

# CARLETON OBSERVER

“TRUTH IS THE MOST SACRED VIRTUE OF THE HUMAN HEART” - SENECA THE YOUNGER

## WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH EUROPE?

BY PETER FRITZ

### ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

THE BORDER: A CLEAR AND  
PRESENT DANGER

BY ANDREW JAHN

PAGE 2

GUN CONTROL: LESSONS FROM  
THE CANADIAN GUN REGISTRY

BY RAWDON BERGQUIST

PAGE 3

CARLETON FACULTY DONATE  
\$14,915 TO 2004 CAMPAIGNS

PAGE 4

CSA BUDGET INFORMATION

PAGE 5

CSA FUNDING FOR  
CHARTERED ORGANIZATIONS

PAGE 6-7

LETTER TO THE EDITOR:  
A SOCIALIST RESPONSE

BY PHILIP SCHRADER '04

PAGE 8

I used to think the EU was a good idea. Efficiency is great, isn't it? The free trade advantages of so many nations being together would be enormous. It's better that everyone can get more for lower cost, right? There are so many nations, so close together; it must be better for people to be able to move about more freely, right? Unfortunately that isn't the whole of what the EU is or will do.

It is first important to understand that my disagreement here is with the idea of a European Union, not opposition to a group of nations attempting to rival the United States or any specific policy that the EU adopts or does not adopt. I first started to realize how intrinsically opposed I was to the idea of the EU last term. One of my courses necessitated the frequent use of a map depicting the European continent in the middle 1800s. Even as recently as the middle 1800s, a political map of Europe looked much different than it does today. Germany was divided among a multitude of small kingdoms, with only Prussia approaching what we might consider to be the size of a "proper" modern state. Austria was the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Italy was divided among several kingdoms. "Such a mess!" someone might exclaim, and they would be quite right. The political geography of Europe at that time was by any objective measure a mess. It was a human mess however, Such a jumble of kingdoms and principalities, empires and republics, excites the imagination and the mind. Each of those societies had their own subcultures and territorial quirks. People knew that they were subjects of the King of Barvaria or citizen of Florence, sharers of common history and tradition with their fellow citizens. This history, tradition, and commonality was what made the states cohesive and human.

Another turning point in my opposition to the EU came in December. I was visiting my cousin, currently living in southern Austria, and the EU came up again and again in conversation with local people. The region they lived in had been dependent on lumber and coal for a long time, but not anymore. For various reasons, but many having to

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

### RALLY ROUND THE QUOTE:

“WHEN I HEAR THE SIMPLICITY OF CONTRIVANCE AIMED AT AND BOASTED OF IN ANY NEW POLITICAL CONSTITUTIONS, I AM AT NO LOSS TO DECIDE THAT THE ARTIFICERS ARE GROSSLY IGNORANT OF THEIR TRADE, OR GROSSLY NEGLIGENT OF THEIR DUTY.”

--EDMUND BURKE



## EUROPE FROM PAGE 1

do with a lethal combination of EU regulation and free trade competition, the coal and lumber trades were being pushed out of business. There were, in fact, no more working mines in the area, only the vestiges of a mining economy and traditions, echoes of a more vital time. I am not one to mock free trade and the great benefits that come with that system, but the EU's free trade scheme serves a raw deal. Hemmed in on one side by paternalistic regulation and on the other by competition from areas not so regulated, there is little room for the creative modification of a region's economy to preserve a region's economic viability or competitiveness. What benefit do these new "citizens of Europe" receive?

Should they be reassured by the benefits of the EU Constitution, that if adopted asserts its "primacy over the laws of Member States" (Article I-6)? Does the repeated assertion that member states should "refrain from all action contrary to the Union's interests or likely to impair its effectiveness" (See Article I-16 2. for example) give hope to a German or Italian or Swedish citizen that their own government will be able to look after their interests? Should they be reassured by the empty motto "United in diversity"?

Or should they look at the EU in fear and disgust? Disgust at the washing away of time and tradition inherent in the EU's activities. Disgust at the presumption seen in the EU bureaucrat who presumes to know the policy goal that magically reconciles the inherently diverse interests of the people of the EU. Shouldn't that cold reason, cold and un-human, that governs the EU's "progress" and policy elicit at least a spark of fear? Fear and sadness, emotions caused by knowledge of what has been and will be lost.

## ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

BY ANDREW JAHN

America's borders, although not as widely publicized as the Middle East, are just as vital a front in protecting America. With over one million illegal immigrants crossing the Mexican-American border annually and over eight million currently living in the U.S., illegal immigration is an extremely critical threat to America's security.

Granted, a great number of immigrants are decent, hardworking people looking for a better life in America. However, there are also a substantial amount of criminals and even terrorists that have an alarmingly easy time crossing America's borders. When one sees that all but one of the 9/11 hijackers were illegal immigrants, and with someone like terrorist leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi commenting on how simple it is to enter America, the consequences of maintaining our borders in their current lax state has become considerable.

*The mission of the Carleton Observer is to uphold and promote freedom of expression and freedom of the press by publishing in depth news, investigative stories, and social and political commentary. The Observer welcomes articles and letters from all viewpoints, and seeks to promote a diversity of keen and insightful thought at Carleton. The opinions expressed herein are the sole creation of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the Observer, Carleton College, or its students. Thanks for reading!*

Editors:

Rawdon Bergquist

Andrew Navratil

Josh Markowitz

Staff Writers:

Peter Fritz

Andrew Jahn

Philip Schrader

Layout Consultant:

Anna Duchon

A few long overdue changes to our border security, among others, include: beefing up the understaffed and overextended Border Control with federal troops; improving communication between border and intelligence agencies; and merely putting forth the effort to enforce the immigration laws already on the books. Not only would these be the first moves toward making our country safer, these reforms would also reduce the significant financial strain illegal immigration causes on America's economy.

Although these reforms will not effectively stop all terrorist threats, they are important and necessary first steps for Washington to take in order to protect America. With the war on terrorism being conducted in Iraq under ambiguous pretenses, it is puzzling that the Bush administration has not addressed so clear and present a danger as border control with more initiative.

# A LESSON FROM CANADA ON GUN CONTROL

BY RAWDON BERGQUIST

Gun Control. Most Carls support it without question, but what the heck does that even mean? Wouldn't People Control be a far better method of preventing violent crime? Alas, the call has been for gun control. Short of confiscating guns or severely limiting their production and/or distribution (which may involve many cold dead hands) gun control has revolved around legislating background checks, waiting periods, and licensing for various weapons of minor destruction. What other specifics have been proposed under the banner of gun control? How about a National Gun Registry? It can aid in police investigations, collect information on criminals who buy guns legally, provide criminals with a list of people not to rob, and create more bureaucracy. What more could we ask for? But wait, it's time to take a lesson from Canada.

The Canadian Gun Registry, reconstituted in 1995 with regulations pertaining to all firearms (the previous registry, in existence since the 1930s, only dealt with handguns), was designed as a means of reducing crime by making all firearms in Canada traceable, registering all firearm owners by 2001 and all firearms by 2003.

Of course, no criminals have registered their weapons. In fact about 1 million law-abiding Canadians, roughly a third of the number estimated to own guns, have never registered nor have any intention to do so; at least a third of the estimated 10 million guns in Canada have never been registered, and these are low end estimates. Surveys by Environics in the late 1990s revealed a plunge in compliance just two years after the registry from 76% to 58%. Nearly all the provinces (aside from Quebec) oppose the registry and have refused to prosecute violators.

Opposition to the registry has also arisen because of its skyrocketing cost. When the Canadian criminal code and gun laws were overhauled in the mid 1990s, it was estimated that the Registry would cost \$119 million and that licensing fees would pay for as much as \$117 million of that sum (all figures in Canadian dollars). A 2002 Department of Justice audit estimated cost overruns at \$1 billion and warned they could balloon to \$2 billion dollars; licensing fees provided only \$140 million. So much for paying for itself. In May of 2004, the government scrapped most of the fees in a futile effort to increase registration.

The soaring costs have angered many police officers as well as concerned citizens. Calgary Police Association President Al Koenig has stated that \$1 billion would have put 5000 more officers on the streets and 50 more helicopters in the air across Canada, which would have aided in crime prevention and investigation far more than the registry.

To put this in perspective, it is estimated that around 50 million Americans own about 200 million firearms. A very rough estimate at the cost of such a system here could easily run north of \$100 billion dollars. An American Gun Registry would almost certainly run into the same kinds of problems the Canadian one has encountered.

