Polish dissident receives honorary degree

by Mitchell Polatin
THE COLLEGE VOICE

"Communism was like a freezer, an empire of evil," explained Adam Michnik, a human rights activist who grew up in the midst of Communist Poland, during his acceptance speech Thursday night. Connecticut College presented Michnik with the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters, Honoris Causa.

Michnik has dedicated his life to the fight for democracy across the world. He is a human rights activist, journalist, historian, political commentator and author.

At the age of 15, Michnik organized "Seekers of Contradictions," a discussion group in his middle school. This group questioned the social and political structure of Poland.

In college, Michnik continued to fight the communist government of Poland. He was expelled from school and jailed. Michnik spent a total of six years in prison.

After he was released from prison Michnik continued to fight for democracy. Michnik went on to form the Committee for the Defense of Workers. It was a social support group that provided financial, legal and medical aid to workers. Michnik played an integral part in the Solidarity movement, which led to the return of Democracy in Poland. Michnik also serves as the editor-in-chief of Gazeta Wyborcza, the most widely read newspaper in Europe.

I was able to sit down with Michnik, prior to the honorary doctorate to discuss his life and goals.

Michnik, whose English is "little," as he explains it, spoke with me through an interpreter.

He explained, that he first began to think that communism was wrong while he was attending middle school.

"We formed a club, the club didn't last. The authorities questioned us and separated us. But we knew that communism was a lie. Communism was a lie, we wanted the truth. Communism was injustice, we wanted justice. Communism was slavery, we wanted freedom. Communism was ugly, we wanted beauty. Communism was closed world, we wanted open world." Mr. Michnik handled the plastic wrappers of his cigarettes very carefully, and he pushed them around the top of the table. The table held cheese, crackers, bottled water and several packs of cigarettes.

When asked about his time in prison, Michnik became austere. He put down his cigarettes, and chose his words carefully.

"Prison is not a place where one should change fundamental views. Polish tradition is such that we know that freedom has a price, it is costly. Freedom is not free, I paid the price." He explained, that he first began to think that communism was wrong while he was attending middle school.

"I was talking with a friend of mine in Japan. Japan has a democracy but no freedom. It is reverse for us, we have freedom but not as much democracy. I travel throughout the world and listen to people speak about solidarity in the most important idea in the second half of the 20th century."

Michnik has accomplished an astounding amount, in the area of democracy and human rights. I asked him what he believes his greatest accomplishment is.

"Of course, it is the doctorate that I will receive here at Connecticut. But really it is the fact that communism is not with us anymore. After all, one can not really live with communism, communism will kill us, or we will kill communism."
Conn network picks up speed
by Joshua Friedlander
THE COLLEGE VOICE
The latest volume of the Conneticut College Magazine detailed the importance of Internet access to Connecticut State students. In its conclusion, the article touched upon plans that the college has for expanding its networking capabilities. For some time now, Conn has had a symbiotic, networking relationship with both Trinity and Wesleyan colleges. The Connecticut Wesleyan (CTW) connection is in place to provide students with access to the libraries and various Internet resources of the three schools. Until now, the systems have worked as most any other Internet hookup, with computers accessing the other schools through the normal Internet procedures. The plan, as of now, is to significantly speed up this process (i.e., speed up the connection) by forming a private network consisting of only the three schools.

At this point, Connecticut College diJiis out into the Internet through a 56 kilobit connection via an Internet server to which the three schools connect. The plan, as of now, is to significantly speed up this process (i.e., speed up the connection) by forming a private network consisting of only the three schools. At this point, Connecticut College diJiis out into the Internet through a 56 kilobit connection via an Internet server to which the three schools connect.
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**ARTS & EVENTS**

**COMING UP IN A&E**

**11/17 - 11/21:** The College Voice

**11/20:** "THE SKIN OF OUR TEETH" - 8 P.M. PALMER

**11/20:** "FALL SCENES" OPERA WORKSHOP - 8 P.M. DANA HALL

**11/21:** "A TIME TO KILL" - 7 & 11 P.M. F.W. Olin AUDITORIUM

**11/21:** "THE SKIN OF OUR TEETH" - 8 P.M. PALMER

**11/23:** ORCHESTRA CONCERT - 8 P.M. DANA HALL

**11/25:** DAS ORGELEBEN, PT. 1 - 7:30 P.M. HARKNESS CHAPEL

**11/26:** THANKSGIVING BREAK

**11/28:** TREASURY BREAK

**11/29:** GUEST ARTIST RECITAL - 8 P.M. DANA HALL

**11/30:** "MAKE-WE-JOY" - 4 & 7 P.M. HARKNESS CHAPEL

**11/30:** DANCE CONCERT - 8 P.M. PALMER

**12/1:** DANCE CONCERT - 8 P.M. PALMER

---

**Opera Workshop sings Friday**

by Peter Gross

THE COLLEGE VOICE

On Friday, October 22, the Opera Preview Workshop will be performing scenes from five operas of all of which have the theme of love and lovers. The workshop, run by Richard Rahn, professor of music, has been meeting since the end of September, and is composed of veterans and newcomers to the music performance world. The students involved with the workshop are Ben Hayes, Erin Munro, Linda Naja, Yumi Taylor, Elizabeth Wohl, Beth Bennett, Sara Beth Carter, and Hannah Schramm. The pieces that they are performing include a trio and a duet from Mozart's Cosi Fan Tutte, selections from Moore's Baby Doe, a trio from Cimarosa's Secret Marriage, a piece from Tchaikovsky's Eugene Onegin, and Gounod's French version of Romeo and Juliet.

Ransom deserving of moviegoer payoffs

by Christopher Moje

THE COLLEGE VOICE

Ron Howard's latest film, Ransom, is built upon the time-honored premise of a family's struggle to rescue their child from the grips of a kidnapper. The fact that Howard gives the film a few new twists makes this often-told story worth watching. The story is about the kidnapping of Sean Mullan, the son of Endeavor Airlines mogul Tom Mullan (Mel Gibson) and his wife, Kate (Rene Russo). Sean is kidnapped from a junior high school fair in Central Park by a team of kidnappers. This team is headed by a corrupt member of the NYPD, Jimmy Snaker (Gary Sinese). Snaker and his four accomplices have mastered this scheme to extract two million dollars from Mullan for his son's safe return, more importantly, to teach him a lesson. It seems Mullan has returned to service his company and someone else took the fall. Shaken figured if Mullan will pay extortionate amounts of cash to save his airline and himself, surely he'd be willing to pay as much, if not more, to save his son. The plot takes several interesting twists and turns and ends on a somewhat predictable and anti-climactic note. The action which preceded it was far more entertaining, and Howard probably could have ended the film much earlier than he did. On the whole, I thought the film was well worth the price of admission.

