Supreme Court allows recruiters on campus

By Stephen Henderson
Knight Ridder Newspapers (KRT)

WASHINGTON — The Supreme Court said Monday that Congress isn’t tram
 ponying free speech by the withholding to
hold federal funding from universities that kick military recruiters off campus
 because the Pentagon’s “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy on gays conflicts with the
school’s anti-discrimination practices.

In a unanimous 8-0 ruling, the jus
tices said Congress isn’t stopping the universities from protecting the policy,
 nor is it asking the schools to endorse the policy by granting military recruiters the
same access they give other employers.

Congress’ Solomon Amendment
 merely seeks to regulate what univer
 sities “must do — afford equal access to
 military recruiters — not what they may
 or may not say,” Chief Justice John G. Roberts wrote for the court.

The ruling is a big boost to the mili
tary and a blow to 36 law schools
 that joined forces to fight what they’d
 been described as overreaching by Congress.

The schools will now face a choice:
 Does it mean military recruiters all ac
 cess to their campuses, or forfeit what in some
cases is hundreds of millions of dollars.

In essence, they tied federal fund
 ing for universities to the hospital
ity they extend to military recruiters.

Many law schools have strin
gent anti-discrimination policies that
 include protections for homosexuals,
they give the same chilly welcome to recruiters from all employers that they
feel discriminate.

A group of law schools objected to
the new rules, saying Congress’ edict
was a violation of their free speech
 rights. They argued that it not only
slapped down their protest, but also
exposed them to “associate” the mili
tary’s message by facilitating their
recruitment efforts.

Breyer, Alito, Jr., Souter

At the Supreme Court last fall, it
seemed clear that the justices weren’t
buying the schools’ argument. Several
justices said it was within Congress’
power to forbid access.

In his opinion on Monday, he out
lined how First Amendment protections of
free speech and association weren’t
an issue, but Congress’ edict was.

“The Solomon Amendment neither
limits what law schools may say nor
requires them to say anything,” Roberts
wrote. “Law schools remain free under
the statute to express whatever views
pleasure with the military’s policy on gay
by sending recruiters off campus or
denying them the kind of recognition
beyond what they may say.” He would have
forbade their funding.

Since 1994, the military’s policy
of “don’t ask, don’t tell” has allowed
gay men and women to serve as long as
they didn’t disclose their sexual prefer
ence or perform blatant homosexual
acts in public.

Well that’s a war we’re winning,”
he said.
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when lawmakers eager to boost
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A bone marrow drive will be held today and Wednesday from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. at the Campus Center. The drive is organized by the Hawai‘i Bone Marrow Registry at St. Francis Medical Center. People in good health between the ages of 18 and 60 are encouraged to register. For more information, please call the registry at 547-6154 or visit http://www.sftransplant.hawaii.org/hawaiibonemarrow.

“Phytochemistry and Bioactivities of Kava (Piper Methysticum, Piperaceae) Alkaloids and Lactones,” a molecular biosciences and bioengineering final oral, will take place tomorrow from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Agricultural Science Building, room 219. For more information, call 956-6000.

“Addressing Alcohol Addiction,” a department of recreation and sound, will take place today at 12:30 p.m. The grand round will take place at 510 S. Beretania Street, 2nd Floor Lobby. For more information, call Sharon Chua at 586-7478 or e-mail sharoc @hawaii.edu.

“The Ethics of Writing Autobiography,” a brown bag biography lecture, will take place today from 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at Kuykendall Hall, room 410. For more information, call 956-3937 or e-mail dtschudi @hawaii.edu.

“Genetically modified plant: the environmental impacts of genetically engineered plants,” a botanical science seminar, will take place tomorrow from 12:30 to 1:30 p.m. at the St. John Plant Science Laboratory Auditorium, room 11. For more information, call Daniel Tischuki at 956-8891, or e-mail dtischuki @hawaii.edu.

