



ERIC JOHNSON
IT'S CALLED THE UNC SYSTEM
Eric Johnson is a Political Science graduate from Chapel Hill.
E-MAIL: ERICJOHNSON@UNC.EDU

Thorp shares in UNC's lofty goals

When Chancellor James Moeser announced last September that he'd be retiring, University leaders were positively giddy about courting potential replacements.

Visions of resumes danced in their heads as they pledged a nationwide search, a scouring of the best and brightest academic minds from every corner of the continent.

"Can you imagine?" exclaimed Jeff Davies, chief of staff, to UNC-system President Erskine Bowles.

"We're talking about the cream of the crop from across the country!"

And after searching far and wide, with months of top-secret discussions and input from a high-dollar consulting firm, UNC had its man. Turns out, he was in South Building, one floor above the chancellor's office.

Convenient! Aside from the fact that he only has to move his supplies down one flight of stairs, there's a clear logic to the selection of 43-year-old Holden Thorp — dean of the College of Arts and Sciences — to be the 10th chancellor of UNC-Chapel Hill.

Roger Perry, chairman of UNC's Board of Trustees, summed it up nicely in his introduction of Thorp last week.

"What he is," Perry said, "is one of us."

The decision to pick "one of us" — a former UNC undergraduate whose wife, mother, brother, sister-in-law and cousin all graduated from the school — says a lot about what Bowles and the trustees are looking for from the University of the people.

They picked someone who, first and foremost, knows that this is a state university.

For many years now, the University has pushed hard to play in the premier leagues of higher education. Moeser was fond of saying that he wasn't content to lead the best public university in the world; he wanted UNC to be the best in the world, public or private.

(This is, perhaps, why Moeser concluded Sunday's abbreviated commencement ceremony by awkwardly assuring rain-soaked graduates, "You're the best in the world!")

It's the reason we spent the last few years piling up one of the largest endowments in the country, the reason we toyed with the idea of opening a satellite campus in Qatar and the reason Chapel Hill maintains a list of "aspirational peers" that includes Stanford University.

To some degree, Thorp is onboard with this kind of lofty agenda.

His acceptance speech, after all, included pledges to end world hunger, stop wars, cure everyone's diseases and find cheap energy.

God himself would blush at such a to-do list.

But selecting a man from Fayetteville is a clear nod to UNC's role as a state institution and a recognition that the most pressing problems for the next chancellor will have less to do with rural Africa than with rural North Carolina.

In our fair University town, about 74 percent of the population holds a bachelor's degree. In Fayetteville, that figure is 24 percent — still higher than the North Carolina average of 22 percent.

While state leaders are no doubt in favor of ending global hunger, they are much more concerned with upping college enrollment.

They want a University that can reduce the high school drop-out rate and search for clean energy. They want a University agenda that will play just as well in Gastonia as it would in Cambridge.

And they're counting on a man from North Carolina to deliver.

EDITORIAL CARTOON By Terrence Nowicki, The Western Front



Election law stymies fraud

N.C. should heed Supreme Court's voter ID decision

Don't feel like leaving the house on Election Day? No problem! Just have your neighbor vote for you.

For first-time voters, last week's primary revealed one of the cracks in our local election process. At the polling places, voters must simply state their names and addresses to receive a ballot.

Election officials are not required to ask for a driver's license; they don't have to ask for a Social Security number — they don't even have to ask for a VisArt card.

North Carolina must rewrite its election laws to prevent voter fraud and, more importantly, to instill faith in the efficacy of the process; its integrity should not rest on the honor system.

With this in mind, precincts should require that all voter identities be confirmed by documentation.

In an April decision, the

United States Supreme Court upheld a law in Indiana which requires voters to have a government-issued ID to receive a ballot at their polling stations.

Critics of the law say that the requirements have been pushed by the Republicans as a method for discouraging minorities and the elderly from voting — two groups who are less likely to have ID (and two groups that primarily vote for the Democrats).

They said that Indiana's primary would be rife with disenfranchised voters. It wasn't. The law provides for those who do not drive or have acceptable documentation by allowing them to receive free picture IDs. But the fear remains that requiring ID is akin to voter intimidation and will keep people home on Election Day.

If that's the case, Americans must address a more press-

ing issue: How did we let our democracy fall so ill that a simple act such as having to show an ID would prevent citizens from fulfilling their most basic civic duty?

