

Review: *Body and Soul*

Ryan Glenn
Guest Contributor

The following film review was originally submitted to the Spectator. The Spectator's editors, who had not seen the film, took issue with the negative portrayal of Palestinian historical revisionism and heavily revised the piece in order to reflect their own political prejudices. Their revisions raise significant ethical questions. In light of the rising anti-Semitism on college campuses and around the world, the Spectator's actions are disturbing and irresponsible.

—The Editors

Last Tuesday, Hamilton welcomed Gloria Greenfield to present her latest film, *Body and Soul: The State of the Jewish Nation*. Greenfield has worked in publishing, marketing, and management for over thirty years prior to founding of Doc Emet Productions in 2007. Greenfield, with Doc Emet Productions, dedicates her work to the advancement of a Jewish identity and advocacy for the Jewish state. Greenfield has produced and directed three films since 2008. The event, sponsored by the Alexander Hamilton Institute, was well attended by Hamilton students, alumni, and faculty.

Greenfield briefly prefaced her film with several critical issues facing the Jewish people today, including Israel's right as a nation to exist and defend its territories, conflicts arising over local opposition to Israel, the "intellectual" attacks on the Jewish people and nation, and a growing illiteracy among modern Jews regarding their history, texts, and liturgy. The film itself is mostly historical, educating viewers on the legitimacy and history of the Jewish state. Late in the film, some of the more modern issues facing the state are explored. Greenfield establishes Judaism as more than just a religion. It is an identity, a community, and a

tradition that ultimately manifests in the Israeli nationality where all who identify as Jewish will be welcome.

The film itself consists of a brief history of the Jewish people, the development of Zionism, establishment of Israel, and challenges currently facing the Jewish nation. Biblical, historical, and archaeological evidence all strongly suggest the ancient Jewish people settled in the modern day Israel, Jordan, and Syria, with Jerusalem at the center of the civilization. The Babylonians first conquered and exiled the Jews, destroying the holy temple in Jerusalem. The Romans later dominated the area, renaming the province Palaestina for the ancient enemies of the Jews. Around 1000 years later, the Crusaders conquered Jerusalem. Every conquest led to the persecution and execution of Jews. The Promised Land passed from conquerer to conquerer, none able to hold and establish rule before the British captured the land in the early 1900s, eventually helping create a Jewish state.

With the rise of European nationalism and widespread anti-Semitism in the 19th century, many Jewish people rediscovered their identity, prompting a will to reestablish themselves in the Zionist movement. Although many areas were considered, none had the attractiveness and historical pull of the original Promised Land. Thus, over the late 19th century and early 20th century, Jews began immigrating from many nations, where they were treated as second class citizens, en masse to the Promised Land.

The two World Wars and their aftermath devastated the Jewish people. Although a push for the creation of a Jewish state in the Middle East gained support, anti-Semitism ran rampant among politics of the mid-20th century. Ultimately, the United Nations managed to establish the Mandate for Palestine: a British controlled home for the Jewish people, with the Jordan River area split into Jewish Palestine and Trans-Jordan

Upcoming Events

Wednesday, April 8

"Are Cops Racist?"

A lecture by Heather Mac Donald
of the Manhattan Institute

7:00 p.m. | KJ Auditorium

(Arab Palestine). Because the UN did not declare official borders, they tolerated attacks on Jewish Palestine, utterly failing to assist Israel when the Arabs invaded, exiling or killing Jews in the conquered lands. These unwarranted attacks persisted, forcing Israel into defensive wars against the surrounding Arab nations, continually surrendering land.

Even today, many Arab nations (particularly Palestinians) rewrite history in attempt to justify anti-Semitism. They preach Israel has no historical right or claim to their land, denying the state's right to exist. The frequent persecution and exiling of Jews throughout history is not used as simply a historical fact, but manipulated into evidence for the inferiority of the Jewish people. This even extends to Christians, with claims that Jesus was not Jewish, but Muslim!

These Arab nations refuse to recognize the legitimacy of the Jewish state. This unreasonable, unjustified aggression continues today, manifesting itself in countless conflicts.

Almost all modern nations take statehood for granted. Israel must continually defend its right to exist. So far, they have been militarily successful, but have a difficult political and ideological war to wage. Israel and the Jewish people cannot suffer these continued attacks on their nationhood. They (and Israel's allies) must demand the right to be recognized and respected as a nation.

Special thanks again to Gloria Greenfield and the Alexander Hamilton Institute for making the event possible and accessible to the Hamilton Community.

Progress on California Drought

Amy Elinski | Staff Writer

The scene was bleak on April 1 as California Governor Jerry Brown attended the annual snow measuring ceremony at the top of the Sierra Nevada mountain range. Where the crowd would normally stand atop six feet of snow for the ceremony, they stood upon dry grass. This year the Sierra Nevada mountain range had the lowest ever recorded cover of snow on April 1 since measurements began in 1950. Statewide snow measurements for the rest of the Sierra Nevadas showed 5% of the average snow cover for this time

of year, providing a foreboding warning to Californians to reduce their water usage.

California draws around 30% of its annual water supply from snowfall in the Sierra Nevadas. With the dismal snow cover to supplement the ground water supply, Californians will have to make major changes in their water usage habits. Governor Jerry Brown has already issued an executive order, mandating a 25% reduction in statewide water usage from California's 2013 usage levels. In 2014 the state attempted to implement a voluntary 20% water usage reduction, but few towns reduced their water use, and even fewer actually met the goal of 20%.

