

Carolina Review

UNC'S CONSERVATIVE PUBLICATION
SINCE 1993

IX.6

MARCH
EDITION

Politics Culture Sports



FEATURING

- Current events
- Campus happenings
- Historical review

Editor's Note

Carolina Review has been busy planning and co-hosting events with prominent speakers, including John Hardister and Mike Pence, playing an important role in shaping our collective futures.

Dear Reader,

I am writing to provide you with an update on the latest events and developments here at Carolina Review. As the Editor-In-Chief of the publication, I want to ensure that you are informed of the latest news and happenings within our community.

Firstly, I would like to thank you for your continued support of Carolina Review. Your readership and engagement are greatly appreciated and allow us to continue to bring you informative and thought-provoking content.

In recent weeks, we have been busy planning and co-hosting several events on campus. On April 17th, we are excited to welcome John Hardister, brought by TPUSA, to campus. The event will be co-hosted by the Carolina Liberty Foundation and the Carolina Review, and we hope to see a great turnout for what promises to be a fascinating talk.

In addition, on April 26th, we will be co-hosting Mike Pence on campus as part of his book tour. The event will be co-hosted by the UNC College Republicans and the Carolina Liberty Foundation, and we are looking forward to hearing from the former Vice President.

Finally, I would like to briefly touch on some of the articles and content that we have published in recent weeks. We have covered a range of topics, from politics and economics to culture and society, and our writers have brought their unique perspectives to these issues.

Thank you again for your support, and we look forward to bringing you more engaging content and events in the future.

Best regards,



NATHAN GIBSON
Editor-in-Chief, Carolina Review



Table Of Contents

Here We Go Again - p.3

Military History to be Replaced - p.5

Thoughts on UNC School of Civic Life - p.10

UNC Does not Understand the Liberal Arts - p.13

The Necessity of Religion in Public Discourse - p.16

The Wild World of NIL - p.19

Carolina Heroes: Benjamin Forsyth - p. 21

Here We Go Again

Why can't we seem to escape campaign season? Grant Lefelar discusses the ever-growing political election cycle.

Written by Grant Lefelar

Here We Go Again

Grant Lefelar



I have a migraine and it's not going away. On most days, it's rather benign; only some minor, yet uncomfortable throbbing behind my right eye. On other days, I feel like an 18 wheeler has parked directly on my head with the diesel fumes gunning straight up my nose and poisoning my precious, tobacco untouched lungs. I've tried all the remedies the "experts" online give: ibuprofen, aspirin, breathing in clean air, a long walk in the park, soaking in the beautiful sunshine, drinking some cool, cool water, etc..

But, it's not going anywhere. To make matters worse, the bad days are becoming increasingly frequent. So, what's behind this?

Could it be all those years drinking the lead-laced water in multiple buildings on UNC's campus? Possibly. Has a massive plume of burned vinyl chloride made the 500 mile trek from East Palestine, Ohio to my bedroom? Wouldn't surprise me. Maybe it's just stress? I don't know, maybe I should go see my doctor or raid a pharmacy like Matt Dillon in Drugstore Cowboy for some more effective medication. But, I think I know the culprit. It's not schoolwork, my diet, a lack of sleep, an increasingly polluted atmosphere, or all the valuable time I waste in front of the TV watching RedLetterMedia videos. In fact, it's something that has not even happened yet, nor will it for over a year-and-a-half. **It's politics.** Specifically, the 2024 presidential election.

Now, I'm the first one to proudly admit that, in many respects, I am somewhat out of touch with my generation. I don't watch Euphoria, I watch Mary Tyler Moore. I don't know who Ice Spice is, nor do I plan on finding out any time soon because I'm too busy listening to Steely Dan. Despite all these differences, there is one thing in my mind that reaffirms the fact I got at least something in common with my fellow zoomers and, well, actually every living and 2 breathing human being who can process information: an aversion to politics. Now, speaking as someone who actually enjoys and has a passion for keeping up with all the weird, wild, and wonderful political events going on throughout the world, that is bit of a bizarre statement. And it is because I don't truly mean it deep down, but in some ways, and especially on certain days, I do. Everyone, even those who reside in the White House, must despise politics, even if just a little.

Case in point, it seems like after every election cycle, there is a massive, collective sigh of relief; not over who was elected, but because we won't have to watch attack ads condemning the horrible, unforgivable monster that is Candidate X during breaks for Wheel of Fortune anymore. The voters have selected their elected representative, the losing opponent is either claiming voter fraud and/or planning their next campaign, someone is inevitable plotting to storm the Capitol again, whatever, we can all get on with our lives and look forward to arguing with our relatives over Thanksgiving turkey. However, it's hard to look ahead to a relatively politics-free oasis when candidates left and right start declaring their intention to be leader of the free world as soon as the midterm winners have been announced. Trump was guilty of this when, nearly a week after he heavily contributed to the GOP underperforming in the midterms against Biden's Democrats, he threw his hat into the ring for his MAGA, or KAG or whatever acronym he's using now, comeback tour.

In response, his opponents within the GOP are announcing earlier themselves as both Nikki Haley and political newcomer Vivek Ramaswamy made their campaign launches in February. On the Democratic side, professional weirdo Marianne Williamson is planning her launch sometime in March to challenge President Biden, likely running on a campaign of love and positivity and peace and hope and change and all other words like that. It's a trend I just can't get behind. Election cycles are starting to become the new Christmas: just creeping up ever so slightly earlier and earlier in the year every single time. While we already have the Hallmark Channel dropping their latest installment of A Christmas Wish starring that actor from that show you like from the early 90s as soon as summer, expect Fox News to have a new heart attack-inducing election graphics package even before you put up your fake Christmas tree in your living room.