Gibson and Russo, as the child's parents, make their pain and anguish seem believable. I felt that Gibson demonstrated the same passion and force which he had in Braveheart. He actually made me believe that he was heartbroken over the loss of his child. Russo also lent believability to her performance, although I felt her character was somewhat weaker than that of her husband's. For the mother of a kidnapped child, I thought she would have played a more prominent role in the film's action than she did. Snaker impressed me with his turn as a mastermind criminal. A man who I used to seeing play a likable character showed me he can be sinister and cold-hearted as the best of them. Dedroy Lindo as Agent Hawkins, though involved with the workshop, was the one getting the most praise. I thought he played a more than 15 minutes role in the film, and his attention to detail made this scheme to extract more than 15 million dollars from Mullan for his son's safe return look more real. The workshop will be singing traditional and more contemporary music, on an instrument that is built upon the time-honored principle that "the best of both worlds" is achieved when one takes the "then" and the "now." In my opinion, Ransom should do a fine job of capturing the moviegoers' money. I don't think it will rank in the annals of movie history as one of the all-time great films, but certainly better than some of the cinematic trash that's been upon us these days. Despite its flaws, it is a good source of entertainment on an otherwise boring night.

---

**Illness cancels Romeo and Juliet**

by Jami DeSantis

THE COLLEGE VOICE

For those of you who were hoping to further your study of community, Cons College's theme for the year, you were most likely disappointed when told that the Garde Theater's production of Romeo and Juliet was cancelled. This performance, which was supposed to take place last Friday evening, was to be like no other: both the students and the audience were eager to see the debut of the students' acting talents. Indeed, the students' dedication and hard work paid off, as seen in the impressive set and costumes that were created. The audience was captivated by the actors' portrayal of the characters and the play's themes of love, betrayal, and tragedy.

Attention has been directed to the delay in getting the play out, which was the result of the last-minute cancellation. The Garde Theater's management has been working with the student actors to find a new date for the performance. In the meantime, the students have been using the time to continue working on their skills and to prepare for future performances.

---

**Faculty Column**

That was then, this is now.

by Michael Adelson

PROFESSOR OF MUSIC

They're back. The "question mark" posters from last year have reappeared all over campus. Again, they're brought to you by the Connecticut College Opera. The only difference is that this year the workshop will be singing traditional opera for the public, because next semester they will perform "children's operas."
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THE REACTION to Schnoorng surprised the editorial board greatly. While it is our responsibility to write fair and unbiased articles, it is certainly not our job to censor others’ opinions. When this year began, there were no “Schnoorngs,” and therefore it became The Voice’s full-time job to choose a pair. This decision gave The Voice responsibility and liability for an editorial opinion. Therefore, we decided not to discuss it. But that does not mean we will cease to print editorials that we find relevant, regardless of content.

A U.S. president once said the best thing about living in America is the fact that some one can tell the president to go to hell and the only thing the president can do is tell them to go to hell back. Most would agree that being told to go to hell is offensive. But does its offensive nature mean the previous sentence should not have been published in The Voice? Or never at all?

If the American public has indeed given the press a mandate not to offend, what does this mandate entail? Telling the president to go to hell is not a right we have in The Voice, feel it is important. One. Not because we wish to offend and not because we are hateful, but because when right is intuitively right in the first place.

In printing The Voice, we write for the entire community. In printing letters to the editor, we allow the community to write for and to itself. Therefore, just as it is our responsibility to edit our articles for content and clarity, it is our responsibility to print relevant letters to the editor in their entirety, even if they step on a few toes.

As one of the most reliable and consistent forums on campus, we areanvected to even fine line limits to the editor for grammar. We prefer to leave them intact, to make the full point the author(s) intended. In an age of political correctness, let it be known that The Voice reserves the right to print any opinion piece we find relevant. Even if our pages do not personally affirm individual readers, to deny what comes from the individual will certainly, in the long term be more damaging.

Earth House

The tragedy of industrial clearcutting has permanently scarred the surface of our Earth, made extinct varieties of species of plants and animals, and put a tremendous strain on one of our most valuable ecosystems. As basic as these truths are, the large industrial timber corporations have succeeded in putting doubts into the minds of even many Americans today. They have pumped lie-ridden propaganda into our heads through the pre-assembled intravenous contam of the media. The false assumptions along with the unsurpassed high interest and profit margin, in the form of vast and complete destruction, is being filtered to our consciousness.

Another myth is that timber harvesting is a necessity. It mimics the natural disturbances of any forest. This is not true. Although sections of natural forests are affected by things such as forest fires, insect infestation, disease and flooding, these processes are much more delicate and complex than bringing in the trucks to haul away the trees. In actuality, occurrences such as these are infrequent and do not claim entire forests. Furthermore, in nature the dead trees remain in the forest, decomposing over time and contributing nutrients to the soil. This is a process which contributes to the health of the forest, and is in no way comparable to the destruction of clearcutting. Clearcutting leaves the soil barren, subject to the effects of erosion and mineral depletion.

Another myth is that reforestation ensures healthy future forests. We can, with our technology, grow rows of trees. We cannot grow a forest. Even the idea is preposterous. A forest is an extremely complex ecosystem, it is a self generating habitat, complete with various interdependent layers of life. This can’t be cloned. One cannot say that the forest is the ecosystem, a habitat and the destruction of natural water and air filters is.

Some people believe that the detrimental ecological effects of deforestation are limited to the area cut. Unfortunately the damage is not so easily contained. The entire forest is connected by minerals, nutrients and water. When this precious balance is upset, the entire forest is affected. The effects of clearcutting can be noted miles away from the site. The loss of riparian forest, forest situated near a major water source, can affect entire forested areas, and can be detected by the previous links over space that the ecosystem maintains for the distribution of minerals and nutrients through water. There is wisdom in the words of Herb Herman, "The health of forest is Nature’s design. To suggest that human modification of the forest, particularly the aggressive modification that accompanies clearcutting, can improve upon Nature’s design is the height of human arrogance. This arrogance may well be our undoing. Many economic fiascos complicate the issue as well. For instance large corporations will defend themselves by saying that clearcutting is the most cost effective method and profitable. But letting you claim that witty observations are important, that the male point of view is important, is not because we wish to offend and not because we are hateful, but because when right is intuitively right in the first place.