“Gender and Media Issues in China,” a seminar, will take place tomorrow from noon to 1:15 p.m. at Moore Hall, room 319, the Tokioka Room. For more information, call Don Drake at 956-3937 or e-mail dondrake @hawaii.edu.

“Bandung, Inter-Asian Migration and the Contradictions of Post-colonial Citizenship,” an inter-Asian migration colloquium, will take place tomorrow from 2:30 to 4 p.m. at Saunders Hall, room 624. Itty Abraham will present. For more information, call S. Krishna at 956-8944 or e-mail krishna @hawaii.edu.

Supreme Court Profiles

Scalia
Antonin Scalia, Associate Justice, was born in Trenton, N.J., on March 11, 1936. He received his A.B. from Georgetown University and the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, and his LL.B. from Harvard Law School, and was a Sheldon Fellow of Harvard University from 1960 – 1961. President Reagan nominated him as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and he took his seat Sept. 26, 1986.

Roberts, Jr.

Stevens
John Paul Stevens, Associate Justice, was born in Chicago, Ill., on April 20, 1920. He received an A.B. from the University of Chicago in 1942 and a J.D. from Harvard Law School. President Ford nominated him as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and he took his seat Dec. 19, 1975.

Kennedy
Anthony M. Kennedy, Associate Justice, was born in Sacramento, Calif., on July 23, 1936. He received his B.A. from Stanford University and the London School of Economics, and his LL.B. from Harvard Law School. President Reagan nominated him as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and he took his seat Feb. 18, 1988.

RECRUIT: Schools forced to facilitate military

From page 1

they may have on the military's congressionally mandated employment policy, all the while retaining eligibility for federal funds.

Heretofore that the law might require schools to send e-mails or post notices allowing military recruiters because they do it for other businesses. But he said said “compelled speech” was only incidental to the requirement that military recruiters be treated equally.

Comparing that situation to similar ones the court has faced, Roberts wrote: “Compelling a law school that sends scheduling e-mails for other recruiters to send one for a military recruiter is simply not the same as forcing a student to pledge allegiance, or forcing a student's Witness to display the motto ‘Live Free or Die.'” He said it trivialis constitutional protections to suggest that the law school face similar barriers.

Roberts said law schools aren't speaking when they aid students in the recruitment process.

“Unlike a parade organizer's choice of parade contingents, a law school's decision to allow recruiters on campus is not inherently expressive,” Roberts wrote. “Law schools facilitate recruiting to assist their students in obtaining employment. A law school's recruiting services lack the expressive quality of a parade, a newsletter or the editorial page of a newspaper.

Rosenkranz, picking up on the court's insistence that the law didn’t prohibit law schools from oppressing the military's interests, argued, “You're clearly more aggressive with more aggressive protests.”

‘Imagine sign over interview room saying: Danger: Discriminating employer inside!’ Or imagine school-sponsored protests when military recruiters come,” he said. “You haven't even seen protests until now.”

The court's 8-0 ruling reflects the absence of Justice Samuel Alito, who hadn't been confirmed to the court when the case was argued and thus didn't vote.

'Recruit: Schools forced to facilitate military'

Imagine Me & You: a charming comedy about love in its many forms

By Suzanna Leibold

Imagine Me & You is a romantic comedy written and directed by Ol Parker. The movie begins with the marriage of two inseparable friends: Heck (Matthew Goode) and Rachel (Piper Perabo). However, the newlyweds’ happily-ever-after ending can’t come within the first few minutes of the movie.

With the arrival of Luce, a new friend and an unexpected love for Rachel, this couple’s life is turned upside down. Suddenly, Rachel is confronted with the question of whether she is meant to be with Heck. The film follows four people finding out about love and their journeys as they try to make sense of destiny and the heart.