With this new political normal, I am going to say something I never thought I would ever say in my life: we should look towards Canada for inspiration. Now, I don't forgive the Canadians for gifting us Yankees the cultural demon that is Justin Bieber, nor will I ever. Nonetheless, I like how they approach their election seasons. For our brothers and sisters in the Great White North, the only time they have to care about politics is in the few months actually leading up to election day, rather than our über-patriotic, never-ending marathon of ads, fliers, and yard signs you've likely run over with your lawnmower once or twice before.

When their Prime Minister, or Premier or Grand Poutine Master or whatever they call the office nowadays, dissolves Parliament in the weeks leading up to polling day, then the election season begins. After that, it's the expected pig's breakfast that we Americans are used to.

Short and sweet, the longest period for an official Canadian campaign season was eleven weeks in 2015. Now that is what I call luxury; a luxury that us Americans should enjoy. Americans have a God-given right to not care about all that red and blue, those Rs and Ds, those liberals and conservatives, if they choose not to. Instead, we should enjoy the simple things in life that make the U.S. of A. the greatest country in the world: our amazingly comfy La-Z-Boy recliners, sweet tea, an awful new reality show provided by the fine folks at TLC. You get the picture, anything but politics for the majority of that 365 day calendar. So, to all the politicians out there, Republican or Democrat, Libertarian or Green, sane or crazy, if you want to truly help your potential voters and constituents, please do not campaign two years out. You will be doing everyone a service and, who knows, maybe their migraines will go away too.

Rich Military History at UNC-Chapel Hill Soon to be Replaced

The Naval Armory building at the University of North Carolina (UNC) is set for demolition, sparking concerns from students, faculty, and community members about the loss of the Armory's historical significance and military traditions.

By Kristen Snyder

Rich Military History at UNC Soon to be Replaced

Kristen Snyder



The bricks of the Memorial Pathway line the entrance of the Naval Armory, engraved with the names of Carolina's service members to remind cadets of the legacy that guides them...but perhaps not for much longer.

Three years ago, I raised a timid salute at the foot of those bricks. I took an oath to serve my country, giving my life if my nation required it. I knew no one, and I had no military experience. Yet, the pathway reminded me, as it does today, that I am not alone.

Before we begin strategizing, it's Tradition and legacy are crucial to military training. They give us the ability to time travel and connect ourselves to those that came before.

"If the Armory is torn down, their memory will also vanish," Air Force Cadet Katie Goldman said.

This year, Goldman wonders if her team will be adding to the Memorial Pathway. She isn't sure whether to begin engraving bricks or to end the tradition and wait for the pathway to be destroyed with the rest of the Armory.

After the University finalized its Master Plan in 2019, many realized the Naval Armory fell under the list of buildings set for demolition. The plan envisions a newly developed Convergent Science or Interdisciplinary Studies Institute to replace the Armory.

Surface 678 is the architecture firm providing planning for the new layout. They believe the institute will give STEM majors a place to connect, expand their research, and develop participation in the market.

But for cadets like Goldman and I, memories of weekly drill sessions, leadership classes, and late-night bondings might soon be replaced by the rubble of the Armory and its broken traditions and legacies.

Our freshmen year, our class painted a ceiling tile in recognition of our own achievements, an Air Force ROTC tradition. We each took turns signing the tile trying to imprint our own legacy on the Armory attaching our memory to a physical representation so that we might live forever.

The Armory holds similar significance for Army Cadet Joseph Thompson. For him, military tradition runs in the family. He watched as the male members of his family left home to travel the world in service to the United States.

"I mean in the military you're going to be in many places; you're gonna move many times, start different journeys, depart journeys in your career, but you can never change your initial training," Thompson said.

Thompson remembered the first time that he saw the Armory. He took a deep breath in as he stared up at the words "NROTC." He knew this building would be the place he would begin the first chapter of his own military legacy apart from those of his family. The Armory will always be homebase to Thompson, an anchor to both his past and his future.

Goldman and Thompson have become good friends of mine. We have spent many nights in the Armory drafting training plans, watching movies, or catching our breath from fits of laughter. I've learned about their lives, while they became a part of mine.

In the Armory, we transitioned from children to leaders. Our growth is tied to this place. Losing it would mean losing a part of myself.

"I would have the same reaction as if they bulldozed the Old Well or the Planetarium or the Bell Tower or the Dean Dome," Lt. Col. Mark Clodfelter said.

Clodfelter taught at UNC from 1994-1997, serving as the Aerospace Department Chair while also heading the Air Force ROTC program. Clodfelter trained over 70 Air Force cadets in the halls of the Armory and bonded the cadets together as a family, inspired by the notion that they fought in the greatest military for the greatest country in the world. He showed them the pillars of the Air Force not only as a military branch but as a brotherhood.

"This building is a symbol of that... the commitment to service and if necessary to lose one's life in that service to the nation...and thus you take this building down you have lost that symbol," Clodfelter explained.

Clodfelter and other members of the community have rallied around Armory in hopes to save both the building and the memories within it.

"The Armory is more than just bricks and mortar," explained Rob Rivers, a member of the UNC NROTC Alumni Association.

Rivers has worked closely with Sandy Henkel from the Naval Armory Preservation Committee to advance the status of the Armory as a historical landmark in order to preserve its place on campus.