It says. "I care about you, because I care about..."
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Working for the City

A few words for Betty and Veronica: everyone thinks they’re a comic. What makes you two think that you got the Moto? Since August over 2000 Moto columns have been written to the Voice in hopes of clinching the coveted, highly respectable, chic magnet, bootie warpping job. But no one has demonstrated a literacy verbosity that could equal that of ours. In fact we heard that Blanche Dubois is pursuing the position, and intends to kick her soon as she returns from SANTA Greece. As for propagating the feminine perspective of caseful affairs, we respect your initiative. However, we wish Betty and Veronica the best. The job in the U.S. The jobs are short term and temporary, the employee job in the U.S. The jobs are short term and temporary, the employee.

Some people believe that the detritus of our economic system is the forest that we are currently cutting. The phrase "it’s the season for Hip-Hop, masturbation, and chopped lips. Well, it’s always the season for those three things. The most unfortunate thing that has come into my room yesterday, and his lips blue and gray. I didn’t know if he was smoking crack or kissing sand paper, but it was nasty. I hooked him up with some Blistex. So, make sure when you head to the next TNE, drink 37 cans of beer, bring your dollar, and a key of chain. Anyway, our pole in this week, is Connecticut College through Time.

In 1911, when it all began, the hell kind of coming on in the prettiest little city of New London Cobblestone streets were
CASE #1
ACCUSED: Student A
ACCUSER: Campus Safety
CHARGE: Illegal Keg
PRECAUTION AT TRIAL: Student A
EVIDENCE: Written Statements, Confiscated Keg

DISCUSSION:
Student A had a party at his/her off-campus home, at which two kegs were present. The party ended early and Student A's friends left, leaving him with one full, unattended keg. Student A stated that she/he didn't want the keg to go to waste, so she/he brought it into campus in the back of a friend's van. After attending an all-campus party and rounding up a few friends, Student A drove the keg to the area outside one of the dormitories.

Student A then tapped the keg illegally while it was in the back of the van. At that time, approximately 10 of Student A's friends began drinking from the keg. Student A stated that they were all of legal drinking age and that no minors were served. After about 10 minutes, a crowd of about 25 people gathered around the van. A Campus Safety Officer noticed the crowd and investigated. At that time, she/he found the keg, and notified Student A that the keg was not legal. The keg was confiscated. It was picked up the next day by Student A.

Student A stated that she/he wasn't sure if it was illegal to have the keg tapped in the back of his/her van, but also stated that she/he "knew [she/he] was breaking some kind of rule" and that she/he was "trying to get away with it." She/he stressed the fact that only his/her "age" friends drank from the keg and that no underage students were served. She/he stated that she/he had his/her first offense, and that she/he didn't want to disrespect the College or its rules, and that it wouldn't happen again.

DECISION:
Guilty of Illegal Keg
For: 6
Against: 0

REASON:
Student A admitted to having an illegal keg, tapping it, and serving from it. She/he further admitted that she/he knew she/he was breaking a College rule.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Board recommended a conference meeting with David Brailey (Health Educator) to discuss the alcohol policy, specifically that regarding kegs. They also discussed liability when serving alcohol.

All Board members were present. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.

CASE #2
ACCUSED: Student A
ACCUSER: Campus Safety
CHARGES: Damage to College Property, Violation of Fire Code, Endangerment
EVIDENCE: Written Statements
PRECAUTION AT TRIAL: Student A — Accused, House fellow A — Witness

DISCUSSION:
Student A lit two candles in his/her room at approximately 10:00 p.m. Shortly thereafter, several friends came over his/her room to hang out. Student A and some of his/her friends consumed alcohol at that time. At about 11:30 p.m., he/she and his/her friends left his/her room, with the candles still burning, and went to go dancing at an all-campus party that was taking place in the Student Center. She/he confessed to leaving haphazardly out of his/her room because he/she and his/her friends were in a rush to get to the dance. At approximately 1:45 a.m., while doing the rounds, a Campus Safety Officer heard a smoke detector going off in one of the rooms in Student A's dorm. As he/she looked at the windows, he/she could see flames in one of the windows. The Officer pulled the dorm fire alarm, found the fire in Student A's room, and extinguished it with a fire extinguisher.

The fire burned the surface of Student A's desk, creating a burn mark. Student A returned to the dorm and was upset to hear about the incident. She/he immediately sought out his/her House Fellow and Campus Safety. She/he stated in the trial that she/he still has his/her two candles in his/her room but has not lit them since the fire.

Student A admitted that she/he knew lighting candles in his/her room was a violation of the C-Book fire regulations. She/he stated that the fire was an accident and was very apologetic.

DECISION:
Guilty of Damage to College Property
For: 6
Against: 0

Guilty of Violation of Fire Code
For: 6
Against: 0

Guilty of Endangerment
For: 6
Against: 0

REASON:
Student A was found guilty of damage to college property, by admission, because his/her desk was clearly burnt. She/he was found guilty of violation of fire code, by admission, because she/he let two candles in his/her room and also because they started a fire. Finally, she/he was found guilty of endangerment because by lighting his/her candles and leaving them unattended, she/he clearly endangered the lives of his/her dorm members.

RECOMMENDATION:
In the case of damage to college property, the Board decided to give Student A a letter of censure since the damage to his/her desk was fairly small.

In the case of violation of fire code, the Board has fined Student A $150 and has also made it his/her responsibility to remove all candles from his/her room, both effective in an immediate manner. The fine is a standard fine for violation of fire code and the candle removal was done for the obvious reasons.

Finally, in the case of endangerment of his/her fellow dorm members, the Board requires that Student A does 24 hours of unpaid work for physical plant. We have requested from physical plant that these hours be spent doing fire safety activities such as refilling fire extinguishers. These work hours are to be completed by the end of the Fall 1996 semester. The Board also mandated that Student A submit to the J-Board Chair a 10 page paper on the fire that took place at Providence College several years ago (in a similar situation) which incinerated a dorm and took the lives of several students.

For: 5
Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Josh Fasano '98 abstained because he/she was unsure that the actual damage to the dorm fit the harshness of the sanction.

REASON:
The Board generally found Student A to be sorry for his/her actions and were thus lenient when considering the charges of damage to college property and violation of fire code. The Board was however, upset that the candles were still in Student A's room and thus mandated their removal.

