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OUR VIEWS

Consensus Opinion

Candidate numbers too low

With student government elections fast approaching, Tech’s student body is looking at an unusually small pool of candidates to choose from.

There are a total of 56 students running to fill representative and executive positions in SGA next year; this is well below the number of slots that actually exist and need to be filled. This could pose some problems that SGA has not had to face before.

In most cases, students running for certain positions face no opposition. With so few contested categories, most students running have to put little or no effort into their campaigns and simply have to wait to be elected. This devalues the ideal of democracy, which hurts the foundation of Tech’s student government. Democracy is truly achieved when candidates who are passionate about these positions work hard to achieve a truly well-deserved victory.

Many of the students that are running for these positions have held positions in SGA in previous years. While maintaining a certain level of consistency with returning representatives is important, it is also necessary that new ideas and views be brought into the undergraduate house each year. New students with an eagerness to be involved and make a difference should be coming in and filling many of these positions at the start of each new year in order to bring fresh voices and ideas to student government.

One explanation for such a small number of candidates could be due to the fact that many students were not made aware of the elections and what the deadlines were. SGA’s Public Relations Committee has a responsibility to inform the student body of this important information. This year’s PR Committee has done a poor job of fulfilling its obligations, and students should value the part that these representatives play and strive to become an active part of this organization.

Class won’t solve problem

The recently formed Academic Misconduct Review Committee has come up with several new proposals with regards to dealing with the problem of academic misconduct. One of the proposed solutions is the idea of having first-time offenders take a class discussing the importance of academic integrity.

While this is a noble proposal, it is unrealistic to assume that students will be enlightened as to the ideals of academic integrity and morality after being made to sit through one class and write a short essay outlining what that class taught. And furthermore that they have the “right” to serve in wars, or fight fires, or be CEOs, or have government-provided child care, or to be paid maternity leave or whatever else the women’s lobby decides to add to the list.

This is nonsense. Women can’t have it all.

Their special little “rights” are going to part more of a drain on the economy through government expenditures than their working will add to it, and in the meantime their children are being dumped in day care from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Pick one! Family or career, and you have to realize that a family will affect a woman’s career.

Feminists should stop whining, make choices

By Casandra Showell

(U-WIRE) U. of Oklahoma—Last week, I took feminists to task for their disgusting exhibition of child rape in “The Vagina Monologues.” This week, I continue my anti-feminist right-wing zealotry by taking feminists to task for their long string of some other crimes of nonsense.

“Women are oppressed!” they say. “They’re held down and paid less than men!” The one thing that feminists keep repeating in their desperate attempt to make it true is that women are “equal” to men.

And furthermore that they have the “right” to serve in wars, or fight fires, or be CEOs, or have government-provided child care, or to be paid maternity leave or whatever else the women’s lobby decides to add to the list.

This is nonsense. Women can’t have it all.

Their special little “rights” are going to part more of a drain on the economy through government expenditures than their working will add to it, and in the meantime their children are being dumped in day care from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Pick one! Family or career, and you have to realize that a family will affect a woman’s career.

Enter the unequal pay farce: Women only get 79 cents on a man’s dollar! Well, they can say this so long as they can suppress any examination of reality.

Even women who choose high-paying male-dominated fields may still choose to have children. This means more time off for childbirth and sick kids and days when the baby-sitter cancels and the other burdens of parenthood that tend to fall upon the mother.

Less time to devote to career means—I can’t resist a “duh” here—

By Matt Norris / STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

Consensus editorials reflect the majority opinion of the Editorial Board of the Technique, but not necessarily the opinions of individual editors.
Tech students have many motivations for academic pursuits

In October of 1986 the Cold War felt a momentary brush of warm air. It happened during a summit in Reykjavik that brought the leaders of the two most powerful nations in history together to attempt to ease the tensions that then existed. In a private meeting between President Reagan and Soviet Premier Gorbachev each of the greatest chances to alter the course of world history and perhaps even eliminate nuclear weapons altogether was placed on the table. Gorbachev, attempting to bring about an unprecedented set of reforms in the Soviet Union, knew that perestroika could not be achieved if the Soviet Union was to continue to pour vast resources into arms expenditure. He thus approached Reagan with a proposal to begin to decrease the number of missiles each nation had stockpiled. When it came down to numbers, both nations began best-stocked. When it came down to the number of missiles each nation had that perestroika could not be achieved and perhaps even eliminating that retaliation would be at least to it. The declared purpose is to protect the US and not to attack a rogue nation. However, it is flawed by both its premise and its execution. The perceived threat that a nation (North Korea is often cited) would develop the capability to send a weapon of mass destruction via a long-range ballistic missile is a relic of closed-minded Cold War thinking. If the United States has learned anything in the past six months, it is that an attack is not going to come from conventional weapons.

The impetus for a nation to spend the resources to develop a ballistic missile against to the US is what worries the US. What worries them much is how much easier it is for a nation to transfer to the US or to build an intercontinental ballistic missile. The US would be able to evade the equivalent of a $60 billion dollar policeman that can be evaded through a $0.50 dart.

What is currently well beyond our capabilities, and will continue to be for some time, is being able to distinguish between an actual warhead and a dummy warhead. By including a dozen or so fake warheads, a ballistic missile can draw an intercepting missile away from a true threat. Other than the already stated issues, the development of a ballistic missile defense system greatly damages the sacred institution of war and peace. If war were to be fought in it, a warhead in New York. A nation would never risk an overt assault if it can remove interceptors from its political stage and instead attack from subterfuge.

