In an interview with the Observer, Dean of Students Mark Govoni laid out the challenges and the wonders, the good and the bad, and the ugly of college administration and student life that he has been immersed in for the past nine years. He talked about his deeply personal decision to resign, and the programs and initiatives he introduced. Finally, he gave some words of advice to students and those who will choose the new Dean of Students.

The announcement that Govoni will leave Carleton at the end of the term came as a surprise to many on campus. Rumors as to why Govoni is leaving spread through the student body like wildfire. Certainly, the vague explanation given in the email from President Oden did nothing to settle these rumors, many of them revolving around pressure from the Board of Trustees and the President’s office. When asked about the rumor, Govoni laughed and said “It’s one of the more plausible ones I’ve heard.” When asked if there was any pressure from the College to change the policy or to resign, he said “No. There was none.”

Govoni’s position on the alcohol policy has also been an item of discussion among students as of late. When asked if the policy is sufficient, he said, “Yes, I think the alcohol policy is in the right place. No, it should not be changed.”
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He went on to explain that Carleton is “no better or no worse” than anyone else in terms of student use of alcohol. “I do not feel that cracking down is warranted,” Govoni said. “It is not educationally sound, and is not in line with the free and open atmosphere on campus.” He explained that Carleton had done everything it could to reduce student drinking. “Looking back on 10 years, we have improved everything but the drinking. The students are the last group to take action.” Govoni explained that he was not in support of requiring RA’s to report alcohol abuse, and that such reporting was the next action the college could possibly take in changing the policy.

“DON’T GROW UP TOO FAST. THERE’S NO RUSH TO GET INTO GRAD SCHOOL, TO GET A GAZILLION DOLLARS…TAKE YOUR TIME. DON’T GET CAUGHT UP IN THE CAREER MADNESS TOO SOON.”

Govoni’s resignation was a voluntary, personal decision. “I need to take stock of my situation,” he said. “I am the age I am, and I knew it was coming.” Govoni explained that retirement from Carleton was not an option as he had “more to do.” His decision came after much personal reflection and contemplation. He explained that the events of last year, including those relating to the alcohol incidents spring term, took a tool on his office. “I was burned out over last year,” he said. He went on to say that those events were more of a “catalyst” than a reason to move on. As for future plans, Govoni is “neither pessimistic nor optimistic.” “I don’t take anything for granted,” he said.

After discussing his resignation, Govoni was asked about the legacy he hoped to leave at Carleton. He described several changes and improvements to the campus over the past 9 years. He also discussed improvements to the Wellness Center and the Residential Life programs. “When I came, Carleton had two separate Wellness Center facilities. Now we have one, with twice the staff of St. Olaf’s health facility,” he said. “When I came, Hall Directors were not paid. RA’s were not on duty with specific requirements.” Hall Directors are now full-time paid staff, and an RA’s are on duty at all times. However important these changes were, Govoni’s largest achievement goes beyond buildings and programs. “My biggest challenge was gaining the respect of the student body,” he said. When one compares the Carleton of 10 years ago with the Carleton of today, it is clear that Govoni met his largest challenge.

Govoni was also asked what final advice he would leave to Carleton students. “Take risks, but be careful,” he simply said. “Don’t grow up too fast. There’s no rush to get into grad school, to get a gazillion dollars…take your time. Don’t get caught up in the career madness too soon.” Govoni stressed the importance of taking time for honest conversation with others, and taking the time to actually think about the paper you are writing, rather than cramming words onto a page. He expressed his view that life should be lived more contemplatively, and expressed concern over the pace of life at Carleton. “The manic nature [of Carleton] is the only thing we would be better without. The binge nature is a little disconcerting,” he said.

At the end of the interview, Govoni was asked to what advice he would give to the College when choosing a new Dean of Students. “Hire someone who really loves college students,” he said. During his time at Carleton, Govoni has immersed himself in student life by participating in Ebony, advising the CSA Senate, and even reading children’s books to students as a Residential Life floor activity. Govoni explained that he loves student life, and that his “love of Carleton grows from being part of student life.” “Carleton places a high premium on good teaching, and that’s very important,” he said. “There also needs to be a high premium on good administrators.” Carleton will be lucky to have another administrator with so great a love for students and student life as Mark Govoni. He leaves behind a proud legacy at Carleton and the respect of the students.
Earlier this week, Sodexho, Carleton’s food service provider, notified its full-time employees that 100 labor hours would be cut from the schedule at the end of this term. The master schedule for employees will be totally redrawn and will include 100 fewer hours of work than it has in the past. Sources inside the dining hall claim the cuts come because Carleton refused to cover increasing costs of food. Because of these cuts, almost all full-time employees will lose hours. Additionally, the quality of food may go down as Sodexho orders pre-cut vegetables and takes other cost-cutting measures.

