



- ① [How Immigration Split the GOP](#)
- ② [James Jacobs on Gun Control](#)
- ③ [Dangers of Brexit](#)

How Immigration Split the GOP

By **WILL SWETT**
STAFF WRITER

If voter turnout is any indication of enthusiasm, then Republicans are more motivated than ever to participate in choosing who will not only represent them in the election against Hillary, but also define the future of the party in other elections.

The passion that's stirring Republicans has found a voice in the vitriol of the bombastic billionaire and GOP frontrunner, Donald Trump, whose presence in the Republican field has split the Grand Old Party and threatened to hand the presidency over to a Democrat who's under criminal investigation by the FBI.

The strong reaction against GOP efforts to court Hispanic votes created a movement that has moved the party in the exact opposite direction.

The recent GOP primaries have received record-breaking turnout rates, outperforming the Democrats by a wide margin in almost every state. Among the eleven states that participated in Super Tuesday, for example, Republicans outperformed Democrats by a margin of 36 percent, meaning that 2.6 million more people voted for a Republican candidate than for a Democratic candidate.

The impressive turnout has led some to conclude that Trump stands a decent chance of defeating Hillary Clinton in the general election, but the opposite seems more likely. Trump's favorability ratings are so negative that swing voters would flock to Hillary en masse, and the party would lose the support of the 30 percent of Republicans who have said that they would never vote for the aspiring tyrant.

Granted, Trump has amassed a large number of committed followers who have generally refrained from voting in the past, but he has roused an equal, if not greater number of detractors against him even within the Republican Party. As the reality TV star's nomination has seemed more inevitable, a campaign has developed under the slogan #NeverTrump in an effort to stop Trump from hijacking the GOP and the conservative movement.

Formerly disinterested,

moderate Republicans, committed conservatives, and the establishment faithful have vehemently declared their unequivocal opposition to Trump, whose liberal background, authoritarian overtones, petty acrimony, and unprincipled policy convulsions disqualify him from being the conservative choice for the presidency.

Trump's presence in the Republican primaries has exacerbated a divide among the party's electorate that is threatening to fracture the GOP completely. If he is the nominee, then along with assuring another Clinton presidency, the party will likely see a mass exodus of conservatives from its ranks and will no longer be able to claim itself as the conservative standard bearer.

To offset the loss of stalwart conservatives who would rather vote for Hillary than see a man like Trump in the White House, remaining Republicans would be forced to collaborate with a candidate whom

continued on back page

James Jacobs on Gun Control

By **MORGAN WALSH**
STAFF WRITER

Taking into consideration a number of recent shootings that were both tragic and abhorrent, such as those in San Bernardino, Newtown, and Aurora, it's no wonder that many Americans feel so strongly that more gun control is necessary. In contrast, one can also see how the strong regulatory sentiment has led to gun-owners to feel threatened, a feeling that has helped fuel gun sales.

Emotions often fuel the debate on gun control, with one side shouting about the deaths of innocent people over the other side's chants of civil liberties and the Second Amendment. A voice seldom heard in the debate, however, is the voice of reason, which the Levitt Center recently brought to Hamilton College in a lecture series by James Jacobs, a scholar who has researched gun control extensively for over 20 years. His considerable research supports the conclusion echoed by gun rights advocates that gun control is not the answer.

Jacobs casts doubt on the breadth of the problem of gun violence and many of the statistics that proponents of gun control often use. For example, those trying to shed light on the problem of gun violence sometimes cite misleading statistics, like the

This Week's News in 140 Characters

EDITORIAL REPORT

-  **andy levy** @andylevy · Mar 4
GOP debate ratings are so good i'm afraid it's gonna get picked up for a second season
204 retweets, 378 likes
-  **Will Antonin** @Will_Antonin · Mar 4
Angry at GOP, voting for Trump = Upset at messy kitchen, cashing out 401k to give to ShamWow guy
87 retweets, 118 likes
-  **John Tabin** @johntabin · Mar 3
Trump thinks a trade deficit means you're "losing," which is like saying you lose to Target when you shop there
284 retweets, 289 likes
-  **Elise Foley** @elisefoley · Mar 2
Trump voter on Fox News says he likes that Trump doesn't give specific policy ideas because otherwise other candidates might steal them.
4.2K retweets, 3.7K likes
-  **Stephen Miller** @redsteeze · Mar 3
6 months of "cuck" You're absolutely insane if you think I'm pulling that lever for your cheeto colored God.
159 retweets, 301 likes
-  **scott feschuk** @scottfeschuk · Mar 2
UPDATE: Chris Christie just finished cutting up Mr. Trump's waffles just the way he likes them.
986 retweets, 1.4K likes
-  **Joe Simonson** @SaysSimonson · Mar 1
there are nowhere near enough normal non-voters to make Trump president, but just enough to destroy the Republican Party #SuperTuesday 🇺🇸
2 retweets, 1 like
-  **Existential Comics** @existentialooms · Mar 3
I hate it when you get all the way to work and realize that you forgot to seize the means of production and eliminate the bourgeoisie.
719 retweets, 952 likes