California has devised several strategies for implementing this water restriction. Each town will be given a specific goal for reduction in consumption based upon per capita water usage. Towns will be forced to stop watering medians in roads, and will instead be encouraged to replace costly grass with drought-friendly foliage. Golf courses, cemeteries, schools, and other areas with large amounts of lawn will be encouraged to drastically cut down on water consumption and reduce the amount they water their lawns. When they do water their lawns, they will be encouraged to use refuse water so they do not deplete the drinkable water supply.

Additionally, towns will be encouraged to implement restrictions for individual use. Towns will encourage individuals to reduce the amount they water their lawns, fining individuals who water their lawns outside of scheduled times. Individuals are forbidden to wash their cars with hoses unless they use shutoff nozzles. The state will offer incentives for individuals to replace older appliances with new, high-efficiency systems. New developments will be required to install efficient drip or microspray systems if they are to irrigate with drinking water as opposed to refuse water.

In order to encourage a decrease in overall usage statewide and discourage waste, the state will also encourage water agencies to increase premiums with higher rates and fees.

The restriction does not apply to farmers, who make up for approximately 80% of the water use in California. Many suggest mandatory restrictions on farmers as well. This, however, is simply unfeasible, as farmers are already suffering due to water shortages.

Farmers in California have borne the brunt of the drought over the last four years. Water shortages have caused massive increases in the price of water and decreases in overall output by farms. In 2014, many farmers saw increases in water prices by thousands of percent. In the central valley, some farmers even paid as much as \$3,000 per acre-foot of water, instead

of the average annual price of \$60 per acre-foot. Farmers across the state engaged in massive bidding wars, competing to claim their share of the meager water supply.

The water shortage is particularly harmful to farmers who grow orchards, as they do not have the option of letting their farms lie fallow for the year. These farmers are forced to either pay egregious prices to keep their trees alive, or let many their trees die and hope that they will eventually be able to replace them. Either option is not favorable and leads to rising prices in the produce industry.

Despite the complaints that California is not doing enough to combat the drought, what California has done is a good start. It is nearly impossible for a state to cut their water usage as much as people would like, especially in a state with such a thriving agricultural industry like California.

If California wants to make a real change in their water consumption, it will have to be a slow process. They are already taking great strides by reducing individual, industry, and state consumption by 25%. In times of emergency such as this drought, it is necessary to make sacrifices. The restrictions the state has already suggested will undoubtedly reduce water usage by drastic amounts.

Additionally, since the start of the 2014/15 rain year on September 30, California has already exceeded the total amount of rain that fell in the 2013/14 rain year. The additional rain should help to alleviate some of the pain from the drought.

Nonetheless, Californians have a difficult year ahead of them, as will the rest of the people in the United States who purchase the produce from Californian farmers. California's farmers are engaged in a massive struggle to keep their farms afloat. So remember, you're not the only one who's suffering the next time you have to pay an extra \$2.00 for guacamole on your burrito.

Concealed Carry at College

Taylor Elicegui | *Staff Writer*

Nevada, Florida, Texas, and Montana are among several states considering bills that would allow concealed weapons on college campuses. In Texas a bill passed the House and will move onto the Senate, and in Florida a bill cleared two Senate committees. If passed, the bills would allow those over the age of 21 that have a concealed carry permit to have weapons on campus. Allowing guns on college campuses would increase violence and the potential for tragic events.

The combination of guns and alcohol on college campuses would prove a deadly mix. According to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, four out of five college students drink, and half binge drink. Adding guns into an environment known for its alcohol and drug abuse seems like a lethal combination.

Students for Concealed Carry, a non-partisan grassroots organization working to legalize guns on campuses, explains that every state has laws prohibiting carrying your gun while under the influence of alcohol or drugs. "Legalizing concealed carry on college campuses," they write, "would neither make it easier for college students to obtain firearms nor make it legal for a person to carry a firearm while under

the influence of drugs or alcohol."

However, much like every state has laws against carrying a gun while under the influence, every state also has laws that prohibit driving while under the influence. Yet 1 in 5 college students admits to driving while drunk, and 40% of students acknowledge they have ridden in a car with a drunk driver. College students are more likely than other young adults to consume alcohol and get behind the wheel of the car, and if guns were allowed on college campuses, I believe college students would be more likely than other young adults to get drunk with firearms.

College students also experience more mental health problems, and increased access to guns could raise suicide rates on college campuses. Suicide is the second leading cause of death for college students and about one in twelve college students (that would be 154 people at Hamilton College) have a plan to commit suicide. What's more, 54% of suicides involve firearms. Adding firearms—the most effective tool for committing suicide—to a high stress environment does not seem like the way to increase safety on college campuses.

Opinion polls show that the American public is split—43% equally support and oppose concealed carry laws. However, when Arkansas passed a similar law in 2013 to allow faculty



to carry guns, provided they had a concealed carry permit, all public and private institutions opted out of it. Given the lives at stake, I'll continue to watch with bated breath and hope that legislators across the nation—and in my home state, Nevada—work to keep our campuses safe and gun free.

Enquiry Staff

Editor-in-Chief: Joe Simonson

Senior Editor: Mike Adamo

Staff Writers: Taylor Elicegui, Amy Elinski, Alex Klosner, Sarah Larson, Andrew Nachemson, Phil Parkes, Will Swett

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.

Enquiry accepts articles of 500 to 800 words at jsimonso@hamilton.edu and madamo@hamilton.edu. Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.