$120,000 lost to taxpayers in anti-student redevelopment

Documents reveal losses on 110 Harrison Avenue

Curt Mills
Staff Writer

In an era of mounting federal budget deficits, it is often easy for Americans to identify examples of fiscal waste at the national level. Some residents of Williamsburg, however, contend that their own city government is a rather egregious example of wasteful spending.

Since early 2006, the city has lost approximately $120,000 of taxpayer money in a seemingly-bungled purchase, renovation, and subsequent resale of a Harrison Avenue home, an action that, according to some, was meant to deny a potential off-campus housing location to William and Mary students.

Critics allege that not only has the deal been immensely wasteful, but that corruption on the part of city officials may have led to the deal.

In 2005, 110 Harrison Avenue was a residence available to rent, both for students and non-students alike, but was traditionally inhabited by students. In early 2006, David Kranbuehl, a chemistry professor at the College and the president of the Home Owners’ Association of West Williamsburg Heights entered into contract to purchase the property for $277,005, roughly $120,305 above the assessed value of the property. He then assigned the rights of the contract to the Williamsburg Redevelopment and Housing Authority (WRHA). Both transactions have yet to be fully explained and have been subject to some, was meant to deny a potential off-campus housing location to William and Mary students.

Nearly unanimous: Members of the Honor Council voted almost unanimously against a change supported by seventy percent of the student body.

Honor Council refuses to honor student vote

Steven Nelson
Editor in Chief

The Honor Council rejected at its October 25 meeting a proposal to alter the organization’s by-laws. The proposal was to change the number of members of the nominating committee needed to reject a student candidate from four-fifths to unanimous. Although seventy percent of student voters supported the change when it was voted on in a referendum on October 1, only three of the twenty-four members of the Council voted for the change.

Prior to the vote, members of the Council debated the utility of the change, which was presented by member Eric Robinson (’12). Mr. Robinson reported that the Rules committee had discussed the proposal over the previous week. The nominating committee is a five member group comprised of two non-returning members of the Council, one representative of the Dean of Students office, one at-large faculty member, and one at-large student. The committee has the
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Former BOV member attacks Norment’s employment

Mason Watson
Editor at Large

Government and law professor Tommy Norment has recently come under scrutiny for his dual employment at the College of William and Mary and in Richmond, where he serves as a Virginia state senator. Mr. Norment, who has been a member of the House of Delegates since 1992, joined the William and Mary faculty in the summer of 2008. He receives $160,000 annually for his work at the College. As a member of the Virginia senate finance committee, Mr. Norment has sponsored a bill allocating nearly $20 million to the College. Norment also provides legal advice to the College administration, though the extent of his duties as a legal advisor is unclear. William and Mary president Taylor Reveley has defended his decision to employ Mr. Norment, saying that the state senator has a real and important function at the College. “The work Senator Norment does as a William & Mary employee is substantive and demanding,” Mr. Reveley said in a press release. “From the beginning of his time at William & Mary, the Senate has provided me with legal counsel,” he added. “He continues to do so while also now working closely with our Coordinator of Legal Affairs.”

Mr. Jost also believes that Mr. Norment’s salary of $160,000 per year from the College is unusually high. “A full professor with tenure in the government department makes $110,000 per year,” Mr. Jost said.

Regardless of the role that Mr. Norment may play as a legal advisor, Mr. Jost holds that it is unnecessary for the College to employ any more legal counselors. “Does the College really need another lawyer when we have all these folks at the Attorney General’s office who are for the most part prime lawyers?”

Brian Whitson, a representative of the College’s office of University Relations, has defended Mr. Norment’s employment. “Senator Norment has provided valuable counsel to the president’s office on many occasions in his role as a legal advisor,” Mr. Whitson said. “It is unknown, however, how many times Mr. Norment has actually met with the administration. ‘It’s not the sort of the thing we keep record of,’ Mr. Whitson said, “and even if we did, discussions and working papers between the president and his advisors are not the sort of information we distribute.”
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City of Williamsburg gets Twitter account

The city of Williamsburg has joined the 21st century, as a colonial settlement in a digital age, and has begun tweeting its latest news, events, and various functions on the social networking site twitter, which the city hopes will be able to broaden its ability to reach residents. The city’s account is at twitter.com/WilliamsburgGov, and the city is encouraging all residents of Williamsburg to begin following for updates. Eventually the city hopes that the account can be used for bill reminders and crisis communication also. This would greatly improve the ability of the city to communicate with its residents because Twitter can be accessed easier than e-mail for many people, according to the city.

Debauchery downstairs: Plans for the Green Leafe Underground, a “cosmopolitan” restaurant and club, were released last fall. The new student friendly night time venue will not have much longer to wait. A ‘cosmopolitan’ vibe which Gormely notes, “When it comes to catering more fully to students be- cause, Wilson notes, “When it comes to bars and clubs on feature- ing the scope of damage that oil spills can cause. The Virginia Institute of Marine Science participated in a drill in the York River that was meant to simulate a possible oil spill scenario. In cooperation with a myriad of federal and state agencies, the respondents simulated various scenarios that could be conceivable. During the daylong drill the response communication, equipment, and other plans were all tested in the name of improvement for a possible future response because of the risk posed by significant shipping traffic and the naval station’s reserves. The VIMS operational suite used the opportunity to test their oil containment booms, which are essential in limiting the scope of damage that oil spills can cause.

