Dear Readers,

Happy New Year!

The first semester of 2018 has begun, and it’s off to a rather slow start. Classes started back for the spring semester, then stopped for Martin Luther King Day, then started back, then stopped for snow, then started back again. But, like the U.S. postmen neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these writers from the completion of their task, and with the first month of the new year comes the first issue of Carolina Review of the new year.

Inside you’ll find articles on recent events, like Will Rierson’s analysis of the Hawaiian missile crisis, Christine DeSimone’s piece on the 2017 Alabama special election and voter ID laws, new writer Joseph Barnes’ look to the future of Trumpism, and more. Chock full of conservative voices of every stripe, we’re just as dedicated as always to giving conservatism on campus a proper platform. It’s a new semester at UNC, but the Review remains unchanged.

Lux et Libertas,

Alec M. Dent

Editor-in-Chief
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Race and the Right
Are Donald Trump and the Republican Party More Beneficial for Minorities than the Left?

For several decades, and with recent fervor, the Democratic Party has tried to represent itself as the party for minorities. Democrats and the Left love making the Right seem like an evil, racist group that’s out to destroy everything minorities have and ensure their white friends are the only ones in power. The Left does this through underhanded tactics such as taking things out of context, assuming moral superiority, convincing minorities they’re all victims, ostracizing those minorities who don’t fall in line, the list goes on. This has proved successful for Democrats as they haven’t received less than 88 percent of the black vote since 2000, and in fact have received no less than 85 percent in every presidential election in the last 50 years. Latinos have also been wooed by the liberals, and are nearly 3 times more likely to vote Democrat than Republican based on the 2016 presidential election results.

The strange part about all this is that the Republican party’s policies end up putting minorities in a better economic position than left-wing policies which seek to divide and keep minorities in a victim role so they’ll be more likely to vote for them repeatedly. When a member of the Left seeks to come up with policy, in many cases the first thing to pop in their head is “race,” while a conservative’s is “maximum effectiveness.” It’s clear which one would be more beneficial for all, and we’ve actually seen over the past several decades which is more beneficial. We can start by looking at the most recent comparison we have, Donald Trump and Barack Obama.

Under President Trump, black unemployment is at 6.8 percent, while under Obama black unem-
Employment hovered around 8 percent at his best, and reached a whopping 16 percent at his worst. From 2009 to 2015, incomes of black Americans fell by more than $900 per family. It’s a little early to see these statistics under Trump’s presidency, but with more than half a million black Americans with new jobs, there has almost surely been an increase in average wealth per black family. Hispanics have also enjoyed a 34-year low in unemployment since Trump became president.

Donald Trump has also shown great interest in school choice for low-income individuals. This includes the opportunity of using federal funds to send low-income students to private schools, a system currently only taking place in a few areas, such as Washington D.C. and Indiana. Another provision of this system Trump is trying to implement would allow individuals and corporations to donate money to scholarship programs in exchange for certain tax reductions. Not only was this something Donald Trump has vouched for, it’s something President Obama refused to support. Why would the racist, hate-mongering party stand up for something that could potentially create thousands of new minority doctors, lawyers, physicians, and other professionals? It’s because what the media tells you and the way the Left portrays conservatives is nothing but propaganda and scare tactics to get minority votes.

I know after reading this the question you might be asking, “Wow, was Trump always this awesome for the minority population?” The answer is yes. Before Donald Trump was President Trump, he had already done great things for minorities and women. One of these accomplishments was opening his desegregated Palm Beach, Floridia club, Mar-a-Lago, when others in town discriminated against blacks and Jews. Trump also lent Jennifer Hudson, an exceptional black actress, a place to stay in Trump’s International Hotel in Chicago for free after two members of her family were found murdered and her nephew missing. This isn’t stuff Trump had to do; he did it out of the kindness of his heart. Trump also gave a black bus driver, Darnell Barton, $10,000 after he talked a woman out of committing suicide. He gave Barbara Res the job of constructing a skyscraper, making her the first woman in history to do so. Sure sounds like a racist and sexist to me! I know some of you will say he did these things for publicity, not out of real compassion. The point is that he did them, regardless of the identity of the recipient of his kindness.

