



CHARLES DAHAN
EYE CANDY

Charles Dahhan is a political science graduate student from California.
E-MAIL: CDAHAN@GMAIL.COM

Coming to terms with the death of a stranger

I never met Eve Carson, and perhaps writing a column about the tragedy seems only obligatory — some soaring epitome to her greatness juxtaposed against the world's dark and evil forces, or something about how we as a community can heal.

Yet Saturday I broke down — a fairly uncommon event and certainly completely unprecedented when the catalyst is an individual completely personally unknown.

I thought writing such a column would be selfish, more a diary entry or therapy session than a newspaper column. I didn't even attend the vigil, an act I thought would amount to

intrusion or be perceived as obligatory. What the hell can I say after her friends, loved ones, colleagues and classmates offered beautiful tributes and thousands leaned on each other to make sense of the event?

Few of the folks who showed up at the vigil personally knew her, but many felt more than an expected pang of empathy and disdain for the tragic act. And I doubt they were there purely to show support for others, comfort friends or out of a sense of moral obligation.

Instead attendance seemed organic, not a manifestation out of some innate sense of duty or an attempted catharsis.

Why is this situation so troubling, more so than other stories of students dying too young?

At first, I wasn't emotionally affected by the tragedy. To get through the day these things are mentally filed away into some "tragic incidents" folder. Indeed, I logged it away with the other evil events, those things you are powerless to influence and do not internalize, and instead placed a check in that mental score sheet tracking existential good versus evil. It's more evidence that we're screwed, that the world is going to hell, but gosh, if I dwell on this for another moment I'm going to be late for a recitation.

If death doesn't carry a personal loss — some sort of tangible consequence such as never seeing a loved one, friend, idol or hero again — it is only the result of some troubling cause. The cause is the tragic and painful part, the thing that requires contemplation and allows for categorization: cancer, drunk drivers or one of those seven sins my Catholic cousin warned me about.

Maybe I broke down Saturday because I was purely selfish, tired of trying to fit this neatly into a folder, trying to go about my own life with as little inconvenience as possible.

There's always some sort of reason, some way to classify tragedies. The killer was mentally unstable. The killer wanted money. The killer was jealous or angry or some other completely unjustifiable and inexcusable reason but a reason nonetheless.

Yet this one isn't right. As details come out, that categorization just doesn't work.

While little is known about the event, the motives and frankly anything more than the fact a 22-year-old woman was found shot to death on a Chapel Hill side street, the complete helplessness of this situation is what is so troubling for me. Had it been a murder out of jealousy, vengeance or mental instability discussing different methods of redress would be possible.

Yet those reasons would allow the incident to be immediately and, perhaps carelessly, filed away — not evoking the same contemplation or emotional investment.

The term "mindless violence" is often thrown around. Yet the combination of the proximity — both geographic and communal — of the victim and the inability to find any discernible motivation, no matter how twisted or perverted, leave examining the killing frustrating. The killing leaves the photo of an amazing woman uncategorized and unfiled, sitting on the forefront of my mind.

EDITORIAL CARTOON By Alex Lee, lobin@email.unc.edu



Attacking the wrong party

Dole's assault on legal immigrants is misguided

The United States of America is not referred to as "the melting pot" because its residents love fondue — that recognition can be left to the Swiss and the 1960s. This nation is called the melting pot because of our tradition of immigrants coming to America searching for a better life.

Sen. Elizabeth Dole, R-N.C., recently teamed up with a group of moderate and conservative Republicans to introduce two anti-immigration bills in the U.S. Senate — and they don't just target illegal immigration.

The Safe Roads Enhancement Act is the first of the two bills Dole introduced that would force both legal and illegal immigrants to start the deportation process if they are convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol.

This is unsound. After all, these people went through legal avenues in order to establish residency and should not

be denied this for something that one in 139 licensed drivers was arrested for in 2004.

As legal residents, they shouldn't be subject to different punishments than U.S. citizens.

The bill does exempt people who are in the United States on student visas and their families, but that still leaves a broad swath of legal immigrants who have come to our country for financial or work-related reasons.

The same bill classifies a repeat drunk driving offense as an aggravated felony, a category of crimes that holds harsh consequences for immigrants in search of citizenship, legal permanent residence or escape of deportation.

Dole's second bill would overturn a Clinton-era executive order that mandates federal government services be offered in foreign languages if requested.

Basically, if you don't speak English, you're out of luck try-

ing to understand any federal brouhaha thrown your way.

We've all seen or heard of the stereotypical American tourist who goes to France not speaking the language and is outraged when a dinner menu is not offered in English. Just imagine not having the ability to obtain a menu of your federal rights.

Stupid is a very harsh word, but quite frankly, these bills are just that — stupid. Stupid, as well as unfair and ridiculous.

It's nonsensical to punish those who actually endured the time and effort to become a legal immigrant. If Dole and her collaborators really want to cut down on illegal immigration, the bill defeats that purpose.

Little Italy, Chinatown — we're a nation of immigrants. If people come here legally, they should not be treated any differently. Pass the fondue — we love this melting pot.

