



The College Reporter

First Class Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
Lancaster PA
Permit 901

THE INDEPENDENT STUDENT NEWSPAPER OF FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2019

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

<http://www.the-college-reporter.com>

VOLUME 55, ISSUE 12

The implications of Trump's sanctions on Venezuela create crises

BY MAX SANO
Staff Writer

On January 28th, the U.S. Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) imposed new sanctions on Venezuela's state-owned oil company--PdVSA. While there are some American companies that share business relationships with PdVSA, they are only authorized to continue their engagements until this summer. These sanctions arrive after more than a decade of related actions against the Venezuelan over a number of violations, including human and drug-tracking complaints, human rights violations, political corruption, terrorism, and numerous other financial sanctions. The impact of all U.S. sanctions has had a debilitating Today, instability and chaos run amok the "petrostate" (nation that depends on nonrenewable energy) and has already caused lasting damage to the Venezuelan people and the surrounding region. First, let's look at why these sanctions were established and analyze the effects they have had on Venezuela and its neighbors.

Sanctions on Venezuela began in 2006 in response to American concern over Venezuela's weak stance on terrorist activities. In 2008, the U.S. government froze the assets and prohibited financial transactions on two individuals and two travel agencies in Venezuela for providing financial support to the radical Lebanese-based paramilitary organization, Hezbollah. Separately, the U.S. government has been insistent on Venezuela's failure to adhere to international narcotics agreements. Ever since, the Treasury Department has imposed economic sanctions on at least 22 individuals (some of which are current and former government

officials) and 27 companies with ties to the Venezuelan government. The U.S. government has also cracked down on political corruption and anti-democratic campaigns in Venezuela, imposing sanctions on 65 Venezuelans involved in such actions to date.

Moreover, President Donald Trump has led a campaign in support of the opposition leader: Juan Guaido. As leader of the opposition party and head of the National Assembly, Guaido declared himself acting president of Venezuela. Just last week, Trump reaffirmed his support for Guaido in a call on Wednesday, January 30th. International support for the acting president is not limited to the United States. On Monday, February 4th, a coalition of European countries recognised the self-proclaimed leader of Venezuela as the legitimate president of the country, striking a major blow to President Maduro's rule. Trump's tough stance on Venezuela has garnered unfamiliar bipartisan support in both Congressional bodies as well, albeit several liberal Democratic lawmakers such as Rep. Ro Khanna of California and Rep. Ilhan Omar of Minnesota. There are several bills on the floor that would address the worsening political and socio economic crises in the country.

What are the effects of these crises on the Venezuelan people? Economic and political disaster has resulted in ridiculously high prices on food, water and various other resources. In 2018, the annual national inflation rate soared over 1,000,000 percent. According to one Venezuelan resident, the price of one Big Mac from McDonald's is worth more than a month's pay. In addition, a once robust transportation system is now no more due to lack of autoparts. A subway system that



Photo courtesy of greenleft.org.

Writer analyzes the sanctions on Venezuela that began in 2006. These sanctions have resulted in multiple economic crises and political uprisings that have created high prices on food, water, and other resources.

used to be hailed as the best in Latin America in the 1980's and 1990's is now in ruins. What was once a developing economy is mired in mayhem due to dependence on petroleum before establishing strong democratic institutions.

In an afflicted to nation such as Venezuela, which for decades has relied upon The indicators of a petrostate represent the current state of Venezuelan affairs. There is a clear dependence on oil in the national economy, as the commodity represented 98 percent of its exports and a whopping 50 percent of its total GDP in the 2018 fiscal year. At the same time, oil output has reached an all time low and GDP shrunk by double digits for a third consecutive year. On top of all that, President Maduro has violated democratic traditions in order to maintain power, including acusals of stacking courthouses in

order to protect drug trafficking. The Council of Foreign Relations argues that oil dependence, falling production, spiraling economy, and growing autocracy, among other factors, point to Venezuela being "the archetype of a failed petrostate". In order for petrostates like Venezuela to adapt and arise from their economic conundrums, there must be strong democratic institutions that ward off corruption, investment in a variety of international assets, and a global shift to renewable energy sources.

If you want to learn more about the ongoing Venezuelan Crisis, go to the website for the Council on Foreign Relations where they published an in-depth video titled "TheEvolvingCrisisinVenezuela".

First-year Max Sano is a contributing writer. His email is msano@fandm.edu.

Inside this Issue...

Opinion & Editorial
Sophomore critiques debate on free speech on campus
page 2

Campus Life
Student discusses Common Hour
page 4

Arts & Leisure
Hugh Grant through the ages
page 6

Sports
F&M winter sports celebrate Senior Days
page 7

Staff Writer Commentary

Editors comment on the presence of free speech on campus

BY ISABEL PARIS & RUBY VAN DYK
Layout Assistant and Editor-in-Chief

This past Thursday, The Black Pyramid Senior Honors Society hosted another debate in their series of debates on campus, titled “Is Free Speech Threatened on College Campuses?” The debate was between Dean Susan Richter of New College House and Don Bryan Stinchfield of Brooks College House. Richter, an Environmental Science Professor, argued that free speech is not threatened on college campuses, while Stinchfield, a Business Organization and Societies Professor, argued that free speech is threatened.