Henkel referred to the building's assets which make it unique and augment the committee's case:

"...Obviously historical significance based just on World War II and the service that this building gave to the university, to America... and under architectural significance..."

In 1940, University President Franklin Porter Graham fought to save the university by bringing Naval funding to campus. His success brought new buildings, a foreign language program, a pre-flight school, and one of the first few Naval ROTC programs.

Henkel explained that the Naval Armory was built in 1942 to meet the needs of the ROTC program by Archie Royal Davis, a leading architect of the time in North Carolina. Henkel determined that Davis's design further contributes to the historical significance of the building.

The design of the building was meant to reflect the colonial look of the Carolina Inn while also giving a modernist approach to the inside. The Drill Deck placed in the center of the Armory was built to fit the needs of trainers preparing midshipmen to serve as our nation's leaders. One of those trainers would later be known as President Gerald Ford.

But in 1996, all cadets and midshipmen were consolidated to the Armory as the university accepted more students that had no need for military training. The Armory became the military hub of UNC, as it remains today.

Yet, ground is still set to break in 2027.

Many, including Rivers and Henkel, are confused. The Armory has a historical and architectural significance that many other buildings do not. According to Rivers, other demolition sites, such as Whitehead and Venable lot, provide more economic and strategic sense than replacing the Armory.

The Armory is still functional and in use for its intended purpose. Moreover, it is valued amongst current students, alumni, and visitors who recognize the building's significance to the university's history.

Both Rivers and Henkel commended Chancellor Kevin Guskiewicz and the Board of Trustees for their willingness to see the significance of the Armory. And while they determine the university to be receptive, the main question still goes unanswered.

What aspects of the Armory set it apart from other antiquated buildings on campus for demolition?

This is a question that has yet to be answered directly.

UNC Facility Services denied an interview to highlight the building's deficiencies. There seems to be limited documentation indicating why the Armory and institute can't exist simultaneously. What is the mystery behind why the Armory's demolition is so finite?

That answer marks the divide between values of legacy and modernization.

Last year, I received a promotion which meant sifting through continuity I had found behind an old bookcase. Flipping through the binder, I found a typewritten, brown piece of paper. The page was dated from the 1950s with instructions for training plans to use in the Armory. Once again, I was reminded of the guiding legacy of the Armory.

Training in Air Force ROTC has always been a challenge. For two years, my classmates and I clawed our way to earn a spot at Field Training so that we might one day be officers. Through physical and mental training, we learned to trust each other while also competing with one another. When I walk through the doors of the Armory these days, I take an extra second to appreciate the transformation I have gone through in this building. Once I walked through the Armory's doors a scared first year, praying that I might just be able to exist above the minimum. Now, as a junior, I train cadets to be successful leaders.

And I am just one of the hundreds of stories that begin with this Armory.

I worry that four years from now, a student might walk past a construction site on the corner of North Campus. They won't know that the bricks that surrounded the Armory may very well have been laid by the Pre-Flight Naval school. They won't know that Archie Royal Davis constructed each element with the hope to augment the training of future officers in the United States military. They'll forget that there used to be a flag for cadets to salute and remember the UNC military legacy that existed since World War II.

They won't know once I looked up at that flag, embolden by God's purpose and the legacy of those paved the way for me so that I might serve my nation too. They won't know that in each stripe in star, I was reminded that I was not alone.

Or... they might just walk past a National Historical Landmark. A symbol of military service and tradition. And perhaps, they might just see a few more engraved bricks in the ground.

Many, including Rivers and Henkel, are confused. The Armory has a historical and architectural significance that many other buildings do not. According to Rivers, other demolition sites, such as Whitehead and Venable lot, provide more economic and strategic sense than replacing the Armory.

The Armory is still functional and in use for its intended purpose. Moreover, it is valued amongst current students, alumni, and visitors who recognize the building's significance to the university's history.

Both Rivers and Henkel commended Chancellor Kevin Guskiewicz and the Board of Trustees for their willingness to see the significance of the Armory. And while they determine the university to be receptive, the main question still goes unanswered.

What aspects of the Armory set it apart from other antiquated buildings on campus for demolition?

This is a question that has yet to be answered directly.

UNC Facility Services denied an interview to highlight the building's deficiencies. There seems to be limited documentation indicating why the Armory and institute can't exist simultaneously. What is the mystery behind why the Armory's demolition is so finite?

That answer marks the divide between values of legacy and modernization.

Last year, I received a promotion which meant sifting through continuity I had found behind an old bookcase. Flipping through the binder, I found a typewritten, brown piece of paper. The page was dated from the 1950s with instructions for training plans to use in the Armory. Once again, I was reminded of the guiding legacy of the Armory.

Thoughts on UNC's School of Civic Life

Elijah Parish offers advice to those seeking to make UNC more conservative via an open letter to the Board of Trustees.

By Elijah Parish

Thoughts on UNC's School of Civic Life

Elijah Parish



The news says you all are expediting the School of Civic Life and Leadership, and word on the street says that this is in an effort to make UNC more conservative. Before giving some unsolicited advice, I'm going to go ahead and assume that you actually want to make UNC more conservative, that this is a goal worth pursuing, and that this is even remotely feasible (I'm unsure if any of these assumptions are warranted, but I find the following discussion interesting on its own merits). I'm going to try and apply some general principles to advise your specific situation. None of these ideas are particularly original to me, and yet they are important and tragically under-discussed.