On November 29, all full-time Sodexho employees will have to go through a rebidding process. Rebidding is the process of resetting the master schedule. Employees sign up for hours in order of seniority. According to sources inside dining hall, this will be the second time rebidding has happened in three months. Because 100 hours are being cut from the schedule, many employees will not be able to work full 40-hour weeks. Sources revealed that up to 80 percent of full-time employees will have their hours cut, most down to 33 to 35 hours per week, but some down to as few as 24 hours per week. By cutting 100 hours, Sodexho’s actions have the same effect as eliminating two full time positions and reducing another to 20 hours per week.

The cutting of 100 labor hours directly affects many Sodexho employees in the Burton and East Dining Halls and the Snack Bar. Current Sodexho policy requires full-time employees to be “on call.” This makes it difficult, if not nearly impossible, for an employee to get another part-time job unless he or she has high seniority. “We’re talking about peoples’ livelihoods here,” one source said. Sources also reveal that two recently hired developmentally disabled employees will be terminated, because their contracts require such action if hours are cut for other employees.

The reasons for Sodexho taking this cost-cutting measure are unclear at this time. Some inside the dining hall claim that Carleton suggested Sodexho cut labor hours. Sources claim that Sodexho has not turned a profit for the college in several years. The way the contract is set up, Sodexho receives all of the profit from food service up to a certain percentage. After that, Carleton receives a portion of the profits. Sources claim that Sodexho asked Carleton for more money to cover an unexpected increase in the costs of food. Sources further claim that Carleton refused and suggested Sodexho cut costs. Reducing labor hours appears to be a standard method used by Sodexho to cut costs.

Whether or not cutting labor hours will negatively affect the quality of food and its service to students remains to be seen. Sodexho, without addressing any specifics, says that students will see no negative impacts. However, sources inside the dining hall reveal that many of the cuts in hours will come from production workers who prepare the food. As a result, food items that are cut fresh, such as vegetables, may be purchased prepared and pre-cut. The future will tell if Sodexho takes other cost-cutting measures and if these measures will affect the quality of the food and service.

Student workers in the dining halls report decreased morale among employees because of the proposed cuts in labor hours. One source described the morale problems as “significant.” Another said “the dining hall was so unhappy…this is a really big deal for [the full-time employees].” The same source described one full-time employee as being “almost drawn tears because […] they will basically be out of work.”

The editor’s note: As of press time, Sodexho could not be contacted to confirm or deny any of the information contained in this article. The information was gathered from reliable sources inside the dining halls. Identities of the sources have been omitted at the discretion of the writer.
How many of you noticed something peculiar in Aaron Weiner’s article, “Socialism at Carleton: Mis-guided, or Just Stupid?” in the October 22nd Observer? He writes “…Marxist-Socialist-Communists (hereafter referred to as just socialists to keep it simpler)…” Now, there is something peculiar about this statement, particularly when it is examined with regard to the whole work. How many times does the word “socialist” appear in this article? I’ll save you the trouble; it’s in there twice. Once in the title and once in the quotation I just provided. It is never used after that. So we must ask ourselves, “Ourselves, why does Aaron Weiner want to waste our time with an unintelligible argument built around excessively verbose language, ad hominem attacks, and pointless qualifications/simplifications/clarifications of terms (hereafter referred to as just idiocy to keep it simpler)?”

He must think he’s better than us, or something, right? In fact, there is evidence in his work to support such a claim. For instance, Mr. Weiner himself writes, “I’m…better than you”.

To be fair, the “you” in that quotation refers to a “hippie” who waxes philosophical about the proletariat. Now, I don’t think I’m a hippie (though I do own Birkenstocks), and I can honestly say I’ve never sipped coffee and waxed philosophical about the proletariat. Actually, I try to avoid waxing altogether. So it looks like I’m not part of the exclusive “you” that Aaron is better than. But he also calls the so-called hippie (a “you”, if you will) an “unforgivable hypocrite” for reasons that could just as easily be used against my non-hippie self.

Let’s look at why. Basically, Aaron argues that because he doesn’t like what the “you” believes, he is better than him. Forget socialism, we got ourselves a genuine Mao Zedong impersonator here. C’mon now, is John Kerry necessarily better than George W. Bush simply because Kerry doesn’t agree with Bush’s beliefs and policies? Ok...that’s a bad example, but I think y’all can see where I’m going with this.