The debate was structured with a set of six questions. Each debater had 2-5 minutes of arguing their side. The questions varied from discussing the overall topic of the debate to the protest tree to specific groups feeling included in their expression of their opinions. In the beginning, audience members were given a clicker to vote whether free speech is or is not threatened on our campus. 52% of people believed that free speech is threatened while 48% of people believed it is not. These close numbers had the debaters in prime form to sway the audience towards their argument.

One of the questions posed was the opportunity for a student to wear a political hat. Do students feel comfortable wearing a Trump or Antifa hat without feeling societal pressure to take it off? Richter argued that students should and do feel okay with wearing such hats and then showed a picture of a student wearing a white Trump hat. The fault with this picture, however, is that while it is a Trump hat, it is not the Trump hat. If the student felt truly safe why not wear the classic and more well-known red hat. While this may seem like a small observation, how is this an example of being comfortable promoting polarizing political views? The student wasn't even wearing true gear from the campaign.

Stinchfield disagreed, arguing that students do not feel comfortable wearing certain hats around campus. This is more realistic as having noticed what people wear on campus, no one is ever seen wearing such hats. This could be contributed to those who simply do not own any accouterments of that kind or do not care, but this also can point those who perhaps own such gear but are too afraid or self-conscious to do so. Stinchfield ended his argument by declaring that if students “cannot

wear that kind of hat on a college campus and feel comfortable then where will they?”

Don Stinchfield argued that speakers invited to campus’ across the country that have then been disinvited have increased significantly over the last 10 years. Stinchfield stated that the problem rests partially in the hands of college administrations. Although this may be true at some institutions, it does not seem to be the case at F&M. The reason why the majority of common hour speakers are non-controversial is not a direct fault of administrative decisions, but more so because of a lack of controversially proposed speakers by students. Dean Richter argued that if students were to band together and advocate for a controversial speaker, it would most likely be approved for common hour.

Although free speech is not formally threatened by college policy and students are technically able to propose whoever they'd like for a common hour, it faces dangerous cultural threats on campus. This discrepancy is something that Dean Richter failed to recognize. Encouraging students to speak their minds, she emphasized that students would always have the support of the college behind them. However, in doing so, she failed to acknowledge that what most often restricts free speech is the culture of homogeneity of thought, perpetuated by students. This culture is not something that can be overcome as easily as Dean Richter seemed to think it could.

One of the questions asked by an audience member questioned whether or not Flemming Rose, a controversial cartoonist, had been accepted on campus in a fair way when he spoke at F&M two years

ago. Rose is a Danish cartoonist who drew controversy over cartoons he'd illustrated of the Prophet Muhammad. Both Dean Richter and Don Stinchfield answered that they believed he had been. This being said, Stinchfield pointed out the fact that speakers like Flemming Rose are hardly ever invited to campus, and that this was a problem. Inviting a controversial speaker on campus every two years is not enough to support a culture of free speech.

While this question did prove that controversial speakers have not spoken as often as others during common hour, this should not sway anyone from believing that F&M isn't ahead of most colleges. Most colleges in this area and of similar caliber to F&M are not as likely to have brought Flemming Rose or Bassam Eid to their campuses. The administration is open to different speakers that are proposed it just so happens that not many controversial speakers are proposed. The College Reporter itself gives a voice to the community as it stands outside of F&M's jurisdiction. This freedom allows both the writers and staff but also the campus population to feel heard. This expression has been seen through many different articles that have been published whether regarding party security, sexual assault, or offensive speakers that have come to this campus. Even this event is another example as to the self-awareness that our campus has in terms of free speech and student involvement. While F&M does offer a few ways to make the individual feel heard and comfortable, there still remains a stigma around the freedom of expression in open society and not behind different forums or institutions.

As the debate was coming to a close, it seemed that both Richter and Stinchfield's arguments began to converge. Both would agree to the frustration and difficulty of challenging systemic norms like F&M's lack of support for students' free speech rights. Richter alluded to the difficulty of conservatives on this campus without explicitly stating so when she didn't truly answer the question but expressed her belief in working together with people of other viewpoints. Stinchfield described how free speech has been vocalized through different outlets but it is still limited in terms of college campus society.

It seems evident that F&M is ahead of many other institutions in the way it handles free speech, but this does not mean reactions to the controversial speakers that have been brought on campus have been overall in favor of free speech, take Jeffrey Lord for example. But this does not excuse the fact that there does seem to be a culture at F&M where students are not allowed to speak their minds freely on some issues. This is something that needs to be changed. One of the most valuable things that can be gained through a liberal arts education is the promotion of differing ideas. Something that F&M brings to the table is that it has students that differ in beliefs. It is up to the students of F&M to take advantage of these differences not discourage them.

Sophomore Isabel Paris is a Layout Assistant. Her email is iparis@fandm.edu.

Sophomore Ruby Van Dyk is the Editor in Chief. Her email is rvandyk@fandm.edu.



Photo courtesy of breitbart.com.

At the Black Pyramid Senior Honor Society's debate on free speech on campus this past week, one of the many topics discussed was whether or not students feel comfortable outwardly expressing their political opinions on campus.