All the characters in this movie go through a complex maze of themes and emotions. Love and fidelity are two very obvious themes that are presented. The question of whether to follow one’s heart or head is shown in Rachel’s quest to understand her feelings toward Heck and potential lesbian attraction to Luce. Homosexuality and its acceptance in the world are prevalent in the film, as the reactions to Luce’s homosexuality are shown in many different ways. The stereotype of men’s fascination with gay women is an example of one of the reactions shown in this film.

The biggest theme in this movie is how love occurs. The question of whether love at first sight truly happens, or whether love comes from a long period of knowing someone is explored through the characters in the film.

The difference between love and friendship is critically looked into and questioned.

The cast is captivating and brings these many themes to life.

Perabo gives a great performance as a confused woman whose feelings seem to have a mind of their own. At times her performance seems a little downplayed, but on the whole, she does well. Goode also gives an extremely heartfelt performance. He creates a character

See IMAGINE, page 3
Dave Chappelle's Block Party': A Hip-Hop extravaganza

Film focuses on music more than comedy

By Sean Horie
Ka Leo Staff Writer

When people started filtering into the theater, there was a sense of anticipation that emanated from this dominantly urban-dressed crowd, eager to watch Dave Chappelle's "Block Party." The film, a production by Rouge Pictures, is also produced by Michel Gondry, who did "Eternal Sunshine of a Spotless Mind." Dave Chappelle's movie, however, is more of a home video than a feature movie.

The movie is based on hip-hop and R&B music, with performers including Kanye West, The Roots, Erikah Badu, Mos Def, Talib Kweli, Dead Prez, Jill Scott and Common, to name a few. In the movie, Dave explains his reasons for setting up such a massive block party in Brooklyn, New York.

"This is the concert I always wanted to see!" Dave Chappelle said in reference to making this epic event.

The first half of the film is the set up of the concert and Dave's preparation for it. Chappelle starts in Ohio to invite some people from around his block to the block party. He hands out Golden Tickets — like "Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory" — to average people. The film documents the interview reactions from the people who get the tickets, and they give some funny responses to their invitations.

The second half is purely about the music. The performances are realistic in their productions — there is no re-editing of many of the microphone glitches or strengthening weak-voiced performances. The concert fades in and out during their preparation for the concert. It is sort of like watching a movie with a built-in director's commentary.

The film is rated "R" because of the language used. This is an adult film and not intended for children because of its references to drug use and strong language in the songs and jokes.

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa sophomore Paul Harmon said, "This movie is for everyone at UH ... it is hilarious and funny because of the comedian, and it was intellectual." There is mature humor in this film, but it still has an underlying message of uplifting and empowering young blacks. There is also the feeling of a stripped budget mentioned at the beginning of the film. Moviegoer Azania Whitmore said, "Even though there was a low budget, they had groups of artists and The Fugees. Money was not an issue to them."

Teela Clowe said, "It's for everyone, even if you don't know hip-hop, it's good to learn." She is on the money about hip-hop being a major theme of the film. "Everything was good (about the film), especially Lauren Hill."

So the final verdict is that you should see this film if you can take hearing dirty jokes set in a documentary type film. There are no crazy special effects, only music and laughs that you will want to share with friends. I encourage you to attend this film with a group of your friends and have a good time.
Akaka Bill benefits no one, threatens many
By Jonathan Callahan
Ka Leo Contributing Writer

The Federal Recognition Bill, also known as the Akaka Bill, has grabbed more than its share of headlines over the past few years as it’s threatened, annually, to be passed — inspiring heated debate at every turn. The Akaka Bill is a wretchedly-composed bill. This would-be law will provide a slight, arguably insulting gain for a small group of people while it simultaneously awoke for a small group of law will provide a slight, arguably insulting gain for a small group of people and its surrounding communities. This will provide a slight, arguably insulting gain for a small group of people and its surrounding communities.

...AND THEN, THE BILL FOUND ITSELF BEING ATTACKED FROM BOTH SIDES.