Duke Of Gloucester one of America’s ‘best streets’

DoG Street has been named one of America’s 10 great streets by the American Planning Association. At 9am on October 31, 2009 there was a brief ceremony during the last farmer’s market of the year on DoG street, according to the City of Williamsburg to commemorate this honor. “APA singled out Duke of Gloucester Street for its unique ability to evoke the past at the same time it maintains a lively mix of modern-day uses,” according to the city. CEO of Colonial Williamsburg, Colin Campbell and College President Taylor Reveley were present to receive the award from the former president of the American Planning Association, Robert Hunter. Jesse Vasold named homecoming queen

The college elected its first transgender homecoming queen during the homecoming festivities last weekend. Jesse Vasold (11) accepted the honor on the football field during halftime. The school garnered some publicity from both the Washington Post and the O’Reilly Factor on Fox News Channel. The campus community stood behind their choice for junior class queen, and has not backed away from the controversy that this event has spurred. When asked to comment for the O’Reilly Factor the College Republicans, Young Democrats, and Lambda Alliance all refused.

VIMS involved in oil spill drill

On October 28 the Virginia Institute of Marine Science participated in a drill in the York River that was meant to simulate a possible oil spill scenario. In cooperation with a myriad of federal and state agencies, the respondents simulated various scenarios that could be conceivable. During the daylong drill the response communication, equipment, and other plans were all tested in the name of improvement for a possible future response because of the risk posed by significant shipping traffic and the naval station’s reserves. The VIMS operational suite used the opportunity to test their oil containment booms, which are essential in limiting the scope of damage that oil spills can cause.

Students eagerly anticipating the opening of the “Green Leafe Underground” may not have much longer to wait. According to Tony Wilson, manager of the Green Leafe Cafe, the bar hopes to open their doors no later than December of this year.

Jessee Vasold accepted the honor on the football field during halftime. The school garnered some publicity from both the Washington Post and the O’Reilly Factor on Fox News Channel. The campus community stood behind their choice for junior class queen, and has not backed away from the controversy that this event has spurred. When asked to comment for the O’Reilly Factor the College Republicans, Young Democrats, and Lambda Alliance all refused.

This is a special feature article, not part of the regular news coverage of the college. It has been produced for the benefit of students at the college and is available at no cost for another year of the greater Williamsburg community. However, copies should be taken if they are meant to be read and enjoyed. Letters to the editor are welcome and can be submitted via e-mail or mail.

Mission Statement

The Virginia Informer is produced by students at the College of William and Mary. The opinions expressed in articles, photos, cartoons, or ads are those of the writers (or creators). This is an independent, non-profit organization devoted to reporting the news to the William and Mary community. We exist to provide an alternative to school sponsored news sources. We do not, and never will, receive any financial support from the College of William and Mary. We will not shy away from controversy or be afraid to challenge the norm. We strive to inform and engage our readers via responsible journalism and in-depth reporting, while fostering and giving voice to opinions that are often shut out by the campus establishment.
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Rejection against majority of student vote
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power to remove student candidates from running for the Council. Proponents of the reform suggested that a unanimous decision would empower the one-at-large student representative.

Brian Focarino ('11) said that he supported the current requirement of a four-fifths majority to reject a student. “Eighty percent already seems to be quite substantial,” said Mr. Focarino. Chase Hathaway ('10) clarified the composition of the nominating committee is not primarily made up of Honor Council members and said, “it’s not like it’s the Council.” Dean Gilbert is one member of the nominating committee.

John Donehey ('10) suggested that all five members of the committee should need to vote in favor of allowing a student to run, the exact opposite of the proposal passed by 70% of voters in the student referendum.

Andy Rudd ('11) was most vocally in favor of adopting the change. He said, “I think it would be irresponsible for us not to move forward with this.” Honor Council Chair Bailey Thomson ('10) said, “we do have bigger fish to fry” but insisted that the change was worth debating. Bailey Thomson ('10) said, “we do have bigger fish to fry” but insisted that the change was worth debating.
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The data was gathered shortly after 9/11 and seeks to refute common stereotypes and misconceptions of Muslims and Islam as a whole. The film aims to present the data in an accessible and aesthetically engaging way. Several experts appear in the film, such as Georgetown professor John Esposito and Da—lia Mogahed, Executive Director of the Gallup Center for Muslim Studies. They declare their mission to inform the public and act as a bridge between the U.S. and the Muslim world. With empirical data, they want to show that the two worlds have similar concerns and values.

Research directors in most of the Muslim-majority countries of the world interviewed people face-to-face in the local language, observing local customs in order to build trust. They asked interviewees of all ages and socioeconomic backgrounds questions, such as what they respected most about their own society, what they found lacking in their own development, what they did or did not respect about the West, the values they wished to teach their children, and general questions about marriage and relationships.

Once they gathered the data, they evaluated the responses under categories such as gender equality, religion, policy, and terrorism. In the film, Esposito stresses that the hard data should “speak for itself” in order to “deconstruct the cliché images” Westerners have of Muslims and vice versa.

For example, Muslims view Shatta as the rule of law much like the Bible represents core values for many Christians. While many non-Muslims think negatively of Shatta and associate it with the political doctrine of a “fringe minority” of extremists, Muslims see it as borrowing protections from God that no government can seize. The experts in the film note the role the media plays in exaggerating the population of those Muslims that resort to violence.

According to the data, most Muslims command Western culture for our democratic ideals, liberties, and freedom of speech. However, they disagree largely with American policy. As an example, the film presented the statistic that, according to data gathered in 2002, 3% of Kuwaitis held an unfavorable view of Canadian foreign policy, as opposed to 67% towards U.S. policies.

In regards to terrorism, the poll asked about the moral justifiability of such acts post-9/11. 11% of responders stated that the terrorist actions were completely justifiable, yet as Mogahed stated, not a single person justiﬁed their answer with a verse from the Quran. They ﬁt the proﬁle of a “revolutionary rather than a religious zealot.” Furthermore, jihad contains positive connotations to Muslims, as they view it as an internal struggle for improvement. According to Mogahed, when we associate that term with terrorists, we give them “moral legitimacy they don’t deserve.”