In the case of endangerment, the Board felt it needed to be extremely firm. Although the actual damage to his/her desk was minimal, the potential damage was great. The fire which Student A's candle set was found relatively by accident. Had the Campus Safety Officer not heard the fire alarm and not taken immediate action, it is clear that Student A's dorm and his/her dorm residents would have sustained great damage. By lighting his/her candles and leaving them unattended, he/she made a decision with life-threatening consequences. The Board assigned him/her a large number of work hours as a punitive measure. The Board also assigned him/her the report so that she/he would come to understand the consequences of his/her actions.

All Board members were present. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.

CASE #3
ACCUSED: Student A, Student B
ACCUSER: Campus Safety
CHARGES: Damage to College Property
EVIDENCE: Written Statements, Witness Statement
PRECAUTION AT TRIAL: Student A, Student B

DISCUSSION:
Student A and Student B went to an all campus party. They began dancing on the window ledge. They then proceeded to dance on top of one of the open windows that are just above the ledge. The hinged glass on the window that they were dancing on broke and the window fell. The glass on the window was not broken, but the hinged glass was.

The incident was observed by Student C and was reported by Student D who was running the party but did not see the incident.

Student A and Student B admit to dancing on the window and admit that it was broken due to their weight. They did not report it being broken because they claim to have seen a maintenance person repairing the window. They stated that they did not know who to tell it was broken and assumed that the maintenance person had taken care of it.

DECISION:
Guilty of Damage to College Property
For: 6
Against: 0

REASON:
Student A and Student B both admitted to breaking the window and a witness reported it.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Board recommended that Student A and Student B pay the cost of the damage to the window. This was a total of $236.60. The Board decided that each should pay half of that amount coming to $118.30 each. The Board felt this was a fair amount to pay for the repairs.

For: 6
Against: 0

Abstain: 0

REASON:
The Board felt that Student A and Student B were sorry for their actions and were willing to pay for the damages.

They took full responsibility for their actions.

ATTENDANCE: All Board members were present. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.

CASE #4
ACCUSED: Student A, Student B
ACCUSER: Campus Safety
CHARGES: Student A: Failure to Comply with Fire Regulations, Underage Drinking, Nuisance to the Community in the Form of Disturbing the Peace
Student B: Failure to Comply with Fire Regulations, Nuisance to the Community in the Form of Disturbing the Peace
EVIDENCE: Written Statements, Witness Statements

PRESENT AT TRIAL: Student A — Accused, Student B — Accused

DISCUSSION:
On a night, Student A, Student B, Student D, and Student E went on their way to an all-campus party. They stopped by Dormitory A so that Student D could pick up a dollar for the admission fee to the dance. As Student D went up to his/her room, Student A, Student B, and Student E waited on the first floor. Moments later,
**Case #6**

**ACCUSED:** Student A and Student B

**ACCUSER:** Student A and Student C

**CHARGES:** Possession of an Unauthorized Keg, Underage Drinking, Presence at an Unauthorized Keg, Underage Drinking, Deception

**EVIDENCE:** Written Statements, Housefellow Statements

**PRESENT AT TRIAL:**

- **Student A — Accused**
- **Student B — Accused**
- **Student C — Accused**

**DISCUSSION:**

The Board found Student A and Student B to be guilty of the charges of Possession of an Unauthorized Keg, Underage Drinking, Presence at an Unauthorized Keg, and Deception. The Board noted that Student A and Student B were present at an unauthorized keg and engaged in underage drinking. Student A and Student B were found guilty of violating the Student Code of Conduct and were required to complete community service as a result.

The Board stressed the importance of responsible behavior and the consequences of violating community rules. Student A and Student B were advised to reflect on their actions and take steps to improve their behavior.

**ATTENDANCE:**

All Board members were present. The case was heard by the full Board.

**CASE #5**

**ACCUSED:** Student A

**ACCUSER:** Campus Safety

**CHARGES:** Underage Drinking, Unauthorized Entry

**EVIDENCE:** Written Statements

**PRESENT AT TRIAL:**

- **Student A — Accused**
- **Student B — Accused**
- **Student C — Accused**

**DISCUSSION:**

The Board found Student A to be guilty of the charge of Underage Drinking. Student A was found guilty of violating the Student Code of Conduct and was required to complete community service as a result.

The Board emphasized the importance of personal responsibility and urged Student A to reflect on their actions and make changes to ensure compliance with community rules.

**ATTENDANCE:**

All Board members were present. The case was heard by the full Board.
REASON:
Student A was found guilty of Possession of an Unauthorized Keg by his/her own admission and by the social host clause which states that because the keg was in his/her room, she/he is responsible for it. Student B and Student A were found not guilty because the Board believed it was not their keg.

Student A, Student B, and Student C were all found guilty of underage drinking by their own admission. Student A was sorry for it. Student B stated that she didn't think underage drinking was a big deal and that she/he felt it was "silly" that she/he was being brought before the Board for it. Both accused said they knew it was illegal to drink underage, but Student B thought it was OK because his/her drinking doesn't affect others. Student C was found not guilty of underage drinking because she said she/his drinking was ok because Housefellow A couldn't remember if she/he saw him with a beer or not.

Student B was found guilty of deception because she/knewingly and willfully led Housefellow A into believing that she/he would turn himself in to J-Board. Student B had more than simple opportunity to turn himself in. Student B never turned himself in.

Student C was found guilty of deception as well. She/he too told Housefellow A that she/he would turn himself in and she/he knew to do so by a large amount of time. While Student C claimed that she/he was unclear about how to turn himself/herself in, the Board found that she/he had ample opportunity and information to do so.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Board recommended that Student A pay a $75.00 fine for failing to sign out a living room. $75.00 was chosen because it is the cost of the refundable deposit required to sign out the room. The board also felt that Student A should meet with Dean of the College Arthur Ferrari to talk about honor and about underage drinking. Finally, the Board felt that Student A should work 28 hours of unpaid work for the Arboretum. All of these measures should be carried out by the end of First Semester.

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Student B was sanctioned heavily for actions that will be explained below. She/he too was given a one hour meeting with Dean Ferris to discuss the honor code and underage drinking. This meeting was held separate from Student A and Student B's. Student C was also given 20 hours of unpaid work with Dining Services as a punitive measure. The meeting and all of the hours must be completed by the end of First Semester.

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Student B was sanctioned heavily for actions that will be explained below. She/he too was given a one hour meeting with Dean Ferris to discuss the honor code and underage drinking. This meeting was held separate from Student A and Student C's and can be extended at the Dean's discretion.