President Trump is not the racist the media would have you believe. In the first year of his presidency he’s done more for minorities than Obama can show for eight years of service. Sure he makes controversial decisions, but to say these decisions are made because deep inside Trump is an evil racist is exactly the stuff that’s laughable to conservatives everywhere, even those who oppose Trump. People should realize that most Americans want what’s best for our country. Using identity politics and moral superiority in order to stifle debate and make yourself feel like only your side can be righteous and good is scummy, sad, and deplorable. Let’s end the talk of which side is more racist or evil, and actually look at what each side accomplishes with their respective policies and make a decision on who we want to elect based on that. CR.
If you were following the news leading up to the Alabama Senate special election in December, you likely read plenty of sensational headlines and rude comments, my favorite being Breitbart’s “Soros Army in Alabama to Register Convicted Felons to Vote Against Roy Moore.” As polls began to show a closer race and Roy Moore’s sexual assault allegations came to light, one claim that the media began to repeat was that Alabama’s 2011 voter ID law would be responsible for suppressing enough minority voters to prevent Doug Jones from winning. As election results and exit polls clearly show, this apocalyptic prediction could not be further from the truth.

In 2011, the state of Alabama passed a voter ID law, often called one of the strictest of its kind. According to the Alabama secretary of state, the requirement to vote is simply that one must present a valid photo-ID when at the polls. This includes a driver’s license, student ID, passport, or other government-issued ID. If a voter does not have one of these forms of ID, he/she is able to receive a free Alabama voter ID. Given that most individuals have some form of valid photo identification and that those who do not are able to get one with no financial strain, these requirements are not difficult to comply with. This law did not take effect until 2014, giving voters three entire years to obtain necessary forms of identification. And since the Alabama Senate election took place three years after the voter ID law went into effect and was after a hotly contested presidential election, it is preposterous to insinuate that a citizen who wants to vote would not be able to meet these requirements.

Nonetheless, as the special election drew near, claims of voter suppression were rampant. Democrats argued that this law was created to target minorities, an absurd claim. How does one’s minority status put one at a disadvantage for obtaining an ID, something the vast majority of Americans already have? Is an Alabama government official going to
deny someone a free ID because of the color of their skin? You need to present a valid photo ID to do a number of things, including buy some types of medicine, pick up your child from school, buy a gun, purchase alcohol or cigarettes, drive, stay in a hotel room, and many more. Do Democrats legitimately believe that minority voters are not capable of obtaining an ID free of cost, especially given that a photo ID is needed for so much? Any time you visit the doctor, you have to show a photo ID. If Democrats claim that healthcare is a right, where are the Democrats lobbying to remove healthcare ID laws? Do healthcare ID requirements not put a burden on minorities that prevent them from receiving care? Of course not. So why should voter ID laws be any different?

Enough of looking at voter ID in theory. Let’s take a look at something objective—cold, hard, facts from CNN exit polling data. In 2008, 6 years before the voter ID law went into effect, black voters in Alabama made up around 29% of voters. In 2012, they comprised 28% of voters. In the 2017 special election, 3 years after the law went into effect, black voters in Alabama made up 29% of the vote—the exact same proportion as in 2008, when the first black president was on the ballot. And yet, clearly voter suppression is rampant, we’re told. Forget that there was no change in electoral composition from 2008, and a slight increase compared to 2012. Forget that #BlackWomen trended on Twitter for hours after the election to congratulate black women for being instrumental in Roy Moore’s defeat. Somehow, voter suppression was at work. Or at least, that’s what the Democrats would like you to believe.

If the Alabama voter ID law suppresses the minority vote, why would the electoral composition remain essentially constant from year to year, even when comparing the composition before and after the voter ID law went into effect? If all the doomsday predictions were true, we would be seeing a sharp decline in black voting and would be hearing reports of thousands of people being denied polling access. Instead, we see no change in the composition of voters, with black voters still turning out in large numbers to vote. Clearly the liberal arguments surrounding voter ID are flawed—the facts simply don’t line up. If a Democrat can win a statewide election in one of the most conservative states that also has one of the strongest voter ID laws, is there really any credible case to be made that voter ID laws are restrictive? I’d be more likely to believe that Bernie Sanders became a diehard capitalist than believe that voter suppression is why the Alabama special election was so close.
Folks, it’s that time of year again. No, I’m not talking about that time for following up on our New Year’s resolutions or courageously attempting to stumble to an 8 A.M. class in the blistering cold, desperately hoping for that early North Carolina spring to commence. Nor is it that time where we begin to dread again the overt liberal insanity on campus. It is, in fact, that time of year in which we, the Carolina faithful, begin to ponder what direction our basketball team is going.