So I’ve never burned the midnight oil waxing philosophical, tooting my own horn all the while proclaiming that we should all be in the same boat. But what if I had? My good friend Aaron says that because I spend money on college and not on the proletariat, I shouldn’t be discussing the problems of the proletariat. Jack Handy summarizes my response to this best: “I’d rather be rich than stupid.”

Now, if I may summarize it worse, here’s my real beef with Weiner’s article: How’s a proletarian gonna drink coffee and wax philosophical all by him/herself? He/she’s a proletarian for God’s sake! As a proletarian, she/he has gotta be strapped for both time and cash. I don’t see a lot of proletarians with time on their hands and money burning a hole through their pockets. Granted, I don’t see a lot of proletarians period.

So it is particularly interesting that Aaron brought up the term “performative contradiction”, and not just because it sent to me to the dictionary either. Is it not possible for striving intellectuals to consider the problems of others without actually experiencing the problems full-force first-hand? Now, I know what y’all are all thinking, “But Ezra, is ‘proletarian’ really the term for a single member of the proletariat class??” Yes it is. So, to summarize:

1) I like the word “performative” and will try to use it more often in casual conversation
2) I also like “proletarian”, and will attempt the same, perhaps while drinking coffee
3) There is no number three

Hey, now I wonder why Aaron has respect for us non-socialists.
On October 28th, Rich Lowry, editor of The National Review, and David Corn, editor of The Nation, squared off at St. Olaf to debate issues related to the presidential election. After the debate the Observer was able to obtain an exclusive interview with Mr. Lowry. We spoke in the reception room, with a fairly long line of admirers gathering to meet Mr. Lowry as the interview went on. Dressed in a suit and tie, he stood out from the far more casually dressed college students who surrounded him. Mr. Lowry is an interesting and gracious conversationalist, devoting time to every one of the people gathered there to, as a whole, give him a welcome somewhat reminiscent of that for a rock star.

“I hope that nobody takes those guys seriously, but I’m afraid that on campuses they probably do.”

The first topic of conversation was the atmosphere of the debate itself. As to the people themselves, Mr. Lowry had nothing but good things to say. “It was great” he remarked, observing that despite the fact that the audience was liberal, they were civil and well informed. “Maybe it was because we were in a church” he jokingly suggested. He compared the St. Olaf and Carleton students favorably, particularly to those at Notre Dame. The atmosphere there had been “kind of nasty,” he said. His experience there “reflected poorly on everyone who loves Notre Dame,” a group that, he noted, includes many conservatives. The one area Lowry found disappointing at St. Olaf was attendance. Organizers stated that 150-200 people were present at various points during the debate. Lowry commented he was surprised by the low attendance, commenting that it was the smallest crowd he and Corn had debated in front of and speculated “people have been tapped out by Leo DiCaprio, Ashton Kutcher and those events which have been occurring.”

Lowry was struck by the absurdity of his competition, stating, “I hope that nobody takes those guys seriously, but I’m afraid that on campuses they probably do.” He allowed that all candidates want celebrities to help their campaigns, but he had strong suspicions regarding the weight with which DiCaprio and Ashton should be taken.

“Republican, Democrat, or in between, all the political parties want to rob you blind to fund entitlements for often times rich, elderly people.”

National Review had just endorsed President Bush for re-election, despite some controversy among conservatives over the ideological propriety of strongly backing Bush. Niall Ferguson, author of Colossus and Empire, had proffered one of the most thoughtful such arguments in an editorial appearing in the August 27 edition of the Wall Street Journal. Lowry reacted strongly to Ferguson’s thesis that a second Bush term would be as toxic to the Republicans as John Major’s election was to the British Conservatives. “It’s totally wrong-headed,” Lowry began, “Bush has a lot of flaws,” but “a Kerry administration would be a disaster for conservatives, particularly on domestic policy.” He also contrasted the political styles and personalities of John Major and George W Bush. Bush, Lowry said, “takes a couple of big ideas and campaigns on them” unlike Major who was “a terrible squish and not an agenda-based politician.” Lowry believes that while Bush isn’t perfect and does have many failings, he has the strong potential in his second term to dramatically change the modern welfare state and enhance limited government, particularly through Social Security reform.