Contributing Writer Commentary

Staff writer comments on how the STEM world threatens the humanities

BY GRACE LEWIS
Staff Writer

The generation currently in college – those born somewhere in the range of mid to late 1990's to maybe the very early 2000's – are in a bizarre spot. We are on the cusp; not quite millennials with their trends and constant battle against the baby boom generation, but also we are too old to be fully considered Generation Z, with Tide-Pods and growing up around constant new technology. We know references from both generations and our lives were shaped by the same things. Growing up in a post-9/11 world filled with anxiety and brand new wars, we learned about the troubles of the adult world much younger than many other generations. Then hit the 2008 recession and all of the sudden people were out of jobs and not being able to provide for their families. The fear of 2008's economic recession hit us like a truck, and we became obsessed with the idea of needing to make sure that we would never end up like those who had lost everything.

It is a known fact that STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) majors have been going up widely in popularity in the past decade. Currently 41%

of college graduates have majors in STEM, while only 11% take up majors in the humanities (The Atlantic). These two different numbers have been going in the opposite direction for years, with humanities dwindling down so low to the point where many schools are attempting to spearhead their humanities programs in attempt to keep them alive. For instance, top schools like Stanford and those in the Ivy League recruit promising students who show interest in the humanities, encouraging them to apply.

But what explains this rise in field of STEM and decline in the humanities? We are convinced of the idea that majoring in a STEM field will lead to higher paid job opportunities, no matter if we like the field or not. Majoring in the humanities seemingly gives very few options and none of them seem to be highly well paid or in many cases respected. I, a projected American Studies major and a minor in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, am trying to navigate what exactly I want to do in the world with my interests so deep set in history. I grew up in a family of medicine, with both parents doctors and an older sister who plans also to go into the medical world.

Being interested in the human-



Photo courtesy of economicmodeling.com

One of the academic world's biggest debates is whether to push students towards STEM or Humanities tracks or majors while in college.

The absence of political conversation at this year's Superbowl Halftime show

BY BETTE SCHER
Staff Writer

Nothing is bigger than the American holiday known as the Superbowl. No event more quintessentially “American” than hordes of people shouting at televisions, hands gripping the buffalo dip, the other clutching the palm of another fellow fan as their favorite QB throws a fourth-down hail Mary. No sport exemplifies American exceptionalism more than the NFL—players like Tom Brady and Drew Brees, the subjects of intense idolization.

But for others, it's people like Colin Kaepernick that carry more weight. Once thought of as merely an exceptional QB of the 49'ers, Kaepernick has, over time, grown to symbolize a merging dialogue surrounding race relations in the United States.

By choosing to first take a knee in protest of systemic racism in America, Kaepernick has come to represent an anti-establishment, anti-racist dialogue, manifesting itself by unhappy NFL players and frustrated owners. Owners have been so frustrated, actually,

at Kaepernick's attempts to “politicize” football, that him and others who kneel could be potentially subject to being benched, or even worse, getting suspended from their teams, and main sources of monetary income.

In Kaepernick's act of defiance, he symbolizes increasing cognitive dissonance in the meaning of football in 2019 America. Of course, there are traditional meanings associated with football and Superbowl hysteria—raucous celebrations of booze, food, friends, and family, those of which have become ingrained in popular culture as an American staple. However, there is also existing dialogue pointing to the fact that cookouts, tailgates, and buffalo dip will not solve the political unrest currently afoot.

In the same vein, there are those who call out the NFL for institutionally supporting racism and racist norms—both in their refusal to rename arguably racist team, the Washington Redskins, and their choice to publicly shun Colin Kaepernick and his supporters for commenting on political unrest in the United States. In

this, the NFL has taken a passive stance on politics, politics which dictate the opinions of a substantial amount of those who identify as fans of the NFL. Who does the NFL support? No clear theme or statement has really emerged other than the certainty that they wish to remain apolitical.

Does Colin Kaepernick, and others, have the right to “politicize” football and bigger events like the Superbowl? Is it the doing of one man on his knee or is he just representing an already changing country? In this arguable transition, what would this indicate about the transitioning meaning of the Superbowl as an American staple? Is the Superbowl only meant to provide sports entertainment without any additional sociopolitical commentary? Or is the Superbowl, like many other events with nationalized attention, a platform to bring attention to political unrest?

I would argue that the key to these questions is in the Halftime show. Past artists like Lady Gaga, Beyoncé, and even Bruno Mars brought some level of social commentary to an otherwise un-

related platform, infusing sports, music, and politics into one night. Performances by these artists provided popular culture with political gold—providing fruitful commentary on the state of the Union, domestic unrest, racism, and other sociopolitical issues. However, the choice to pick Maroon 5, arguably bringing the most anti-political performance crossing the Halftime stage in over five years, demonstrates the dissonance afoot.

The NFL deems “football” to mean buffalo dip, drunken tailgating, and cheerleaders. A growing population of Americans are saying no—these things are not enough. No longer are talks of race, sex, and protest taboo or off the table.

The underwhelmed national response to Maroon 5 shows that times are changing. Football and its inherited meaning are changing. Get with the times or get off the stage.

Sophomore Bette Scher is a Staff Writer. Her email is bscher@fandm.edu.

Campus Life

Jonathan Lomma '99 talks success in entertainment business at Common Hour

BY CHRISTA RODRIGUEZ
Campus Life Editor

William Morris Endeavor agent Jonathan Lomma '99 presented at Common Hour last Thursday on what he has learned through working in the entertainment business. Lomma's clients include a multitude of screenwriters and playwrights, including Paula Vogel, who originally was scheduled to speak at Common Hour. Lomma graciously offered to talk in her place.

