Robert Landau

That's right, another article on the draft. It appears that there still exists some doubt as to the seriousness and danger of a peacetime draft. First, it must be realized that the potential for another attempt at enactment of draft registration is very real next year. Secondly, it must be realized that an astute awareness and an active lobby on "our" part is of paramount importance in retarding the present pro-draft drive. "Our" being the 19 to 26 year olds who will be subjected to this onerous registration requirement.

A serious delusion recently echoed states that the Congressional legislation is simply to reinstate registration, NOT to reinstate the draft. Let's be realistic, if it's not the draft that we would be registering for, what would it be, a ping pong tournament? This issue goes far beyond the mobilization capabilities of the Selective Service System. The S.S.S. is the cornerstone of the system of compulsory military service. Its sole function is to provide inductees for the Armed Forces. The shift from the service's current stand-by status to an active mode signals a return to a system of conscription.

Furthermore, proponents of pending bills have made it clear that they view the return to a Selective Service registration and classification as a major step towards phasing out all Volunteer Force and returning to a draft. It would be a good idea to face the music before this thing is rammed down our throats.

A presidential study is due in January, but let us do our own scrutinizing of the draft. All of us bore witness in the 1960's to the Southeast Asian conflagration. The draft provided a ready vehicle to obtain military manpower which enabled our leaders, without any accountability, to involve our nation deeper and deeper, in that bitter and unnecessary struggle. The draft had been manipulated to serve adventurist goals of foreign policy. The lessons of Vietnam must not be forgotten. A peacetime draft facilitates the possibility of starting or entering (another) war.

The typical response on the part of draft proponents is that the youth of this nation owe something to society and its government. The absolute equation of the state with society is assumed in this argument. What we should "owe" however, is a resistance to the bad ideas of people in government. Thousands of youths made sacrifices for their country during the Vietnam war. These sacrifices meant disruption of, and often the losing of, their lives, for reasons they didn't understand. These same sacrifices were later to be rationalized by top officials as a grave mistake.

Serving our nation when its future is truly at stake is a different story. For that matter, so are civil service obligations and other types of nonmilitary service.

Continued on page 3
THE SPARK is finally back!

Its early history began with the NEWSLETTER, which was an independent, alternative newspaper to the old PUNDIT. After its first year of existence, the NEWSLETTER became THE SPARK. It is our every intention to remain the alternative, slightly radical newsmagazine of Connecticut College.

THE SPARK is an editorial newsmagazine with its focus on our College community. We feel that it is our duty to publish articles about issues, both campus and local/national/international, which affect our lives as students, faculty, administrators, or just concerned Americans. We intend to constructively criticize (as well as voice our disapproval when necessary) issues and policies which we feel need improvement and to support those which will be beneficial to the College community and our lives. We urge letters of agreement or disagreement with THE SPARK. It is important for us to have your input so that we may better serve the College community. We look forward to the College community’s support in the upcoming year.

If you have listened at all to 91.5 FM you must realize that the college radio station is now on the air. WCNI is a student run radio station managed by an elite group of students at Connecticut College. Being a College club, the station receives a substantial portion of its budget from the Student Government Association. You may wonder from where exactly does the SGA obtain the money to subsidize a radio station, especially if you are a freshman or transfer student. The answer is simple enough: it comes from a definite, earmarked, percentage of each student’s tuition—it is student money.

With this in mind, you might expect that this student station would employ only students as disc-jockeys or other personnel. Indeed, over eighty persons tried out for only thirty-nine time slots. But no! The station is only student run. The elite management has seen fit to choose on air personnel who are not presently enrolled members of the student body, and thus pay no tuition, when in fact there is an excess demand from the student body for these highly coveted time slots. We, the student body, are therefore subsidizing disc-jockeys who are not part of this community. Of course, if a disc-jockey were from the Coast Guard, this situation would be different: since Connecticut College and the Coast Guard Academy have always shared facilities.

If this situation bothers, or even outrages you, it is imperative to have your voice heard. Write to the radio station, the media, or complain directly to your SGA representative. WCNI is a College owned and run station, and is therefore directly responsible to the student body for all its action. This situation should not be tolerated.