Before we begin strategizing, it's important to take stock of where you are and where you want to go.

(1) What do you want? To make UNC more conservative. Presumably the goal of "making UNC more conservative" refers to the student body and faculty rather than the BoT as you already have significant control of the BoT.
 (2) What means do you have to affect this change? Due to NC's present slight-right lean and the governmental influence over the UNC school system, you have a high degree of what James Burnham calls Aristocratic Power.
 (3) What means do you lack? Due to UNC's significant majority left-wing student body, faculty, (and presumably administration), you have very little of what James Burnham calls Democratic Power. You are in the popular minority.

(4) How do you use what you have to get what you want? How can Aristocratic Power be used to affect the composition and output of the student body and faculty? This will be the primary focus of the following section of the article.

(5) Why don't you already have what you want? I won't dive into this question here, and it is somewhat tangential to the issue at hand, but it's interesting and worthwhile for developing a more thorough understanding of your present position.

Rule 1: personnel is power. Even an absolute monarch cannot make every decision unilaterally—he lacks the epistemic and temporal resources—and you are far from having the power of an absolute monarch. Did you know that in the 90s there was a two to one ratio of teaching faculty to administration across American universities and now there's a two to one ratio of administration to teaching faculty? What are all of these administrators doing? What are all of these administrators being paid to do? Has administration gotten four times more difficult in the last 30 years? Is the UNC administration aiding or impeding your vision? I admit my ignorance regarding the power of the BoT as well as the day-to-day functioning of UNC's administration, and yet I'm confident that you're not powerless and I'm certain that at least some machinations of UNC admin are contrary to your desires. Is someone being paid to ensure that every syllabus has a diversity statement? Is that something that someone should be paid to do? Certainly, even if no one was ensuring that every syllabus had a diversity statement, most still would—that's the nature of the political inclinations of the UNC faculty; the point is that you're not going to ban diversity statements (I mean, hypothetically you could), but that doesn't mean you have to mandate or finance them—to pay someone to oppose your goals.

Manage the incentives. Don't fund your opposition. Delegate power to your allies.

Rule 2: Weather the populist storms. So you've just done something that upset (a loud yet very small portion of) the student body, what do you do now? Weather the storm. Let it blow over. Bide your time. Do you know why the Vietnam war ended? I'll give you a hint: it wasn't because Harvard students invaded University Hall (and UNC students are a far cry away from invading the South Building). If there's one thing we should learn from the (hopefully concluded) Trump era and the January 6th protests, it's that populism is feckless. This is far from saying democratic power isn't real; it is very real and you must be aware of its reality. However, part of its reality includes the fact that it is unstable, difficult to coordinate, and virtually incapable of creating sustained change without aristocratic support. This is why populist movements so often must develop vanguards: because 100 loyalists will always be more effective than 10,000 casuals. You're in the minority, but you have Aristocratic Power, and that is more valuable in the long-run (though of course you need some democratic buy-in to your vision). Please see Rule 1 on consolidating your Aristocratic Power.

Keep the long game in mind. Remain firm. Blowback will blow over.

Rule 3: Power should beget more power. Rule 1 is perhaps a subset of this rule, but I felt compelled to move Rule 1 up in my list, despite having it last in my outline. Once more, if you had absolute power—absolute hegemony—you'd be free to pursue pet projects and take far more liberties in what you attempt to accomplish. You are in no such position—not even close—and one of the worst things you can do is delude yourself about the amount of power that you have. As I mentioned earlier, you have significant amounts of Aristocratic Power, and you should seek to consolidate such power. Change the incentives. Change the structure of the few institutions in which you have an advantage. Entrench your control. Don't splurge. Be economical with your political capital. If you want a more conservative student body, increase the requirement for students taken from rural counties. If you want a more conservative faculty, change hiring practices. Have you ever noticed how students at classical Christian schools were required to wear collared shirts and ties whereas me and all my fellow public school kids weren't? Why not incentive the former to apply and disincentive the latter via uniforms? Again, this is something that would never happen (but again, hypothetically it could), and yet the principle of using power to gain more power is quite clearly elucidated in this example. You already require that a certain proportion of the student body comes from North Carolina, why not increase the proportion of students from rural areas?

Take power. Consolidate power. Take more power.

UNC Does Not Understand the Liberal Arts

Erik Hanson outlines the classical basis for a liberal arts education and the disconnect UNC suffers from- are we too far removed?

By Erik Hanson

UNC Does Not Understand the Liberal Arts

Erik Hanson



What are the liberal arts? Does UNC provide a true liberal arts education? Does completing “U.S. Diversity” and “Beyond the North Atlantic” general education requirements make you liberally educated? Is, as UNC seems to think, simply taking a broad survey of courses the hallmark of this esteemed education? If UNC’s liberal arts curriculum has ever left you scratching your head, your skepticism is not unjustified. UNC does not understand the liberal arts. But to understand where UNC has gone wrong, and to truly ascertain the structure and purpose of the liberal arts, we must travel back to their foundation. We must consult Plato.

Among Plato’s most famous works is the *Republic*, a written dialogue between Plato’s mouthpiece, Socrates, and his fellow interlocutors. In the *Republic*, while trying to understand the nature of justice, Plato conducts a thought experiment where he builds a utopian city. He plans for this city to be ruled by philosopher kings, so for this reason Plato dedicates a great portion of his *Republic* to examining what a true philosopher looks like, and how education can create one.