A little dirt isn't bad

Clean campaign fund is too restrictive to be effective

Politics in North Carolina have always been particularly dirty, but Lt. Gov. Beverly Perdue is hoping to clean them up.

The Democratic candidate for governor wants to create the Endowment for Positive Gubernatorial Campaigns, a \$50 million trust fund that would aim to reward candidates for staying positive in elections by giving out money to candidates who agree to a series of stipulations, such as refusing to run negative ads.

Although versions of the plan have been supported by everyone from Richard Moore, another Democratic gubernatorial candidate, to former Vice President Al Gore, it is still a bad idea.

The plan is a bit overzealous in its desire to keep campaigns clean. The fund goes so far as to forbid candidates from mentioning other candidates' names in commercials.

It's going to be tough for candidates to differentiate themselves from each other if they aren't allowed to refer to

their opponents in advertisements. Candidates should be able to tell voters why they are different from other candidates, and this fund doesn't allow for that.

If the number of presidential candidates accepting public funding is any indication, very few candidates will sign up for the gubernatorial fund anyway. Accepting the fund's money means adhering to its rules, and these rules will force campaigns to stay positive under all circumstances.

Negative advertising works, thus putting campaigns that have accepted the fund's money at a disadvantage against those that have not.

Presumably, politicians would prefer to have a winning campaign rather than a positive one, something the fund needs to take into account when crafting its rules and principles.

Furthermore, we dislike the nature of the bipartisan board that would run the endowment. The board would consist of 12 members chosen by legislative leaders and would

have the power to determine which candidates qualify for the fund's money.

If the fund has the power to give campaigns money, it also has the power to take that money away, which would be particularly detrimental since one of the requirements is that the endowment is the candidate's only source of funding for advertising.

What constitutes a "negative" advertisement is a definite gray area. If for some reason the board decided to arbitrarily cut off a candidate's funding when the election is only a few weeks away, that candidate would be virtually guaranteed to lose the election. No candidate wants his entire campaign to hinge on the whims of a board, even a bipartisan one.

In the end, while it might sound nice to have elections that are positive and upbeat, there isn't any need to have a \$50 million fund to encourage it. Instead, stick to what has worked for decades: Let the voters decide what kinds of campaigns they like.

Spread the wealth

NCCU students should be able to choose where to serve

As college students, it can sometimes be difficult to remember that a community exists outside the dining halls, the classrooms and the sports stadiums.

While we certainly support hitting the books, we also strongly encourage students to get out into local communities and make a difference.

N.C. Central University has certainly committed itself to community, requiring all students to complete 120 hours of service in order to graduate. Chancellor Charlie Nelsms hopes to refocus that mandate so that students complete these hours at local public schools.

While the push to provide a positive presence in local communities is certainly laudable, it

also presents some challenges.

Academic, social and financial demands can make it difficult for students to amass 120 hours during their undergraduate stay. A number of NCCU students with tight schedules have probably developed relationships with other community service organizations.

In making the change, Nelsms hopes to increase the visibility and presence of NCCU students in local public schools.

C.C. Spaulding Elementary School principal Vandi Kelley said a closer relationship with NCCU will also mean that more local elementary students will have the opportunity to visit college classrooms.

Many young students never seriously consider the possibil-

ity of a college education, so it is prudent on the part of administrators to instill in these kids the hope of continuing education.

However, this change restricts the ability of NCCU students to connect to a number of other laudable service organizations that could help open up future career opportunities.

Plus, other service organizations are just as worthy for enlisting the help of NCCU students as the neighboring schools.

And with an enrollment of nearly 5,500, surely there are enough students to go around.

Instead of mandating service in local schools, NCCU would be better off simply strongly encouraging it, while allowing students to choose their own method of service.

QUOTE OF THE DAY:

"We're all better in some way because we knew Eve Carson."

MAXINE EASOM, CARSON'S HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AT CLARKE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL IN ATHENS, GA.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Feel strongly about something that has been printed? Post your own response to a letter, editorial or story online. VISIT www.dailytarheel.com/feedback

Women-only gym hours are insulting to women

TO THE EDITOR:

Regarding "No men allowed" (Mar. 5): I can see the well-intended reasons behind women-only hours at gyms, especially if the women such a program benefits are otherwise unable to work out due to rigid religious principles (in the rest of my argument, I am not referring to such women).

But even though it's obvious for anyone who's gone to the SRC in the afternoon that UNC's recreational centers are annoyingly undersized, the main problem in instituting women-only hours isn't practical but ideological.

A program of gendered gym segregation designed to "help" women seems to be glaringly ironic; it was the same problem with the self-contradicting Jim Crow maxim of "separate but equal."

By the very act of implementing such a policy, there seems a tacit admission not only that women cannot function effectively by themselves in a male-dominated environment, but also that they're not as naturally inclined to athletic pursuits as men and hence need university-sponsored help to integrate them into the male world of exercise.

And without this help, such a policy also seems to imply, women in a co-ed gym would fulfill the same old false stereotypes that they've been combating for centuries: They have self-image problems, are self-conscious and cannot transcend their meekness to powerfully assert their own physicality and sexuality.