PROPOSED A BILL THAT I FEEL WILL CREATE AN ATMOSPHERE OF RACIAL EXCEPTIONALISM

The issue
The problem with the Akaka Bill is that its effect would be precisely the opposite of what its proponents claim. It would impose upon the well-being of some or all of the citizens to whom it applies.
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The reason we have laws is to intervene, at a systemic level, when hatred and divided interests propel people or groups of people into conflict. Laws are, in theory, created to suppress what history tells us is an inevitable human tendency towards oppression — in a world of limited resources, people will quarrel, and the ones with the power will push to get what they want. Laws are not inherently just, right or moral but instead derive value from the wisdom of the people who’ve devised them. As such, a just, good or moral law is one that maintains the safety and freedom from oppression of citizens who come under its jurisdiction. Accordingly, an unjust law would be one that creates a negative impact upon the well-being of some or all of the citizens to whom it applies.
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small concession, invisibly ensure that the larger goal of voting could be accomplished. In other words, Hawai‘i would be locked into statehood forever.

The Akaka Bill helps no one

There ought to be a broad spectrum of opponents to the bill, and from what I can glean of editorials in the local papers, this seems to be the case: U.S. citizens of all persuasions ought to be vehemently opposed to the idea of a law enacted that essentially institutionalizes preference for a single ethnic group. Political activists engaged in the fight for the reinstitution of the sovereign kingdom of Hawai‘i ought to be equally fervent in their opposition, for the simple reason that the enactment of the Akaka Bill would signal the death knell for their cause. Proponents of good old common sense ought to be equally appalled that a law clearly in the womb if taken within 72 hours of unprotected sexual intercourse.

Before its announcement, Wal-Mart refused to carry the drug in its pharmacies. Wal-Mart’s stance has been the target of such groups as the National Organization for Women, NARAL, Pro-Choice America and Planned Parenthood.

Lawyers for Wal-Mart said it “chooses not to carry many products for business reasons.”

In the past, Wal-Mart has refused to carry music with explicit language and magazines that contain overly sexual material. That’s their choice, if consumers don’t like their decisions, they should shop somewhere else.

What differs here, critics say, is that women need access to this “lifesaving” medication that will “greatly benefit women’s health.”

Nonetheless, Plan B isn’t a catch-all, and it’s not a panacea. Women who use it when they’ve made a mistake. This isn’t directly needed like heart medication or a drug that’s going to keep you alive.

As the name indicates, it’s a “plan B” for women. Have a drunken Saturday night momentary lack of good judgment? Don’t worry! One pill can prevent any repercussions from actions.

Should Wal-Mart refuse to carry something that promotes a poor lifestyle? Absolutely not. Yet, that’s what has happened.

Wal-Mart made its decision to carry Plan B based on the numerous lawsuits that have appeared across the country because of its decision to not provide access to the drug.

Opponents to their policy have several arguments besides the wom-en’s health impact. They stated denial of access could cause unwanted pregnancies in cases of rape or incest. However, in many hospitals across America, women have access to the drug.

Besides, after you’ve been raped, is your first stop really going to be the neighborhood Wal-Mart?

Another argument takes place in the hypothetical Southern town where there only exists a Wal-Mart and two small, family-owned pharmacies.

Hypothetically, in this mystery town, if the two small, family-owned pharmacies are for instance, devout Catholics and therefore do not carry any birth control, then it falls on Wal-Mart to be the only other potential provider of the drug.

Those against Wal-Mart’s policy would have you believe that there’s no one else, and sewage is running into the streets. Yet, so far, the areas that have challenged Wal-Mart’s stance are Massachusetts and Connecticut.

In Massachusetts, Wal-Mart was ordered by the Board of Registration in Pharmacy to sell Plan B. The government is not just legislation.

Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal stated Thursday that unless Wal-Mart reversed its policy, all 188,000 state workers should have Wal-Mart removed as a prescription coverer in their insurance plans.