It is within this context that Plato’s mystical Allegory of the Cave takes on meaning. In Plato’s Allegory of the Cave, people are chained in a cave in such a manner that they live their whole lives seeing nothing but the shadows on the cave’s wall, shadows cast by sunshine and the outside world behind them. The people, who have spent their entire lives knowing nothing but the silhouettes on the wall, believe the shadows are reality.

But in the allegory, one person breaks free and leaves the cave. Outside the cave, the sun is bright, blinding, and initially painful. But once the person’s eyes adjust, he can see the world as it actually is. In Plato’s analogy, the cave represents the uneducated state into which we are born, ignorant of the truth, the reality, and the very world in which we live. The outside world represents what Plato calls the “Forms,” which are perfect, universal, and unchanging qualities which worldly objects temporarily and imperfectly manifest, such as beauty, or goodness, or even just the quality of being a color. For example, a beautiful painting reflects the Form of beauty, but imperfectly, because no painting lasts forever, and because another work of art could always be more beautiful and thus closer to that Form. In Plato’s eyes, a person who has left the cave can grasp the Forms, including those Forms of truth, beauty, and the good. This person is a philosopher, and he is brought out of the cave and into the light through education.

Plato discusses at great length the qualities of a philosopher’s education, and he asserts that it will naturally have two parts: gymnastics and music. Gymnastics refers to the training of the body, but “music” is an imperfect translation of the ancient Greek word *mousikê*, which refers to any art over which the Muses of classical mythology presided. In this sense, “music” means everything from poetry and music (in the modern sense) to drama, literature, and history. From there, Plato begins expounding on his list. He includes arithmetic and geometry in his list of subjects, as well as dialectical training, which concerns the logical and articulate interchange of ideas.

These educational principles gradually evolved and then ossified. In the middle ages, the liberal arts were definitively established, consisting of two standardized categories: the trivium and the quadrivium. The trivium consisted of three topics: logic, grammar, and rhetoric. Logic involved thinking in accordance with reason so that one could identify truth and shun falsehood. Grammar involved mastering the mechanics of language. Rhetoric concerned how to communicate ideas to an audience. The trivium was the groundwork for the interchange of ideas in pursuit of higher truth.

The quadrivium consisted of four topics: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, which were, respectively, the study of numbers, the study of numbers in space, the study of numbers in motion, and the study of numbers in time and sound. This mathematical emphasis has manifold purposes. Numbers and math exist in the abstract. "Two" and "five" are not tangible entities, but rather are concepts which exist outside of the material world. Math forces us to explore truths which, just like Plato's Forms, exist beyond our flesh. Moreover, by studying the numerical patterns and the invisible relationships between all the parts of our world, mathematics allows us to perceive the cosmic organization of our universe. Ever since the Middle Ages, the trivium and quadrivium have been known as the seven liberal arts, and for centuries they have set the standard for a liberal education.

So how does UNC's liberal arts curriculum compare? UNC's liberal arts curriculum centers around its general education requirements, mandated for each student to complete before graduation. Completing these general education requirements requires the student to reluctantly enroll in a blanket sampling of courses whose content has been arbitrarily made important, often despite that content's irrelevance to the traditional liberal arts. Did you want to take a philosophy class to study Aristotle or Thomas Aquinas? Well, if your progress within the general education curriculum conflicts with your interests, you may have to settle for a Native Americans in film class. This curriculum format reflects UNC's misunderstanding of the liberal arts. The liberal arts do not insinuate a general-knowledge, all-subjects-included education synonymous with "knowing a little bit of everything."

The liberal arts are the form of education which builds on Plato's blueprint of orienting our minds toward the true, the beautiful, and the good, an educational philosophy which was standardized in the middle ages into the trivium and quadrivium. Even today, the liberal arts are valuable because that same good, that same truth, and that same beauty still exists in the world, and the liberal arts are the tools by which we pursue, share, and revel in it.

UNC has the responsibility to institute a series of reforms to its liberal arts curriculum to stay true to the purpose of the liberal arts. Some parts of UNC's general education curriculum can stay, such as the English requirement, the foreign language requirement, history requirement, and the Quantitative Reasoning. All of these courses are in direct alignment with the liberal arts. Even Lifetime Fitness courses answer Plato's call for the physical training of the body. But all the parts of UNC's general education curriculum that do not align with the liberal arts ought to be cut. For a replacement, UNC can flesh out those course requirements which deserve to remain. For example, for the sake of perfecting one's English grammar and understanding the Western world's foundations, it would be sensible to require the study of either Latin or Greek. Courses in higher level math, in physics, and in music also ought to remain or become standard. Students ought to face much more of the great literature of the West.

But there is one caveat to all of this: Plato's theory presupposes the Forms, which were Plato's way of categorizing absolute truth. By extension, a liberal arts education presupposes the absolute truth which it equips students to pursue. The dialectic tools of the trivium are important, not for treating all ideas as equally veracious, but for disproving the bad ones and spreading the good.

Postmodern nihilistic philosophies and moral relativism have no place in a liberal arts curriculum, nor do gender studies courses that obfuscate the obvious differences between men and women, art classes which treat a Jackson Pollock painting as though it rivaled Raphael's School of Athens, and English courses which prize mediocre books over the works of Milton and Shakespeare simply because the authors of those books are minorities. The liberal arts teach us to recognize why one painting is better than another, to see why certain works of literature are timeless regardless of the color of their author's skin or gender, and to explain why these things are so. After reforming its liberal arts curriculum, UNC must ensure that its classes are being taught so that they guide students out of the cave rather than lead them deeper.