He received a B.A. in English and Theater from Franklin & Marshall, and a J.D. from American University's Washington College of Law. One of his current projects involves Stephen Spielberg's remake of West Side Story among many others.

As an F&M alumnus, he remarked he "would give anything to go back in time" to the "best four years of my life," referring to his time as an undergraduate. He recalled his activities at F&M, such as directing plays, costuming, being the cartoonist for The College Reporter, as well as the support from all his teachers. For Lomma, college was "where I found myself."

He started his talk by discussing the different business models for playwriting and film. For example, playwrights own and control their own work, with theatre being an "artist first enterprise." With film, it is the opposite, where the studios are in charge and can make changes without consulting the writer. Another major difference is that playwrights strive to write plays no one has ever seen before, while films try to appeal to all demographics and repeat what makes money. As an agent, it is his job to be a champion for the artist and their work, which shows just how business and the arts can come together in a career.

Lomma then outlined his ten core beliefs, including advice he wished someone had explained to him earlier in life. He emphasized that these are just his personal views. Firstly, he advised, "Do what you love," answering the three questions: 1) What do you love?, 2) What am I good at?, and 3) How could I support a family? He suggested mentally creating a "Venn diagram of three circles" and see where they intersect to figure out a career path. Of course, he stated that he thought of this retrospectively and did not actually write out a Venn diagram. Nevertheless, his epiphany about becoming an agent stemmed from the intersection of these three questions.

Secondly, he advised the audience to promote yourself. "Have no shame," Lomma said, because in the business world, speaking up is vital. He stressed the value of putting oneself out there in order to be heard and advance in one's career. "The world isn't waiting for you," he noted. The third piece of advice was to tell the truth. He recommended to acknowledge our own shortcomings and places for growth. While it is still important to cast everything in a favorable light, especially when trying to persuade others you are working with, it is best not to deceive.

The fourth recommendation was to be an assistant, especially when entering the entertainment business. If hired as an assistant, you are in the door and have access to connections and experience essential to moving up. Lomma recalled that people thought he was "nuts" for spending five years as an assistant with a law degree. However, he described working as an assistant as the "best kind of graduate school."

Fifthly, he suggested that one know their job, "but know even more than that," meaning that



Photos courtesy of patrickmcmullan.com

F&M alumnus Jonathan Lomma '99 spoke at Common Hour, giving his ten beliefs for success in one's career, especially for the entertainment industry.

one should learn as much as they can about the business they want to enter so that they can "display a deep level of knowledge about it."

Conversely, the sixth word of advice was that nobody knows anything. Nobody knows the next trend, the next hit, or the next star. It is all unpredictable and surprising.

The seventh idea he imparted was to embrace failure, or rather, separate "failure from the feeling of failure." The eighth recommendation was to "build it before you need it," emphasizing the importance of kindness and diplomacy, especially as the entertainment industry is a business of relationships.

Ninthly, he advised the audi-

ence to "take massive action," meaning to carefully do as many things you can at once and "see what sticks." Finally, Lomma imparted that "life is not a dress rehearsal, yet we can rehearse." By this, he meant that we can easily predict and control certain situations from job interviews to important meetings. He encouraged the audience to "start exercising that control."

In conclusion, Lomma stated that it "really takes a village for anyone to get anywhere," recognizing that he would not be where he is today without all the support he had in his life.

Senior Christa Rodriguez is the Campus Life Editor. Her email is crodrigu@fandm.edu.

Black Pyramid Senior Honors Society hosts debate on campus free speech

BY SARAH FRAZER
Staff Writer

The question of free speech on college campuses has been the topic of many conversations and was the subject that Dean Richter and Don Stinchfield sought to answer in their debate this past Thursday evening.

Dean Richter took the position that free speech is not threatened on college campuses while Don Stinchfield made the case that

speech is, indeed, under threat, though both said that they actually agreed more than their arguments would suggest.

Don Stinchfield kicked off the debate by arguing that many faculty, staff, and students on college campuses want speech constrained.

Two data points he cited were: a) that there has been a measurable increase in the number of students entering college who think that colleges should prohibit the use

of racist and sexist language; b) one way this attitudinal shift has manifested itself has been in the increase in the number of extreme speakers disinvited from campuses. In 2000 there were five or six speakers disinvited. In 2016 the number was over forty.

For her part, Dean Richter contended that students on college campuses are fully able, and even encouraged, to exercise their right to free speech. She argued that, while students may

want free speech limited when they first get to college as Stinchfield said, these views changed over students' four years of college, as they see the value of free speech. Richter emphasized that, in her view, the best antidote for speech one doesn't like is more free speech and engagement with ideas.

Senior Sarah Frazer is a Staff Writer. Her email is sfrazer@fandm.edu.

F&M Model United Nations hosts talk on Brexit given by Professor Fontana

BY SARAH FRAZER
Staff Writer

Professor Fontana sought to answer the question, "What is Brexit?" this past Thursday in his presentation on Brexit, which was hosted by F&M's Model United Nations.

In fewer than fifty days, on March 29, 2019, the UK will officially be out of the European Union. However, no one really knows what that means.