After coming off a strong road win against a good Tennessee team, we have lost at home to Wofford, nearly lost at home to a bad Wake Forest team, and lost a close game to Florida State (a game that we should have won had we not committed so many unnecessary turnovers) and embarrassed ourselves yet again in Charlottesville with an embarrassing loss to a terrible Georgia Tech team. At this time last year, I was pessimistic and gave up all hope of potentially going to another championship. Fortunately, I was wrong. When it comes to this year’s team hoping for that early North Carolina spring to commence. Nor is it that time where we begin to dread again the overt liberal insanity on campus. It is, in fact, that time of year in which we, the Carolina faithful, begin to ponder what direction our basketball team is going.
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After coming off a strong road win against a good Tennessee team, we have lost at home to Wofford, nearly lost at home to a bad Wake Forest team, and lost a close game to Florida State (a game that we should have won had we not committed so many unnecessary turnovers) and embarrassed ourselves yet again in Charlottesville with an embarrassing loss to a terrible Georgia Tech team. At this time last year, I was pessimistic and gave up all hope of potentially going to another championship. Fortunately, I was wrong. When it comes to this year’s team hoping for that early North Carolina spring to commence. Nor is it that time where we begin to dread again the overt liberal insanity on campus. It is, in fact, that time of year in which we, the Carolina faithful, begin to ponder what direction our basketball team is going.

After coming off a strong road win against a good Tennessee team, we have lost at home to Wofford, nearly lost at home to a bad Wake Forest team, and lost a close game to Florida State (a game that we should have won had we not committed so many unnecessary turnovers) and embarrassed ourselves yet again in Charlottesville with an embarrassing loss to a terrible Georgia Tech team. At this time last year, I was pessimistic and gave up all hope of potentially going to another championship. Fortunately, I was wrong. When it comes to this year’s team hoping for that early North Carolina spring to commence. Nor is it that time where we begin to dread again the overt liberal insanity on campus. It is, in fact, that time of year in which we, the Carolina faithful, begin to ponder what direction our basketball team is going.

After coming off a strong road win against a good Tennessee team, we have lost at home to Wofford, nearly lost at home to a bad Wake Forest team, and lost a close game to Florida State (a game that we should have won had we not committed so many unnecessary turnovers) and embarrassed ourselves yet again in Charlottesville with an embarrassing loss to a terrible Georgia Tech team. At this time last year, I was pessimistic and gave up all hope of potentially going to another championship. Fortunately, I was wrong. When it comes to this year’s team hoping for that early North Carolina spring to commence. Nor is it that time where we begin to dread again the overt liberal insanity on campus. It is, in fact, that time of year in which we, the Carolina faithful, begin to ponder what direction our basketball team is going.

After coming off a strong road win against a good Tennessee team, we have lost at home to Wofford, nearly lost at home to a bad Wake Forest team, and lost a close game to Florida State (a game that we should have won had we not committed so many unnecessary turnovers) and embarrassed ourselves yet again in Charlottesville with an embarrassing loss to a terrible Georgia Tech team. At this time last year, I was pessimistic and gave up all hope of potentially going to another championship. Fortunately, I was wrong. When it comes to this year’s team hoping for that early North Carolina spring to commence. Nor is it that time where we begin to dread again the overt liberal insanity on campus. It is, in fact, that time of year in which we, the Carolina faithful, begin to ponder what direction our basketball team is going.
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ketball last year to see what
a real championship-caliber
team looks like. I’m sorry
to say that this year’s team
will not make it to another
National Championship, let
alone another Final Four and
here’s why.

This year’s team has little
interior offense, which
is a huge problem—a
problem that many Carolina
fans should have known go-
ing into this season. Sure,
we get a lot of rebounds but
that’s not enough. We have
no players who can effectively
score in the post. The three
freshmen, Brooks, Manley,
and Huffman, do not have the
skills yet to be effective scor-
ers. Maybe they will improve
those skills in the offseason,
but right now, they don’t
have it and they won’t have
it until next year. Some may
say, “well Matt you’re wrong
because Luke Maye is aver-
aging 17 points a game and
he’s a post player”. In actual-
ity though Maye is not a true
post player like Isaiah Hicks
or Kennedy Meeks were.
Maye gets most of his buckets
hitting jump shots, driving
to the basket, or getting easy
put-backs. Maye is not an ef-
efective interior scorer—at
least not as effective as Hicks
or Meeks were. All in all, be-
cause this team has no effec-
tive interior scoring, they are
unbalanced, predictable, and
limited—all flaws that are se-
rious enough to prevent them
from returning to the Final
Four again.

