



ENQUIRY

A publication of the AHI Undergraduate Fellows

Free thought and discourse

VOL. II No. 25 | CLINTON, NY. MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2015

① Overparenting

② Obergefell v. Hodges

③ UKIP and Its Enemies

Overparenting

By **AMY ELINSKI**
STAFF WRITER

Sunday morning while walking through a shopping center, I stumbled across a table of Girl Scouts and their mothers selling Girl Scout Cookies. I purchased a box, and said that as a child I had always loved selling Girl Scout cookies, mentioning that I did so door-to-door.

“Well, it’s just not safe enough for kids to do that anymore,” one of the mothers replied. I found myself perplexed. Sure, the area of town they were selling in was not a high-end neighborhood, but it was far from dangerous. It was the type of neighborhood I would have felt more than comfortable exploring as a child.

Americans have begun sheltering their children to an extreme degree, not allowing them the freedom to explore. We’ve has come to the conclusion that children must be protected from all circumstances where safety is not 100% guaranteed, which makes one wonder what place *is* 100% safe.

In 2014, a mother in South Carolina was charged with unlawful conduct towards a child, a felony punishable by up to ten years in prison, for allowing her nine-year-old daughter to play alone in a park six minutes away from their home while she was at work. Harrell gave her daughter a key to their home and a cell phone in case of emergency, and allowed her to stay at the park while she was working nearby. The state took Harrell’s daughter from her, explaining that the daughter was being endangered.

In January, a couple in Maryland was investigated by CPS for allowing their children, ages ten and six, to walk one mile home from school. Danielle and Alexander Meitiv, members of the free-range kids movement, live in a suburban community considered to be very safe. When the children were approximately half a mile from their home, someone called the police to report they had seen children “wandering through the neighborhood” by themselves. The police picked up the children, despite the children’s protests that they had their parents’ permission to walk home.

The children and parents were interviewed by CPS to determine if they were competent guardians. While the children remain with them, the state conducted an investigation for the sick crime of allowing their children to play in parks by themselves.

The only thing the current fad of incessant coddling has accomplished is to diminish the freedom of children and increase their dependence on an authority figure. The parents who constantly supervise their children, or chastise those who allow their children to roam free are creating people who, when they reach adulthood, will struggle to cope with independence.

The only thing the current fad of incessant coddling has accomplished is to diminish the freedom of children and increase their dependence on an authority figure.

People who claim that the world is simply not safe for their children anymore are ignoring the fact that the world is a safer place for children today than it ever has been. Violent crime

continued on back page

Obergefell v. Hodges

By **TAYLOR ELICEGUI**
STAFF WRITER

On April 28, the Supreme Court will hear *Obergefell v. Hodges*. The case addresses the constitutionality of state bans on same-sex marriage. It raises two main issues. First, does the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment, which reads, “No state shall ... deny to any person in its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws,” require states to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples? Second, does the Fourteenth Amendment require states to recognize the out-of-state marriage licenses of same-sex couples?

The case consolidates four other challenges to state laws banning same-sex marriage and parents in four states: Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan and Tennessee. James Obergefell, the namesake

This Week’s News in 140 Characters

EDITORIAL REPORT



jon gabriel @exjon

19h

Slow news day. Hillary needs to buy a burrito or something.

Collapse · 25 RETWEETS 40 FAVORITES



Marco Rubio @marcorubio

13 Apr

My father stood behind a small portable bar in the back of a room...so that tonight I could stand behind this podium in front of this room

Collapse · 349 RETWEETS 505 FAVORITES



andy levy @andylevy

10 Apr

man it sucks being old enough to remember when the left was hardcore in support of free speech

Collapse · 137 RETWEETS 201 FAVORITES



David Frum @davidfrum

14 Apr

“Be yourself.”
“I’m a narcissist compulsively seeking in elective office the validation I lacked in my stunted childhood.”
“OK then”

Collapse · 49 RETWEETS 56 FAVORITES



Lachlan Markay @lachlan

17 Apr

Mike Huckabee is out to prove that you can embrace progressivism but still call yourself a conservative if you bash gay people enough.

Collapse · 39 RETWEETS 17 FAVORITES



UKIP and Its Enemies

By **WILL SWETT**
STAFF WRITER

OBERGEFELL V. HODGES cont.

of the case, and his husband John Arthur, married in Maryland in June 2013. Arthur, terminally ill with ALS (amyotrophic lateral sclerosis), and Obergefell wanted to get married so they could be buried together in Arthur’s family cemetery plot that only allows for spouses and descendants of the family. After returning to Ohio, Obergefell and Arthur sued the state for failing to recognize their marriage. Arthur passed away on October 22, 2013.

The Court has received 72 amicus briefs that oppose state bans on same-sex marriage. One of the briefs, filed by the federal government, urges the Supreme Court to classify sexual orientation as a category deserving heightened scrutiny, recognizing that there has been historic discrimination against same-sex couples. The briefs include challenges to the states’ position that banning same-sex marriage is necessary to encourage oppo-

There is not a more polarizing figure in British politics than Nigel Farage, and for good reason. As the head of the UK Independence Party (UKIP), Farage has been stirring the pot since 2010, attracting more media attention for his provocative statements than for his policy proposals. The outspoken Brit was intensely criticized when he blamed immigrants on the highway for his late arrival to a party conference. Farage also took heat when he suggested that mothers “sit in the corner” when breastfeeding in public. Nigel may lack political tact, but many UK voters appear unfazed by the blunt party leader.