In a film full of percentages and comparisons, the experts in “Inside Islam” stress the importance of understanding what the mainstream believes about their own faith and separating it from what the media portrays. They realize the data from the poll will not alter stereotypes overnight or even within the next few years. However, taking the time to learn about a culture viewed negatively and exposing such information to the public can dispel misunderstandings and steer foreign policy and relations in a more harmonious direction.

Get The Education You Deserve

**ISI Membership Benefits**
- Receive a 15% discount on tuition to the Intercollegiate Review
- Compete for graduate fellowships
- Host campus lectures and debates
- Obtain financial support for alternative student newspapers
- Network with leading sociologists
- Develop leadership and career skills
- Attend conferences and seminars
- Membership discounts on ISI Books
- Membership in loyal ISI group

**Intercollegiate Studies Institute**
P.O. Box 4431
Wyckoff, NJ 07481-0431
(800) 576-7022
members@isi.org

MEMBERSHIP IS FREE! JOIN ISI TODAY!

**Christian theologian speaks to College**

Jordan Bloom
Arts and Culture Editor

Ravi Zacharias, theologian, evangelist and defender of the rationality of the Christian faith, preached to a standing-room-only audience last Tuesday in the Sauder Center. The lecture, titled “Jesus Among Other Gods” was jointly sponsored by several campus ministries, including Inter-Varsity. A lecturer at Oxford and Cambridge, and author of more than 20 books, Zacharias prefaced his sermon with an invitation to “question if what [I] say corresponds with the world as we can test it.”

Students and a remarkable number of community members packed into Chesapeake, crowding around the sides of the room and sitting on the floor. Many came from local churches, especially Williamsburg Community Chapel, where Zacharias spoke the day before.

He combined logic, history, and colloquial anecdotes to argue that Christianity offers the best answers to “life’s big questions.” Despite his philosophical bent, he spoke in the folksy aphasisms of a pastor.

He has earned headlining spots at Urbana and the Veritas forum—telling stories of his encounters with sheiks, diplomats and celebrities, always culminating in a spiritual lesson just a bit too pithy and poetic to feel real.

Zacharias sees his role as a “classical evangelist in the arena of the intellectually resis—tant,” and explores answers to universal philo—sophical questions from a Christian point of view. When he speaks, he draws on a broad array of anecdotes, from Buddha’s rejection of Hinjun’s Vedas and the caste system—one to demonstrate that all religions aren’t essentially the same—to the United Nations. It has the effect of bringing the full gravity of world history behind his arguments.

Zacharias was especially critical of post—modern and atheistic thought, stressing the “unmitigated hubris” of writers like Richard Dawkins; he contended that an unquestioned atheistic framework was irrational and far less complete in its philosophical answers. Dawkins himself acknowledges a lack of a satisfying answer to the origin of life, sexual—ity, morality, and consciousness.

Zacharias argued for the reality of evil, cit—ing some of the most extreme and detestable examples of humanity, such as Stalinist Rus—sia and the Southeast Asian child sex trade, as violating an essential human purpose, ful—filled and defined, he argued, by a Christian God.

Raised in India, Zacharias experienced a spiritual awakening when he was 17 and suicidal. On his hospital bed, he vowed to change the course of his life and devote the remainder of it to exploring the Christian worldview. Since then, he has become one of the world’s most visible and well-regarded apologists, speaking at the National Day of Prayer and at Virginia Tech in the wake of the 2007 shootings. Most recently, Zacharias published a book consisting of a series of hypothetical conversations between Jesus and Krishna. He exited Wednesday night to two successive standing ovations.
**Blame It on the Alcohol**

Strawberry beer brings best of both worlds

I have blacklisted both Trader Joe's and Bloom for the time being since I have yet to find any beers there that really wow me. For this reason, I decided to head to Fresh Market for this issue's featured beer. Fresh Market's beer selection isn't by any means extensive — it's just a small refrigerated section of wall space to the far left side of the store — but there are a few local beers and microbrews that make the trip semi-worthwhile.

Another interesting perk of Fresh Market is that you can make your own six-pack, which I initially planned to do. I soon realized, however, that most of the individual beers that I had to choose from to customize my six-pack were standard U.S. beers and imports.

The more that I thought about it, the stranger it began to seem that anyone would purposely buy and then drink such different beers. I will admit to sometimes scavenging my refrigerator after midnight, when the stores are no longer selling alcohol, and downing a Milwaukee's Best after first drinking a Stella Artois. Desperate times call for desperate measures. Deliberately drinking a beer whose primary function is filling beer pong cups after finishing one that is meant to be enjoyed, is a criminal act... not to mention dissatisfying. I may have slightly exaggerated the implications of creating one's own six-pack, but it really isn't that appealing to me. I would rather have six of one type of beer so that I can share it with friends and be able to form a concrete review. This would not be possible if I had six different beers.

Needless to say, I opted out of the make-your-own option. It also costs $8.99, which, in my opinion, is a little steep. Just as I was starting to get discouraged with my ability to find a good beer, the stars aligned and I discovered Pete's Wicked Strawberry Blonde. Pete's is a very drinkable and light golden lager with a pleasant kick of strawberry flavor. It's not at all the kind of beer that will put hair on your chest or that the average frat guy would buy in bulk for Saturday's tailgating festivities, but I would go as far to say that people who “don't like beer” (one of my housemates) and seasoned drinkers would both enjoy Pete's.

Pete's strikes the perfect balance between the beer and fruit aspects, which together work to create a refreshing and flavorful combination. The strawberry is not so powerful that it detracts from the beer, but it's also not so subtle that you can't taste it. Although Pete's is a fruit beer, it is not a fruity beer. One should not be embarrassed for liking it, nor should it be considered a “girly beer.” The strawberry flavor in Pete's does not hog the spotlight or else it would akin to a wine cooler. Pete's Wicked Strawberry Blonde is overall a casual and affordable beer that I highly recommend trying.