At the beginning of the debate David Corn suggested that if Paul Wellstone were still alive Minnesota would not have been a battleground state in 2004. In the interview after the debate, Rich Lowry emphatically disagreed. “One guy, no matter how important, probably couldn’t stand in the way,” Lowry stated. He pointed out a combination of general demographic trends, particularly the growth of suburbs, and economic factors, namely the growth of the “new economy,” medical technology, and financial sectors as pushing Minnesota to the right.
Learning to Love America:
A Review of Michael Moore
Hates America

by Rawdon Bergquist

Last Saturday, a group of enterprising Carleton conservatives set out to see what all the hype about Michael Moore really is. Of course, not wanting to waste time on obviously biased “documentaries,” we headed off to Eagan to see Michael Moore Hates America, a film by Michael Wilson which sells itself as a documentary, and most of the time manages to be one. In his film, Mr. Wilson pursues an interview with Michael Moore (which he never gets) while stopping by some of the sacred ground on which Moore has tred in his films. Mr. Wilson interviews a slew of other people, from award winning documentarian Albert Maysles, to magical funny man Penn Jillette, as well as conservative commentators Dinesh D’Souza and David Horowitz (both of whom have spoken at Carleton in the recent past). There’s also a psychiatrist giving advice to Michael Moore to treat both his narcissism and his self-loathing for being a rich white man (despite how contradictory that sounds).

The film features refutations of some of the scenes in Bowling for Columbine: an interview with Charlton Heston’s PR person, interviews with the operators of the infamous bank where Moore gets a gun, and a reenactment of Moore’s famous walk around Toronto checking to see if people’s doors are locked. Surprise, surprise, like any other big North American city, nearly all of them were. The tagline of the film is “the truth about a great nation,” and that probably comes closer to Mr. Wilson’s goals of the movie rather than the controversial title.

Mr. Wilson spends a good deal of time in Flint, MI, documenting its slow recovery, focusing on some entrepreneurs and residents with a solid work ethic. Of the themes of the movie, this is the strongest: hard times are a reality, but with a little hard work and some American ingenuity and spirit, they can be overcome. Mr. Wilson spent a good deal of time talking with a disabled soldier who had lost both arms in Iraq, but still possessed a determined true American spirit: “I may not agree with what you say, but I’ll die for your right to say it.” There is also an undercurrent attacking the shrill voice of Michael Moore, and a sharp critique of his presentation of problems without solutions.
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Is America Stupid or Is It Just You?

by Emma Carey

Yes, I realize the fact that Bush won really pisses people here off. A lot of people. But what’s with all the smug, know-it-all generalizations? I have heard or seen “America is stupid” or “Americans are stupid because they re-elected Bush” or something similar so many times that I want to scream! Please remember that not only did a decent majority of Americans elect our president this time, but a decent majority of Americans are also older and wiser than a dumb college kid. (Actually I would argue that all adults are wiser than college-aged kids, but here’s not a good place to do so.) Though it may surprise you, college students are NOT the only ones in this country with gray matter between their ears. So please, cut the elitist crap and watch what you say about our country.

Kerry Lost. Now What?

As I sat watching the news on election night, I overheard the comments of a Kerry-supporter sitting nearby. He was extremely disappointed with how the election was turning out, but I thought his comments were something everyone should hear. He said “[Democrats] really need to start focusing on what’s going well in politics today. Now that the election is over, good news can be good news again.” He’s right—we need to focus, as a country, on pulling ourselves together. The election is over, it’s decided, and we need to focus on the future, not on what the other candidate might have done. That type of mentality will not work because America is not two separate countries, one of Republicans and one of Democrats, it is one country. We must work this out! To wish that the next term of presidency goes poorly should seem ridiculous to you because it affects every single person living here, not just the outcome of the next election. We need to start working together and quit fighting. Fighting with each other doesn’t get anything done; it only makes the situation worse.

“Be not angry that you cannot make others as you wish them to be, since you cannot make yourself as you wish to be.”
--Thomas a Kempis
ANTI-SEMITISM: COMING TO A COLLEGE NEAR YOU

BY AARON WEINER

Recently an article was published in the opinion section of Duke University’s Independent Daily newspaper (similar to the Carletonian here) titled “The Jews.” It discussed, among other things, the status of Jews as a minority in the USA, claiming that “It is well known that Jews constitute the most privileged ‘minority’ group in this country. Among the top 10 universities, Jews enjoy shocking overrepresentation.” In addition it takes a stab at Jewish attitudes towards anti-Semitism, saying that “what Jewish suffering—along with exorbitant Jewish privilege in the United States—amounts to is a stilted, one-dimensional conversation where Jews feel the overwhelming sense of entitlement not to be criticized or offended.” If you’d like to read the whole article (which I strongly encourage you to do) it can be found here: http://www.chronicle.duke.edu/vnews/display.v/ART/4173b1de57041

And this article isn’t the only example of virulent anti-Semitism among colleges and universities, even those in the supposed top-tier of US institutions. My sister began her freshman year at Grinnell this last fall and one of her classes is a seminar on Just and Unjust Wars. I told her not to take it because, as a strong, intelligent conservative she would become frustrated beyond imagination with the opinions of her fellow students. I had no idea that I should have warned her off because of the deep-seated hatred of Jews in her classmates.