If North Korea were to launch against the US, it would do so knowingly that retaliation would be at least equal but more likely much more severe. It is the same doctrine that prevented either the US or the Soviet Union from destroying each other during the Cold War. The current design of the ballistic missile defense system is simultaneously a technologically featurable and technologically ineffective. Provided that the interceptors that are needed are made, the US would then be struck with the equivalent of a $60 billion dollar policeman that can be evaded through a $0.50 dart.

When it comes to current and future students, they should be aware of the many reasons that motivates the other students to Tech, and you should ask yourself, “Am I proud of what motivates me?”
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The United States should help other nations achieve global security

Tech students have many motivations for academic pursuits

It’s fun to observe what motivates Tech students. The motivation of many students, motivation is a necessity in order to graduate from Georgia Tech.

A great part of Tech academia is endurance, and one has to wonder what keeps someone going when you see them sleeping for 24 hours straight in a lab. Is it money? Is it a love for the area of study?

I think there are some clear trends. Many of the students, and I will present and judge each of them here. The most obvious thing that motivates a great many Tech students is money. If you graduate from the computer science students and theorize than produce and apply knowledge.

Tech students have many motivations for academic pursuits

The first and most obvious thing that motivates the other students to Tech, and you should ask yourself, “Am I proud of what motivates me?”

When discussing Georgia Tech with their peers and away from the profes- sional projects and, in general, acade- mic life.

This newest incarnation of Reagan’s drive hard to produce something new, and instead attack through subterfuge.

One of the reasons for the computer science students and love to look for interesting undergraduate research projects. Instead of reading about the idea of graduation that drives these various types of motivation, and, by coming up with your own classifications, you can judge what really motivates you.

With that in mind, I would like to share with you some of Tech’s student’s motivations for academic pursuits.
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Feminists

less chance of job promotions and raises. When the child factor is set aside, women get equal pay. They do.

Show me a woman who has not had the distraction of children to keep her away from work more often and prevent her from going the extra mile—in short, a woman who is the equal of her male coworkers in every particular—who is still paid less, and I’ll show you a woman smart enough to sue her employer for a clear-cut case of illegal discrimination.

There is absolutely no need for the National Organization of Women to step in and white about the oppression of all women based on such rare instances.

They will still whine that women should not be ‘punished’ for having children, but this is a question of productivity—women with children don’t produce as much in economic terms. Their contribution to society is their children, and if they chose to have children, they should realize and be content with this.

Honestly, any businessman who pays some employees twenty percent more than the rest of the employees based on non-productivity should realize and be content with this.

American women oppressed? Pshaw. I today can vote, serve on a jury, testify before it, own property, and have continuous parental involvement and interest. I have doubts that such a method can teach enough SAT math in six two-hour sessions for every student to score a 600 on the math part of the test, how could a remedial class possibly instill integrity into someone who has already fallen short of the mark?

Something must be missing from the integrity equation. The responsibility for instilling values should not fall upon college administrators. By that time, it’s too late.

tutor can’t teach enough SAT math and have a conversation with kids about cheating that leads to higher standards and values education.

If parents aren’t doing a good job of setting high standards for their children, how can schools such as Tech expect their students to exhibit integrity and character? Tech plans to send those found responsible for cheating to a class on integrity. Students will have to write a 500 word essay and discuss ethics.

The results of a recent AJC “Voice of Atlanta” poll suggests some Atlanta area parents are more than a little confused.

Almost ninety percent of the 583 people who answered the survey think that parents are failing to teach their children “morals, values, and high standards,” instead allowing their kids to learn from their peers and the media. Of course, over ninety percent also think they do a very good job of instilling values in their own children—other words, the problem must be what the other parents are doing. Obviously, someone must be wrong.

In my part-time job as an SAT tutor, I spend time with a variety of high school students. Although they have one thing in common—their parents are willing to shell out the cash to have a private SAT tutor explain the finer methods of test-taking strategy, reading comprehension questions and the ever-baffling idea of triangle geometry—the similarities stop there. I see students who are motivated to learn and have continuous parental input, and I see students who wish I would leave before the two-hour session is over so that they can return to their regularly scheduled lives of unsupervised bliss. Pop quiz, which students end up with the better SAT scores?

Although quantitative scores can’t offer a measuring stick of ethical aptitude or manutenx, academic success tends to reflect directly on parental involvement and interest. I would argue that character development likewise depends on parental attention and involvement. Others think that values should be taught in schools. Who should take responsibility for values education?

Feminism has done its job here.
**Buzz Around the Campus**

**Question of the week**

“What do you think about the new online sign-up process for housing?”

**Josh Ebeling**
ME Sophomore

“I don’t have a computer. What’s online?”

**Rich Murphy**
CS Junior

“Even though I didn’t apply, the webpage looks nice.”

**Megan Preble**
ME Junior

“It’s really easy to use.”

**Genevieve Wolff**
MGT Senior

“Do what?”

**Jeff Kock**
Arch Junior

“Housing, how arousing”

**Ben Walker**
ID Senior

“Quick and easy, just how I like it.”

**Katy Gustashaw**
CE Freshman

“I like anything online. It’s more convenient.”

**Holly Harris**
TPE Freshman

“Didn’t we just have to do like one click?”
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