There is an old saying
“he who lives by the 3,
dies by the 3”. Interest-
ingly, that is Carolina basket-
ball right now. Unlike many
of Williams’ previous squads,
this year’s relies heavily on
shooting three-pointers (be-
cause they have little interior
offense). When a team makes
about 50% of their three-
pointers, they usually win (our
win this week against Bos-
ton College) and when they
miss a lot of their threes and
have little interior offense,
they usually lose, badly (our
loss against Virginia, Michi-
gan State). Though watch-
ing a team sink in perimeter
shots can be entertaining,
teams that rely too heavily
on the three-pointer without
the chance of getting second-
chance points usually don’t
make it too far in March.

For a team that is mainly
made up of experienced
guards (Berry, Pinson,
Williams), they certainly turn
the ball over excessively. Our
loss against Florida State
showcased this issue. There
were too many unnecessary
turnovers committed by ex-
perienced players. This came
through players throwing er-
rant passes, dropping easy
passes, and losing control of
their dribbling. Though UNC
could be sloppy at times last
year, they fixed their slop-
liness quickly in games, re-
gaining their composure and
ultimately finishing strong.
The Heels have yet to cure
this weakness this year.

So yes, I know I sound
pessimistic, but it’s the
truth. UNC is just not as
good this year. Rest assured,
we will make the NCAA Tour-
nament and probably make
another appearance in the
Sweet 16, but nothing beyond
that. I believe we will finish
around 4th or 5th in the ACC.
I think we might beat Duke
at home and should be able
to beat other ranked ACC teams
at home like Clemson and
Miami. I think we will drop a
few road games to teams like
Louisville and we will beat
bad ACC teams like Georgia
Tech or Pitt. UNC has talent,
but overloaded talent on the
perimeter and not enough
down low. UNC has some
team chemistry, but only
amongst the guards. If UNC
can shoot better than 40% ev-
every game, then they will win
a lot of games. Unlike last year,
if they shoot under 40%, then
they will probably lose those
games.

As hard as it is, don’t fret
about our “down” year.
A down year for us is
much better than a down year
for most other programs. En-
joy what you can out of this
team. Don’t expect too much
and maybe they will surprise
us. Ultimately, look forward
to next year’s team which will
be a serious contender for
the 2019 National Champion-
ship. CR.
The aftermath of the 2016 presidential election result has magnified the social and political stratifications throughout the country and further polarized not only Congress, but the American public. Nearly a year after assuming office, President Donald Trump has continued to promote Trumpism and its core principles amid repeated and unwarranted attacks by biased media outlets and uncooperative Democratic policymakers. Despite the opposition against the Trump White House, his team has secured major legislative victories, removing the individual mandate from the Affordable Care Act and pushing an unprecedented tax overhaul through Congress. Trump has also fulfilled other campaign promises, such as moving the embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, increasing military spending, and putting forth a plan to secure the southern border.

Trump’s achievements during his first year in office have not been without their costs. He’s continued his frequent use of Twitter and other social media platforms, seeing it as a method to directly speak with the American public. Although effective, his straightforward approach provides a stark contrast to political elites like Hillary Clinton, and often leads to questions regarding his fitness for office by the left. Those on the Left, especially House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, and Senator Elizabeth Warren, frequently use Trump’s social media tendencies to criticize him while ignoring his policy successes. Democrats in office, along with prominent members of the party like former presidents Bill Clinton and Barack Obama, have added to these attacks by calling into question his competence for the office. Democrats are attempting to brand all those under the “conservative” or “Republican” umbrella as Trump supporters who fully support his actions. However, this is far from the truth and merely a campaign tactic to stir public support for candidates at all levels of government.

“Nearly a year after assuming office, President Donald Trump has continued to promote Trumpism and its core principles”
some optimism within the Democratic party. Democrat Ralph Northman won the Virginia gubernatorial race against republican Ed Gillespie, Democrats gained fourteen seats in the Virginia House of Delegates, and Democrat Philip Murphy became the New Jersey Governor. Perhaps the most surprising of all was the Democratic victory in the Alabama special election. Alabama, a deep south state, has not been represented by a Democratic senator in nearly two decades. However, Democrat Doug Jones’ upset victory over controversial Republican Roy Moore provided much needed optimism for those on the Left entering the 2018 midterm elections.