STAY CONNECTED

@ENQUIRY_AHI

JAMES JACOBS ON GUN CONTROL cont.

32,000 firearms deaths seen in 2011, without noting that 60 percent of those deaths were suicides.

Similarly, these statistics often lack scope, like the fact that on average smoking kills 480,000 people per year. In 2011, cigarettes caused 15 times as many deaths as firearms.

Jacobs casts doubt on the breadth of the problem of gun violence and many of the statistics that proponents of gun control often use.

Jacobs also notes the confusion about gun classification and what qualifies as an "assault-weapon," an ambiguous term often misused by proponents of gun control. As Jacobs notes, an assault weapon is simply a term for semi-automatic rifles and some handguns which have at least two military-style features.

While the prospect of "military-style" features may seem frightening and unnecessary to many who

continued on back page

Dangers of Brexit

By **SAM BENEVELLI**
STAFF WRITER

David Cameron set the date for a British referendum on membership in the European Union for June 23 of this year. He promises to run a vigorous campaign to stay in, whereas many high ranking officials, including the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, and Justice Secretary, Michael Gove, promise to lead a strong initiative to abandon the Union.

Britain's membership in the European Union has been a subject of debate since the 1970s, with opinions fluctuating every decade or so. As of late, the UKIP party led by Nigel Farage has bolstered anti-EU sentiments with a one-plank platform of British independence. In 2011, UKIP made a few strides with the European Union Act, requiring any EU treaty that gives Brussels substantive new powers to be subject to a British referendum.

Many believe that if Britain

continued on back page

they have few means of keeping under control. Many establishment Republicans would have to embrace the loose cannon and his strategy of carving out an electorate of “right-wing crazies” in order to maintain the party’s presidential aspirations. In this way, the GOP would officially become a party that defines itself almost solely by its racial makeup, a party that once again overlooks the obscene racism of David Duke, and defers to an influential bloc of white supremacists.

The Republican Party of Donald Trump, with its key demographic of poor, white males, will not survive long in the future of American politics. According to Pew Research Center, by 2050, whites will make up 47 percent of the country while Hispanics will grow to 27 percent. That is why, after Romney lost the election, the establishment saw the changing demographics and the declining influence of the white electorate as a threat to the party’s future.

They had two options, they could either try to take a share of the Hispanic electorate from Democrats, or they could try to stop immigration altogether. They resolved to gain support among Hispanics, whom they suppose to have a vested interest in immigration policy, by running candidates such as Marco Rubio and supporting immigration reform.

The party was not wrong to believe that the Hispanic vote presented an opportunity for growth, considering that many American Hispanics are deeply Christian and hold similar policy beliefs when it comes to education, jobs, spending, and other issues. Almost all Republicans already supported some kind of immigration reform, and half supported a path to citizenship, so the party hoped that stepping away from their traditional hardline approach to immigration would give the GOP its best chance to defeat a Democratic candidate in 2016.

As this election has showed us, however, opposition to immigration is deeply entrenched in the Republican base. What’s more, candidates who pushed for immigration reform did not earn a decisive share of the Hispanic vote. Although over half of the Hispanics planning to vote in the Republican primaries indicated Marco Rubio as their first or second choice for the nomination, his favorability among Hispanics does not cover the fact that only 14 percent of Hispanics plan to vote Republican in the general election.

Republican voters became increasingly angry at their party for promoting the interests of nonparty members over its own. When the Republican Party promoted bills such as the “Gang of Eight” bill, which was lenient towards immigration violations, but did nothing to stem the tide of illegal immigrants President

Obama allowed to cross the border on a daily basis, it gave an opening to outsiders to run for the nomination.

Donald Trump capitalized on voters’ anger and came to embody the resentment many Republicans felt towards the establishment. His support grew, not because of his beliefs—most of which are still unknown—but because of the rage he invoked against the party.