When discussing the US’s foreign policy, and Israel specifically, I would understand and respect an argument about Israel’s human rights record or its lack of compliance with UN mandates (I would disagree, but at least we could have a reasonable discussion about it). What I cannot understand is beginning an argument with the “obvious fact” that the United States is secretly controlled by “the Jewish banking establishment.” Wow, do I wish that were true.

Editor’s note: The Palestinian Solidarity Movement, now in its 4th year, holds an annual convention at a major university to discuss solutions to problems in the Middle East. It has become controversial, being rejected this year by several potential hosts, and objected to by Duke students, for several reasons, including: 1) Past conventions have led to chants of “Kill the Jews!” 2) PSM organizers allow no cameras or recorders of any kind inside its sessions, 3) PSM organizers have openly expressed praise for suicide bombers and desire to emulate them, and 4) Registrants at last year’s Ohio State convention were forced to sign a document in which they agreed unconditionally to the “Right of Return” as condition of entrance.

"IF WE DON’T BELIEVE IN FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION FOR PEOPLE WE DESPISE, WE DON’T BELIEVE IN IT AT ALL.”

--Avram Noam

Should “hate speech” be allowed on college campuses?
Should it be protected in general?

But I didn’t mean to spend this much time on anti-Jewish sentiments at colleges and, honestly, I have had almost no problems since I arrived at Carleton. The bigger issue here relates to free speech and its ramifications. You see, Mr. Kurian (the author of the referenced piece) was writing about various Jewish groups’ opposition to Duke’s decision to allow a “Palestinian Solidarity Movement” event to take place on its campus. Now, Mr. Kurian claims that, “[he] tend[s] to err on the side of complete academic freedom; [he] would probably let the Ku Klux Klan hold a conference on campus, as long as it could be couched within the framework of serious discussion,” and I have no reason to doubt his claims. But is that attitude appropriate? Should “hate speech” be allowed on college campuses? Should it be protected in general?

To be honest, I’m not entirely sure. Part of me wants to say that ignorance and bigotry have no place on a college campus. Incidentally, that’s the same part of me that despises “affirmative action” and other racist college admissions standards. But by the same token, who am I to censor what others express? Just because it is despicable and I would really like to punch this guy in the kidneys, is that a reason to stop him from speaking his mind? Part of me says, YES!

But to be fair, another part of me disagrees. All forms of expression should be allowed - that’s what makes a democracy function. If the Nazis want to march down Division St., I don’t need to be waving a swastika, but I can’t just tell them not to. The problem isn't the expression, it’s the thought itself; but stifling expression never changed anyone's mind. So I suppose I have to allow Mr. Kurian his article, and my sister’s classmates their hatred, but does that mean the college should too?
Yes, you did read that correctly. I totally agree with what he does for a living. You heard it from a conservative: I like Michael Moore. Want to know why? I like him for the simple reason that what he does is protected by our wonderful Constitution. And you all want to know something else? For all intents and purposes Fahrenheit 9/11 is a 527 ad, like all the others that are sponsored by organizations not associated with any particular candidate or political party. Those wonderful, but yet dreadful spots you’ve been hearing about on the news, seeing on TV, and talking about in more than likely derogatory terms with your friends. These ads are an expression of free speech, which is protected by the Constitution. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, the Constitution protects Michael Moore and the Swift Boat Veterans for Truth equally. They are perfectly well within their rights to say what they said. The only real written caveat to this is the protection against slander and libel. So unless you can prove those conditions to the author, a lawyer, and quite a few judges and possibly Justices, both groups are equally well within their rights to say what they said.

Some people who read this would turn to the author and say that what they say isn’t the important part. That the 527 ads should be banned due to the “influence” that they peddle due to the amount of money spent on them is what their argument would be. Well, for those people, a bit of bad news exist for that argument; no, check that, a lot of bad news. Supreme Court precedent states repeatedly that money does in fact equal speech; so in effect, banning these advertisements due to the “moneyed influence” that they have would be just as unconstitutional, if not more so. While I can understand this argument, it does not have any more valid of a base to stand on than the less tangible one of inflammatory speech.