Despite its applauded guise of liberal progressivism, this policy seems insultingly paternalistic, more insulting, in fact, than a man who indiscreetly checks out women at the gym.

Marc Formeister
Senior
English

Itemizing student fees would solve gym issues

TO THE EDITOR:

There comes a point where one has to draw the line on issues of political correctness, and The Daily Tar Heel (editorial board) should have drawn that line ("No men allowed," Mar. 5).

Women-only gym hours are not a bad thing, given they are justified correctly. Justifying them based on the "needs" of six women is absurd, to say the least. A gym is a public facility; everyone contributes together for equal access.

If a woman feels uncomfortable exercising in a gym, it's not the job of everyone else to pander to her needs. That's why things like private gyms, private schools and private hospitals exist — to cater toward more unique consumers who are dissatisfied enough with the public equivalent that they are willing to pay a higher premium.

How is it that the needs of those six women supersede everyone else's right to use the gym? The solution: itemize student fees. If someone doesn't want to use a gym because they are too uncomfortable exercising in it, don't make them pay for it. It would be unfair to have to pay the same amount for gym access if it's not as accessible as it would be to someone else.

Adrian Randall
Junior
Chemistry

SPEAK OUT

WRITING GUIDELINES:

- ▶ **Please type:** Handwritten letters will not be accepted.
- ▶ **Sign and date:** No more than two people should sign letters.
- ▶ **Students:** Include your year, major and phone number.
- ▶ **Faculty/staff:** Include your department and phone number.
- ▶ **Edit:** The DTH edits for space, clarity, accuracy and vulgarity. Limit letters to 250 words.

SUBMISSION:

- ▶ **Drop-off:** at our office at Suite 2409 in the Student Union.
- ▶ **E-mail:** to editdesk@unc.edu
- ▶ **Send:** to P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, N.C., 27515.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Columns, cartoons and letters do not necessarily reflect the opinions of The Daily Tar Heel or its staff. Editorials are the opinions solely of The Daily Tar Heel editorial board. The board consists of nine board members, the associate opinion editor, the opinion editor and the editor. The 2007-08 editor decided not to vote on the board.

Religion not a good reason for women-only gym hours

TO THE EDITOR:

The concept of "women-only" workout facilities is by no means a new one ("No men allowed," March 5). I can see plenty of reasons why women might not feel comfortable working out in the presence of a bunch of sweaty jocks.

However, I am concerned by Harvard's decision to bring religious preference to the forefront of this issue. Such a move risks setting a dangerous precedent in a nation founded on the separation of church and state.

Our friends in Britain, for example, are currently engaged in serious debate over the extent to which Muslim Sharia law ought to apply to British citizens (Sharia courts are legal under British law). Let's hope it never comes to that in this country.

As far as I'm concerned, Harvard can do what it wants as a private institution. We're talking about the same university that proposed restrictive "speech codes" at its law school.

UNC, on the other hand, is a public institution and ought to take the U.S. Constitution a bit more seriously than Harvard chooses to.

I'm not saying we shouldn't have women-only hours at Fetzer or the SRC; in fact, I generally support the idea, but for the edit board to imply that religious preferences are an acceptable justification for the policy is an outright affront to the same amendment that protects us as journalists.

Andrew Stiles
Junior
Journalism

Greenbridge will be bad for the local community

TO THE EDITOR:

From car companies to coal mining, every smart marketing executive for big business today is using a green spin on their advertising campaign. It's called "greenwash," and the proposed condominium Greenbridge, to be built between Carrboro and Chapel Hill, is no different.

This will be a towering eyesore of 10 stories that will lead to a radical change in the local community.

Greenbridge Developments is using the mask of sustainability to make an ugly project look prettier. Condominiums never have and never will be good for the earth. Drawing more residents into town will only lead to more development, and soon Carrboro and Chapel Hill will see a huge rise in population and sprawl.

Forests will be cut down to make room for more housing, more stores and more parking. If this company really cared about the earth and global warming, they would donate the land to the city to be used as a community garden to provide locally grown, organic food and help build community, equity and self-sufficiency.

The only thing green about Greenbridge is the money these developers will be stuffing into their already filled pockets.

Tamara Matheson
Sophomore
Biology

The Daily Tar Heel

Established 1893,
115 years
of editorial freedom

ERIN ZUREICK
EDITOR, 962-4086
ZUREICK@EMAIL.UNC.EDU
OFFICE HOURS:
MON., WED. FRI. 1-2 P.M.

ADAM STORCK
OPINION EDITOR, 962-0750
ASTORCK@UNC.EDU

JONATHAN TUGMAN
ASSOCIATE OPINION EDITOR, 962-0750
TUGMAN@UNC.EDU

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS
JESSICA SCISM
TED STRONG
SARAH WHITWORTH
KATHRYN ARDIZZONE
SARAH LETRENT
DUNCAN CARLTON
ELYSE MCCOY
GRAHAM ROWE
DAVID GIANCASPRO