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Abstain: 1 Josh Faisano '98 abstained because he stated he was biased after he perceived Student B to have threatened him during the trial.

REASON:
The Board felt that Student A was relatively sorry for his/her actions. However, the Board also felt that strong action should be taken because Student A willfully tugged the keg, even though she/he knew it was illegal. The Board was glad that Student A came forward and took responsibility for his/her actions. Nonetheless, the Board was unhappy to see that Student A had an illegal keg when it is relatively simple to have a legal keg in a signed out living room.

The Board felt that Student C was relatively remorseful for his/her actions as well. While the Board understood that Student C may have been unclear about how to turn himself/herself in, they also felt that she/he had ample opportunity and information to do so.

The Board sanctioned Student B heavily for his/her actions for several reasons. First, Student B had prior offenses involving illegal kegs. Second, Student B knowingly and willfully deceived Housefellow A into thinking that Student B would turn himself in. Even knowing that she/he was guilty of possession at an illegal keg and underage drinking and even after Housefellow A gave him numerous chances to turn himself in, Student B came before the Board only after being formally charged by Student Life. Furthermore, on the night of the incident, Student B tried to prevent Student A from taking responsibility for his/her actions. The Board believes that these acts of willful and intentional deception a violation of the honor code and a violation of the sense of honor which governs our community.

Finally, the Board felt that Student B was absolutely unreasonable for his/her actions. Student B stated that she/he thought his/her offenses were "no big deal" and that she/he felt the whole trial was "silly." Student B also stated that: "if I knew all this BS was included in the honor code, I wouldn't have signed it."

The Board found his/her attitude both before and during the trial to be absolutely inappropriate and thus she/he was sanctioned heavily. Student B stated that she/he knew that she/he was being brought before the Board for being at illegal kegs was "a few hours in Harris," and she/he also stated that she/he thought this was an ineffective punishment.

ATTENDANCE:
All Board members were present except Courtney Blair (coordinator) who had an excused absence. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.

Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Student B: Not Guilty of Theft

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Guilty of Deception

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Reason:
Student A and Student B were both found not guilty of theft because the board could not prove that they had stolen or taken the extinguisher from anywhere other than the middle of the road. The board believed that the two just found the extinguisher and they did not consider this theft.

Student B was found guilty of violation of fire code because she/he did not discharge the extinguisher. Both Student A and Student B were found guilty of deception. Student A was found guilty because she/he tried to hide the extinguisher from Officer A. Student B was found guilty because she/he lied to Officer A and told him that she/he did not discharge the extinguisher.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Board recommended that Student A receive a letter of censure and that she/he perform six hours of unpaid work for dining services to be completed by Thanksgiving Break.

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Abstain: 0

The Board recommended that Student B receive a letter of censure, a $150.00 fine, a meeting with the J-Board Chair for four hours, and six hours of unpaid work for dining services, all of which should be completed by Thanksgiving.

For: 6 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Josh Faisano '98, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Abstain: 0

The Board felt that six hours of work in dining services was an appropriate punishment for the two charges of deception. Both accused intentionally tried to deceive the Campus Safety Officer in an effort to get out of trouble.

Student B was given the $150.00 fine as a standard fine for violating the fire code. She/he was also given a meeting with the Chair because the Board thought that she/he should educate him about honor, especially because she/he didn't really understand how she/he deceived the Campus Safety Officer.

ATTENDANCE:
All Board members were present. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.
J-Board log, ctd.

CASE #8
ACCUSED: Student A
Student B
ACCUSER: ... and Josh Faisano '98 who both had excused absences. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.

EVIDENCE:
Written Statements, Witness Statements, Housefellow Statement

PRESENT AT TRIAL: Student A - accused
Student B - accused
Student C - witness
Student D - witness
Housefellow A - Housefellow/witness
Student E - witness
Officer A - Campus Safety

DISCUSSION:

Student E had a group of friends over to his/her room. Among them were Student B and Student A. Student B and Student A admitted to drinking heavily before going over to Student E's room. Both also admitted to drinking a great deal more once reaching Student E's room. Because Student A was drunk to the point of passing out, several of his/her friends brought him into the bathroom and put him in one of the stalls.

At about 2:00 am, before Campus Safety arrived, Student E asked his/her friends to leave. Student B then went into the living room to talk with his/her friends some more. There, she/he claims she/he was goofing around with some friends. She/he claims to have jokingly ran after one of his/her friends, tripped over the leg of a table in the room, and thus went falling through the living room window. Both of his/her arms were through the window and she/he received cuts on both arms. At about that time, Campus Safety received a noise complaint and were dispatched to Student E's room to investigate.

After breaking the window, Student B left the common room and went into the hallway where one of his/her friends told him that they had brought Student A to the bathroom and that Student A was really drunk. Student B then went to check on Student A in the bathroom. None of the witnesses recall or knew anything about how all the glass bottles got broken in the bathroom that evening. They stated that they don't believe Student B or Student A broke them, but most witnesses don't remember much of the time in the bathroom.

Student B stated that she/he found Student A passing out in the stall and decided to talk him back to his/her room to "sleep it off." With the aide of Student F, Student B started helping Student A off the floor and decided to put Student A to the infirmary. Neither she/he nor any of the witnesses could recollect or testify that she/he did it. Finally, she/he was not guilty of the events of the night due to alcohol use.

DECISION:

Student A: Guilty of Underage Drinking
For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Guilty of Underage Drinking: 0

Not Guilty of both counts of Damage to College Property:
For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Not Guilty of Nuisance to the Community:
For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Student B: Guilty of Underage Drinking
For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Guilty of one count of Damage to College Property (for the window): For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Guilty of one count ofDamage to College Property (for the bathroom):
For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

Guilty of Nuisance to the Community:
For: 5 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99
Against: 0

REASON:

Student A was found guilty of underage drinking by his/her own admission and by the overwhelming preponderance of evidence that indicated that she/he was drunk. She/he was found guilty of breaking the window because it was his/her own admission and by the overwhelming evidence that she/he was really intoxicated. Student B, too, claimed to be unsure of the events of the night due to alcohol use.

A's best interest to spend the night in the infirmary. There, when asked if she/he was injured from the window breaking, Student A looked at himself, and proceeded to urinate on the Campus Safety Patrol car. The officers transported him to the infirmary and then left the scene.