Professor Fontana explained that what "Brexit" is depends on whom you ask and their subjective interpretation of it. Indeed, when millions of British citizens cast their ballots to leave or to remain over two years ago, no one knew what they were voting for. In the Brexit referendum, voters were given two choices: to leave the EU or not. This binary choice failed to give voters the ability to express their true desires since voting leave does not answer, among other questions whether one wants a Hard or Soft Brexit. And a vote in favor of remaining does not paint a full picture either, since one can vote to remain and still want to change Britain's place in the EU.

Many people were made false promises by the Leave campaign, which declared that the UK would have hundreds of millions more pounds per week to spend on the NHS. Yet after the referendum, Nigel Farage admitted they could not make that guarantee. Given that the complexity of Britain leaving or staying in the EU was not understood by millions of people and that their votes are impossible to interpret in any detail, Professor Fontana wondered whether the referendum truly represented the will

of the people.

Regardless, Brexit is happening, with or without a deal between the UK and EU, so it is useful to consider how this happened and what could happen now. According to Fontana, the story of how Britain ended up voting to leave is more a story of Conservative Party politics than some great demand to leave from the public. In 2013, then-Prime Minister David Cameron agreed to hold a referendum if the Conservatives were re-elected in 2015 since, at the time, the Tories were in a Coalition Government with the Liberal Democrats. The Conservatives were concerned about winning reelection and with the makeup of their party, which has had deeply divided views over Europe. Fontana explained that this divide has plagued the party since Thatcher. The Conservative Party is the most plagued by divisions over Europe than any of the parties.

Furthermore, in 2013, there was a surge in support for UKIP in local elections, which was worrisome to the Conservative Party. Thus, Cameron made a political calculation to put the question up to a referendum if his party won. Fontana argued that he was "passing the buck to the people," so he and his party "don't have to make the tough decision." Cameron hoped it would "diminish the internal tensions that exist in the conservative party." Now, no one can say what will happen. Recently, Prime Minister Theresa May's "plan suffered the largest defeat in Parliament's history." Many MPs from her own party voted against her Brexit deal, and May lost by a wide margin.



Photos courtesy of BBC.com

Cary Fontana, a government professor at F&M, lectured on Brexit for an event hosted by F&M Model United Nations, breaking down what Brexit is, and its implications.

It was unprecedented. That Britain may leave without a deal creates a lot of uncertainty about what will happen. The entire British economy could be affected. Many questions will be left unanswered such as whether British and EU citizens will have freedom of movement across the UK border. Fontana argued that, while many Leave voters were motivated by the notion of "taking back control in terms of their immigration policy," seventy percent of British people are in favor of free movement of EU citizens, which is what leaving the EU would complicate. In other words, according to Fontana, Britain already had a lot of control in terms of immigration from non-EU citizens, so that is not necessarily even what Leave voters opted to change.

Probably one of the largest sticking points is the contentious issue of what will happen

to Northern Ireland. The EU has said it would have to remain a part of the common market until they find a reasonable solution, but that means indefinitely. The European Union will also face costs, such as a significant budget reduction, an end to the free movement of people from the EU into the UK and vice versa. Three million people from Europe live in UK.

No one knows what will happen to them in less than fifty days. The EU will lose a major trading partner and will lose significant fishing rights off the coast of the UK once it leaves the Union. Lastly, Professor Fontana posited, Britain will face the question of who it will blame now that it will no longer have the EU to blame for all its problems.

Senior Sarah Frazer is a Staff Writer. Her email is sfrazer@fandm.edu.

Full Staff Opinion

Last Friday night, F&M students and staff encountered an unusual email from the Office of the President. In the email, President Barbara Altmann described the campus' delicate budget situation. Altmann illustrated that F&M "currently ha[s] an \$8 million deficit for next year. To put that number into perspective, \$8 million is about 6% of [the campus'] annual operating budget."

While this news has caused some worry throughout the campus, The College Reporter commends F&M administrations' transparency on this issue. Especially for a close-knit campus like ours, it is critically important that the administration remains clear in this process of budget planning.

It is a known fact that all of us, both students and staff, deeply care about F&M as an institution. We all know and love how this campus has improved and enriched all of our lives. Each and every day, we all dedicate ourselves to representing F&M in the best way possible. This budget crisis, however, doesn't mean that love and commitment has to stop. We all should work to come together, unified by our Diplomat pride, and continue to push ourselves and this institution to new heights. In the end, the amount of money in the bank does not define us as a college. All that matters in terms of characterizing our campus is the passions and achievements of those present here and now.



The College Reporter

Transparency. Accuracy. Credibility.

THE INDEPENDENT STUDENT
NEWSPAPER OF
FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE

Gabby Goodwin & Ruby Van Dyk
Editors-in-Chief

Gabby Goodwin
Managing Editor

Christa Rodriguez
Senior Editor

Sunya Hassan
Anna Goorevich
Christa Rodriguez
Abigail Sokolsky
Gabby Goodwin

News Editor
Opinion & Editorial Editor
Campus Life Editor
Arts & Leisure Editor
Sports Editor

Layout Assistants: Jamie Belfer, Isabel Paris, Danielle Rice
Copy Editor: Amanda Leonard

The College Reporter office is located on the second floor of the Steiman College Center.
Address all correspondence to The College Reporter, F&M #27 P.O. Box 3003, Lancaster, PA 17604.
Email: reporter@fandm.edu Business Email: reporterads@fandm.edu Phone: (717) 291-4095.
© 2015 The College Reporter. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without written permission is prohibited.