A Canadian Justice Department Audit described significant problems with the finances of the registry; 70% of funds being requested were listed as unanticipated expenditures. The registry database itself has crashed multiple times, in some cases causing the loss or deletion of thousands of registrations. The registry itself has an error rate of 110% (most registrations have multiple errors) and there is no practical way of updating the database when someone dies, moves, or gives or sells their guns away without having people reregister, adding billions of dollars to its cost.

The most serious problem that an American gun registry would encounter would be a lack of compliance. What does one do with those that don't register, or state and local governments that refuse to enforce the registry? What is the point of making millions of farmers, hunters and gun enthusiasts criminals? Do you plan on arresting them all? Just think of the legal costs involved in the enterprise. Perhaps the most damning argument against a gun registry is its failure to significantly reduce crime by firearms. Handguns (not rifles or shotguns) have been registered in Canada for over 70 years, and gun violence has not been eliminated or even decreased by a significant margin. The vast majority of deaths by firearms in Canada are by unregistered handguns. Go figure.

If you are a supporter of 'gun control' then by all means support licensing restrictions, extensive background checks, and waiting periods, but take a lesson from Canada: gun registration costs a whole lot of money, and it doesn't even catch criminals.

## POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY CARLETON FACULTY AND STAFF

Donations reported to the Federal Election Commission from 9/1/2003 to 2/20/2005 by those listing Carleton College as their employer. Source: Campaign Finance Disclosure Database of the Federal Election Commission (<http://www.fec.gov/disclosure.shtml>).

Name, Occupation	Organization	Date	Amount
Jackson Bryce, Professor	Democratic National Committee	10/27/04	\$250.00
Marion Cass, Professor	Next PAC	10/26/04	\$300.00
Clinton Cowan, Professor	Democratic National Committee	9/22/04	\$250.00
Joan Higinbotham, Director of Alumni Affairs	Patty Wetterling for Congress	9/30/04	\$250.00
	MN DFL Party	10/29/04	\$500.00
Stephen Kennedy, Professor	Moveon PAC	9/10/04	\$200.00
Les LaCroix, ITS	Democratic National Committee	9/28/04	\$250.00
Stephen Lewis, Economist	Rush Holt for Congress	6/18/04	\$250.00
	Democratic National Committee	8/16/04	\$1000.00
	Democratic National Committee	12/3/04	\$1000.00
Jennifer Macalady, Professor	John Kerry for President	5/24/04	\$250.00
David Moran, student	America Coming Together	8/21/04	\$265.00
Lewis Newman, Professor	John Kerry for President	5/31/04	\$2000.00
	America Coming Together	8/27/04	\$1000.00
	America Coming Together	11/24/04	\$4000.00
Mary Savina, Professor	Daly for Congress	11/8/04	\$200.00
Parna Sengupta, Professor	Friends of Jamie Metzl	9/28/03	\$700.00
	Friends of Jamie Metzl	6/29/04	\$300.00
	Friends of Jamie Metzl	7/16/04	\$250.00
Anne Ulmer, Professor	John Kerry for President	3/11/04	\$250.00
	John Kerry for President	6/30/04	\$500.00
	Emily's List	7/7/04	\$200.00
Kristin Wedding Crowell, Professor	John Kerry for President	7/20/04	\$500.00
Carl Weiner, historian	Democratic National Committee	7/30/04	\$250.00

# CSA BUDGET INFORMATION

2004-2005 ACADEMIC YEAR

INCOME	
Student Activities Fee	165
Number of Students	1715
Income from SFA	282975
Other Income	70000
Total	352975

Every spring term the Carleton Student Association (CSA) Senate prepares a budget for the upcoming fiscal year (July 1-June 30). The income is a projection, while expenses are exact figures. The budget includes monies set aside for specific uses during the year and monies allocated to CSA Organizations Chartered with Funding. The process of allocating monies to Organizations is called Spring Allocations.

Income: The primary source of income for the CSA is the \$55 per term Student Activity Fee. Other sources of income include revenue from laundry, vending, gaming (electronic games in Upper Sayles), and soft drink contracts.