This supposed rebuke of Trump’s presidency is not isolated at the federal level, and has motivated many in states such as North Carolina to use the low approval ratings as a catalyst to regain control of power. The Democrats historic control of the North Carolina legislature ended in 2010 after Republicans implemented an all-out attack on available seats, capturing a majority in both houses for the first time in almost a century and a half. This monumental shift in power continued in 2013 as Republicans secured a veto-proof legislature that has allowed them to cut taxes and promote other conservative values, even with a Democrat currently serving as governor. Then-candidate Trump won North Carolina’s delegates with a less than four percent margin in the 2016 general election against Hillary Clinton. The small margin of victory could be the result of multiple factors, such as Trump’s populist movement, his appeal to forgotten workers, his stern rhetoric, or perhaps his proposed policy initiatives. Whatever the reason, North Carolina Democrats are aiming to mimic the controversial rhetoric used by the president to reduce this margin in hopes of regaining control in 2018.

Since taking office in 2016, Governor Roy Cooper has tirelessly worked to raise funds to assist quality challengers in their 2018 bids to unseat incumbent Republicans. The Republican controlled legislature will now face opponents backed by an ever-growing war chest. Although the date to register as a candidate is not until mid-February, Democrats have already compiled a large number of potential candidates. These candidates will test the resilience of the Republican party and the voters when all 50 Senate seats and 120 House seats in the 170-member bicameral legislature go up for grabs November 6, 2018. The GOP currently maintains a 75-45 majority in the House and a 35-15 majority in the Senate. Democrats are aware of the challenge it would be to sweep the board, which is why their main goal is to shrink the Republican majority in the General Assembly down to sub-veto-proof levels, a much more feasible goal. In order to do so, they would need to flip 16 House seats and 11 Senate seats. This would end the Republican’s ability to circumnavigate the governor, and force cooperation and negotiation among parties.

The political landscape has drastically changed over the past year. Many members of Congress have stepped down from office and Trump has continued to use rhetoric that infuriates members of both parties. Democrats are hoping the divisive behavior of the president and the eye-opening defeat of Hillary Clinton will be enough to provide a boost in the midterm elections that will catapult candidates to victory in all levels of government. Individuals should be cautious of poll numbers and recognize that in a fast-changing political environment where every moment is instantaneously published on some form of media, anything can happen before November. Trump can continue to add to his legislative victories and reignite his populist movement, which could deter Democratic victories. As time passes, only one thing is clear, 2018 will be a clear indicator of how the Democratic establishment, the fractured Republican party, and Trumpism have been perceived by the American people. CR.
must say, the start of this semester has been so much more boring than the last. Fall semester started with a bang, with protests, rallies, and a general to-do over the continued presence of Silent Sam. The white nationalist gathering and subsequent mess of a situation in Charlottesville spurred renewed cries to tear Sam down, and it seemed we had reached a turning point at UNC. It seemed we’d reached a Moment. But then, something happened. Without any fanfare, the Moment passed.

At UNC, it all started with a flyer. Or, more accurately, dozens of copies of a flyer around campus, all bearing the same message. Paraphrased, it read something like, “Let’s make this FDOC Silent Sam’s LDOC,” and detailed plans to hold a protest at the statue the night classes began. The university took precautions to ensure order, setting up barriers and calling in dozens of police. The mood on campus was generally tense.

Night came.

And with it came protestors, scores of them. Various news outlets on-site reported over 200 people flooded McCorkle Place, which is, perhaps, a generous estimate given the actual size of the quad. They marched for a bit, then settled around Silent Sam, where they stayed for several hours, chanting the whole time. One particularly popular refrain was the uncreative, but to the point, “Tear it down!” which echoed through the night.

There’s a scene in the television show Arrested Development, in which the main characters are all together at a family celebration. A champagne glass in each hand, they all start chanting “Speech! Speech! Speech!” This goes on for some time, with all the characters calling for a speech, all expecting someone else to do it, and all unwilling to do so. A similar moment played out at the protest, but went on for an even embarrassingly longer period of time. For hours the protestors chanted “Tear it down,” all hoping that someone else would have the nerve to approach the statue and strike the first blow, all unwilling to do so. Eventually people started to peel off the protest—there were classes the next morning after all—and numbers dwindled. But a dedicated base stayed on, vowing not to leave until the statue was torn down.