The strong reaction against GOP efforts to court Hispanic votes created a movement that has moved the party in the exact opposite direction. The dispute that has fractured the party now threatens to break it completely, expelling traditional conservatives and essentially reforming the Grand Old Party on the Know-Nothing principles that achieved popularity during America’s identity crisis of the mid-nineteenth century.

JAMES JACOBS ON GUN CONTROL cont.

assert that assault weapons have no purpose but in acts of violence, these features include things such as a flash suppressor, which makes shooting in poor lighting easier and is helpful to hunters. Other examples of military-style features include a folding telescopic stock, which makes the gun easier to transport.

Opponents of assault weapons fail to realize that no added military features of the gun make it any more dangerous than it would be without these features, as they do not shoot faster or use different bullets from non-assault weapons.

Jacob’s lecture series helped to dispel many of the myths typically perpetuated by those in favor of gun-control. He used statistics to back up his assertions and, while taking a more pro-gun stance, he acknowledged the arguments of both sides and explained how he reached his conclusions, an approach many fail to take when it comes to the sensitive topic of gun control.

While many walked away still disagreeing with Jacobs, this lecture series helped in part to assuage perhaps the largest fundamental issue in the gun control debate: those in favor of gun-control lacking a comprehensive knowledge on the very tools they want to restrict at the expense of subsistence hunters, sportsmen, and those who feel more safe when in possession of a firearm.

With a heightened understanding of the issue, perhaps more people will see that taking away people’s constitutionally granted rights is not the answer to the problem of violence in America.

DANGERS OF BREXIT cont.

leaves, the EU will be unable to live up to its full potential—the EU needs Britain more than Britain needs the EU. This is a plausible scenario. But there is a more likely second scenario in which Britain leaving the EU tanks exports and negotiating power.

Some arguments for leaving the EU include a new power to negotiate independent trade treaties with India, China, and the United States. Proponents contend that, if not restricted by harsh EU regulations, British exports would grow dramatically.

If Britain does pass the referendum and leaves the EU, it still needs the EU to take the majority of its exports. Like Norway and Switzerland, Britain would still need free movement from EU countries and would have to send a large payment to the EU for trade benefits.

A number of Brits want to leave the EU to claim back some sovereignty lost to European judges interfering with business practices and labor laws. But the potential gain in sovereignty would be minor.

Britain already gives up sovereignty and decision-making power to throw its weight around in NATO, the IMF, and other power-sharing institutions. In abandoning the EU, Britain would be pushed to the outside of negotiations but would still be affected by EU decisions.

Immigration would be an exception. Almost half of British immigrants come from the EU, and with open borders there is nothing Britain can do to stop the influx. Free from the EU, Britain could regulate its own immigration policy, but it would come at a high cost.

Long-term effects of Brexit

would spread beyond immigration and economics. If Britain leaves the EU, Scotland would have greater reason to break up the United Kingdom. Results from the Scottish referendum in September 2014 show that a Brexit may be the force to push the last 6 percent to vote for Scottish independence. Leaving the EU could spell economic catastrophe for Britain and Scotland if they decide to divorce.

European Union officials know that Britain holds an important place in a bloc of countries struggling with immigration and economic crises. The EU would suffer if Britain left—EU policy would turn increasingly conservative and self-serving if left to other current powers, Germany for one.

The EU is steadily becoming more important in implementing of international security measures, and a Brexit would steal the majority of EU military might. This would not only weaken the security of the EU but also burden poorer countries with military responsibilities abroad for which they are not equipped. It is not surprising that Vladimir Putin supports a British exit whereas President Obama stands in opposition.

The British referendum may seem to promise sovereignty and independence to Britain, but hopefully UKIP proponents and their supporters can see before June how a Brexit will hurt Britain and the European Union.

vol. III	ENQUIRY	issue 21
<p>Mike Adamo <i>Editor in Chief</i></p> <p>Michael Levy <i>Creative / Digital Director</i></p>		
STAFF WRITERS		
Alex Klosner	Will Swett	Amy Elinski
Ryan Glenn	Elizabeth Barry	Will Utzschneider
		Sam Benevelli
<p><i>The opinions expressed in these articles are the views of their authors and do not represent the views of Enquiry or the Alexander Hamilton Institute.</i></p>		<p><i>Enquiry accepts articles of 500 to 800 words at madamo@hamilton.edu. Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.</i></p>