SET ASIDE	\$
Honoraria	30000
Special Allocations	21000
Alternative Beverage	2700
SLOF	6000
3rd Center	4500
Diversity Initiative Fund	18000
Metro Arts Access	2500
Love Bus	8100
Lagniappe	5000
Emergency Transport	8000
Appeals	10000
Total	115800

Monies Set Aside:

The following funds contain monies set aside for use during the academic year by students and Organizations: Honoraria, Special Allocations, Alternative Beverage, Social Life Opportunity Fund, 3rd Center, Diversity Initiative, and Metro Arts Access. (See Article III, Section 3 of the CSA Senate Bylaws for a full description of the funds).

Emergency Transport: Monies given by the CSA to the Dean of Student's Office for distribution to students in need of emergency transportation.

Appeals: Monies set aside before Spring Allocations that are reserved for Organizations appealing their budget recommendation to the Senate.

Rollover: Monies allocated in the previous fiscal year's budget but not spent. Rollover goes into the Capital Reserves Fund (See Article III, Section 3 of the CSA Senate Bylaws for a description of the fund).

Remaining 04-05 Budget: Total Income-Total Expenses.

Remaining Budget plus TR: Total Income-Total Expenses+All Rollover

Total income minus set aside funds	237175
Estimated Group Rollover	35000
Total Rollover (TR)	52067
Estimated Remaining Capital Reserves	65000
Estimated Capital Reserves after Rollover	88975
Remaining 04-05 Budget	-28092
Remaining Budget plus TR	23975

Budgets of Chartered Organizations: "Total Requested" is the amount the Organization requested in Spring Allocations. "Allocated" is the amount they received in the final budget approved by the CSA Senate.

# BUDGETS OF CSA CHARTERED ORGANIZATIONS

2004-2005 ACADEMIC YEAR

<u>GROUP NAME</u>	<u>TOTAL REQUESTED</u>	<u>ALLOCATED</u>	<u>% OF REQUEST</u>
Afrisa	3010	267	8.9%
AHA	513	55	10.7%
ACTR	300	85	28.3%
ANPO	987	408	41.3%
AI	838	290	34.6%
AWESOME	60	60	100.0%
ASIA	20208	5460	27.0%
Barkada	8900	1830	20.6%
BSA	4039	3056	75.7%
Breaking Ground	2565	2030	79.1%
Campus Alliance to Pre-vent Gun Violence	1852	157	8.5%
Canadian Club	790	248	31.4%
Quiz	3021	2286	75.7%
Anime	680	335	49.3%
Canoe	7533	4253	56.5%
CCLU	260	235	90.4%
Chess	1505	760	50.5%
CCU	1867	1095	58.7%
Croquet	10	5	50.0%
Democrats	230	59	25.7%
CFS	805	570	70.8%
Gymnastics	230	168	73.0%
CIAO	1015	632	62.3%
Juggling Fish	12727	303	2.4%
CIA	2078	1117	53.8%
CLAP	1900	1400	73.7%
Rugcutters	1258	317	25.2%
CSA	5000	3970	79.4%
Yellow Bike	125	125	100.0%
CFC	3053	494	16.2%
Chinese Club	2142	877	40.9%
CHS	5363	965	18.0%
COWOC	2900	2654	91.5%
CWI	290	210	72.4%
DESI	3225	722	22.4%
Ebony II	596	596	100.0%
ETB	2500	2200	88.0%
Faribo Project	800	750	93.8%
Farm Club	600	250	41.7%
Film Society	7706	4125	53.5%
Folk Music Society	55	35	63.6%
Gospel Choir	1767	473	26.8%
Habitat	11425	7665	67.1%
Handbell	417	96	23.0%
IRC	1650	1350	81.8%