Government interference in this matter is absolutely ridiculous. Wal-Mart is a corporation and no government should pressure them on their business practices, especially on the decision to carry Plan B.

Wal-Mart’s reservations in carrying Plan B don’t just reach to this, but also to the FDA. While Plan B is an FDA-approved drug, they have refused to allow it to become an over-the-counter medication. That decision has provoked more than one argument among feminists and women’s health experts.

But their decision is completely justified, this is a very dangerous drug to have over-the-counter. It gives people a reason to have unprotected sex with no consequences at all. Sure there are sexually transmitted diseases, but if those using Plan B haven’t considered pregnancy, do you really think that STDs are going to be on their mind?

Plan B isn’t a catch-all, and it’s not a solution.

Wal-Mart shouldn’t be forced to carry it - which they’re not - but the extreme pressure for them to do so exists which explains its actions last week.

While I don’t believe there is much Wal-Mart can do, there is something the FDA can do. Require everyone who gets a Plan B prescription filled to be counseled. Let people understand the consequences of their actions. Part of the solution of stopping unwanted pregnancies in America should be education, not just medication.

Wal-Mart not a plan ‘B’

By Troy Calva
Daily T Buchanan (Texas Tech)

(U-WIRE) LUBBOCK, Texas - Superstores should not be disci-plined for refusal to carry emer-gency contraceptive.

Last week, Wal-Mart announced it will now include Plan B on its pharmacy shelves. Plan B is an FDA-approved Emergency Contraceptive Pill, or ECP. The pill contains high doses of hormones typically found in traditional oral contraceptives.

Elevated levels of the hormones are able to cease fertilization in the womb if taken within 72 hours of unprotected sexual intercourse.

Before its announcement, Wal-Mart refused to carry the drug in its pharmacies. Wal-Mart’s stance has been the target of such groups as the National Organization for Women, NARAL, Pro-Choice America and Planned Parenthood.

Lawyers for Wal-Mart said it “chooses not to carry many products for business reasons.”

In the past, Wal-Mart has refused to carry music with explicit language and magazines that contain overly sexual material. That’s their choice, if consumers don’t like their decisions, they should shop somewhere else.

What differs here, critics say, is that women need access to this “lifesaving” medication that will “greatly benefit women’s health.”

Nonetheless, Plan B isn’t a catch-all, and it’s not a panacea. Women who use it when they’ve made a mistake. This isn’t directly needed like heart medication or a drug that’s going to keep you alive.

As the name indicates, it’s a “plan B” for women. Have a drunken Saturday night momentary lack of good judgment? Don’t worry! One pill can prevent any repercussions from actions.

Should Wal-Mart refuse to carry something that promotes a poor lifestyle? Absolutely not. Yet, that’s what has happened.

Wal-Mart made its decision to carry Plan B based on the numerous lawsuits that have appeared across the country because of its decision to not provide access to the drug.

Opponents to their policy have several arguments besides the wom-en’s health impact. They stated denial of access could cause unwanted pregnancies in cases of rape or incest. However, in many hospitals across America, women have access to the drug.

Besides, after you’ve been raped, is your first stop really going to be the neighborhood Wal-Mart?

Another argument takes place in the hypothetical Southern town where there only exists a Wal-Mart and two small, family-owned pharmacies.

Hypothetically, in this mystery town, if the two small, family-owned pharmacies are for instance, devout Catholics and therefore do not carry any birth control, then it falls on Wal-Mart to be the only other potential provider of the drug.

Those against Wal-Mart’s policy would have you believe that there’s no one else, and sewage is running into the streets. Yet, so far, the areas that have challenged Wal-Mart’s stance are Massachusetts and Connecticut.

In Massachusetts, Wal-Mart was ordered by the Board of Registration in Pharmacy to sell Plan B. The government is not just legislation.

Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal stated Thursday that unless Wal-Mart reversed its policy, all 188,000 state workers should have Wal-Mart removed as a prescription coverer in their insurance plans.

Government interference in this matter is absolutely ridiculous. Wal-Mart is a corporation and no government should pressure them on their business practices, especially on the decision to carry Plan B.

Wal-Mart’s reservations in carrying Plan B don’t just reach to this, but also to the FDA. While Plan B is an FDA-approved drug, they have refused to allow it to become an over-the-counter medication. That decision has provoked more than one argument among feminists and women’s health experts.

But their decision is completely justified, this is a very dangerous drug to have over-the-counter. It gives people a reason to have unprotected sex with no consequences at all. Sure there are sexually transmit-ted diseases, but if those using Plan B haven’t considered pregnancy, do you really think that STDs are going to be on their mind?

Plan B isn’t a catch-all, and it’s not a solution.

Wal-Mart shouldn’t be forced to carry it - which they’re not - but the extreme pressure for them to do so exists which explains its actions last week.

While I don’t believe there is much Wal-Mart can do, there is something the FDA can do. Require everyone who gets a Plan B prescription filled to be counseled. Let people understand the consequences of their actions. Part of the solution of stopping unwanted pregnancies in America should be education, not just medication.
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New KTUH program director rocks airwaves

By Darlene Dela Cruz
Ka Leo Features Editor

The nine o’clock hour falls and shadows stir the night. Haunting sounds ring from the radio dial as music straight out of Elm Street creeps out of stereo confines. Guitar walls; heavy drums beat; singers scream out in lyrical despair. On the other side of this sinister scene, KTUH’s new program director Monty Anderson sits at the Hemenway Hall station, mastering these weekly macabre moments through his heavy metal radio show.

As host of KTUH’s “The Monster Show” on Tuesday from 9 p.m. to midnight, Anderson meshes eerie horror movie mood with the intensity of heavy metal music to create a dramatic radio formula. The structure and playlist of Anderson’s show seems almost like a cinematic plot, an intention influenced by Anderson in his attempt at an unconventional radio show.

“I’m trying to create an auditory monster movie,” Anderson said. “I had originally come up with the title because my name is Monty. But it actually worked to my advantage because it came up with a theme based on that.” Anderson begins his show lightly, as the first hour winds its way through tracks of classic rock from the 1980s. The catchy guitar riffs and bouncy drum scores of “hair metal” acts like Poison almost play an ironic foreshadowing in its light-heartedness, as the second hour of “The Monster Show” segways into more intense speed metal and “stoner rock” acts like Black Sabbath.

“Stoner rock” is Anderson’s favorite metal sub-genre. “It’s also during the second hour, which Anderson described as the first hour winds its way through tracks of classic rock from the 1980s. The catchy guitar riffs and bouncy drum scores of “hair metal” acts like Poison almost play an ironic foreshadowing in its light-heartedness, as the second hour of “The Monster Show” segways into more intense speed metal and “stoner rock” acts like Black Sabbath. Anderson may not fit the stereotype of Hawai‘i’s typical all-black-wearing, “metal head” rockers, Anderson may not fit the stereotype of Hawai‘i’s typical all-black-wearing, “metal head” rockers, but his passion and knowledge of music is given an intensity just as strong. Anderson grew up in Glendale, Ariz., where his roots in rock music were formed early. “I remember being like six or seven years old and listening to KISS,” Anderson said. “My first experience into heavy metal as we know it today was probably ‘Master of Puppets’ by Metallica. Today that still remains one of my favorite albums.”

After graduating with an associate’s degree in psychology at the University of Phoenix in Arizona, Anderson packed up his metal albums and moved with his dad to Maui in 1991. He made his way to O‘ahu in 2002 and earned his psychology degree at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa in 2003. In 2004, Anderson mixed musical experience into his studies when he started his run as a KTUH DJ, a move sparked by the motivation of others.