---

**Unrestricted administrator bank accounts provide funding alternatives**

One administrator debunks “slush fund” perception

Steven Nelson
Editor in Chief

According to Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs Mark Constantine, many senior administrators at the College have special unrestricted bank accounts. These accounts are referred to by administrators as “8” accounts because they begin with that number.

Money is deposited into these accounts from vending machine proceeds. The College currently contacts in vending services to Coca Cola. Mr. Constantine says that the amount of money in his office’s “8” account is typically around $11,000 to $12,000 a year. Other offices with such accounts include Residence Life, the Vice President’s office, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Provost’s office, according to Mr. Constantine.

In an interview with The Informer, Mr. Constantine said that these funds are not as restricted as those provided by the state. They are discretionary and intended to enhance the effectiveness of various offices and organizations. Student organizations may request funding from administrators with unrestricted “8” accounts.

The amount of money given to groups, and the rationale for the giving, is determined by offices with these accounts. Some examples Mr. Constantine provided included providing money for student conferences, start-up funds for student organizations, and money to put on special events. The funds can also be used for staff development, according to Mr. Constantine, as the account is “unrestricted.”

One notable use of the account managed by Mr. Constantine’s office was providing money for an MBA program’s softball trip to the University of Virginia, which he noted was done to increase student ability to participate without financial burden. Another use was giving around $400 or $500 to a law student group so that they could attend a conference that did not fit strict conference-defining guidelines that regulated other potential sources of funding.

The “8” account managed by Mr. Constantine’s office has been pejoratively referred to as his “slush fund” by students aware of this source of money. Mr. Constantine told The Informer that students often write proposals for funding from the account, and that receipts are required for reimbursement by his office. There is “no blank check” given to recipients of funding, which may disappoint those who consider requesting money from unrestricted “8” accounts.

**CafMan’s Mailbox**

The food has made me as jumpy as a nervous shrew... Thank you!  
Student

Thanks for the comment. Um um um Have a nice day, LS  
Thurs, October 29

The turkey soup was awful!!! Where the 1000 Island dressing at? And the Reese Puffs! Talk to me  
Student

Thanks for the comment. The thousand Island has been on the salad bar since Tuesday. Reese puffs we will get  
Thanks, LS  
Thurs, October 29
October Student Opinion

Students divided on attitude towards Williamsburg city government, want student candidate elected

More oppose than agree with three person housing ordinance by nine to one margin

Andrew Blasi
Editor at Large

As the Williamsburg City Council grapples with proposed reforms to the three person housing ordinance, just over half of the on-campus student body, 52%, say they hold a positive attitude towards Williamsburg city government; 44.7% hold a negative attitude. Students living on-campus oppose the three person housing ordinance by over a margin of nine to one, with 57.1% in disagreement and 6% in agreement. 36.9% of respondents did not care or did not know enough about the ordinance to render an opinion. Those with a positive attitude toward Williamsburg city government varied significantly between social classes, with 75.3% of freshmen, 47.2% of sophomores, 39.2% of juniors, and 31.3% of seniors holding a positive attitude.

On-campus student opinion regarding the city’s sound ordinance is more evenly divided than the three-person housing ordinance – 36.5% agree with the measure while 42.1% disagree. 21.5% of respondents did not care or did not know enough about the ordinance to render an opinion. Notably, the desire to see one of their own serve on the Williamsburg City Council is significant – 77.7% of students say they believe a student candidate should be elected. Corresponding with this response, 61.4% of respondents said that their interests are very unrepresented or somewhat unrepresented in the current City Council. Similar to the results measuring attitude towards Williamsburg city government, the freshman/social class believes student interests are better represented than older social classes – 50.6% of freshmen, 28.3% of sophomores, 21.0% of juniors, and 10.4% of seniors believe that their interests are currently very well or somewhat well represented.

58.8% of students believe the College administration should be involved or somewhat involved in the current three person and sound ordinance debates while 33.1% believe they should be uninvolved or somewhat uninvolved. In addition, when students were asked if they find the William and Mary Police Department to be lenient or harsh, the results clearly favored leniency – 76.3% said they believe the campus police to be overly lenient or somewhat lenient while 22.3% said they believe them to be overly harsh or somewhat harsh.

The survey data includes the opinions of 233 students, roughly 5.5% of the entire on-campus student population. The sample selection and collection process mirrors the procedures employed by major polling firms as well as the William and Mary Department of Government to ensure true accuracy of the results. Students who participated in this survey were randomly selected on a multitude of levels to make certain that the sample reflects the overall on-campus population of the College. Off-campus students were not included in this survey because it is extremely difficult to do so while obtaining truly accurate results. The Virginia Informer is seeking broader data sources to change this circumstance for our next survey.

Survey Respondent Breakdown

Survey Date: October 26-31, 2009
Gender:
Male - 101 (43.3%)  Female - 132 (56.7%)
Social Class:
Freshman - 81 (34.8%)  Sophomore - 53 (22.7%)  Junior - 51 (21.9%)  Senior - 48 (20.6%)

Attitude by class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
<th>Somewhat Positive</th>
<th>Somewhat Negative</th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student interest represented in City Council by social class

Question: Are student interests very well represented, somewhat represented, somewhat unrepresented, or very unrepresented in the current City Council?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Very Well Represented</th>
<th>Somewhat Represented</th>
<th>Somewhat Unrepresented</th>
<th>Very Unrepresented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Contributors: Jordan Bloom, Will Clements, TD Crowley, Hart Moore, Bert Mueller, Sarah Nadler, TJ O’Sullivan, Alexander Powell, Mason Watson, Michael Young
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Student Opinion Survey Results

Do you believe a student should be elected to the Williamsburg City Council?