For the next few weeks, Silent Sam had an official guard of police and an unofficial guard of protestors. The protestors set up camp beside the statue, with sleeping bags, posters, and everything else they’d need to live and protest. The statue’s base was plastered with anti-Sam signs, which, from the distance, gave the unintended appearance of pilgrims build-
They stayed for some time, unwavering in their ultimatum: they would stay at the statue until it was removed. But the passion was already dying. They'd been filled with a heat as they stood there, side by side, marching against the man, protesting as a part of a movement! They were members of something bigger! They were making history! And that heat, that energy was dissipating. By the time the police asked them to leave, it was completely gone. They left without any sort of fight or, no pun intended, protestation. Those very protestors who swore—swore!—they would not leave, simply gave up after only being asked. They came in with a roar and left without even a whimper.

The unofficial guard gone, and the official guard still firmly in place, “woke” UNC students looked for a new faucet for their self-righteously rebellious spirit. A plan was hatched, and the message was spread across campus that in order to take a stand against Silent Sam, campus social activists were launching a boycott of the student stores, restaurants, etc. goes to scholarships for low income students. Such places also employ large numbers of minorities. If the protest were to actually succeed it would hurt the very people it was meant to help. Another pretty big issue was the decision to give the boycott an end-date. Immediately after it was announced that the boycott would only last a month, two major problems were pointed out. The first being that it wasn’t nearly enough time to actually make a difference. The second was, obviously, that showing your hand to the powers that be is just not a good idea in a boycott. A boycott with a known deadline is just something to wait out, not something to take seriously. As it turned out, none of these holes in logic mattered much anyway. Barely anyone participated.

Pretty early into the boycott, people starting pointing out some flaws. For starters, the money UNC makes at the student stores, restaurants, etc. goes to scholarships for low income students. Such places also employ large numbers of minorities. If the protest were to actually succeed it would hurt the very people it was meant to help. Another pretty big issue was the decision to give the boycott an end-date. Immediately after it was announced that the boycott would only last a month, two major problems were pointed out. The first being that it wasn’t nearly enough time to actually make a difference. The second was, obviously, that showing your hand to the powers that be is just not a good idea in a boycott. A boycott with a known deadline is just something to wait out, not something to take seriously. As it turned out, none of these holes in logic mattered much anyway. Barely anyone participated.

“To protestors, Silent Sam is simultaneously so offensive that its continued presence makes it impossible to go about business as usual at UNC, and taking it down is still less important than going about business as usual at UNC.”

As of the writing of this article in January 2018, there’s been nothing but silence from the social justice warriors at UNC—maybe they’re finally focusing on classes? As a consequence, the start of this semester has been so much more boring than the last. But maybe that isn’t such a bad thing. Quiet is good for the soul, after all. CR.
It’s a beautiful Saturday morning in Honolulu. You wake up early to fly back home to the mainland after spending a nice two-week vacation exploring the tropical island state. While waiting in the security line at the airport, your phone starts buzzing wildly. You notice that everyone else’s phone is doing the same, pull it out of your pocket and look down:

“BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT INBOUND TO HAWAII. SEEK IMMEDIATE SHELTER. THIS IS NOT A DRILL.”

Thirty-eight minutes later, your phone buzzes again: “There is no missile threat or danger to the State of Hawaii. Repeat. False Alarm.”

Hawaiians and their vacationing guests spent a very uneasy 38 minutes beginning at 8:05 a.m. local time on January 13th. In fact, it was pure terror for many people in Hawaii, though word spread slowly to folks on the American mainland and in other parts of the wired world through friends, social media, or news reports. Governor David Ige told reporters that a civilian employee of the state civil defense alert system accidentally sent out the statewide alert instead of just testing the feature. It only took about two clicks of a computer mouse, and the state had to build a retraction to send to citizens.

Local civilian reactions to the false missile alert were varied, though it appears many panicked. Stories have emerged of parents lowering their children into storm drains and people struggling to choose where and with whom to spend what seemed to be their last minutes on earth.

“The Hawaiian missile scare will soon fade away in our fast-paced news cycle, but its lessons should be carefully reviewed.”

There are two types of people in an impending doom situation such as this: those who take steps to preserve themselves, and those who resign themselves to death or deus ex machina rescue, with the plurality of the population falling in the latter description. There was a terrible lack of information available to citizens in the 38 minutes of mania before the emergency alert system officially retracted the warning. This contributed to the civilian panic and may have featured article by WILL RIERSON
confused our federal government and military leaders, who of course did not detect an incoming missile. The severity of the information deficit among these offices might not be shared with the public, though I imagine that folks tasked with missile response systems and public warning systems were stressed out for at least a few moments. Tweets from government offices like Hawaiian congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard reassured people that it was a false alarm within moments, though it is important to note that it did take 38 minutes for the emergency alert system to officially retract the warning. Coincidentally, that’s about as long as it would take for a missile to travel from North Korea to the Honolulu area. On social media, Americans reacted with a mixture of political disgust and dark humor that is increasingly common in our polarized and over-sensitized world. For instance, liberal celebrities like Jamie Lee Curtis took to Twitter to criticize President Trump. Internet trolls will undoubtedly turn images from the event into memes.