<u>GROUP NAME</u>	<u>TOTAL REQUESTED</u>	<u>ALLOCATED</u>	<u>% OF REQUEST</u>
Japanese Circle	354	303	85.6%
JSC	4875	4528	92.9%
Kairos	3360	10	0.3%
KFC	390	390	100.0%
Kite Club	300	75	25.0%
Knightingales	340	328	96.5%
KSA	4257	1450	34.1%
Exit 69	312	187	59.9%
KRLX	7783	3319	42.6%
Kyudo	1280	0	0.0%
La Esquelita	1930	1580	81.9%
LASO	3243	1732	53.4%
Lenny Dee	100	50	50.0%
Manuscript	2132	2112	99.1%
Men of Color	1930	305	15.8%
MSPC	3578	95	2.7%
Mock Trial	820	820	100.0%
NEO	1500	350	23.3%
Newman	764	348	45.5%
Pangea	1773	731	41.2%
Photo Co-op	220	0	0.0%
Project Friendship	931	771	82.8%
PRANK	233	100	42.9%
RDNA	214	150	70.1%
Human Society	414	373	90.1%
Russian Club	430	130	30.2%
SFA	400	70	17.5%
SaGA	1346	242	18.0%
SDC	730	134	18.4%
SJMC	100	30	30.0%
SPB	40169	21894	54.5%
SCA	972	411	42.3%
SolaScriptura	145	60	41.4%
SMT	1999	444	22.2%
SOPE	45	30	66.7%
SUMO	31613	28941	91.5%
SRBA	192	10	5.2%
The Algol	36379	34350	94.4%
The Cave	45612	41249	90.4%
Tim Viet	8476	732	8.6%
Unitarian Universalists	68	38	55.9%
WARM	422	147	34.8%
WE	175	0	0.0%
WHIMS	1800	710	39.4%
Club Sports	65700	60500	
Total	408601	265267	

## AN ANSWER FROM A SOCIALIST

BY PHILIP SCHRADER '04

DEAR SIR,

I graduated from Carleton last year and I've spent the time since then calling myself not only a Socialist but also a Marxist and even a Communist. Naturally, my friends saved your editorial in the Observer (vol.3, issue 5) for me. How do I justify myself as a Socialist? The short answer is-- by ruthless introspection. I am afraid that it is arrogant for those of us among the privileged few to talk as if we are certain that equality would come at the price of our freedom. I don't believe that liberty and equality are inversely proportional, nor do I believe that human equality must be enforced with some sort of Soviet-made Harrison-Bergeronian social steam roller. I believe that the fundamental equality of human beings is a self-evident and natural fact. I justify myself as a Socialist because I don't feel justified any other way. I don't want to limit your liberty. I want to limit your and my ability to limit the liberty of others. I think the deck is stacked in our favor. Like everyone, we have our unique talents, but I have my doubts as to whether we are more talented than most. The way I see it, we've got a lot of folks out there, reaping the benefits of a social and economic structure which is tilted heavily in their favor (myself included), talking about how independence and equality are incompatible (myself not included). If low-income workers in our nation and the rest of the world had the means to be truly independent, we might find out that they are...equals. Not equals because you and I are held back. Equals because we aren't riding on their backs.

I think the main point of contention for us is whether or not liberty and equality are necessarily inversely proportional. If you can convince me that the vast disparities of wealth and opportunity which exist in our nation and the world are the natural consequences of the independence that we all enjoy, I would be greatly relieved. Until then, I'll be in agreement with my dirty comrades. "Freedom is merely privilege extended unless enjoyed by one and all."

My guess is that one of your frustrations, like Mr. Taft, with Socialists is the question of what our happy socialist utopia is going to look like. What is the substitute for "enlightened" selfishness? On one hand, I would argue that the self-interest which theoretically forms the bedrock of our economy is not all that enlightened. When my fellow man has the opportunity to freely interact with the world, to employ her labor creatively and purposefully, my world is enriched. That, to me, is enlightened selfishness. More to the point, Frederick Engels once remarked that "communism is a movement, not an ideology." As I suggested above, I don't believe that real progress can or should come from simply rounding up all the goods and redistributing them by simple division. That is more the method of the ancient king, not the honest Marxist. We are not all Lenins. Socialist change, I believe, will come about organically (but not on its own). Voluntary collective effort can replace top-down management within the framework of freemarket enterprise. The organization that employs the minds as well as the hands of the worker, which distributes meaningful ownership among all who labor within it, will be more efficient as well as more democratic. How do we get there? Hard to say. We can start by not making limiting assumptions and striving to be honest about ourselves and the scope of our self-interest.

Philip contributes to a group blog at [www.stocafe.blogspot.com](http://www.stocafe.blogspot.com)

*"It is preoccupations with possessions, more than anything else, that prevents us from living freely and nobly."*

*--Bertrand Russel*

Questions? Comments? Rants?

Want to Burn this Issue?

We want to hear your opinion.

Contact the Editors:

Josh Markowitz  
[markowij@carleton.edu](mailto:markowij@carleton.edu)

Rawdon Bergquist  
[bergquir@carleton.edu](mailto:bergquir@carleton.edu)

Andrew Navratil  
[navratia@carleton.edu](mailto:navratia@carleton.edu)