- Yes 77.7%
- No 14.6%
- Don’t Care/ Don’t Know 7.7%

Do you find the campus police to be overly lenient, somewhat lenient, somewhat harsh or overly harsh at the College?

- Lenient 76.3%
- Overly 2.1%
- Somewhat 74.2%
- Harsh 22.3%

Do you agree, disagree, or don’t care about the current three person housing ordinance?

- Agree 6%
- Disagree 57.1%
- Don’t Care 25.3%
- Don’t Know 11.6%

Do you agree, disagree, or don’t care about the current city sound ordinance?

- Agree 36.5%
- Disagree 42.1%
- Don’t Care 11.2%
- Don’t Know 10.3%

Behind the numbers...

Sarah Nadler
Managing Editor

The questions posed in The Virginia Informer’s October survey were based upon the following issue areas:

The Housing Ordinance
A current housing ordinance in the City of Williamsburg makes it illegal for more than three unrelated residents to live in the same rental property regardless of its size, number of bedrooms, or age of the inhabitants. The definition of “family” in the Zoning Ordinance regulates the number of unrelated persons that can live in a dwelling unit. This ordinance is commonly referred to as the “three person rule.” There was no limitation in the City’s original 1947 Zoning Ordinance, and was amended in 1983 by establishing a four person limit. The three-person limit was created as a part of the complete revision of the city’s zoning ordinance in 1991. The ordinance has driven up the cost of living off-campus for students and is especially relevant given that approximately 200 students are bumped from on-campus housing each year.

The Sound Ordinance
In an April 17, 2009 decision, the Virginia Supreme Court struck down the City of Virginia Beach’s noise control law which defined excessive noise as sound that would “offend a reasonable person.” The Court’s decision in Tanner, et al. vs. City of Virginia Beach found Virginia Beach’s noise ordinance too subjective, so amendments were necessary. Since the City of Williamsburg used the same vague “reasonable person” standard as Virginia Beach, the law in Williamsburg had to be changed as well. Williamsburg’s sound ordinance moved to a decibel standard in order to be more objective. The ordinance now prohibits sounds in excess of 55 decibels from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. The “large party nuisance” component of the ordinance should be of particular interest to students, as the ordinance prohibits “plainly audible sound that continues unabated for thirty (30) minutes or more, and emanates from a gathering of ten (10) or more people where the gathering is not completely contained within a structure.” Students caught in violation of the ordinance face fines of $300 or more, class 2 misdemeanors, administrative discipline, and court fees.

Campus Police
In recent years the William and Mary Police Department (WMPD) has made a concerted effort to improve relations with the student body. The department had been criticized for perceived overzealous, or “harsh,” enforcement of the noise ordinance, underage possession of alcohol, drunk in public, and other policies. The WMPD is funded primarily through student tuition, but operates as a police force in its own right with full powers accorded to other police forces. During the Spring 2009 semester, members of the Williamsburg Police Department tasered an underage student outside of the Green Leaf for being uncooperative and resisting arrest. William and Mary police do not carry Tasers, but are a visible presence on campus.

Williamsburg City Council
The Williamsburg City Council is composed of five members elected at-large. Currently Jeanne Zeidler serves as mayor and Clyde Haulman serves as vice mayor. Paul Freiling, Robert Braxton and Judith Knudson also serve on the council. Most recently, the council is responsible for changes to the sound ordinance and the addition of the trolley to public transportation. Students registered to vote en masse in 2007 and since then the city has increased efforts to engage the student population and discuss town-gown issues. The past two students to run for the Williamsburg City Council, Matthew Beato (2008) and David Sievers (2006), lost in close election campaigns.
Book Review:

Californication spinoff has rock 'n roll verve

Justin Duke
Staff Writer

While God Hates Us All certainly was not written by Californication's Hank Moody, it certainly exudes a great deal of his irrepressible, cynical verve.

God Hates Us All follows Hank Moody as he embarks on an adventure one part Office Space, one part On The Road, one part Catcher in the Rye. Trapped in a world that manages to contradict any possible conjurations of Americana, the narrator finds himself a college dropout thrown into the not-so-tumultuous whirlwind of corporate drug trafficking.

The narrator isn't exactly content with his situation, thankfully, and he aspires to gain lodging in the Chelsea Hotel, the city's Village for the self-endowed slackers. The majority of the book, then, is defined by his interactions with clientele and his (sometimes weak) attempts at social mobility, and particularly when these two goals become intertwined.

One might notice, the concept of being a slacker with aspiration is not alien to American culture. Still, the pervading tone of Moody's journey is surprisingly energetic and, well, not so moody. As we follow Moody across New York and into in Canada, we are exposed to less wry cynicism and more good-natured enjoyment.

Thematically, the book chiefly explores (besides the obvious motif of the merits of self-medication) the idea of how our private and personal lives interact. As a go-between, Moody deals with what he presents as the raw form of his clients – you don't really hide much from the person who gives you drugs, he posits.

Moody's interactions (which become very emblematic of the New Journalism style that he emulates so well) quickly get classified into ones that are 'sober' and ones that are laced with falsities, and the point that God Hates Us All argues so impressively is that the 'sober' interactions are so rarely made with sober people.

A problem with this idea of genuinity and sobriety is that it reveals that a lot of the heavy inspiration comes from oft-trodden sources. We can see this genuinity with significantly less apollobm in Salinger, and the style with more refinement (or, as Moody himself argues, 'stylistic endowment') in Ellis. And the novel's argument for genuinity and 'breaking away from the sheeple' is significantly undermined by essentially shophifting its argument from the closest Beatnik thrill store.