Approximately, two hours later, Officer B and Officer C were called by the nurse at the infirmary because Student A was causing trouble. Student A had climbed out of bed, urinated on the floor and refused to get back into bed. As the Campus Safety report says "it took an ammonia inhalant and several minutes to get him to comply." Finally, Student A got back in bed and Campus Safety again left the infirmary.

Student A claimed she/he has no recollection of any of his/her incidents with Campus Safety or later in the infirmary as she/he was severely intoxicated. Student B, too, claimed to be unsure of the events of the night due to alcohol use.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Board recommended that Student A meet with Dean Catherine Wood Brooks, Dean of Student Life, to talk about his/her excessive drinking. Student A is also on Alcohol Probation until the end of the academic year. This means that if she/he is brought before the board for another alcohol related violation in that time, the board will automatically convict him/her. Moreover, Student A was found guilty of nuisance to the connected with the window breaking. She/he was not guilty of the other witness claims that she/he was in the bathroom. Finally, Student A was found guilty of nuisance to the Community because she/he was being loud in the common room and in the bathroom.

The Board recommended that Student B pay for the damage that she/he did to the window. Furthermore, the board recommended social probations for Student B until she/he graduates from Connecticut College. Finally, the board recommended Student B do 24 hours of unpaid work for Dining Services by Christmas.

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

For: 3 Rachel Gaines '97, Eric Olson '97, Stacie French '98, Craig Dershowitz '99, Elizabeth Wohl '99

Against: 0

The Board felt that based on the board's recommendation, the board's recommendation, and the fact that Student B put the Dormitory A Living Room off line for a few days while the window was being fixed was also taken into account.

The Board felt that based on the board's recommendation, the board's recommendation, and the fact that Student B put the Dormitory A Living Room off line for a few days while the window was being fixed was also taken into account.

The Board felt that based on the board's recommendation, the board's recommendation, and the fact that Student B put the Dormitory A Living Room off line for a few days while the window was being fixed was also taken into account.

ATTENDANCE:

All Board members were present except Courtney Blair (coordinator) and Jo Fako '98 who both had excused absences. Representatives from the Class of 2000 were not elected yet.
Students protest Prof's dismissal

This letter was submitted for publication in the Tuesday column but networking confusion was not printed until this week. On Wednesday of last week, 76 members of the faculty and administration received this letter by e-mail. The letter was taken.

One of the students involved in the protest told the Daily Campus that they were upset. "I understand this is a student right issue, but we were not consulted." The student also said that "this feels like a violation of the student body rights." The letter was written in response to the dismissal of Professor Goldstein.

Professor Goldstein's departure marks a potential void in the gender studies curriculum, particularly concerning the contributions of women in color of the United States, Gay and Lesbian Studies, and the critical theoretical perspective she has brought to the campus. It was a sad day for all of us who have studied under her. The letter states that Professor Goldstein's teaching first has been instrumental in the development of the field of gender studies.

In the letter, the students write: "In our estimation, Professor Goldstein has provided the most current and ambitious education. We would like to ask the people who wrote these letters to think about what they have done.

The students argue that the college should have consulted them before making the decision to dismiss Professor Goldstein. They write: "We would like to stress the need for a gender studies department with a full-time tenure track position to be fulfilled."

The letter ends with a call to action: "We would like to encourage everyone to contact the editor last week regarding 'Schmoozing.'" The letter concludes: "We would like to ask the people who wrote these letters to think about what they have done. It seems to us these individuals have something, intended to be funny, and turned it into a political issue. There is a potential void in our gender studies program."

Hints for revision by Lisa Hawkins '99

Why would some people rather pull out their teeth than write? Much of the frustration is due to the fact there is no clear-cut method to writing. A universal set of rules that people can master to make themselves good writers does not exist. Styles differ as much as snowflakes; changes are no two alike. Maintaining a strong sense of efficiency without a vast amount of time pains difficult. One hope for us lies in improving our revision techniques.

Revise, revise, revise. A trip to the revision is a trip to the future. Look at yourself. Ask your friends. More than likely, all of you have different and even obscure revision practices. Find what is important enough to make you laugh. Unfortunately, the letters to the editor last week regarding "Schmoozing" have terminated the column. We would like to ask the people who wrote these letters to think about what they have done. It seems to us these individuals have something, intended to be funny, and turned it into a political issue. There is a potential void in our gender studies program.

2) Filter your ideas, making sure the paper is not boring. How good are your language skills? Does your language forceful enough? (Avoid using words similar to "maybe" and "seems.")

3) Explore the actual language of the paper. (It does little good doing this earlier since much could be changed in the previous steps.) Are there confusing sentences, ambiguous, redundant phrases, repetition? Ask yourself these questions: "Is the writing clear?"

4) Focus on grammar. Are there proper punctuation and word choice? How is the subject verb agreement? Have I used the correct tense?

5) Finally, GET RID OF TYPOS! Spellcheck doesn't help, your bottom line does not affect her the same rights and modes of recourse that are accorded to tenure track professors. Although we realize that non-tenure track professors do not have the inalienable right to a procedural review, the dismissal of Professor Goldstein is a blatant example of the obvious injustice of such a precedent. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution. This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students. Dr. Goldstein challenges her students with an academically and intellectually challenging course load. Some students accustomed to receiving "B's may be shocked to receive "C's" — or no grade at all and advice for the loss of a teacher.

Professor Goldstein will always be here next year, and the implications of this reality are far-reaching. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution. This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students.

Professor Goldstein's departure marks a potential void in the gender studies curriculum, particularly concerning the contributions of women in color of the United States, Gay and Lesbian Studies, and the critical theoretical perspective she has brought to the campus. It was a sad day for all of us who have studied under her. The letter states that Professor Goldstein has provided the most current and ambitious education. We would like to ask the people who wrote these letters to think about what they have done. It seems to us these individuals have something, intended to be funny, and turned it into a political issue. There is a potential void in our gender studies program.

2) Filter your ideas, making sure the paper is not boring. How good are the ideas? Are there enough details? Is the paper too short, too long? Could I change the name? Possible is the name of Connecticut College in the document. (You could also use a name similar to "maybe" and "seems.")

3) Explore the actual language of the paper. (It does little good doing this earlier since much could be changed in the previous steps.) Are there confusing sentences, ambiguous, redundant phrases, repetition? Are the words used consistently or too passive? Is my language forceful enough? (Avoid using words similar to "maybe" and "seems.")

4) Focus on grammar. Are there proper punctuation and word choice? How is the subject verb agreement? Have I used the correct tense?