The College Reporter was formed in 1964, as a successor to The Student Weekly, which was formed in 1915 by the union of The F&M Weekly, founded 1881, and The College Student, founded 1881. The crest of The College Reporter was designed in 2004 by Kim Cortes '05.

The College Reporter is a weekly student-edited newspaper, published every Monday except during exam and vacation periods. The website was created by Tim Jackson '12, Christian Hartranft '12, Joshua Finkel '15, and Lauren Bejak '13. The subscription rate is \$51 per year.

The Editorial Board, headed by the Editor-in-Chief, has sole authority and full responsibility for the content of the newspaper. The College Reporter and its subsidiaries are designated public forums. All content is selected and printed by a board of elected or appointed students. The Masthead Editorial is the majority opinion of the Editorial Board. No other parties are in any other way responsible for its content, and all inquiries concerning that content should be directed to the Editor in Chief. All opinions reflect those of the author and not that of The College Reporter, with the exception of the Masthead Editorial.

Arts & Leisure

Staff Writer shares his predictions for winners of upcoming Academy Awards

BY JEREMY MAUSER

Staff Writer

After an awards season known for its unpredictability, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences will soon reward some of the most revered prizes in film to the people who created the best movies of 2018.

Usually, a clear frontrunner emerges for each major category by this point in the season, yet experts are torn over several major awards.

The greatest example of this unpredictability is the top award, Best Picture. Eight films are nominated, and each has won several major awards and received several nominations, making it more difficult than usual to predict the winner.

A Star is Born (2018), the hit film that stars Lady Gaga as a rising vocal artist who Bradley Cooper's rock star character takes under his wing, entered awards season as the favorite for Best Picture. However, it has failed to gain as much traction as expected and didn't pick up all the Oscar nominations that predicted by many, most notably Bradley Cooper for Best Director.

Bohemian Rhapsody (2018) surprised many by winning Best Picture-Drama at the Golden Globes. The Freddie Mercury/Queen biopic received mediocre reviews despite its box office success and has built up gradual success over the past month. However, those who worked on the

film are rumored to have suffered from mistreatment from the director.

Green Book (2018), which tells the story of a white driver and an African American pianist in southern 1960's America, earned the Best Picture-Comedy/Musical award at the Golden Globes.

Roma (2018) a Spanish-language film from Mexico, recently won the Critic's Choice Award for Best Film. *Roma* (2018) was directed by Academy Award-winner Alfonso Cuarón, who won for "Gravity" in 2014.

Black Panther (2018) is the first superhero film to be nominated for Best Picture. After earning over \$1 billion at the box office, the Marvel film earned the top award at the Screen Actors Guild Awards.

BlakkKlansman (2018), *The Favourite* (2018), and *Vice* (2018), movies about a black detective who goes undercover with the KKK, a servant who becomes the Queen of England's right hand woman, and George W. Bush's Vice President Dick Cheney, respectively, are also nominated for Best Picture and stand chances for winning.

So which film will come out on top? My guess is *Roma* (2018). The Critic's Choice Awards are usually indicative of the who will come out on top at the Oscars, the director is regularly an Oscars favorite, there are no controversies, and as someone who's seen the movie, it's really good.

Regarding the acting categories,



Photo courtesy of themovieclub.org.
Fans predict outcome of upcoming Oscars.

the winners for Best Supporting Actress and Actor seem pretty clean-cut. Regina King, who played a supportive mother in *If Beale Street Could Talk* (2018), and Mahershala Ali, who played the above-mentioned African American pianist in *Green Book* (2018), will likely win Best Supporting Actress and Actor, respectively.

But the outcomes of Best Leading Actor and Actress are a little fuzzier. The former is a toss-up between *Bohemian Rhapsody* (2018) actor Rami Malek, who won the Golden Globe for Best Actor-Drama for playing Queen singer Freddie Mercury; *Vice* (2018) actor Christian Bale, who won the Best Actor-Comedy/Musica for playing former Vice President Dick Cheney; and *A Star is Born* actor Bradley Cooper, the alcoholic rock star who helps Lady Gaga's character in finding stardom. Willem Dafoe and Viggo Mortensen are almost nominated for *At Eternity's Gate* (2018) and *Green Book* (2018), re-

spectively, but are less likely to win.

In the end, Malek will probably win, although Bale is a probable dark horse.

As for the female nominees, the real competition is between Lady Gaga and Glenn Close. Gaga, a first-time nominee from *A Star is Born* (2018), and Close, a seven-time nominee from *The Wife* (2018), have earned several awards each, although Close is entering with better chances of winning. Yalitza Aparicio of *Roma* (2018), Olivia Colman of *The Favourite* (2018), and Melissa McCarthy of *Can You Ever Forgive Me?* (2018) also delivered phenomenal performances, yet Close will most likely win, although Gaga could end up taking the prize.

Clearly, these are not the only awards that will be given out on February 24, yet they are the ones that receive the most attention and have stumped awards experts for months. However, this is all mere speculation, and you'll have to tune in yourself to see who wins these prestigious awards in Hollywood.