Ultimately, the book is entirely derivative, owing its profit to its title and its style to Bret Easton Ellis. It shouldn't be discredited for this, however – like an episode of the series to which the book owes its context, it is an engaging and surprisingly optimistic ride.

Music Review:

Lil' Wayne in top form for No Ceilings

Jack Evans
Music Critic

Last month in Miami, Lil Wayne told MTV that he planned on going out as long as the "the studio don't swallow me." These words made me very happy. The studio is where Lil Wayne belongs—specifically, in the studio rightbig. For a second we can all pretend that dreaded rock-crossover album doesn't exist and listen to No Ceilings.

Like the 2007 masterpiece Da Drought 3, No Ceilings is a free mixtape released on the internet in which Lil Wayne basically hijacks other rappers' beats, spewing out line after line of stoned, Freudian, stream-of-consciousness brilliance. It certainly isn't as good as Da Drought 3, but it's the respectable follow-up that some people have been waiting for since 2008's lukewarm The Carter III.

The bizarrely quotable punch lines are there ("You're local news I'm 60 minutes" and "I keep a house full, call me Bob Saget"); and Wayne just demolishes the two Jay-Z tracks, "D.O.A" and "Run this Town," like he previously did with "Show Me What You Got."

Even hornid top 40 like Black Eyed Peas' "I Gotta Feeling" and Kid Cudi's "Poker Her Face" somehow become tolerable. But as on Da Drought 3, Lil Wayne's greatest strength is his attention to detail and vivid storytelling. In these seventeen tracks, the listener can really get a sense of who Lil Wayne is as a person, what his life is like, and how he thinks. Case in point: "Throw it in the Bag (Remix)," Wayne's relationship-ship testimonial about shopping with his girlfriend. He casually drops these relatable details like the "L'Oreal all around the bathroom sink" or how he "bought her a mac now we be iChatting." As opposed to other gangsta rappers, Wayne has never had problem stepping out of his hardened street persona to address the mundane and everyday.

So if you want it to be, No Ceilings is a warm, welcome reassurance that Lil Wayne is still on top of his game and still the self-proclaimed "best rapper alive."

Make an impact on campus...

JOIN THE VIRGINIA INFORMER

The Informer is the only paper at William and Mary that is independent of the College, meaning we report the truth and go in-depth to publish what others dare not print!

COME TO A MEETING:
Mondays at 7:30pm
Blow 331
The Finer Side:

A Tale of Two Letters

Jennifer Souers
The Finer Side

It is the best of times, it is the worst of times. We live in a society today where communication is instant. Too many people think emotions can be more easily read through a colon and end parenthesis than by the body language of a real person. Our generation is more comfortable behind a computer screen than a dining table. And while today’s technological advances help us keep better connected, they also pull us further apart. We may know how to network with others on Facebook, but that won’t help us when we’re standing at a reception in a room full of real people.

So how do we live in a world of technology, yet still maintain the social graces that make “social creatures”? The trick is to find a balance. Technology, when used in conjunction with other social practices, can foster communication.

There is no doubt that Facebook has helped keep us connected to people we may not otherwise stay in touch with. But it should not be a replacement for other forms of communication. Emails take the place of handwritten letters far too often. The problem with solely relying on electronic forms of communication is that it takes the personal element out of interactions. Emailing someone isn’t the same as talking in person. And too often, we say things in an email or a Facebook message that we would never say in person because we don’t have time to look the person in the eye.

Keeping things personal in communication isn’t only for your friends and family, but for your professional life as well. Many employers and career counselors stress the importance of thanking people you interview with after the actual interview. Believe it or not, a handwritten thank you note can actually be the difference between getting the job and losing it. Send a handwritten thank you note – no later than two days after the actual interview. This tells your hopeful future employer that you care about the job, you appreciate the time they took to talk with you, and that you know how to be gracious and courteous. It reinforces a positive lasting impression and will keep your name in the front of an employer’s mind. Also remember to send out thank you notes after receiving a scholarship or grant, attending a dinner, or meeting someone at a reception.

Those personal touches are important in your private life too. Instead of dashing off a quick email, call them later when you have time. Send a handwritten note to a family member. Send out Christmas cards to family members you haven’t seen in a while. And when you’re at those holiday dinners and parties with other family members, remember don’t text and talk. Not every-thing understands how normal it is for us college students to text someone else in the middle of a conversation.

Technology is a wonderful thing and helps us stay connected with people we otherwise may not. But don’t let it become your only means of communication. Remember that an email is never a satisfying substitute for personal interaction.

Dancing in the dark: Dance event was displaying original choreography and student talent for years. In this dance, I felt the need to find the secret spots on campus.

With Halloween season, the hunt to find the secret spots on campus begins. Ghost stories abound, the statue of TJ tries on several costumes, and the trees on campus take on far more eerie shapes than usual once night falls. Hal-loween is the time when students pilgrimage to the third floor of Tucker Hall, the President’s House, and Matthew Whaley Elementary School on ghost tours. I feel that now might be the best point of time that may be two of the most ghostly spots on campus: the College Cemetery and the crypt below Wren Chapel. The two spots hold no ghost stories of their own, but the locations themselves certainly lend an aura to the Halloween spirit that spreads annually through campus. When you enter the Wren Chapel, if you can draw your eyes away long enough from certain brass objects in the room, you will see several plaques mounted above the chapel seating. Take a closer look and you will see names like John Randolph, James Blair, and Lord Fairfax刻在这些牌匾上。These plaques represent different men buried in a crypt below the chapel. The crypt was built in 1695, and the Chapel itself was built over it in 1732. email to your employer. You can do that right now; email to your president. These plaques represent different men buried in a crypt below the chapel. The crypt was built in 1695, and the Chapel itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.