We must entertain the very real possibility that the flaws of our current voting process are hurting this country far more than the proposed solutions.

Americans stay home in incredible numbers because we do not have faith in the system — or in our candidates.

We have a system that weighs some votes more than others, that excludes third parties, that trusts elections to machines with no paper trails.

And because of this, we are disillusioned.

While an ID requirement will not solve all these problems, it can restore at least some of our faith in the system.

And that's a start.

Green-light the blue lights

SBP, town should continue efforts to add street lights

If you are ever alone, stumbling to your apartment after last call, you might find yourself in some dark places.

And that's not just the Heinekens getting to you.

Certain spots in town are under blackout. Street lights do not shine there. 911 call boxes do not stand within reach.

And students whose schedules require evening trips through Umstead Road or the historic McCauley and Ransom districts shouldn't have to worry about lurkers in the shadows.

Which is why Student Body President J.J. Raynor's administration and the Chapel Hill Town Council should be commended for attempting to add more pedestrian-level street lighting and more call boxes to several streets in town.

Still, they should be urged to better include affected residents in their discussions.

The project, backed by Raynor's predecessors, James Allred and Eve Carson, and bankrolled by \$80,000 in student fees, was authorized at last

week's Town Council meeting. Now it should be adopted by the Historic District Commission, which has veto power over the project.

Some residents, especially those in the historic McCauley and Ransom districts, have voiced concerns about the project.

One speaker suggested added lighting would be "aesthetically intrusive" and could ruin "evening ambience" in the neighborhood.

The town should not drown out the clear-skied view of the stars. Chapel Hill's natural beauty — on campus and off — helps bring people to town and keep them here.

But the government has a greater obligation to prevent robbery and sexual assault against its students — the majority of whom are young women.

Further, students have a right to feel safe when they walk the streets at night.

These residents argue that Chapel Hill is a low-crime area, and perhaps they simply possess a sense of perspective that

has grown with age.

But in the still-tender aftermath of Carson's murder, we're forced to wonder if they've lost touch with the University.

It's important to remember that this project is the result of three years of work. It is not borne of passion resulting from Carson's death — instead, it's made urgent by it.

Surely a compromise can be struck between safety and aesthetics, between town and gown.

Lights do not have to be eyesores or harmful to the environment, and other measures — such as improved P2P service — can supplement town security in ways that lights and call boxes cannot.

Nevertheless, the surprising level of concern at last week's meeting indicates a lack of communication between the various parties.

The Raynor administration must improve at seeking the input of affected residents.

They will have to live with the results of this plan after most of us have gone.

Fare thee well

To the undergraduates, to make much of their time

Goodbye to our friends. Good riddance to our enemies.

They say that all life's moments are but beginnings and ends. And who are we to disagree?

Last Sunday, Chancellor James Moeser bid a quick adieu to our umbrella-covered seniors, officially sending them off into the much-talked-about real world, into new universities and, for some, into uncertainty.

And this was his last farewell, too. But this is not a message for the chancellor, new or old.

Some of our seniors will be back, unable to resist — or unable to avoid — a victory lap or two. We don't blame them.

But this is not a message for those who walked Sunday. Rather, it's for those whose graduation looms off in the distance.

For those of us who'll be around next fall, graduation makes us feel a tinge of our undergraduate mortality. We feel out-of-sorts when we part ways with the graduated because we see ourselves on the other side of those hugs and handshakes.

We're not ready to be there.

But we can't spend our time in college worrying about its end. We've seen seniors upset about having to leave, rushing to see all their acquaintances before time is up — and what a shame that exams and move-

outs interrupt this process.

Yet many of these seniors came to terms with graduation. They realized it was time to move on.

On the other hand, we've also seen those who boasted for four years about how they couldn't wait to leave softened by a sudden appreciation for Carolina and the role it has played in their lives.

We shouldn't rush to get out of the door, nor should we be forced to it kicking and screaming.

So let's make the most of our days here, and, when it's time for us to don the cap and gown, we can do so knowing we've enjoyed it fully.

And then we can start again somewhere else.

QUOTE OF THE DAY:

"Today's weather just doesn't matter. It's really just about the Carolina spirit."

KATE CUNNINGHAM, UNC ALUMNA, ON COMMENCEMENT

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

Both Obama and Clinton should stay in primary

TO THE EDITOR:

This letter is in response to the articles calling for Senator Hillary Clinton to withdraw from the Democratic Party nomination for President of the United States.