5) Finally, GET RID OF TYPOS! Spellcheck doesn't help, your bottom line does not affect her the same rights and modes of recourse that are accorded to tenure track professors. Although we realize that non-tenure track professors do not have the inalienable right to a procedural review, the dismissal of Professor Goldstein is a blatant example of the obvious injustice of such a precedent. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution.

This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students. Dr. Goldstein challenges her students with an academically and intellectually challenging course load. Some students accustomed to receiving "B's may be shocked to receive "C's" — or no grade at all and advice for the loss of a teacher.

Professor Goldstein will always be here next year, and the implications of this reality are far-reaching. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution. This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students. Dr. Goldstein challenges her students with an academically and intellectually challenging course load. Some students accustomed to receiving "B's may be shocked to receive "C's" — or no grade at all and advice for the loss of a teacher.

Professor Goldstein will always be here next year, and the implications of this reality are far-reaching. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution. This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students. Dr. Goldstein challenges her students with an academically and intellectually challenging course load. Some students accustomed to receiving "B's may be shocked to receive "C's" — or no grade at all and advice for the loss of a teacher.

Professor Goldstein will always be here next year, and the implications of this reality are far-reaching. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution. This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students. Dr. Goldstein challenges her students with an academically and intellectually challenging course load. Some students accustomed to receiving "B's may be shocked to receive "C's" — or no grade at all and advice for the loss of a teacher.

Professor Goldstein will always be here next year, and the implications of this reality are far-reaching. She teaches the most current perspectives in Gender and Woman's Studies and her departure is an already irreplaceable area of study at even greater risk. That a college that was originally a women's college would show such apparent disregard for the fate of its gender programs is a disgrace to our reputation as a progressive institution. This disregard is illustrated in the dismissal of an outstanding professor who is essential to the core of the program and popular among students. Dr. Goldstein challenges her students with an academically and intellectually challenging course load. Some students accustomed to receiving "B's may be shocked to receive "C's" — or no grade at all and advice for the loss of a teacher.
The College Voice will not be published next week. We extend wishes for a happy Thanksgiving to the entire campus community and their families.

Campus is lacking in senses of humor

Hey you!!! Yeah the one without the sense of humor! Ok, we're sorry, we guess that description is too general since many of you seem to have forgotten how to laugh. We are of course referring to the articles that appeared in last week's voice regarding the "Schmoozing" column. If you become so insulted by a broad statement such as "big but female" that you want an entire Connecticut College tradition like "Schmoozing" to be canceled, then we'd like to give you a wake up call. Soon you'll be forced out of this cocoon of political correctness into a harsher society where you'll need to know how to laugh at yourself and others in order to survive. Someday, you'll be thankful if you can find such a means of escape that forces you to step back and smile at life and all its quirks. As students of the campus, that is what "Schmoozing" does for us. A good laugh is hard to find. Take it where you can get it.

Jamie Burns '97
Claudia Bum's '97
Adriana Torres '97

Dessert & dialogue

On October 30 in Lamblind Livingroom, Cathy Horne hosted a Dessert and Dialogue called "To Play or Not to Play." The discussion there included why coaches push athletes so far, and comparing the importance of the sport to the athlete and to the coach. Do some coaches push athletes to play when injured? Alvariscussed was why do athletes insist on playing when they could aggravate an injury? The relative importance of sport was compared to that of academics, and philosophies of taking away athletics as a punishment for poor academic performance were also discussed.

On Sunday, November 3, Michael Adelson hosted, "Why My Music? A discussion of Music Taste." He spoke about why we listen to what we listen to and made an interesting point about which never had really been put in such a way. He said that the more we love music, the less music we love. We find this to be true in my own listening habits. The more I get into the style of music I listen to, the less music I appreciate the love that people have for their kind of music as I have for mine.

From our point of view we cannot see any reason for the deletion of the columns. Many of you seem to have forgotten how to laugh. We are of course referring to the articles that appeared in last week's voice regarding the "Schmoozing" column. If you become so insulted by a broad statement such as "big but female" that you want an entire Connecticut College tradition like "Schmoozing" to be canceled, then we'd like to give you a wake up call. Soon you'll be forced out of this cocoon of political correctness into a harsher society where you'll need to know how to laugh at yourself and others in order to survive. Someday, you'll be thankful if you can find such a means of escape that forces you to step back and smile at life and all its quirks. As students of the campus, that is what "Schmoozing" does for us. A good laugh is hard to find. Take it where you can get it.

Peace and Love,
The Overnight White Anglo-Saxon Prost(etan: Ethan Colgate Rosser

The administration position is that there has not yet been sufficient development to ensure that the nations will adapt to the new political arrangements of the Dayton Peace Accord and will slip back into war. In fact, tensions have increased as all three factions - Serb, Croat and Muslim - have become increasingly bold in initiating small attacks against each other. For Clinton, who does not need Congressional approval to send troops that will likely arrive before Congress is in session, this recent decision could possibly indicate the future of foreign policy as he begins his second term. It is not the presidential campaign, debate on the future of U.S. involvement in Bosnia was conspicuously absent. Republicans have accused Clinton of being intentionally misleading prior to the elections about the Bosnian issue, claiming that he never intended to unconditionally end the U.S. presence in Bosnia. Clinton, defending the lack of discussion regarding Bosnia, claimed that the substantive difference between him and Republican presidential nominee Bob Dole was essentially non-existent and therefore was not an appropriate topic to highlight facing an upcoming election. Within a week following the election, however, Clinton alluded, at a press conference, to the fact that the Christmas deadline to withdraw troops would not be met and that the U.S. would continue to maintain a powerful presence in the region.

QUAKER HILL VILLAGE BARBER SHOP

STYLIST

HAIRCUTS $9
$1 off with this ad.
18 Old Colchester Rd.
Phone: 439-1916
(Right out back of College, straight 1 mile. Left on Old Colchester, across from Firehouse.)

MYSTIC'S ARMY NAVY STORE

Downtown Mystic
Army & Navy Surplus Clothing
Belts - berets - bandanas - backpacks - more!