While I may disagree with what he said and his methods, I perfectly agree with and accept the fact of what Michael Moore did. When you read the phrase of “Congress shall make no law […] abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press,” think now about the “horrible advertising” that 527’s that have been broadcast. As long as they follow Court precedent and Congressional rule, they should be perfectly protected in the United States of America. Since we’ve now established both the Court and Congressional rule and precedent, we can now safely say that 527 ads are protected by our Constitution. So next time you see a 527 ad and think that it should be banned for the simple reason that you don’t agree with it, or that it’s inflammatory, or that the people who put it on the air have too much money, think of the consequences that could come of that. Is there anyone here willing to tear up what is arguably the most important document in human history just because of an opinion? Yeah, didn’t think so.
My ideologies and opinions have often been confronted and attacked in the Observer. And it's a wonderful thing. It challenges me and offers differing opinions. But the last Observer was the first time that I was personally attacked; not the views I hold, not my political persuasion, but me. In his infuriately inflammatory article “Socialism at Carleton: Misguided, or Just Stupid?” Aaron Weiner points to the “Marxist-Socialist-Communists” who discuss “things like the injustice of capitalism or the exact shade of red to use as the background for [their] awesome new Che Guevara shirt.” He points to the hippie who is “waxing philosophical about the proletariat” and calls him/her an “unforgivable hypocrite” and flat-out states, “I’m just better than you.”

But you know what? I have to hand it to Mr. Weiner because he, my dear friends is correct. As I read his article sitting under my red Che Guevara poster and sipping my fair-trade, shade-grown, organic coffee it suddenly hit me what an idiotic, unforgivable, hell-bound hypocrite I am. I do, in fact, consider myself one of the “Marxist-Socialist-Communists” for whom he claims to have no respect. Okay, well actually just a moderate socialist, but Mr. Weiner doesn’t seem to care that any differences exist between political philosophies. I do strongly support high taxes (and very stringent progressive taxes, I might add, an idea which I understand Andrew Weiner, another Observer writer, believes to give incentives to be lazy and poor). I also want federally subsidized healthcare for every citizen, free education through college for every citizen, a subsidized postal service, and housing for every person, to mention a few. Jesus, please stop me before I crush under the weight of my own hypocrisy.

Since I so strongly believe in this system I probably shouldn’t be going to this “very expensive, very exclusive, private college.” As Mr. Weiner suggests I should pay for 4 MN residents to attend the U of M with that same money. And I think that’s a great idea. I’ll see if I scrape together the loads of financial aid I’m on and the loans that I’m taking out to finance this education and pay for 4 people to attend the U of M instead. But unfortunately I’m a hypocritical, bad person so I won’t be doing that any time soon. Not to say that his idea isn’t rational. It makes perfect sense to give up my own struggles and my own opportunity to further education which I can use to help the world simply to give four years to some underprivileged young adults. I’ll go live on the street in the meantime. It’s completely rational; I’m just a terrible person.

But forgive me for I digress. The focus of this article is not why I’m a terrible person, but rather why I’m a hypocritical one. Oh, how true it is. I’m against sweatshop child-labor, but I wear clothes. I’m against capitalism as it’s practiced in our country, but I pay money for food and other commodities. I’m against global warming, but I occasionally drive a car. I’m even against logging and yet I use paper. How do I live with myself? I guess I could throw away any ideals that I have and fall into a moral abyss, the route Mr. Weiner has clearly chosen. That way I could live my hedonistic life for only me and not really care who or what gets hurt from it. But there’s another option. I could give away all my possessions and become some sort of ascetic. Go off to a national park, play pretend it’s a wilderness, and be a squatter for the rest of my life. But alas, it seems more rational to stay where I am and continue being an unforgivable hypocrite.

Whew! Now that my burning secret is off my chest here’s my minor complaint with capitalism. I’m all for people earning an honest living and keeping what they earn. But unfortunately in my mind an honest living is not, for example, Person A, who gets millions of dollars every year for dribbling a basketball. But isn’t there demand for it? Aren’t there millions of screaming fans practically throwing money at him? Well yes, there are. But what about Person B? Person B is a social worker who has dedicated her life to helping others. Isn’t there demand for her too, and a much more dire demand at that? But, unfortunately, so often the demographic that Person B deals with doesn’t have the monetary resources to compensate her fully. So, in my honest, hypocritical opinion, I believe that that Person A must share his hard-earned money with Person B. Call it ridiculous. Call it folly. Call it unrealistic. I call it just. So go Mr. Weiner. Go, grow, and become a lawyer. Make lots of hard-earned money that no bleeding-heart liberal has the right to take from you and be sure to step on lots of people on your climb to the top. If you need me I’ll be sitting in my coffee-shop, waxing philosophical about the proletariat, hurting no one, and reveling in my hypocrisy. And you, Mr. Weiner, will be a better man than I.
PAY THE DOCTORS!