The College Cemetery, located behind Tucker Hall and in front of Monroe Hall, is far more accessible than the burial vaults beneath the Wren building. A faculty meeting in January 1859 established the cemetery for the use of professors and their families, as well as students. The first people placed in the cemetery were actually relatives of President Benjamin Ewell. He was also given permission to exhume the remains of his father, as well as a few other family members, and transfer them to the College Cemetery. The cemetery itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.

The College Cemetery, located behind Tucker Hall and in front of Monroe Hall, is far more accessible than the burial vaults beneath the Wren building. A faculty meeting in January 1859 established the cemetery for the use of professors and their families, as well as students. The first people placed in the cemetery were actually relatives of President Benjamin Ewell. He was also given permission to exhume the remains of his father, as well as a few other family members, and transfer them to the College Cemetery. The cemetery itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.

The College Cemetery, located behind Tucker Hall and in front of Monroe Hall, is far more accessible than the burial vaults beneath the Wren building. A faculty meeting in January 1859 established the cemetery for the use of professors and their families, as well as students. The first people placed in the cemetery were actually relatives of President Benjamin Ewell. He was also given permission to exhume the remains of his father, as well as a few other family members, and transfer them to the College Cemetery. The cemetery itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.

The College Cemetery, located behind Tucker Hall and in front of Monroe Hall, is far more accessible than the burial vaults beneath the Wren building. A faculty meeting in January 1859 established the cemetery for the use of professors and their families, as well as students. The first people placed in the cemetery were actually relatives of President Benjamin Ewell. He was also given permission to exhume the remains of his father, as well as a few other family members, and transfer them to the College Cemetery. The cemetery itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.

The College Cemetery, located behind Tucker Hall and in front of Monroe Hall, is far more accessible than the burial vaults beneath the Wren building. A faculty meeting in January 1859 established the cemetery for the use of professors and their families, as well as students. The first people placed in the cemetery were actually relatives of President Benjamin Ewell. He was also given permission to exhume the remains of his father, as well as a few other family members, and transfer them to the College Cemetery. The cemetery itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.

The College Cemetery, located behind Tucker Hall and in front of Monroe Hall, is far more accessible than the burial vaults beneath the Wren building. A faculty meeting in January 1859 established the cemetery for the use of professors and their families, as well as students. The first people placed in the cemetery were actually relatives of President Benjamin Ewell. He was also given permission to exhume the remains of his father, as well as a few other family members, and transfer them to the College Cemetery. The cemetery itself was built over it in 1732. The crypt is not open to the public and is not even accessible through the Wren Chapel itself. However, a small group of students on campus called the Sportswood Society, has the opportunity to go on a crypt crawl each spring.
To the Honor Council,

Students are dismayed to see your institution reject the wishes of nearly 70% of the student body. It is difficult to get 70% of people to agree on anything, especially on political matters. The student body made its position on reform clear and yet you callously disregarded our wishes. Is it really so much to ask that five members of the nominating council must unanimously reject a candidate from running instead of four out of five? The change we, and the voters, are asking for is not much at all. If a person running is truly so horrible they cannot serve on the Honor Council, why can’t all of committee agree on this before they are removed from the running? Or does the Honor Council truly believe that you are more honorable than the rest of us?

The process of electing those who mete out honor punishments should be open. The entire system is designed for students; however, on this matter you have dug in your heels and said ‘no’ to a change that would make you, and your organization as a whole, more accountable to student opinion. How many people would really be affected by changing this statute? Your refusal to make the changes that student voters want makes us beg the question, what do you really have to lose?

Requiring a unanimous decision to remove someone from running is a trivial matter compared to all of the work that you do. We feel this change would only diminish your power in the slightest way, and yet you refuse to budge.

Despite the overwhelming dismissal of the students’ will, not all of your members are hostile to change. Andy Rudd was one of the most vocal supporters of the change, saying that it would be “irresponsible” for the Council not to move forward with the reform voted on by students. Dimelza Gonzalez-Flores spoke of her support for a compromise approach. The compromise would be the addition of a sixth member of the nominating committee. A possible nominee would have to be rejected by five-sixths of this committee.

Although the proposed “compromise” would make it harder to dismiss a person, this compromise is still a bitter pill to take. You still reject the wishes of student voters and give us a compromise that allows you to retain essentially all of your power. According to your website, your election is “unique” because the candidates are selected without the use of campaigning and run solely on their reputation and status “honorable members of the William & Mary community.” If you fail to compromise, your elections will also be unique in that are overseen by a nominating committee that a vast majority of students found sufficiently dysfunctional, secretive, and undemocratic.

How can we trust you to deal honorably when you refuse to listen to this reasonable request? It certainly doesn’t befit a council whose purview is, allegedly, honor. The referendum came from the Student Assembly as a check on your power. They would not have presented such a question to the student body if they did not believe there was a problem with the status quo. The students have spoken, and so has the Student Assembly, and your refusal to listen paints you as an elitist group of students not interested in honor or democracy, but only in your own stranglehold on the power to select who is able to join you on the Council.

The Virginia Informer thinks this type of behavior is highly unproductive and undemocratic. Acting in this way trivializes our historic honor code itself and endorses the good faith and pride the student body has staked on it. The honor code and its council are here for the students. We urge you to look at this situation seriously and make the necessary change the voters prescribed.

Sincerely,
The Virginia Informer

Staff Editorial:

An open letter to the undergraduate Honor Council

To the Honor Council,

Students are dismayed to see your institution reject the wishes of nearly 70% of the student body. It is difficult to get 70% of people to agree on anything, especially on political matters. The student body made its position on reform clear and yet you callously disregarded our wishes. Is it really so much to ask that five members of the nominating council must unanimously reject a candidate from running instead of four out of five? The change we, and the voters, are asking for is not much at all. If a person running is truly so horrible they cannot serve on the Honor Council, why can’t all of committee agree on this before they are removed from the running? Or does the Honor Council truly believe that you are more honorable than the rest of us?