Open Seven Days & Nights
Fax & Notary Services
(860) -536-1877
37 West Main Street
I.M. Update: Freight Train, Wet Edge win titles
By Chris Capone

The culmination of the Fall Intramural Season reached its pinnacle with final games being played in soccer and football this past Sunday. In I.M. Football the Superbowl match featured Sully’s Kids and Freight Train and, like freshman year end of season, was far from pretty. Chris Capone opened up the Freight Train offense by throwing for three interceptions on the opening three drives. Part of the reason for this was the quick threat of genital torture from fellow Freight Train teammate Vin Talamo if he didn’t perform. Capone was

able to relax and bear down throw-
ing three touchdown passes the rest of the way. (Authors Note - I do not mean to poke fun at the incred-
ibly serious problem of genital tor-
ture, however in this case since the geni
ts at stake were mine I feel that all groups offended should take this into consideration. I have writ-
to my Congressman and sought psychological help. Thanks for your consider-
ation.) The first of which was to Freight Train Captain Bill O’Malley who was beaten by his own teammates after crossing the goal line. Sully’s Kids would come
close when on the final drive of the first half, Freight Train connected with Kevin Ward for an easy seven points. Asked to comment on the touchdown pass, O’Malley stated, “This was the most exciting an liberating ex-
perience since waking up face down in a pool of my own vomit this morning.” In the second half Freight Train would pull away as Aaron DeMaio would beat Mark Driscoll for yet another score this season. With time running out, Sully’s Kids made one last attempt to score but was intercepted by Gregg McNeil on a play which was more confus-
ing then Kyle Moek’s acceptance to this school. Gian Giordano would add an insurance touchdown at the end to make the score 21-7. Sully’s Kids was hurt by the loss of Derek Hass who was severely in-
jured when he accidentally sat down on the thumb which he had placed in the huddle. I.M. Athlete of the Week - Aaron DeMaio one touchdown, two cham-
pionships, a number of references to his sexual prowess in The Voice, and an incredibly inflated ego as a result of all these factors.

A Hard Act To Follow...

by Tim Sheflin

Last year the Con College men’s hockey picked up the pieces of a disappointing 5-16-4 ’94-’95 campaign, and put to-
gether their best season in recent memory. The season was high-
lighted by their first ECAC Quarterfinal in six years and an amazing 11-game unbeaten streak. Calling it an unbeaten

wreck is unfair when you con-
sider it was made up of a tie followed by 10 straight Camel victories. They finished the sea-
son at 16-7-1 overall, and 12-5-1
in the ECAC East. This year the Camels hope to build on last sea-
son and once again qualify for the

ECAC tournament.

Improving on such a great sea-
son will be a tough task, but Conn is returning 18 players including their leading scorer Dave Kessler (20pts) and Dave Gechowski. Gechowski was second in goals scored last season with 16. Other key offensive returnees are Gerry Rinn and Curt Wilcox. Wilcox III the larg 10 times last season while Rinn netted 13 of his own. These four seniors are make up the offensive nucleus of the ’96-97 team.

The Camels will get a chance to see how they stack up to the

best team in Division III when the head up Middlebury, VT to face Middlebury College on No-

vember 22. Middlebury has dominated Division III hockey for the past decade, and has even considered the possibility of jumping to Division I. For now, however, the Panthers are stay-
ing put, giving Conn a chance to pull off a great upset. While in

Vermont, Conn will stop a

Nor-

wich who they beat 5-2 early last season.

If all goes exactly as planned, when the Camels play their ninth game of the year on January 11, at Amherst, Coach Doug Roberts will be celebrating more than a NECCAC win. Roberts will have picked up career victory number 200 as coach of the Connecticut College team. Even if the Camels don’t start out 9-0, Conn has a great chance to improve Roberts

reach that plateau.

Conn has a lot at stake this season. While last year’s success surprised Conn College lost in the ECAC and national elite, a strong season this year would be evi-
dence of a program ready to be-
come a potential power. The Camels finished last year ranked eighth in the ECAC East. If they stay in the top 10 again this year, they would be making a serious statement.

Wet Edge soaks Guster in IM soccer final

The first half saw a single goal, and intense defense. Curran Ford

connected a pass to TJ Green to put

Guster on the board. There was a lot of contact, mud, and sliding in the field to close the half. Wet Edge knew they had come out strong to gain control, but Guster was ready to take an even larger edge to secure the victory. The second half had Wet Edge goalie Kyle Sheffield all over the box, defending his goal with life and limb. Forcing the ball into Wet Edge’s scoring half meant two goals for the WE. Ken Meyer had a breakaway, resulting in the ball flying through the posts into the net. Toby Elmore had a scramble that led him to push the ball past the Guster defense for another goal. That made the score 2-1 in favor of the Wet Edge. Guster regained control, and came close to evening the score. But Sheffield cleared the ball far up field with one minute left. Guster tried a strategic play of

pulling the goalie to put everyone on offense. This plan lasted few seconds, and the goalie was put back. But the whistle blew, and the war had ended. Bodies limped off the green. Some were elated, some only thought of what could have been. As the gray and blue Lauren flew through the air to congratulate, the defeated could only think of next year. There are rumors that CONNecตก messages have already

been written. The victorious put the

labels of "Champions" plastered across their chests. The author of this article will go unrecognized, as no name was available at the time of publication. Ed.

HELP WANTED

Men/Women earn $480 weekly assembling circuit boards/electronic components at home. Experience unecessary, will train. Immediate openings your local area. Call 1-520-680-7891 EXT C200
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### Sailing '96: Team of Champions

**by Carolyn Tribble**

The Connecticut College sailing team has been on a roll this fallseason. The team placed third overall in the Women'sNavy regatta last week and has moved up to seventh overall in the nation. The team is being led by Captain Morgan Bunnell '98 and Coach Greg Skidmore. The team has been working hard all season to improve their sailing skills and has shown great improvement in the last few weeks. The team has a strong bond and is working well together, which is a key factor in their success.

### Ultimate Frisbee: A Tense Season

**by Tim Hebra**

Ultimate frisbee is a popular club sport at Connecticut College, but it has faced some challenges this year. The team is trying to improve their skills and has been working hard in practice. The team has had some exciting games, but they have also faced some setbacks. The team is looking forward to the rest of the season and is hoping to improve their ranking.

### Club Sports Lack Support

**by Todd Klarin**

Club sports at Connecticut College are facing some challenges this year. The team is trying to improve their skills and has been working hard in practice. The team has had some exciting games, but they have also faced some setbacks. The team is looking forward to the rest of the season and is hoping to improve their ranking.

### Athlete of the Week

This week, the athlete of the week is basketball player *insert name here*. The player has been a key contributor to the team this season, showing great skill and dedication to the game. The player is a leader on the court and is always looking to improve. The player is a great asset to the team and is a role model for other players.