Although UNC does not understand the liberal arts, UNC does not have to fail as a liberal arts school. Problems can be solved. By turning its all-encompassing, arbitrary general education curriculum into an enlightened course of classes, and by calling on Plato, the trivium, and the quadrivium to serve as guides while doing so, UNC can adopt an educational blueprint which will teach students to see, recognize, and articulate the good, the true, and the beautiful. That is the purpose of the liberal arts.

The Necessity of Religion in Public Discourse

Stephen Halley details the fruitless attempt to separate religion from political discourse, illustrating the intertwined nature of the two.

By Stephen Halley

The Necessity of Religion in Political Discourse

Stephen Halley

I'm sure if you asked a number of students on this great campus when they became invested in politics, many would say the 2016 presidential election. America was leaving an unprecedented moment of our history with the first black president leaving office after an eight-year tenure. Expectations were high as the Democrats nominated the first woman to represent a major political party and Republicans nominated someone who would change the party for years to come. Both candidates were eccentric, ran their mouths a bit too much, became marred by some pretty outrageous mudslinging, and showed thirteen-year old me just how interesting this whole politics thing was. I credit that Republican nominee with my political investment today; I'm certain many other young Republicans would say the same.

began to learn how our political system works and to understand what was going on in the culture, but most of all, I asked my dad and grandpa exactly what it was I should think. I'll certainly admit that my eighth-grade political tendencies were nothing more than spoon fed talking points from the men I looked up to, but damn did I feel smart. Over the next couple years, however, I had to truly grapple with what these ideas were. I was a conservative, then as I am now, but I had no idea what exactly I was trying to conserve.

Two-years later, a mental breakdown would lead me to the answer I was looking for. It was right in front of me the whole time: Christ. My political propensity became intimately entangled with my religious persuasion and has been ever since. In fact, I find that my religious ideals are much more important to me than my conservatism. I'm a Christian first and conservative second.

This notion of a linked religious and political ideology is something that has been lost in the culture today. The idea that you shouldn't bring religious views into a political discussion wrongfully covers our discourse. I believe that all people, atheist, agnostic, and theist alike, bring religious assumptions into political discourse and asking people to leave these assumptions behind is, for a lack of a better word, problematic.

Before going further, I should explain what I mean about religion. The common understanding is, as comprehensively as I can put it, that religion relates to a set of traditions, practices, or beliefs relating to some divine and/or spiritual figure. This definition of the term, I will refer to as 'organized religion'. I use the term religion much more liberally; religion refers to a person's faith-based beliefs based on a spiritual understanding of the world which informs their worldview.

Religion manifests itself through practices and traditions but does not necessarily have to. A religious belief therefore refers to any of these faith-based claims which implicitly cannot be definitively proven nor perfectly defended. They merely exist within the mind of the adherent as something immutable about the world. The spiritual understanding of the world can be both deity or idea and as such, religious belief exists in all people. This brings me to the first problem with trying to work religious ideas out of political discourse. It simply cannot be done.

Contemporary thought holds that any moral position must be argued from a secular and nonreligious place. You should not appeal to a religious ground because not everyone shares your religious assumptions and it is therefore pragmatic to exclude religious belief from political discourse. But, as I have explained previously, faith-based assumptions are what form our religious beliefs and the worldview we hold to.

For example, the idea that all human life is inherently valuable, to beat a dead horse, must be taken on faith. There is no perfectly rational secular explanation for treating other people as if they possessed individual dignity. Any explanation must, at some level, rely on faith alone in its justification.

Should we then leave that assumption behind because we cannot explain why it's right? It could be argued that we should let the poor and homeless die off, relieving the tax burden from the rest of us and disincentivizing unproductivity. This idea is monstrous, and relies on the faith-based claim that the individual does not possess inherent value and that collective societal growth is an ultimate end in and of itself.

Any argument against this position requires the similar faith-based claim that society exists to protect the weak because those lives are inherently valuable. My point is that if you throw religious values out of political discourse, you are left with nothing. Nobody can make any salient argument because they don't have a moral understanding of the world from which to argue.

But perhaps the point isn't to exclude religious claims in general, but instead to exclude organized religion? For the sake of argument, I don't think that this idea is meant to be taken as something designed to hurt others and is instead a pragmatic idea to promote discourse in the public square. To start, I certainly would agree that, "Leviticus said so," isn't a great excuse for public policy. Maybe in the raising of children you should do it, but in the interest of creating a functioning society, you need a better answer than that.

The attempt to rid the public square of organized religion doesn't stop here, however. It instead intends to rid our discourse of anything related to an organized religion. Let's go back to our dead horse, individual human rights. I believe that people possess and deserve individual dignity because they were made in the image of God. An opponent of organized religion (in the public square) might say that not everyone believes in God so that can't be the reason.

"You can believe that being made in the image of God means everyone possesses individual dignity, but that can't be the reason we pass an amendment guaranteeing equal protection under the law," he protests. Moving past the fact that our strawman's vision of the world would require a fundamental reordering of the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights and ends up making the same leap of faith to rationalize human rights, I want to focus on what it is he is asking me to do. The proposal is that I should leave behind my faith in God as creator of the universe and the beliefs I prescribe to because of that faith, for not everyone shares in it and the appeal is not coherent to everyone.

I am being asked to leave behind the thing I have committed my life to, my worldview informed by that commitment, and my belief in the supremacy of that faith above all others, before I can participate in political discussion.