This article previously contained incorrect information regarding racist comments made by Director Peter Farrelly. This information is false and has since been removed. The College Reporter apologizes for this mistake.

First-Year Jeremy Mauser is a Staff Writer. His email is jmauser@fandm.edu.

Hugh Grant through the ages, more than just a romantic-comedy superstar

BY ABIGAIL DOTTERER

Staff Writer

If any actor should be considered the king of romance movies, it is Hugh Grant. He has starred in many featured films that are considered to be at the top of the genre, including *Notting Hill* (1999) and *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (1994). If you are looking for a wide range of romantic movies for this Valentine season, look into putting Grant's movies at the top of your list.

The British 58-year-old first appeared in his first leading film in 1987, in which he portrayed Clive Durham in James Ivory's *Maurice* (1987). This drama takes place in 1909 when Maurice Hall (James Wilby) enters Cambridge and befriends Grant's character. The two embark on an intense and private relationship, attempting to avoid ruining Clive's reputation.

In an interview with GQ magazine, he said this about his role and the film: "Sometimes people say to me, 'are you wor-

ried about playing a gay role?' I wasn't at all. Never sort of struck me as if that was in anyway difficult, dangerous, or controversial."

Following this film, Grant took on what is considered to be his "breakthrough" role as loveable Englishman Charles in *Four Weddings and a Funeral* (1994). After this appearance and his following performance in *Notting Hill* (1999), Grant became a recognizable face in film, particularly in the romance genre.

Though he was used to playing the "nerdy" and loveable type, as said in the GQ interview, there were a number of other roles in which he plays a different side of the story. This can be seen in the more current *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001) in which Grant plays a brash playboy book publisher, Daniel Cleaver. The role was the opposite of his co-star, Colin Firth, who portrays a quirky and quiet Mark Darcy.

Besides these films, Grant has had parts in a number of different films over the years, ranging from the British Prime minister in *Love Actually*



Photo courtesy of hollywood.com.
Hugh Grant, versatile actor and film icon.

(2003) to former 1980s music superstar in *Music and Lyrics* (2007).

In his role as Prime Minister, Grant was concerned about becoming typecast going forward in his career. "I can't just be that guy from *Four Weddings and Notting Hill*." However, director Richard Curtis said that he had written the part to be "tougher, harder." Grant liked this and agreed to play it this way but said in the interview, "and then I just did exactly the same characters."

Though Grant's career is primarily grounded in romantic movies,

he did step out of the box a bit. This can be seen in movies including *Cloud Atlas* (2012) and *Paddington 2* (2017), in which he plays the part of a washed-up actor with a longing for the fame he once had.

In 2018, he even crossed over from film to television with *A Very English Scandal* (2018). In the Amazon Prime Original, he portrays 1970s parliament member Jeremy Thorpe who has a secret love affair and conspires to kill his ex-lover before the secret is unleashed, with the potential to ruin his political career.

Though his spectrum of characters and genres seem to be widening, there are many Grant films that can be enjoyed this Valentine's day season, whether they fit in the romantic movie genre or not. Within his extensive catalog of films, Hugh Grant has the potential to be an actor that captures hearts while eliciting lots of laughs along the way.

Freshman Abigail Dotterer is a Staff Writer. Her email is adottere@fandm.edu.

Jamie Belfer recaps Patriots vs Rams Super Bowl LIII. Read more below...



photo courtesy of godiplomats.com

F&M winter sports teams celebrate Senior Day with a bang. Read more below...

Franklin & Marshall Sports

F&M Wrestling, Men's, Women's Basketball celebrate Senior Day

BY GABBY GOODWIN

Editor-in-Chief

This past weekend, the F&M Wrestling team, as well as the F&M Men's and Women's Basketball teams, all celebrated Senior Day with a bang. On Friday night, in a home wrestling match against the Virginia Military Institute, F&M honored its seven-member senior class of Jacob Conners, Corey Kerkesner, Anthony Mancini, Chris Martorello, Antonio Pelusi, Paddy Quinlan, and Philip Robilotto.

F&M's Jose Diaz started off the night at 125 lbs. with a pair of takedowns en route to a 12-0 major decision. F&M's Mike Simonetti at 133 lbs. followed closely with a 11-2 victory in the next match with a third-period takedown and four back points to secure the Dips' second straight major.

Ahead by a score of 8-0, a 14-9 decision from F&M's Wil Gil (141 lbs.) and strong performance by Martorello (149 lbs.) put the Dips firmly in front at 17-0.

While VMI responded with a tech. fall at 174 lbs. and a decision at 184 lbs. in attempt to close the gap, it was too late, as the match was already firmly in the Dips' control at 23-8.

Performances by Quinlan, Crew Fullerton, and Robilotto all added to a Diplomat victory. Additionally, heavyweight Antonio Pelusi (ranked No. 32 in the nation) concluded the match with a pin at :55 over VMI's Trey Momon to secure F&M a 25-point win.

The Diplomats improved to 3-6 with the win, while the Keydets fell 2-11. The Diplomats face-off against Millersville at Millersville this Wednesday for the Rupp Cup at 7:30 PM. Additionally, this Sunday, they face-off against Penn in a Conference match at 7:30 PM in Maysers.