It seems that in potential crises people will panic, the flow of accurate information can mean life or death, and time is of the essence. The Hawaiian missile scare will soon fade away in our fast-paced news cycle, but its lessons should be carefully reviewed. This odd occurrence is a sobering reminder of the dangers that nuclear powers like North Korea and Russia may pose to the United States, and show how the public and government officials could react to a genuine, imminent security threat. American and foreign military intelligence services undoubtedly gained a massive amount of insight by observing the 38 minutes of the Hawaiian panic and hours of public reaction and recollection. Civilian emergency management officials of all kinds also learned how the American public operates in crisis.

The enormous idiocy of this dangerous, so-called “mistake” by a civilian state defense employee during a real North Korea missile threat exercise causes one to wonder if there’s something more to the story. Conspiracies floating around the internet claim that there could have been a real threat, anti-Trump government officials staged a false flag security alert to try and trigger an overreaction by the president, or the deep state conducted a too-real test of the public reaction. One would think that sending an emergency alert to the public’s smartphones would require several steps and orders from a serious chain of command. As a conservative, though, I am mindful of government incompetence and believe Hawaii Governor David Ige when he says that someone pressed the “wrong button.”

For the foreseeable future, the truth of whether the missile alert was a mistake or a deliberate test may not even matter. I cannot pretend to know much of what military intelligence agencies learned from the crisis, but we can all take at least a few lessons from observing public knowledge of this frightening event. Choose whether you want to try to live through an impending doom event, or if you want to accept death within minutes and calmly ride out your time on earth. One direction involves storing supplies like food, water, flashlights, and emergency radios. The other involves getting right with friends, family and God. Both are good choices really. CR.
I participated in the 2015 March for Life and had the opportunity to return to the annual event this January. Every politicized demonstration has its extremists, who inevitably bring out the worst in each other. But March for Life is different. The March reached a milestone in 2018: its 45th anniversary. Since the 1973 Roe v. Wade Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion nationwide, pro-life demonstrators have turned out the Friday nearest its anniversary to demonstrate in the nation’s capital. The March for Life is now the longest lasting human rights demonstration in American history, and there are plenty of reasons for this. The goal of this article is to identify what has made the March for Life so successful and lasting, and what distinguishes it from other, shorter-lived movements. This is my how-to guide on exercising First Amendment rights to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for a cause that will eventually bring lasting change.

Have something worth demonstrating for. This is the simplest reason that the March for Life stays relevant after nearly half a century. The protection of human life is worth fighting for. Pro-lifers cherish life as a gift, but not one that ought to be returned. We see each life as something that is miraculous, precious and ultimately special. It is truly a selfless cause; we love life, so we want it to be saved for everyone. We march for others, not ourselves.

Establish your allies. House Speaker Paul Ryan summed it up best: “Do you know why the pro-life movement is on the rise?” he asked, it’s because

“At all costs, avoid making our pro-choice peers into an enemy, a ‘them.’”

How to Make a Movement Last
Why the March for Life is still relevant 45 years later

Featured article by CHRIS ANTONELLO

stone in 2018: its 45th anniversary. Since the 1973 Roe v. Wade Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion nationwide, pro-life demonstrators have turned out the Friday nearest its anniversary to demonstrate in the nation’s capital. The March for Life is now the longest lasting human rights demonstration in American history, and there are plenty of reasons for this. The goal of this article is to identify what has made the March for Life so successful and lasting, and what distinguishes it from other, shorter-lived movements. This is my how-to guide on exercising First Amendment rights to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for a cause that will eventually bring lasting change.

Have something worth demonstrating for. This is the simplest reason that the March for Life stays relevant after nearly half a century. The protection of human life is worth fighting for. Pro-lifers cherish life as a gift, but not one that ought to be returned. We see each life as something that is miraculous, precious and ultimately special. It is truly a selfless cause; we love truth, science, and love are all “on our side.” Facts, data, and compassion come together in the pro-life movement to create a cause that becomes harder to argue against by the day. Science has proven that life undeniably begins at conception, that the unborn have nerves and brainwaves while in the womb, and that abortion has a negative psychological effect on the would-have-been mother. But perhaps even more important than the cold facts, pro-lifers
tend not to be violent or angry; our cause comes from the heart. We don’t resent women who have had abortions; we establish clinics and support groups to help them cope with loss. We want to bring change for the sake of women, children, and even men everywhere.

