INTRODUCTION

On a crowded night during dinner in the Dining Center, Bob got up on a table and announced a party. His announcement did not mention alcohol specifically, but did mention the time and the place of the party. A community member, Leslie, immediately confronted Bob, inquiring whether or not alcohol would be served at the party. As Bob was answering, another community member, Fred, a member of JSAAPP, also confronted Bob. Bob said that alcohol would be served at the party, but that he didn't know that such an announcement was a violation of the Alcohol Policy. When presented with the recommendation that he not serve alcohol at his party, and thus not violate the alcohol policy, Bob declined, saying "you can crucify me if you want to." The party was held and alcohol was served.

Because the issue involved a possible technical breach of the Alcohol Policy, JSAAPP reached consensus that an inquiry was necessary. Both Bob and Leslie were asked to write letters stating their versions of what happened, and using these letters as a basis for discussion, the inquiry began.

FACT-FINDING INQUIRY

The inquiry began with a moment of silence, after which the chairperson outlined the inquiry process. It was explained that a JSAAPP inquiry is supposed to be a round-table discussion that attempts to discover whether or not a violation of the Alcohol Policy has occurred. If so, the inquiry would move to a discussion of resolutions aimed at repairing the breach of community standards.

Leslie, as the confronting party, then began. In her letter, Leslie stated that Bob had "made a public announcement" in the dining center. She continued by saying that Bob "admitted that there would be alcohol at the party and I simply told him about the guidelines of invitations to alcoholic parties." Leslie remarked that Bob seemed "very flippant," and "more concerned with the success of his party than any 'guidelines' that this community had put together." Leslie was "deeply disturbed" about this, and about the fact that even when told about the Alcohol Policy guidelines he would simply throw them aside as an "inconvenience" to their party. Leslie felt that Bob "understood" that he had violated the policy, but was willing to accept the consequences of his actions.

Bob then spoke. He said that "no offense...[but he was] surprised that [his announcement] was 'illegal.'" Bob said that the idea for the party was formed before dinner at a "pre-party." Some friends had suggested to him that he throw a party that night. Bob said he "found a way to get kegs" at short notice, but "realized that people needed to find out about it." He came up with the idea to announce it at dinner. At 5:30, he made one announcement, and at 6:30 he made another. In these announcements, Bob did not mention alcohol, but stated the time and place (a location at which alcoholic parties are often held). When Leslie confronted him, Bob asked Leslie if she was on JSAAPP, and before her reply, Fred approached him. He asked Fred if he was a JSAAPP member, and Fred replied yes. At this point, Bob "knew he was in for it," but went ahead with the party.

At this point, Fred stated that he had told Bob that such an announcement of an alcohol party, even without mentioning alcohol per se, constituted a violation of the Alcohol Policy. Fred then advised Bob that a "sure-fire way" of not violating the
Policy was not to have alcohol at his party. To this, Bob responded that he couldn’t do that, and that JSAAPPP could “crucify” him if it wanted to. Fred recalled that Bob said he would continue with the alcohol party despite any anticipated consequences.

Members of JSAAPPP then asked questions to clarify their understanding of the events. One member asked Bob if he understood the danger he was putting the College in by going through with his publicly announced party, and if he knew about the strict enforcement of new Pennsylvania state laws dealing with underage drinking at colleges. Bob replied that he did not know what was happening in Pennsylvania, and that he was ignorant of the dangers to the College involved in his party.

Another member asked why Bob went ahead with the party even after the confrontation, and with full knowledge that having alcohol would be in violation of the policy. Bob replied that he was not going to break his word to throw the party. He felt that his promise to his friends precluded his responsibility to the Policy. He said he would rather break the Policy than break his promise to his friends. He added that he wasn’t going to "slime out of responsibility" by moving the party or having someone else throw it. Besides, he felt that the announcement itself broke the policy, not the fact that the party occurred, and that alcohol was served.

One member asked about the timing of the preparations for the party. Bob responded by saying that he had part of one keg already, but that he went out to buy two more kegs after the confrontation in the Dining Center. To another question, Bob replied that he had "already broken the rule [by announcing the party]," so he didn’t think that not throwing the party, or not having alcohol would solve the problem. Bob stated that if he had not thrown the party after the announcement, it would have been a type of breach of trust to the community, considering it would have been a false announcement.

Another member inquired about what Bob felt his obligations were as a host. He replied that he was supposed to control the party, keep beer inside, and make sure that no one was overly drunk. He noted that this was his first party, and that he had made a fair amount of money.

