity of both the legal and medical communities).

The biggest problem with the pro-choice argument is that it requires someone to decide, namely the state, that developing genetically human entities are unequivocally non-human in order to legalize their killing. Talk about pushing your morals on someone! You may consider an opposing "anti-choice" view as an imposition of unreasonable morality on a pregnant woman's right to choose, but there is not greater imposition of a moral system or judgment on someone else as that of the advocacy of subjecting them to death — an action which is both irreversible and final — on the sole basis of one's possessing the inherent right to choose to kill them, as validated by their dehumanized and therefore insufficient worth. The only way therefore for the pro-choice advocate to circumvent this heinous, ultra-right wing bigotry is for her or him to move beyond acting on the belief of when human life begins and actually know when human life begins; yet, the fact is that at the present time no scientific criteria of this nature exists. But even without this knowledge of nature, given the medical fact that at only six weeks of gestation the developing fetus possesses detectable EEG's already, it is highly probable that consciousness exists for many who are already "termi-

nated" on a daily basis.

The Nazis likewise possessed a "final solution" to their particular social problems through "termination" and a similarly absolutist moral mechanism by which to justify it. Dr. Mengele among other prominent and highly respected German doctors, lawyers and statesmen reasoned that since Jews were indeed "worthless lives," they were therefore fair game for experimentation and death for the benefit of those whose lives were intrinsically valuable. The present day advocates of choice concomitantly legitimize killing another dubious life form for exactly the same reason: as long as no one else sees it as human then it is okay to kill it. It is that simple — this is the law in 1990. As John Bradshaw, noted lecturer, author and clinical psychologist specializing in family systems therapy pointed out recently on his PBS series, "It is our task to recognize that the black miracle of Nazism was only the German version, superbly planned and superbly bungled, of a universal, contemporary potential."

Hopefully, someday in this country not only will women achieve full equality with men politically and economically, but also the day will come when we stop making scapegoats and carcasses of pre-born children for the errors and emotional inadequacies of both parental sexes, neither of whom are responsible enough to work to solve their own problems resulting from their own decisions and voluntary actions. This too the Nazis did; they chose to make others suffer and die for their own sake in the name of a necessary cause. Can we not learn from this horrible history of humanity only a generation ago, and instead of being similarly narcissistic, judgmental and irresponsible for our actions, work together to find a solution to what is our problem? — and to which, I might add, the human fetus is an unwitting guest.

Fifty years ago, a torn nation rose up and retaliated against external oppression following a devastating World War by making scapegoats of an innocent group of people. Must today's women also rise up and retaliate from years of exploitation in a male dominated culture by making scapegoats of their own progeny? Surely there must be a better, humane alternative to this dilemma than to destroy "worthless lives" in the name of choice.

MICHAEL B. EVANS  
Graduate  
Education

### The Daily Tar Heel

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the DTH Publishing Corp., a non-profit North Carolina corporation, Monday-Friday, according to the University calendar.

Callers with questions about billing or display advertising should dial 962-1163 between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. Classified ads can be reached at 962-0252. Editorial questions should be directed to 962-0245/0246.

The Daily Tar Heel office ..... Suite 104 Carolina Union  
Campus mail address ..... CB# 5210 Box 49, Carolina Union  
U.S. Mail address ... P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-3257

Daily Tar Heel board opinion editorials are the majority view of the editorial board, which consists of the editor, the editorial page editor and three editorial writers. Signed editorials are the opinion of the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the entire board. Cartoons and columns represent the author's view.