Special thanks to:
Sunday Afternoon Blues
But that is not the issue at hand. The militarist legislators in Washington are specifically referring to registration in the armed forces. As several studies have shown, there do exist alternatives to a peacetime draft. Perhaps with a more positive professional and imaginative military leadership, along with the continuing elimination of nitpicking, demoralizing regulations and requirements, the volunteer army will continue to supply us with the necessary manpower. Conscription should be the last resort of a nation facing imminent threat. It must rest upon the interest of national security, what James Madison called "the impulse of self preservation". The government has a duty to prove to the public, that such a drastic step as conscription is absolutely necessary today.

Chairman Bill Butterly asserts that "The government has no right to deprive any young person of their rights to live their life free of government control. If the bureaucrats think they need more men let 'em draft the bureaucrats."

Bill Butterly

Every young person, especially we students here at Connecticut College, should be concerned about plans to reinstate the draft and/or registration. That is why Conn. College Young Americans for Freedom has made opposition to the draft its top priority for this semester.

In recent days, the college YAF Chapter has been passing out pamphlets door to door to inform students why they should actually be against the reinstatement of the draft. YAF's main argument is that the draft runs counter to American principles. As conservatives, YAF members believe strongly in the promotion and protection of individual liberty. They see the draft as contrary to the protection of the 13th amendment against involuntary serfdom. They site the fact that the continuation of the draft was passed in the 1940's by only one vote, and that conservative senator, Bob Taft, called the move "totalitarian."

In addition, the YAF argue that the draft is less efficient because it trains men at great cost only to have them quit after two years because they didn't want to be in the army in the first place.

Further, the YAF organization believes that the service-men who are drafted pay a high price in lost wages they could be making in the private sector.

As an alternative, YAF suggest a continuation of the all-volunteer army with the increased pay scale enough to make the job attractive to more and higher quality recruits.

The YAF pamphlet blames the future of the present volunteer on the government saying, "because today's government bureaucrats are as inefficient and ineffective with the volunteer army, as they are with most other government programs the bureaucrats claim their only solution to America's military problems is to draft you!!"
**Noise Pollution**

Barbara Fried

I would like to address the problem of noise on this campus. Although there appears to be sufficient student frustration with the noise level to warrant some type of action, none has been taken to date.

The type of noise of which I speak is caused by total inconsideration. In this sense, noise made by one who, although living in a college community, does not ascribe to the social contract theory. This person is different from the person who generates noise but is more civically minded. They are equally disturbing.

In light of the campaign against partying by... the administration...

Bruce Liebman

Immediately before last semester's spring break, the Health Services Committee met with the college’s physician, Dr. Murphy. The intent of the meeting was to report the results of a recent student poll which had indicated general satisfaction with infirmary care, especially the gynecological services provided by the semi-retired Dr. Murphy. At the HSC meeting, Dr. McKeehan announced that the administration was considering cutting out much of the infirmary services. Proposed changes included reducing the nursing staff, closing down the in-patient overnight service, and firing Dr. Murphy. HSC and the SGA did not support the proposal, as both bodies were highly angered that their views on the matter were apparently ignored by the administration. The ousting of Dr. Murphy was not economically sound as two people would have to be hired to replace him—one nurse practitioner and a physician on call every other night. HSC sent a letter to the president of the school, the Secretary-Treasurer, and to Mr. Schlassinger in which the committee stated its reservations concerning the proposal. It asked that the members be notified before any action was taken.

But after returning from vacation, HSC learned that Dr. Murphy had not been asked to return for the fall. The committee learned this fact through student rumor confirmed on confrontation by Dr. McKeehan.

After an SGA forum with Dean Alice Johnson and Dr. McKeehan, SGA decided that pamphlets outlining the situation would be printed up and distributed during parents' weekend describing the administration's disregard for student input. After considerable debate, SGA chose not to defy the administration by writing the letter; in part this decision was due to the administration's refusal to give SGA access to the computerized addressing system and in much larger part due to the spring fund raising season.

Soon after a considerable number of parents questioned the logic of the proposed plan, SGA and the Board of Trustees agreed that the administration had handled the issue poorly and expressed concern about the "communications problem" which existed. The administration then agreed to let SGA contribute input to Oakes Ames' summer letter on the issue. The letter was sent out over the summer, but there was no student input. Only a small paragraph dealt with the issue in a vague, passing manner.