Some members asked about Bob’s state of knowledge about the Alcohol Policy. He replied that he knew it existed, but that he hadn’t read it, and that he hadn’t gotten too involved in the discussions surrounding ratification. He said he was just too busy with his "hectic life at Haverford. Even by the time of the inquiry, he still had not read the policy.

To a question about his state of mind before announcing the party, he said that he had had a few beers, but not that much. He “was in a good mood” when he made the announcement.

At this point, members of JSAAPPP had no further questions for Bob or Leslie. The two left, and the members then discussed whether a violation had occurred.

INQUIRY DELIBERATIONS

Members of JSAAPPP all agreed that a violation had occurred, at least in the technical sense of Bob’s publicly announcing his party. But beyond that, the discussion centered on defining the scope of Bob’s violation. Could ignorance be an excuse? After the confrontation, could Bob be called ignorant? To what extent did Bob’s refusal to not serve alcohol at his party, in the face of the confrontation, accentuate his violation?

One member referred to Bob’s "tortured logic of concern for friends and community;" Bob had said that if he had not thrown the party after the announcement, it would have been a "breach of trust" in itself. The member
expressed that this logic was "distressing," since Bob's decision not to let down his friends had put the College in jeopardy.

JSAAPP discussed Bob's ignorance of the Alcohol Policy in general, and how much this ignorance could be used to excuse Bob's actions. The Alcohol Policy states that "all members of the Bi-College community are expected to be familiar with and abide by the principles of the alcohol policy." In short, ignorance is not an excuse. Further, members felt that Bob's ignorance ended after the confrontation with Leslie and Fred.

Most members felt that the most serious part of Bob's violation was not the announcement itself, but the fact that Bob went through with serving alcohol at his party even after the confrontation. With full knowledge of his potential violation, Bob proceeded to host the party, and thus put the College and the entire community at serious risk from lawsuits and/or the police. One member pointed out that Bob actually organized the party by buying the kegs after the confrontation, so it wasn't even a function of using or losing spent funds.

Discussion then turned to the issue of the spirit versus the letter of the Alcohol Policy. All members felt that Bob had not just violated the letter of the policy by announcing the party, but had also violated the spirit of the policy by virtually ignoring the confrontation.

JSAAPP discussed whether it had the authority to deal with this issue, or whether it should indeed go to Honor Council. Looking at the clause in Section One of the Policy which states that "Students who choose to consume, provide, or serve alcohol...should do so with a sense of responsibility and concern for themselves and others," JSAAPP felt that it should handle this, for this is in the Alcohol Policy, and, thus is the mandate of JSAAPP.

JSAAPP reached consensus that Bob had violated the Alcohol Policy. The members formulated a statement of violation which reads:

Bob violated the Alcohol Policy by publicly advertising and then hosting a party at which alcohol was served. His actions were in direct violation of the section of the policy which states, "...alcoholic beverages are not to be served or consumed at student parties open to and/or advertised in the college, bi-college or tri-college community." The seriousness of the violation was compounded by the fact that he held his party in spite of a confrontation by two community members, one of whom was on JSAAPP. Bob's actions constituted a serious danger to the college and a violation of community trust.

JSAAPP DISCUSSION

Bob was given the statement of violation to mull over, and then come up with a list of suggested resolutions. JSAAPP then met with Bob, and he presented his suggestions:

1.) Letter to the Community
2.) Write a set of guidelines for throwing a responsible party.
3.) Organize first-year student discussion groups.

Bob felt that these resolutions would help cure much of the ignorance in the community, which he felt was the root of his violation. According to Bob, "not a lot of people will think that I did something terrible since it was out of ignorance and it is not only me..." Bob further stated that "what we should try to cure is my ignorance and everybody else's."

Members of JSAAPP agreed that we should address both Bob's and the community's ignorance of the policy. They felt that Bob's resolutions were directed
more toward the community's ignorance than to Bob himself and his violation of the Alcohol Policy. One member stated that they were more "outward than inward." Bob responded by saying that the violation was in the announcement itself, and not in the party, and thus the only issue was ignorance.

Members disagreed strongly, emphasizing to Bob that the announcement itself was not a violation. It can only be a violation if it is followed by an alcohol party. If there is no alcohol party following an announcement, then the announcement means nothing, and the Alcohol Policy has nothing to do with it.