Have empathy for the other side. Pro-lifers sometimes stray from this principle, but sticking to it really pushes the March for Life forward. In order to win any debate, you must understand what your opponent believes and why they believe it. Have compassion for those who do not yet see what you see. At all costs, avoid making our pro-choice peers into an enemy, a “them.” They are our fellow citizens and their individual voices are equal to ours. What we want, after all, is a greater number of Americans who value life. That will never happen if we decide that we can never change their minds.

Show respect. The March for Life takes this one very seriously. The official website asks demonstrators not to engage with counter-protestors. It encourages us to show why we march: a desire to show respect for all life, regardless of another living person’s point of view.

Be inclusive. The March could use some help with this one. While the majority of Marchers demonstrate as a part of God’s will, they are not the only ones who march. What we’re really fighting for is a return to morality. We say that killing the innocent is wrong and that we see a gap in that moral belief and the legality of a heinous act like abortion. Defining the pro-life stance in a secular way could help bring out even more demonstrators.

Be unconditional. Nothing stops the March for Life. Even a blizzard does not cancel the demonstration. Convenience is not a factor when a cause reaches your core. Americans fly and drive to Washington every year from all over the United States. They sacrifice time at work and at home to show their support for the protection of innocent life.

Be patient. Forty-five years is a long time. But that hasn’t tired us out. When we march on the Supreme Court, we know that the nine justices won’t suddenly emerge from the building with a decision to overturn the 1973 ruling. Change takes time, but more importantly, it demands patience. That’s something that can only be found in love. That’s why this year’s March for Life theme is #LoveSavesLives.

When you look at the characteristics of this movement, it’s easy to immediately contrast it with other recent ones. Think about March for Life, Occupy Wall Street, the Tea Party movement, the Women’s March, and Black Lives Matter. Why does each group demonstrate? What does each one demand? Who benefits if each group wins? What is the motivation behind each movement? What is the tone of each? Does the group demonstrate only when it’s convenient? The March for Life’s answers to these questions are unique. That is why it’s remained so prominent for so long. That is why it will go on until its clearly defined goal is achieved. CR.

**“Convenience is not a factor when a cause reaches your core.”**

**“Change takes time, but more importantly, it demands patience. That’s something that can only be found in love.”**
Quotes & Quips
Classic conservative lines from throughout history

“Liberals claim to want to give a hearing to other views, but then are shocked and offended to discover that there are other views.”

William F. Buckley Jr.

“On Thursday, there will be a vote at the UN criticizing our choice. And yes, the US will be taking names.”

Nikki Haley
“People’s lives have their roots in the past, and in institutions and and customs and beliefs that have grown out of the past. People’s lives are part of the past; and if the past is to be destroyed they have to be destroyed as well. The past and the people stand or fall together.”

Malcolm Muggeridge

*Winter in Moscow*

“I am a conservative. Quite possibly I am on the losing side; often I think so. Yet, out of a curious perversity I had rather lose with Socrates, let us say, than win with Lenin.”

Russell Kirk

“Boundaries aren’t all bad. That’s why there are walls around mental institutions.”

Peggy Noonan
MISSION STATEMENT

Carolina Review is a journal of conservative thought and opinion published at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, founded by a group of graduate and undergraduate students in 1993. Carolina Review has been the most visible and consistent voice of conservatism on campus, providing students with an alternative to the left-wing orthodoxy promoted by other student publications, professors, and student groups.

Our purpose is to show students that a political philosophy of conservatism, free thought, and individual liberty is an intelligent way of looking at the world—contrary to what they may hear in the classrooms and on campus. We believe the University should be a forum for rational and informed debate—instead of the current climate in which ideological dogma, political correctness, fashion, and mob mentality interfere with academic pursuit.

We believe any attempt to establish utopia is bound to meet with failure and, more often than not, disaster.

We believe free enterprise and economic growth, especially at the local level, provide the basis for a sound society.

We believe the University is an important battleground in the “war of ideas” and the outcomes of political battles of the future are, to a great degree, being determined on campuses today.

We believe a code of honor, integrity and rationality are the fundamental characteristics of individual success. There is no excuse for lack of individual initiative.

We emphatically oppose totalitarianism and its apologists.