The process of electing those who mete out honor punishments should be open. The entire system is designed for students; however, on this matter you have dug in your heels and said ‘no’ to a change that would make you, and your organization as a whole, more accountable to student opinion. How many people would really be affected by changing this statute? Your refusal to make the changes that student voters want makes us beg the question, what do you really have to lose?

Requiring a unanimous decision to remove someone from running is a trivial matter compared to all of the work that you do. We feel this change would only diminish your power in the slightest way, and yet you refuse to budge.

Despite the overwhelming dismissal of the students’ will, not all of your members are hostile to change. Andy Rudd was one of the most vocal supporters of the change, saying that it would be “irresponsible” for the Council not to move forward with the reform voted on by students. Dimelza Gonzalez-Flores spoke of her support for a compromise approach. The compromise would be the addition of a sixth member of the nominating committee. A possible nominee would have to be rejected by five-sixths of this committee.

Although the proposed “compromise” would make it harder to dismiss a person, this compromise is still a bitter pill to take. You still reject the wishes of student voters and give us a compromise that allows you to retain essentially all of your power. According to your website, your election is “unique” because the candidates are selected without the use of campaigning and run solely on their reputation and status “honorable members of the William & Mary community.” If you fail to compromise, your elections will also be unique in that are overseen by a nominating committee that a vast majority of students found sufficiently dysfunctional, secretive, and undemocratic.

How can we trust you to deal honorably when you refuse to listen to this reasonable request? It certainly doesn’t befit a council whose purview is, allegedly, honor. The referendum came from the Student Assembly as a check on your power. They would not have presented such a question to the student body if they did not believe there was a problem with the status quo. The students have spoken, and so has the Student Assembly, and your refusal to listen paints you as an elitist group of students not interested in honor or democracy, but only in your own stranglehold on the power to select who is able to join you on the Council.

The Virginia Informer thinks this type of behavior is highly unproductive and undemocratic. Acting in this way trivializes our historic honor code itself and endorses the good faith and pride the student body has staked on it. The honor code and its council are here for the students. We urge you to look at this situation seriously and make the necessary change the voters prescribed.

Sincerely,
The Virginia Informer

Like what you see?
JOIN US.
Informer meetings are every Monday 7:30 p.m. Blow 331
On Hedonism and the philosophy of “whatever”

Seldom has our generation been ascribed a coherent popular philosophy. Don’t we stand for something? Certainly as the self-righteous heirs to our parents’ Boomer decadence and disillusionment, we tend to think of ourselves as the most liberated of all generations; we are tolerant, accepting, and non-judgmental; thank you very much. “Whatever” is our mantra and our automatic response to most inquiries, whether it be in regards to our opinions, desires, or preferences. This attitude is not dismissive. We have a definite preference in all things, but lest we offend, we opt to conceal it.

Despite its appearance, “whatever” is not apathy necessarily, but rather a desire for a cessation of our habitual, pleasure-saturated youth culture. We prefer pleasure. We are a generation of hedonists; we seek the organization and focus of the utilitarian form, where pleasures are divided into high and low, with the highest pleasures consisting of the spiritual intangibles of art, music, and literature and the lower reflecting our basal desires. The lower pleasures have the advantage of being abundant and absurdly easy to come by and what better for us lovers of consumerism and instant gratification? The higher pleasures, on the other hand, are not obtained cheaply and lack the publicity that the lower receive. Even if the rewards of the higher would inevitably make us happier, the attraction of the immediate bestdamnals we matter how ubiquitous. The introversion pro-vided us by drugs and sex when selectively indulged in can profoundly move the spirit. Undoubtedly, the pursuit of pleasure is why we live. Being so vi-tal to our lives, why must we be so indiscriminate? Assuredly, we are not in danger of running out of alcohol or finding willing sexual partners. Does it not seem unnecessary that we pursue so fiercely, constantly, and recklessly?

Who am I to call it reckless? Perhaps, we are not hedonists, but libertines. We love pleasure, all pleasure, unapologetically. Scruples are a vice of the past. There is nothing empty or incomplete in this lifestyle. We have everything in excess and are epicurean to the extreme. Is this what we ought to be living and striving to be? We self-called he- donists have a popular phrase we tend to throw about: “Don’t judge me.” For example, “I’m going to get wasted tonight. Don’t judge me,” or “If I hook up with him, don’t judge me.” Why, in our robust confidence, would we even care to beseech others not to judge our actions? Why should we care? Perhaps we realize that there is hollowness, a shallowness in our intellectual reasoning, when we wallow exclusively in the prevalent lower pleasures. Why and how have we forgotten to judge our-selves and reflect critically on our actions? Only by actively questioning ourselves can we learn how to obtain the pleasures we truly seek rather than just take what we can get. The refusal to reflect displays a key weakness in this mindset. Truly we cannot claim any philosophy that refuses self-examination to be a lifestyle appropriate to reasonable people. This lifestyle’s rejection of self-reflection seems to posit “non cogito ergo vivo” (“I don’t think therefore I live”), which rejects our very humanity and leaves us as not much more than mere beasts.

Despite its appearance, “whatever” is not apathy necessarily, but rather a desensitized expression of our habitual, pleasure-saturated youth culture.
Tailgating without tailgates

Michael Watson
Editor at Large

In the most predictable event in the history of student politics at this College, our esteemed Honor Council has once again decided to ignore the will of the student body. Who can blame them? Why would they allow their little club to be infiltrated by the unwashed masses?

The Honor Council is in decline, and, alas, suffers from a terminal illness that will see its potential power and, alas, suffers from a terminal illness that will see its potential power and, suffer suffering from an unwashed mass? Why would they allow their little club to be infiltrated by the unwashed masses?
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