This past Saturday, F&M Men's Basketball honored Senior forward J.C. McGrath and manager Jordan Cohn before the game in a special senior day presentation. Four players scored in double figures to lead F&M to a 76-70 CC win over Muhlenberg. The Dips improved to 14-9, 8-8 CC, while the Mules fell to 12-11, 9-7 CC.

Performances by Matt Redhead, Les Thomas, Solomon Mathis, and Justin Kupa all gave the Dips an edge, while McGrath ended with a game-high seven rebounds for F&M.

Furthermore, before their Saturday game, F&M Women's Bas-

ketball honored its four-member senior class of AnnMarie DiCarlo, Haley Pilone, Sarah Pisani, and Lindsey Powers. With a 65-41 CC victory over Bryn Mawr, the Dips improved to 12-11, 9-9 CC, while the Owls dropped 1-22, 0-18 CC.

Performances by F&M's Kristen Hamill, Maia Lockhart, Emily Moran, and Kenna Williams all led to a Diplomat victory. Additionally, Pilone led scorers with

25 points, going 7-for-10 from behind the arc. Hamill followed with 13 points and brought down 9 boards.

F&M faces-off against Johns Hopkins this Wednesday at 6:00 PM in Maysers for a CC game that is sure to be interesting!

Junior Gabby Goodwin is the Editor-in-Chief. Her email is ggoodwin@fandm.edu.



Photo courtesy of godiplomats.com.
F&M Wrestling, Men's Basketball, and Women's Basketball teams all celebrated Senior Day this past weekend. All three teams clenched a win.

Patriots win Super Bowl LIII, second lowest scoring Super Bowl in history

BY JAMIE BELFER

Layout Assistant

Super Bowl LIII was a game of the experienced versus the inexperienced. On Sunday, February 3, the New England Patriots battled the Las Angeles Rams at the Mercedes-Benz Stadium in Atlanta.

Bill Belichick, the second oldest coach in the NFL (age 66), and his quarterback, Tom Brady, the oldest quarterback in the league (age 41) were ready to take on their ninth Super Bowl together. Meanwhile Sean McVay, the youngest head coach in the NFL (age 33), and his quarterback Jared Goff (age 24), among the youngest in the league, were hoping to share the feeling of winning their first Super Bowl.

Both the Patriots and the Rams fought hard on their way to the Super Bowl. In the first game of the postseason, the Patriots defeated the Chargers with ease in a 41-28 victory. However, in a close game, New England barely got past the Kansas City Chiefs as they defeated them in overtime. The Rams were able to defeat the Cowboys in their first postseason game 30-22. However, they also went into

overtime against the New Orleans Saints in order to clutch the NFC Championship and move on to the Super Bowl.

The first half of the Super Bowl was controlled by each team's defense. The Rams won the coin toss and deferred in order to start with the ball in the second half. After a 38-yard return, the Patriots started their first drive on their 39-yard line. After four straight runs, Tom Brady threw his first pass of the game which was intercepted by Cory Littleton at the Ram's 27-yard line. The Rams did not take advantage of this opportunity as they went three and out on their first drive. In their following drive, the Patriots marched their way down the field and Stephen Gostkowski missed a 46-yard field goal. The first quarter ended with a score of 0-0 as neither team was able to get close to the red zone.

The Rams started the second quarter with another three and out. With two completions to Julian Edelman and Rob Gronkowski apiece, the Patriots were able to march to the Rams' 24-yard line. Gostkowski was able to knock

down a 42-yard field goal, putting New England up 3-0. Jared Goff tried to comeback with a score in the next drive. He threw a successful pass to Robert Woods for 18 yards. However, the Rams were ultimately stopped by the Patriots' defense. The second half ended without another score from either team. The Rams only had two first downs in the entire half.

The second half was only slightly more eventful than the first. To start the third quarter the Rams had a short drive, only getting to their 46-yard line. Because the Patriots were able to stop the Rams' main run threat, Todd Gurley, the Rams struggled to put the ball on the ground. The Rams were able to put together their longest driving of 10 plays at the end of the third quarter. The Rams neared the red zone with a series of complete passes and runs. However, on a third down at the 26-yard line Patriots' Dont'a Hightower sacked Goff, pushing the Rams back to the 35-yard line, forcing them to settle for a 53-yard field goal by Greg Zuerlein. The third quarter ended with a score of 3-3.

With ten minutes left in the game, the Patriots put together a scoring drive. With a 29-yard pass to Gronkowski, the Patriots marched their way to the Rams' 2-yard line. Sony Michel ran in for the touchdown, putting the Patriots up 10-3. On the following drive, the Rams were able to make it to New England's 27-yard line. However, Stephon Gilmore intercepted Goff's pass intended for Brandin Cooks. The Patriots drove down the field with the help of some big run gains by Michel and Rex Burkhead (over 25 yards each). The Patriots ended their drive with a 41-yard field goal, putting them up 13-3 with one minute left. The Rams were unable to score, making the New England Patriots Super Bowl LIII Champions.

Julian Edelman of the Patriots was named MVP. This was the second lowest-scoring Super Bowl in the history of the NFL. Teams are now preparing for next season. The NFL draft starts April 25.

First-Year Jamie Belfer is a Layout Assistant. Her email is jbelfer@fandm.edu.