I shouldn't have to explain why this is such a problematic idea. People of organized religion are being asked to leave behind something nobody else has to, something that is intimately involved with who they are and the way they see the world. Under any other context, this would be unthinkable. Excluding organized religion from political discussion can only lead to marginalization of those adherents no matter how well intentioned or thoughtfully it is put together. The simple fact of the matter is that they are being asked to enter the public discussion only after leaving something integral to themselves behind.

Understanding that all claims to morality are religious and based on faith allows us to better understand not only ourselves, but also our opponents. Everyone holds religious views whether they like to admit it or not and will act on those views more vehemently than anything else. Anything perceived as an attack against these views is met with fervor and indignation and a response is levied in kind, to the degree one's worldview allows.

Adherents to the transgender movement, for example, hold the belief that it is violence to call someone by the wrong pronouns or to 'deadname' someone. When people express extreme outrage over the most recent trans figure being called their previous name, usually by referring to the event as "literally murder" or "erasure", many on the right act confused. The reaction makes perfect sense, however, if you truly believe that acts committed against a trans figure were actually violent, it would be a moral outrage if punishment wasn't dealt out in kind.

On the right, the pro-life movement has the exact same issue. Adherents to the pro-life movement truly believe that the baby in the womb is a human life and was made at conception. When they see the stats about how many abortions were committed in the past month, they get upset and take to the streets outraged.

Those not ideologically aligned with them are confused, as it doesn't make sense that they would be this upset over something that doesn't affect them.

However, it makes perfect sense once you understand that the pro-life adherent does not see how many abortions were performed but instead sees how many human babies were killed. Again, it would be a moral outrage if something wasn't done about it. Understanding that each side possesses distinct religious claims can help to understand and be sympathetic to the other side. It also helps to frame how we should work in trying to get people to our side. We should not beat their face in with stats and or use pointless appeals to emotion. You have to restructure the very way they see the world by proving to them that violence is committed when you deadname a trans person or that the baby in the womb is alive. Understanding that is the key to political success.

I started by telling my story of finding a political voice. Without a religious belief, there is nothing to anchor your beliefs on. You will simply go with the tides of whatever is being told to you by someone who does recognize the importance of religious beliefs. That or you'll become an establishment republican- unprincipled and ineffective. The sooner we recognize the religion under our worldviews, the sooner we can become effective political leaders more open to understanding opposition. Political discourse will flourish as we are able to more clearly understand where our opponents are coming from. A religious view should be seen as a unifying part of discourse, something we used to persuade others to our ideas and which can be relied upon to make sense of the world. Religious faith cannot be avoided in political discourse, it's an inevitable part of it. Without it, we have no worldviews or ideas upon which to discuss.

The Wild World of NIL

Nic Valdespino analyzes how NIL deals are transforming college athletics, for better or worse.

By Nic Valdespino

The Wild World of NIL

Nic Valdespino

Ahead of the Tarheels' Holiday Bowl matchup against the Oregon Ducks, the rumor mill swirled with speculation regarding UNC's star Quarterback Drake Maye. After an incredible season in which the freshman threw 38 touchdown passes and added another seven on the ground, UNC fans faced the cruel reality of the new college football landscape, under which the recruitment process has become a battle of the highest bidder.

Early in December, reports surfaced that NIL collectives from powerhouse schools, possibly Alabama and LSU, were attempting to lure Maye away from his home in Chapel Hill in exchange for a massive payday. In an interview with 93.7 The Fan, Pittsburg head coach Pat Narduzzi claimed that two schools had offered the standout QB five million dollars to switch his allegiance.

Although Narduzzi did not specify which programs put forth the massive incentive packages, he called the new state of affairs in college football a "sad, sad deal." In response to the news, Coach Mack Brown called for more comprehensive regulation, stating that the ability of teams to "tamper with guys on [his] team and pay them to transfer" is an "issue that needs to get stopped."

On December 7th, Maye took to the podium to put an end to all the hoopla, telling ESPN that the rumors regarding his situation "weren't the reality" and that no other university could give him the "that same heartbeat feeling" as UNC does.

Although Carolina's signal caller chose to remain loyal to the powder blue, the majority of stories regarding novel Name, Image, and Likeness spending do not end with such fairytale conclusions. Instead, the Maye transfer controversy spells a dangerous future for college football, a future in which small programs will not have the resources to keep pace with their high-powered counterparts.

To illustrate the destructive and chaotic nature of the newfangled transfer portal, consider the story of West Virginia Quarterback JT Daniels. Throughout his college career, Daniels has transferred schools three times, each time securing a more lucrative deal in exchange for his on-the-field talents. Before transferring from Georgia to West Virginia, Daniels took an official visit to Oregon State, where his father, serving as his de facto agent, demanded his son receive a four-bedroom apartment if the Beavers hoped to see TJ in Corvallis. The OSU coaching staff considered the conditions unreasonable, leading Daniels to sign a mid-six-figure per year deal with the Mountaineers. College athlete's transfer decisions previously centered around a plethora of factors including playing time, game-day atmosphere, and the quality of the coaching staff. Today, it seems many of these decisions are simply a battle of the highest bidder.

The over expenditure issue extends to freshman recruitment as well. As part of Tennessee's effort to bring in five-star 18 year-old recruit Nco lamaleava, the Volunteers offered up to \$8 million in incentives per year.