“Throughout my life, people have always told me that I have a radio voice,” Anderson said. “After a lifetime of hearing that, I thought maybe I could do something. At the same time, I’ve always been powerfully affected by music and the idea of sharing that music with other people.”

Anderson described his initial days in radio as “a process,” as he had no prior radio experience when he jumped behind the KTUH radio board a year ago. Added to the challenge of adjusting to his new job was his visual impairment. But with the help of others, Anderson was able to surmount those challenges within months and has since fared well in his DJ gig.

“The programming director at the time was Vicky DeMerce – she and manager with an offer to serve as the station’s new program director. According to Anderson, the radio station had been without a program director for six months after the station had tried to shift all the staff management responsibilities to its four genre directors. Anderson accepted the offer, and now manages the staff at the station. Having risen through the KTUH ranks first as a free form director - a genre director in charge of the station’s late night DJs - and now serving as its program director, Anderson has amassed a world of experiences, from interviewing members of Opeth, one of his favorite metal acts, to interacting with his fellow DJs and understanding the technical art of radio. All of this, he said, has made his radio run a satisfying one - a run he hopes to continue as long as he can.

“My experience with the station itself has been very rewarding,” Anderson said. “It’s helped me to learn a lot about myself and to develop skills. The people have been great.”

An attitude of learning best sums up Anderson’s philosophy on life. Whether he be parlayed through his analysis of music or through his recent attempt at learning to play the guitar, Anderson uses this drive to learn to continue his creative morale at KTUH.

“Musicians who think they know enough to get by and leave it at that without wanting to progress as a musician, their music gets stale and their creativity sort of dies,” he said. “I think to keep it going, you have to have that attitude of wanting to learn.”
Wet Week in Paradise

Rainbows finish rain-filled tournament 2-3

By Andy Taylor
Ka Leo Contributing Writer

The University of Hawai'i Rainbow baseball team split a day-night doubleheader with the University of Washington Huskies on Saturday to cap off the First Hawai'i Title Rainbow Baseball Tournament in front of a crowd of 2,205 at Les Murakami Stadium.

The two teams were forced to play doubleheader on Saturday after being rained out on Friday. It was the second doubleheader of the tournament for a tired UH squad that was clearly in need for a break.

"I've never been more happy for a tournament to be over," commented UH Head Coach Mike Trapasso. "I'm so glad we're done with the rain and trying to battle through every day with the delays."

"The errors are going to happen," said Trapasso. "This [field is] a joke right now, we're playing on a sponge."

The errors were hit by pitches. Frash, Inouye and Rindal all had singles for the Huskies.

Washington battled back in the sixth when they finally got to UH starting pitcher Ian Harrington, scoring an RBI single by Avila to take a 5-0 lead.

Washington scored six runs in the first inning in large part due to two errors as scattered showers made for a sloppy field and sloppy play by both teams.

The elements continued to be a factor in the second game of the day as scattered showers made for a sloppy field and sloppy play by both teams.

Washington scored six runs in the first inning off of left-handed pitcher Nate Young. Ryan Anderson, Matt Hague, and Curt Rindal all had singles for the Huskies.

The 'Bows finished the game with four wild pitches and six errors.

In the third inning both teams drew three walks but were unable to manufacture a run.

The 'Bows benefited from sloppy play by Washington in the fourth when they scored three runs after two players were hit by pitches. Freshman Inouye and Avila all had RBI singles in the inning to bring the 'Bows to within one.

Washington added one more run in the fifth to lead 7-5 after UH committed another error. The lead carried into the sixth inning.

Washington rallied in the ninth to end the game 10-7 with a two-run single by Matt Inouye.

The 'Bows added three more runs in the seventh on a two-out triple by Curt Rindal followed by an RBI single by catcher Matt Lane, but the 'Bows answered in the bottom of the inning.