After the Trustee's meeting, it became clear that the issue warranted strong follow-up attention. A new ad-hoc committee was formed to investigate the issue and make recommendations to the administration. This committee consisted of one trustee, two advisors from outside institutions, three administrators, students Seth Marcus and Janice Mayer, three doctors, and six parents.

The committee met several times over the summer, with the bulk of its time taken up drafting proposals modifying the administration's initial proposal. While delaying a decision on Dr. Murphy's possible retention... Continued on page 6
Despite a degree of caution, and perhaps a bit of reluctance, Conn. College has acknowledged an issue of vital importance outside campus boundaries. This most recent attempt to widen the scope of educational concerns was the Conference on Nuclear Energy and Health (sponsored in part by Chapel Board), which was held on October 12 & 13. It was held in Palmer Auditorium.

Both the evening session and the following day of workshops were host to an impressive and diverse panel of specialists in various aspects of nuclear energy. Each 15 minute introductory presentation was concise and informative, flashing a glimpse of the complexities involved in approaching the issue of nuclear energy-its risks and its benefits. Consequently, as the Conference progressed, many questions were asked, and still more left unanswered.

The evening began with Sister Rosalie Bertell revealing test results on the correlation between three factors: radiation exposure, aging (particularly premature), and susceptibility to leukemia. Her admittedly frightening conclusions prompted her keen observation that we must question whether this society is, in fact, able to recognize, and ultimately deal with, the reality of radiation effects. Considering where our energies are focused, as a country, it seems clear that nuclear health hazards are not yet a primary concern to Americans. More specifically, have we, as college students, recognized these risks as serious ones?

Speaking on the subject of alternative sources of energy was Dr. Howard. A "facts and figures man", he showed that while the U.S. uses nuclear power for 3% of its total energy consumption, Connecticut uses 17.5% nuclear energy for its power! The important point, however, is not the relative use of nuclear over petroleum or gas, but the significant factor lies in the country's emphasis (1) on ever increasing energy consumption, and (2) on its existing preference for exhaustible, rather than renewable, energy resources.

There is a need to research these renewable sources of solar, wind, waste, and geothermal energy. Finally, Dr. Howard placed most of his faith in the concept of "Energy Management". This concept would entail great reductions in fuel wastes—especially in the areas of transportation and electricity—In addition, efforts could be made to reduce and reallocate demands on specific energy sources.

The voice heard from John Cagnetta of Northeast Utilities was clearly and understandably defensive. Although the conference was not officially anti-nuclear, the seriousness of the controversy along with the ramifications, as college students are not widely known to be concerned about "outside" problems. Still, there is no excuse for the poor attendance at this Conference. Even if the worldwide or nationwide scale of the nuclear issue is beyond the scope of Conn. students, certainly we could show more interest in our local situation! This college sits in the center of 3 (potentially 4) nuclear power plants. Increased

We cannot afford to leave the debate over nuclear energy and its health risks in... manipulative hands.
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NUKES

radiation exposure, and
higher taxes to cover the
costs of possible accidents.
With so vital a controversy,
we cannot afford to leave
the debate over risks in the
manipulative hands of politi-
cal businessmen. We have
our health, if not our entire
future, at stake. The nuclear
issue demands some serious
attention and a conscientious
effort by all of us. But, as
Sister Bertell asked, are we,
indeed able to deal with
these dangers honestly? If
so, it will be the most im-
portant and necessary step
toward arriving at a worth-
while resolution to the ever-
increasing danger of the use
of nuclear reactors and mate-
rials.

HEALTH

the committee did endorse
much cost-saving measures as
eliminating the infirmary's
own production of food, re-
leasing one nurse, cutting
back on some beds, and in-
stituting a self-help cold
clinic. Crucially, though,
the administration did not
agree with the committee on
Dr. Murphy's future status
here. When students return-
ed in September Dr. Murphy
was no longer practicing
here.

The committee then foc-
used attention on students'
rights in the matter. It
recommended that transport-
ation to town in emergency
cases must be arranged and
paid for by the infirmary and
not by students, as had oft-
en been the case in the past.
Also, student member Mayer
requested that the college
lawyer be placed on the com-
mittee. Disturbingly remin-
iscent of the earlier "commu-
nications gap" is the fact
that the lawyer has yet to
appear in committee.