BY ADAM SUNDERLAND

When you enter a doctor’s office or a hospital, you assume that the people who are there to treat you and possibly take your health into their hands have gone through some of the most rigorous training possible. You also assume, unless you don’t value your health, that they are the highest skilled people possible for that job, or at least near the top. Those are fairly safe assumptions, and they need to be if our healthcare system is to continue to help people. Now imagine a system of socialized medicine where everyone in the country can get any procedure no matter what, from any doctor, at a price that the government has set. You might think, that sounds great. I really like that idea, let’s set it up tomorrow. On the surface it does sound good, especially the part about everyone having access, but I would like to caution you about the last bit. I am talking about the government set price for medical procedures. The consequences of such a program could be devastating. Further, taking choice away from doctors about whom to serve or when to do so insults them and removes a great deal of the respect, dignity and joy from their job.

As an example of the negative effects of ruining a job I will use politics. We all complain about how the best candidates are never there on the top of the ticket. Do you ever wonder why in our country full of amazing, intelligent, charismatic and talented people none of them are interested in being president? Well the reason is the job sucks. You get to spend four years of your life earning relatively little compared to what you could make in the private sector and to make it up to you we will search out every tiny character flaw, and unpopular idea you have ever had in your life. We will probably look at your family as well, just to make sure that we caught every possible embarrassment. You wonder why none of the smart people are in office, it is because they are all lawyers or CEOs making eight figures, and I can’t blame them. This is what could happen to our nation’s doctors if we don’t ensure that the job is livable, and the wage fitting to the service they render for the country.

It is damn hard to become a doctor. One has to spend about 11-15 years in college, medical school and then residency after high school before one can actually practice medicine. Beyond that, the average medical student graduates with over $120,000 in debt. If there is not a promise of a high paying, well respected job at the end almost no one would decide to follow that path. Our nation’s smart and talented people have an infinite amount of choice in their careers after graduation. If we as a society decide that we would not like to pay our doctors a large salary, or that we don’t trust them enough so we need to shackles them to their jobs or to unnecessary bureaucracy that removes their autonomy then we run the risk of violating our assumptions that the person about to move an artery from your leg to your heart, or the person about to cut out a tumor from your brain is the best person for the job. I would rather pay a lot more for my health and have skilled men and women that are the absolute best possible candidates for the job than get my medicine at a reduced cost and have those talented people managing Biotech firms. We can all get great healthcare and pay for it, or we can get second rate care for second rate prices.
Academic Liberals, From Page 12

All these heroes ask for is a mandate to decide what kind of economic activity and how much of it is okay and how its output should be distributed. And they’re not after the little guy’s liberty, anyway. They only want to punish, I mean, tap, the rich, whose wealth, after all, can keep the world healthy, sheltered, and fed forever. They don’t want to own everything, either—heavens no! The Soviets already tried that and we all know how that worked out. They understand that business must go on and set its own prices and that a little self-interest and inequality is, after all, a good thing. They just want to give us the security that we’ll all have a stellar standard of living and that we won’t blow ourselves up, but to do so we need to cough up some liberty. And haven’t the Europeans accomplished this already? I’d almost vote for people who could swing this, but the fact is that at every turn, they propose to give us everything while destroying or limiting our means to create it. How are we going to solve global warming (if, indeed, it needs solving) if the best solution we’re offered (Kyoto) dictates that we cripple our economy? Who will develop the Hydrogen car when we’re hungry and unemployed? If you think this is a good scenario and that it might work, fine. But don’t go around quoting Mr. Franklin when you talk about civil liberties.

I say all this not because I am a dogmatic optimist in human nature, but because I believe the facts suggest overwhelmingly that we stand on the cusp of the greatest age of peace and prosperity humanity has ever known—but only if we continue on the path towards greater individual liberty in all aspects of life. Think about it: 90 years ago we lived in fear of nationalist imperial powers waging constant war over pride and land. 60 years ago we lived in fear of racist totalitarians out to kill, conquer, and rampage. 30 years ago we lived in fear of a few quick blasts bombing us back to the stone-age. And all that time, through the wars, darkness, and uncertainty, what did the private citizens, fighting only for their own happiness, accomplish? They created the longest, healthiest lives, and greatest comfort and prosperity the world has ever known... by a lot, and for a mind-boggling and ever-increasing share of the earth’s citizens! The voice of humanity, as defined by the choices people make about how to live, has deemed liberty—particularly economic liberty—the true magic wand that may not solve all our problems, but will at least give us a fighting chance at most of them. Governments that promise the world and demand only the sacrifice of a tainted minority...

