

## Chain e-mail punishments inappropriate

Taking away student VAX and e-mail privileges is not the answer to the chain e-mail problem. Instead, more constructive punishment methods should be used.

In September and again in December, the computer center cracked down on chain e-mail. Those who abused the system by clogging up disk space with inappropriate materials were caught and assigned level twos. As part of the punishment, most had their VAX privileges, including e-mail, revoked.

The problem is the course of action. The VAX system, as well as e-mail, is essential to the academic life of every student here. Students receive homework assignments, club meeting dates and a variety of other important information using e-mail. The VAX system itself is used for everything from MathCad to word processing. Although students can still use these programs by logging on as "guest," the lack of an M drive makes it difficult to access and save documents. To deprive students of these systems is to affect

*To deprive students of [computer] systems is to affect their academic performance—opposite of every idea behind school and especially this school.*

their academic performance—opposite of every idea behind school and especially this school.

Some students punished for chain e-mail abuses were allowed to regain their privileges, provided they write an essay on computer and technology ethics. This course of action should be taken instead of revoking essential student resources. Although not as drastic as taking away e-mail, such an essay would have a great enough effect to discourage those punished from repeating the same offense. This is an example of the kind of constructive, effective administration that benefits both students and faculty while still achieving its end goal of decreased computer misuse.

## Is in-room really necessary?

The in-room policy here at NCSSM is a very simple one to understand. It states that students should be in their rooms at the appropriate times. These times are from 12 midnight to 6 am on Sunday through Thursday and 3 am to 6 am on Friday and Saturday.

Though the implications of the in-room policy are precise and clear, they are sometimes misinterpreted by students. In the past students have frequently taken this policy to mean that they should be on the way to their rooms at 12, or getting ready for bed at 12. However, earlier this year students were informed that they were indeed wrong in assuming that they could take the liberty of dallying in the bathroom or stretching in the lounge for one last minute of chatter before they headed to their rooms.

Student Life instructors have been accepting no slack when it comes to keeping students in check. "I think that it is silly," said junior Aisha McGriff. "What if I need to do work outside of my room, what if my roommate is sick? As long as I'm not bothering anyone by sitting in the hall and doing my homework, then I don't see the problem with it."

Many students feel the same way. Regulation in the extreme sense is an indication of a lack of trust. There is no denial that people naturally need rules and boundaries. In other words, it is reasonable to deduce that people need to be informed about what they can and can not do. The problem in this case is that we can not do what seems perfectly safe and innocent...which is to sit in another student's room and study, chat in the hall lounge about politics or the news, or exchange a few words with a friend in a foreign language.

There is, however, the perspective of the Student Life staff. By requiring students to be in their rooms at a certain time, there is a nearly one hundred percent chance that any given student can be found if necessary. Logically, one could deduce that the main purpose of the in-room policy is to strive to achieve maximum security for the students...but this method is not the most reasonable. There are no real dangers in allowing students to be on their own halls instead of in their own rooms after 12. It is sad that such drastic measures and restrictions must be taken to ensure the security of mature students.

## LOOK WHO'S TALKING

Compiled by Joey Tucker

What are your thoughts on O.J. Simpson's trial?



If O. J. Simpson had been poor, he would have been found guilty twelve months ago.

—Phil Fieler, Senior

Based on the evidence presented to the public, the jury made the right decision because reasonable doubt existed.

—Maria Tyson, Senior



I thought he was guilty, but I knew the prosecution wouldn't get a conviction.

—Chris Rathjen, Senior

The whole trial was stupid. It was a waste of taxpayers' money.

—Rayetta Grasry and Almas Abbas, Seniors (in unison)



I was happy with the verdict because O.J. was a hero of mine.

—Walker Robinson, Senior

It's sad that we live in a society where money can justify anything.

—Tak Hirata, Senior



The whole process would have been much quicker if Judge Ito [had] closed the trial to the media.

—Kelly Carter, Senior