In addition, Miami Hurricanes commit Jaden Rashada received a total of 9.5 million in NIL deals to take his talents to South Beach. Blue-chip programs like Miami and Tennessee may be able to afford these high sticker prices, but other schools may be unable or unwilling to spend so much on one single player. In fact, the executives of the UNC NIL Collective have expressed their opposition to senseless overspending and the "free agency blitz" that college recruiting has become. In an interview with Inside Carolina, Graham Boone, the executive director of Heels4Life, stated that NIL at Carolina will not be something that "is just done to give money." Instead, Boone intends for the program to help athletes develop their business acumen rather than simply providing a "short term boost to their bank accounts." While this approach to Name, Image, and Likeness is surely more beneficial for the athletes, it may prove a detriment to the football program overall. If other universities continue to offer multi-million dollar packages to all the high-profile recruits and the NCAA does not put a stop to the practice, the Tarheels may find themselves without exceptional talent and lagging behind on the gridiron. Thus, as the Heels look to recover from their defeat in the Holiday Bowl, they must also look to formulate a strategy to tackle the changing dynamics of college football, one in which spending is controlled but the team remains competitive.

Carolina Heroes: Benjamin Forsyth

Easton Matthews tells the story of Benjamin Forsyth, a North Carolina rifleman who led daring raids during the War of 1812, and emphasizes the importance of preserving the memories of historical figures like him.

By Easton Matthews

Carolina Heroes: Benjamin Forsyth

Easton Matthews



Near Germanton, North Carolina, there stands a lone historical marker by the side of an old colonial home that tells the story of the rifleman Benjamin Forsyth, the namesake of Forsyth County. Once renowned throughout the state, Forsyth has fallen into obscurity recently along with many of the Old North State's past heroes and heroines. As Carolinians and conservatives, we should work to ensure that the memories and exploits of those who made our state and nation great do not recede into the darkness of insignificance. The story of Benjamin Forsyth deserves to be told.

Forsyth's origins remain somewhat obscure, but it is clear by 1810 that Forsyth had moved to Stokes County, North Carolina, and purchased 3,000 acres of land. Forsyth also married a certain Bethemia Ladd, with whom he would have six children.

Also, by 1810 with the Napoleonic Wars in full sway, the nascent United States was beginning to find itself in conflict with the British Empire and Napoleonic France. The impressment of American sailors into the Royal Navy and a continued British presence in territories ceded to the United States after independence increased the likelihood of war.

By 1812, the conflict with Great Britain had become irrepressible. In June of 1812, a few days before Napoleon's disastrous invasion of Russia, President Madison signed the declaration of war against Great Britain, inaugurating what has become known as the "War of 1812." Although North Carolina was far from the frontlines on the border with modern-day Canada, the state still provided forces to defeat the British. One of the units supplied by North Carolina was an elite regiment of riflemen led by Benjamin Forsyth.

Forsyth's men arrived just in time, as in August, an entire American army under the command of General William Hull was forced to surrender to the British at Detroit. To offset the disaster and raise morale, Forsyth and 95 riflemen attacked the town of Gananoque in Canada, capturing an assortment of prisoners, supplies, and weapons.

Later in 1813, Forsyth would lead an even more daring raid on the settlement of Elizabethtown. Using sleighs to cross the frozen rivers between Ogdensburg and Elizabethtown, Forsyth and his now 195-man Rifle regiment surprised the British garrison taking 52 prisoners and a trove of muskets and rifles before escaping back to Ogdensburg. With his reputation now established and the prestige of his regiment soaring, Forsyth and his men were called upon by General Henry Dearborn to cover the American advance on York (modern-day Toronto).

As Forsyth and his men were crossing the Saint Lawrence River by boat, they came under heavy fire from British forces on the shore. After fighting their way ashore and flushing out the Indian allies of the British, they arrived just in time to provide much-needed covering fire for General Zebulon Pike's landing troops. American forces captured and looted York. The capture of Upper Canada's capital of York failed to prove decisive, and Forsyth's Rifle Regiment was soon called upon again to take a leading role in American operations.

The British position of Fort George provided an excellent avenue of attack into American territory. The capture of Fort George would prevent further British inroads and allow American forces to assume the offense in other areas. To secure the location, a force under Forsyth and Colonel Winfield Scott moved to capture the fortress. After an uncontested amphibious landing near the fort, Forsyth's riflemen, with a collection of light artillery, compelled the British to evacuate the fort. Forsyth's men chased the retreating British for a few miles before returning to seize the strategically significant position sealing off any future British incursions from the fortress.

Forsyth's dramatic raids and daring assaults did not remain unknown in his home state of North Carolina. Men offered toasts in taverns throughout the state for the victories of Forsyth and his gallant band of North Carolinians. The citizens of Salisbury held a parade and the Mayor of Fayetteville decreed that the town should be illuminated in celebration of the many victories achieved during the conflict. But as his home state was celebrating the successes of American arms, Forsyth was preparing for his final adventure.

By the spring of 1814, now lieutenant colonel Forsyth found himself preparing an ambush around the settlement of Odelltown. When the British chanced upon the hiding riflemen, Forsyth refused to retreat and decided to stand his ground. Sadly, Forsyth's men fell back, leaving Forsyth in an exposed position. Benjamin Forsyth, one of North Carolina's foremost heroes during the War of 1812, was shot through the collarbone by a British soldier and expired shortly thereafter. North Carolina did not forget the contributions of Forsyth, and in 1817, the General Assembly adopted a resolution of appreciation for the contributions of Forsyth to the American war effort. In addition to the resolution, Forsyth's son James was sent to The University of North Carolina for free with the bonus of a ceremonial sword from the General Assembly.