You may also be wondering what exactly I mean by an “academic liberal,” and how he may differ from any other liberal. I distinguish the academic liberal from his peers, because I believe he is actually out of step with most of them. Even well-educated liberals in their 40’s who once considered themselves academic liberals usually learn a few things about how the world works: what makes America the freest, most prosperous, and, yes, most tolerant country on earth (and why these are all related), where money comes from (and I don’t mean simply the Fed), and the propensity of people seeking power to tell others whatever they need to hear in order to give it to them. The academic liberal is the person who finds it within himself to look around at the world and conclude that it’s going from bad to worse and that the only solution that can save us is a return to the shackles of the past. What makes his brand of liberalism particularly “academic” is that he directs his education towards a quest to reinforce, rather than to test, this vision. He approaches knowledge having already decided what he will find and how he will feel about it. Oftentimes he will become bitter with the majority of Americans who disagree with his vision, resorting to angry, self-righteous theorizing, perhaps leading to tenure at a prestigious college. Not all students or academics who are liberal fall under this description, of course, but this position and its alleged alliance with liberty has gone unchallenged for too long. I urge those liberal students who disagree with this mindset to consider its promises of security in light of its demands on freedom and implied opinion of humanity. Also, please consider that over the last century government has brought us world wars and social programs of arguable success, while the exercise of economic freedom has given us the very means to be here debating this today. Want to save the human race? Now’s your chance, after millenia of waiting.

Michael Moore Hates America, From Page 6

Mr. Wilson comes off as a genuine filmmaker. He repeatedly confesses to the camera when he feels deceitful, acknowledges the controversial title, and even sends an apology to the mayor of Davison, MI, for not being fully honest about the purpose of his documentary. The camera work and editing seem a bit amateurish on occasion, and at times it moves slowly, but it adds to the persona Mr. Wilson is trying to create: the genuine and honest America patriot, the regular guy, the David vs. the Goliath of Moore, a deceitful wealthy sell-out who refuses to see the good in America. So, does Michael Moore truly hate America? Albert Maysles thinks so, but that isn’t the purpose. It is really about the good side in America, which is present even in the midst of depression and war. You just have to open your eyes.
ACADEMIC LIBERALS ARE NO FRIENDS OF LIBERTY
BY JOSH MARKOWITZ

THOSE WHO WOULD GIVE UP AN ESSENTIAL LIBERTY FOR TEMPORARY SECURITY DESERVE NEITHER LIBERTY NOR SECURITY. --BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

This great quotation describes succinctly what I believe should be the driving ethic behind America’s political system. I am tired of hearing academic liberals drag it through the mud every time they invoke it in denunciation of the PATRIOT Act. Although they are correct in pointing out the new legislation’s infringements on the Bill of Rights, they are dead wrong in proclaiming Franklin’s maxim to be their own. They have stolen this concept and I would like them to relinquish it. In fact, they should even reconsider calling themselves “liberal.”

Academic liberals trade essential liberties for temporary security without even a second thought as to freedom’s intrinsic value. Unlike conservatives, who justify the PATRIOT Act as a defense of our freedoms against hostile foreigners seeking to subvert them, academic liberals will take away liberties on the mere pretense that honest, law-abiding citizens have failed to use them properly. Of course, they don’t just come right out and say they want to trample your freedom, but the logical implications of their ideas point to nothing else—and inevitably their reasoning involves appeals to fear.

To academic liberals, the government ought to protect us from our own exploitative and selfish impulses; from the inequality and imminent destruction we will bring about if left to our own devices. But economic liberty is the essential foundation for real freedom, for what use is a freely-held value if it cannot be acted upon at one’s discretion? This liberty, to academic liberals, creates danger, uncertainty, and oppression, and if only we give up some of it we can create a safer and healthier society.

At all levels, it is economic liberty that academic liberals call negotiable, or even nefarious, standing between humanity and the truly “just” society. Development is unsustainable, poverty, hunger, and disease are increasing, and globalization is destroying communities and turning nations of people and their nuclear weapons against America. Does this litany sound familiar? At the root of all these appeals to fear lies the premise that economic freedom has either unleashed incalculable harm upon us or at the very least has done nothing to help the less fortunate of the world. And the warm guardian to whom academic liberals turn to rescue us is inevitably the benevolent dictator, who has really been our greatest benefactor all along. The partnership of government and activist, that ended depression and gave us social security, that banned DDT, that busted the trusts, and that refuses to allow the misguided capitalists to get away with pillaging the world, can finally save us for good if we just vote away a little more of our freedom.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 11