Despite the constant parade of controversy, UKIP continues to garner support under their anti-EU and anti-Immigration platform. Support for UKIP has ris-

rates have dramatically plummeted across the country, falling 48% since 1990. Many violent crimes against children have fallen that much or even more.

Children need to be allowed to be children. They should be allowed to explore the world, make their own choices, and deal with the consequences of those choices. Children will learn from getting hurt. They will never learn if their parents are watching their every move. Parents should be there to support their children and help them to grow, but there is a definite line that parents cross far too often when their support turns into helicoptering. Whether it is selling cookies, walking home from school, or going to the park, children need to be allowed freedom to develop on their own and become independent.

OBERGEFELL V. HODGES cont.

same-sex couples to have children, briefs from family welfare organizations contending that a ban on same-sex marriage hurts the children of same-sex couples, and arguments that the denial of same-sex marriage hurts the physical and mental well-being of couples. One brief from former members of the military, who state that denying same-sex couples and their families the benefits associated with marriage actually threatens the United States' military preparedness. Given the variety of the briefs, the Justices will have many arguments to justify striking down bans on same-sex marriage.

On the other side, 66 legal briefs have been filed to support the states' ability to limit marriage to heterosexual couples. According to Lyle Denniston of *SCOTUS Blog*, "Taken as a whole, the sixty-six legal briefs filed in defense of the four states' bans on same-sex marriage show evident signs of mainly trying to satisfy Justice Anthony M. Kennedy... the Court is no longer willing to hear a gay rights challenge heavily focused on moral revulsion to the homosexual lifestyle." Many of the briefs attempt to describe the impact of same-sex marriage on traditional marriage. One brief states that traditional marriage will decline by five percent in the next thirty years and result in 300,000 children being born outside of wedlock. Other briefs argue that same-sex marriage is

best left to the states, which was the Supreme Court's plan until the resulting circuit-split in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals

Given the variety of the briefs, the Justices will have many arguments to justify striking down bans on same-sex marriage.

The final decision will most likely rely on Justice Kennedy. In the 2013 decision *United States v. Windsor*, which struck down the Defense of Marriage Act, Justices Kennedy, Kagan, Ginsburg, Sotomayor and Breyer made up the majority. Justice Kagan even officiated the same-sex marriage of her former law clerk. Justices Roberts, Scalia, Alito and Thomas were the minority in *United States v. Windsor* and argued that the Supreme Court should not decide the legality of same-sex marriage. Given the impact the decision has on millions of people, it will be nice to hear the Supreme Court finally rule on same-sex marriage and provide some much-needed clarification, and reaffirm, as many district court judges did, the unconstitutionality of banning same sex marriage.

UKIP AND ITS ENEMIES cont.

en to 15% according to polls for the upcoming general election, which would make them a powerful player in the minority-controlled Parliament. This rise in popularity represents a drastic improvement from their 2010 performance when they only polled 3% of the national vote.

In a speech in the EU Parliament, Farage said the EU President has "the charisma of a damp rag, and the appearance of a low-grade bank clerk."

For all that UKIP is, it is definitely not boring, which may be another reason for its growth in British politics. It appeals to the casual spectator of politics who have been, as Farage put it, "bore[d] into submission" by the "Westminster college kids." The UKIP leader seems like a relatable and refreshing change of pace to the average politician, breaking from the usual political scene

with his robust and occasionally obtuse behavior. In a speech in the EU Parliament, Farage said the EU President has "the charisma of a damp rag, and the appearance of a low-grade bank clerk."

Farage's political opponents have called him a bigot and, in true progressive fashion, used the label to justify acts of violence and intolerance. Last month, for example, protesters chased Farage and his family out of a local pub and attacked his car. The protesters acted because they "refused to succumb to [Farage's] prejudice" and hoped to intimidate Farage, his wife, and his children. As one protester put it, Farage was targeted because he "othered" people. The proponents of this activism are quick to "other" Farage and anyone who disagrees with them in their quest for global unity of thought.

Even Farage's political rivals condone intimidation tactics. When Farage was forced to abandon a tour of Rotherham when a mob of protesters "trapped" him in a party office, MP Sarah Champion described the scene as "hilarious." Many shrug off this kind of behavior because they feel that Farage brings it on himself.

UKIP's opponents cite the party's strict stance on immigration to justify their violence and aggression. They are so offended that UKIP's members do not follow their cult of diversity that they cannot help but express their displeasure through militant activism. But Farage's idea, that a nation has a right to control its own borders, is not an extremist othering of anyone; it's a basic privilege of sovereign nations.

Because of UKIP's stance on immigration, opponents have proclaimed Farage and his associates as enemies of "diversity" resembling Nazis, establishing them as viable targets for harassment. Farage admittedly invites some of these comparisons by proudly declaring that "I'm not on the right or left. I'm a radical." Nevertheless, when it becomes acceptable to intimidate politicians based on their views there is a serious problem in the state of political discourse.

Progressives' outright intolerance of opposing ideas threatens the political and intellectual freedom that are necessary in a liberal democracy. One should not be so quick to discount an entire political platform and denounce an entire portion of the British population as bigots just because one pot-stirring Brit has an opinion.

vol. II

ENQUIRY

Joe Simonson
Editor in Chief

Mike Adamo
Senior Editor

Michael Levy
Creative Director

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 jsimonson@hamilton.edu and madamo@hamilton.edu. Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.