The present position of
the issue is this: The chan-
ges made so far constitute a
trial semester for the in-
firmary. A questionnaire ask-
ing students' opinions of
the infirmary will be sent
to every one in November.
Mayer has stressed the imp-
ortance of having a very
large response on these. The
more the students respond on
this issue, the greater the
credibility and strength of
the ad-hoc committee to det-
\termine policy. It must also
be stressed that while trus-
tee and student opposition
to the administration al-
tered the latter's plans, the
trustees do not have actual
'veto power' over adminis-
trative decisions. This writ-
er's discussion with the
three most recent student
trustees last weekend indi-
cated, however, that the ad-
ministration is "seriously
concerned" about student and
committee views on the issu-
e. The future will reveal
how much of a "communicat-
ions problem" still remains.

NOISE

Contrary to popular conception,
it would not be contingent on
recitation of Locke's Social
Contract, rather a sincere ac-
ceptance of responsibility in
this community. It is to this
end that the undercurrent of
exasperation with the noise
problem should be directed.

Recycle this paper
Jim Francese

1
Silence in fear, it is not right.
Fear is a demon who burns a wicked sight.
lovers—Estranged, people I have known well.
Silence is but living hell.

2
To be trapped in silence—god
What pain!
How to make it right again?
Unable to speak, for
Unspeakable fears
Trapped in silence, how the demon eeks!
God help me—let
Her speak first.
To be trapped is silence is what I fear worst.

3
I shouted and screamed, but not a word fell.
Silence is but living hell.

QUESTIONS

Jim Francese

Who are you? they say.
(the breeze is blowing warm today)

What is it you have been?
(the sun is smiling a great wide grin)

What is it you will be?
(the fish are dancing in the sea)

Can't you speak, have you no tongue?
(let's go outside and have some fun)

Come; Let's go; He's mad, can't you see?
(why can't they just let me be)
Truth in Testing?

Bruce Liebman

Most Conn. students are aware of the law which permits one to see any written test, many can not: thus the New York law hopes that by equalizing the testing process for everyone, the disadvantaged students can gain some measure of their academic strengths and weaknesses. Enactment of the law, however, will be a boon to those coaching courses, since they will have actual tests to work with.

Were it not for the increased cost and the obvious unfairness of ever-increasing numbers of students who will profit from cram courses competing against students who are not able to take prep courses and thus do as well, the law would still be objectionable on philosophical points. The first is that it is the government that is trying to rectify deficiencies in the educational testing system. The second problem is the numberOf students taking standardized tests just as there are truth in packaging and truth in advertising laws. This notion indicates a crude attempt to transfer the consumer ideology of the sixties and early seventies to a non-business sector of society.

The number of students taking standardized tests has been increasing every year. Apparently, these test-takers have not been too perturbed they would never see their graded tests. Governmental regulations in the educational sector have been a continual bane to many colleges and universities. The truth in testing law not only curbs the E.T.S. E.T.S. is aware of the tests' major influence as an admissions criteria, yet it also warns against abuse and over-dependency on scores. One wonders whether this law would even exist if the scores had not declined, and the need to redress the obvious "injustice" of lost prestige. In the end, E.T.S. is treated as the messenger who brings bad news. Perhaps if the government establishes its own test service, in the same way it formed and then proceeded to run into the ground the Postal Service, Amtrak, and Social Security, we will realize that the problem of declining achievement is the fault of the public school system and not that of an efficient testing corporation like E.T.S.

Ostensibly, government issue regulations in order to protect individual rights. What "right" is being protected by this law? E.T.S. is merely the scapegoat of the rational problem of plummeting verbal and math skills. In our increasingly fragmented and individualistic society, it has become the norm to expect and even feel entitled to certain rewards and privileges. Thus, when students do poorly on their college boards, the government officials who are responsible for the administration of public education immediately conclude that the fault lies with the slightly imperfect standardized tests. E.T.S. is aware of the tests' major influence as an admissions criteria, yet it also warns against abuse and over-dependency on scores. One wonders whether this law would even exist if the scores had not declined, and without the need to redress the obvious "injustice" of lost prestige. In the end, E.T.S. is treated as the messenger who brings bad news. Perhaps if the government establishes its own test service, in the same way it formed and then proceeded to run into the ground the Postal Service, Amtrak, and Social Security, we will realize that the problem of declining achievement is the fault of the public school system and not that of an efficient testing corporation like E.T.S.