Jon Hee led off the inning with a single and Frash then belted his second home run of the season off Washington reliever Bryce Mooney to put UH ahead for good.

The 'Bows added three more runs in the eighth on just one hit, a two-RBI single by Matt Inouye. Darrell Fisherbaugh bunted a Husky rally in the ninth to end the game 10-8. Fisherbaugh (2-1) got the win after throwing 2 1/3 strong relief innings and Tyler Cheney (0-1) took the loss for Washington.

In the seventh on a two-out triple by Curt Rindal followed by an RBI single by catcher Matt Lane, but the 'Bows answered in the bottom of the inning.

The 'Bows added three more runs in the eighth on just one hit, a two-RBI single by Matt Inouye. Darrell Fisherbaugh bunted a Husky rally in the ninth to end the game 10-8. Fisherbaugh (2-1) got the win after throwing 2 1/3 strong relief innings and Tyler Cheney (1-1) took the loss for Washington.

Game 2 Washington 8 — UH 7

The elements continued to be a factor in the second game of the day as scattered showers made for a sloppy field and sloppy play by both teams.

Washington scored six runs in the first inning off of left-handed pitcher Nate Young. Ryan Anderson, Matt Hague, and Curt Rindal all had singles for the Huskies.

The 'Bows finished the game with four wild pitches and six errors.

In the third inning both teams drew three walks but were unable to manufacture a run.

The 'Bows benefited from sloppy play by Washington in the fourth when they scored three runs after two players were hit by pitches. Freshman Inouye and Avila all had RBI singles in the inning to bring the 'Bows to within one.

Washington added one more run in the fifth to lead 7-5 after UH committed another error. The lead carried over to the bottom of the seventh, in a game that was only scheduled to go seven innings.

'UH managed to tie it up when Adam Roberts' pinch hit single scored both Matt Roquemore and Eli Christensen.

The Huskies took the lead in the ninth when pinch hitter Bradley Boyer drove in what would be the winning run with a triple.

Elliott Cribby (2-1) shut down UH in the bottom of the ninth and earned the win after pitching five innings in relief.

The Rainbows had a chance to win the second game of the day but were unable to come through with a run in the bottom of the ninth against a new pitcher.

With the split, the Rainbows are 10-8 after a huge game from Nathan Young, who was named to the all-tournament team as was UH starter Justin Costi.

Next up for the 'Bows is a five-game set with Western Illinois beginning Friday.

Rainbows lose national ranking

A week after reaching the national polls for the first time in seven years, a 2-3 showing in its first Hawai'i Title Rainbow Tournament caused the University of Hawai'i baseball team to drop out of the Collegiate Baseball newspaper Division I poll yesterday.

The Rainbows had not been nationally ranked since Feb. 22 of 1999 when they earned a rank into the Collegiate Baseball poll last week at 11-3 after going 2-1 over the then nationally-ranked USC. UH is currently 13-6.

Arkansas (13-3-1), which beat UH during the tournament, improved from 19th to 10th in the poll.

Other Tournament Games:

Wednesday, March 1 Day Game

The 'Bows fell 15-9 to the Texas-Arlington Mavericks to open the First Hawai'i Rainbow Baseball Title Tournament. UH pitcher Tyler Davis (1-1) earned the loss, while Maverick pitcher Randy Cornejo (1-1) got the win.

UH first baseman Luia Vaili tied a tournament record by hitting two home runs in the game.

Wednesday, March 1 Night Game

Hawaii rebounded from the day game loss to defeat University of Washington 10-6. Justin Costi (1-0) earned the win for UH and gave up just one run in six innings. Adrian Gomez (0-1) earned the loss for UW.

Thursday, March 2 Game

The Rainbows lost to 19th ranked Arkansas University 5-1 in front of a crowd of 2,405. Steven Wright (3-1) earned his first loss for UH but earned nine strikeouts in just over six innings. Nick Schmidt (4-0) got the win for the Razorbacks.