Members felt that the resolutions could not solely deal with ignorance, for after the confrontation, Bob was no longer ignorant. By throwing the party anyway, he knowingly violated the policy and broke his commitment to the community. One member stated that Bob didn't have the right to put "the college, its students, faculty, and administration" at risk. Another member felt that the resolutions had to address the breach in community trust illustrated by Bob's post-confrontation, knowing violation. Most of JSAAPP agreed that the resolutions should be aimed at the community, but should also be aimed at Bob, and his accountability for his actions.

With that, the discussion closed, Bob left, and JSAAPP discussed possible resolutions.

**DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTIONS**

Members agreed that the resolutions should not be "too harsh or too easy," saying that they must fit the violation.

One member felt that Bob's resolutions were satisfactory in terms of education, but that they must also hold Bob accountable for his actions. The member suggested that Bob be barred from hosting any parties for a certain length of time. Other members were uncomfortable with this suggestion, saying that it would be impossible to monitor, since a friend could throw the party for him.

Another member suggested that Bob live off-campus for a semester or be taken off the meal plan, so he could take time to realize the importance of community. But others felt this would be purely punitive, and not educational at all. One member stated that he "saw clear sense of a lack of understanding of what the community is about...and separation from the community may never let him understand the importance of community." Another member felt that being off the meal plan would simply serve to isolate him.

Addressing the question of leading first-year student discussions, one member felt uncomfortable with Bob representing the alcohol policy.

One member even suggested the idea of a public apology, for Bob seemed to not care about confidentiality. But most members felt that this would make it seem almost like a show trial. Another suggestion was that he live on the quiet hall for a semester. But this was felt by some to imply that JSAAPP could tell Bob who his friends should be. Members did not want to the resolutions to be too moralistic.

All agreed that a letter to the community would be a good step toward educating Bob and the community about the Alcohol Policy and the JSAAPP inquiry process. But members also wanted resolutions that would deal with Bob's accountability and the breach of community trust displayed by Bob's throwing the party after the confrontation.

JSAAPP discussed community service as a means to achieve a compromise between accountability and education. Such service must be directed towards issues of legal liability with regard to the consumption of alcohol, since anything dealing with just alcohol abuse would cloud the issues surrounding Bob's violation. One member suggested Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) as an example of a good organization for which Bob could do his community service. Other members
emphasized that community service, while painful in terms of a time commitment, could be educational and beneficial to Bob.

Discussion then focused on the amount of time the community service would take. JSAAPP reached consensus that five hours a week would be a good amount, for it would not be debilitatingly harsh, yet would avoid being insignificant.

PRESENTATION OF THE RESOLUTIONS

JSAAPP reached consensus on the following resolutions:

1. Bob will write a letter to the community discussing the inquiry and the issues surrounding his violation.
2. For a full semester, Bob will engage in five hours a week in some form of community service dealing with alcohol and legal liability. He will discuss this and be assisted in finding this community service by Marilou Allen. The ultimate decision as to what Bob does will up to him.
3. Bob will keep a journal of his activities and thoughts about his service for the length of the semester.
4. JSAAPP suggests that Bob become more involved in the community by attending such things as study breaks, plenary, and collection.

JSAAPP then reconvened with Bob to discuss the resolutions, and the chairperson read them to Bob. JSAAPP members stressed the educative aspects of the resolutions, hoping that Bob would internalize any lessons learned by his community service. Bob was concerned by the amount of hours of community service, but in the end, agreed to the resolutions. Bob thanked JSAAPP; JSAAPP thanked Bob, and the inquiry process came to a close. This inquiry, spanning five days, represents the longest JSAAPP inquiry to date.

Questions For Further Thought:

1.) Were the resolutions too harsh/too easy? Is ignorance an excuse? Was Bob ignorant?

2.) What constituted Bob’s violation? Should the confrontation have played any significance?
3.) How should JSAPP facilitate more awareness of the Alcohol Policy on campus?
Dear Community,

    I violated the alcohol policy here at Haverford. In doing so, I came to realize certain key points. Before the infringement, I knew almost nothing about the alcohol policy aside from a few of its rules: no beer in the hallways, and a host cannot charge for beer. Sadder yet, I had a total misconception about what JSAAP was about and why the school has it. I admit now that I was wrong. I believe I now better understand the scheme of things. Yes, I did violate the alcohol policy in hosting a party after publicly announcing it. In doing so, I jeopardized the school. And although I don't agree one-hundred percent with the resolutions, I accept them. In passing, I would just like to urge you all to please get to know the alcohol policy. Even if you think you know it head to toe, you may learn something; I surely did.

    Sorry.

Bob