The total number of delegates required to nominate a Democratic candidate is 2,025. To date, neither candidate has reached this number. If the number is not reached by the date of the final primary (June 3, 2008) then the contest must continue to the Democratic convention.

During the convention, delegates and superdelegates can vote on as many ballots as necessary to determine the winner. The controversy concerning the popular votes and delegates from Michigan and Florida must also be resolved prior to the convention.

Just as with the presidential election of 2000, President Bush could not become president until he received the 270 electoral votes. No Democrat considered him the presumptive victor.

To ask either democratic candidate to withdraw before either one reaches the required tally does a disservice to the entire process.

Both candidates and their supporters have waged a very good campaign but if neither one can "close the deal" before the convention it is up to the delegates and superdelegates to decide. Let us continue.

Joe Bialek
Cleveland

Clinton shows concern for women's health in N.C.

TO THE EDITOR:

Breast cancer is a devastating disease that has struck nearly two million American women in the past decade. The statistics are sobering: A woman is diagnosed with breast cancer every three minutes, and another dies of breast cancer every 13 minutes in the United States.

As a breast cancer survivor who has lost friends to this disease, I am so grateful to hear about Senator Hillary Clinton's plans to eradicate breast cancer in our lifetime.

Breast cancer is a disease that crosses all categories of identity: race, religion, ethnicity and age, but it is not an equal opportunity player.

A disturbing American Cancer Society study published this year finds that African-American women's death rates are either flat or rising in many states, including North Carolina.

As someone who has fought for African-Americans' rights for years, it is no surprise that Hillary Clinton plans to address the needs of affected populations and establish a new racial disparities research project.

I am encouraged by Hillary Clinton's concern for the health and well-being of the women of North Carolina and elsewhere. We do need change in this country when our mothers, daughters, sisters, wives, partners, friends and co-workers are faltering. Ending breast cancer would be a magnificent

change.

Thank you, Hillary, for fighting for me. You are the candidate for me and for the men and women of North Carolina.

Joan Lipkin
St. Louis, Mo.

Media feeding audience U.S. military propaganda

TO THE EDITOR:

As we now know, thanks to the New York Times, the military-industrial complex is well represented in the daily television news coverage of the Iraq and Afghan occupations.

Those former generals who seemed generously to have come out of retirement to provide disinterested analysis of the Bush administration's military adventures are neither generous nor disinterested.

Instead, they are self-conscious, self-seeking conduits for the Pentagon's talking points, and well connected to military contractors trying to make money off war.

The Times says that "several dozen ... (television) military analysts represent more than 150 military contractors either as lobbyists, senior executives, board members or consultants."

Where did they get their inside information?

From briefings with some of the most senior officials of the Bush administration. And why did those officials provide the briefings? Because they wanted the retired generals to pass along the official administration spin to the television audience.

Disguised as objective analysts, the Defense Department's mouthpieces faithfully delivered the administration's propaganda.

This is not the first time the administration's corruption of the news has been revealed.

In fact, this very story was hinted at in the Times five years ago.

No one paid much attention. Even the Times ran op-eds by some of the retired generals. The latest story has gotten little notice outside the blogosphere. The television networks certainly have no interest in covering it.

One might think that the major news organizations would be ashamed of themselves, but they, along with the major newspapers, were little more than cheerleaders during the administration's run-up to the Iraq invasion.

Who needs state-controlled media when you have a lapdog press?

Its official spokesmen could have openly presented the propaganda any time.

The networks would have been delighted to accommodate them.

Instead, it chose undercover agents, taking advantage of the good will most people have for former military officers.

The analyst scandal shouldn't surprise anyone.

The American people were deceived into supporting the Iraq invasion, from claims about WMD to hints that Saddam Hussein had something to do with 9/11.

So why wouldn't the administration continue the deception by disguising its propagandists as objective analysts?

Sheldon Richman
Editor
The Freeman Magazine

The Daily Tar Heel

Established 1893,
115 years
of editorial freedom

RACHEL ULLRICH
SUMMER EDITOR, 962-4086
RULLRICH@EMAIL.UNC.EDU

CLINT JOHNSON
OPINION EDITOR, 962-0750
CLINT@UNC.EDU

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. It consists of editorial board members, the opinion editor and the summer editor. The 2008 summer editor decided not to vote on the board.