SGA elections

Once again, it is time for Student Government Association elections. While the Elections Committee has surely done an excellent job educating the candidates about the proper way to campaign, some conflict seems to arise in every election. All of the candidates, both for major offices and for representative positions, should do their best to keep the campaigns clean and fair.

This year’s elections continue a pattern of low turnout in the races for undergraduate representatives; a trend that is disturbing because of the importance of self-governance among students. Without strong, competitive races with high voter turnout, students cannot feel connected to the decision-making processes of the Undergraduate House. This lack of connection to the House contributes to the low turnout in races for representative positions.

The problem of few applicants for House positions is clearly a complex problem without an easy solution. Beyond the lack of knowledge among most of the student body about what SGA does, general campus apathy, a tough academic environment and a myriad of other activities to pursue make recruitment of representatives difficult. Perhaps the representatives next year could make a concerted effort to reach out to their constituents both to keep students more connected and to encourage higher candidate yields in next year’s elections.

Auxiliary Services

This week’s announcement that smoking will no longer be allowed in any on-campus housing is a clear demonstration of the Auxiliary Services’ use of student opinion in deciding policies on issues that directly effect students. Lately, there have been several good examples of incorporating student opinion into policy, among them the renovation of the post office and recent changes to parking policy.

These legitimate and significant uses of student opinion can easily be contrasted with other decisions that the Tech administration has made recently, most notably the increase in housing fees. Even if price increases are necessary and unavoidable, students should play a proactive role in determining those price increases from the beginning, not just serving as rubber stamps at the end of the process.

Student input in administrative and sometimes even academic decisions is essential to helping the Institute maintain its focus on its education mission. Without this input, Tech could easily lose sight of what is best for the students.
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**Around the Campus**

What's the most exciting thing you did on Spring Break?

**Susan Kennedy**

Assistant News Editor

“I got a job interview.”

**Kyle Butler**

Civil Engineering

“Went back to my high school after three years.”

**Jessie Kollmeyer**

Biology

“Saw the eagles’ nest at Kennedy Space Center.”

**Kevin Gorham**

Computer Science

“Getting drunk at a bar.”

**EDITORS**

Letters to the Editor

“Monologues” fail to achieve education goal

Education is at the core of our mission here at Georgia Tech. Copying other universities, which might have their own reasons to produce “The Vagina Monologues,” is not among all options which address violence against women and rape. I fail to see how this play topped the list of best educational vehicles on the subject.

Top universities earn their status by contributing to the development of new knowledge and discourse in their fields. Perhaps it is characterized as having a diverse, even controversial, set of cultural opportunities. However, having this play occupy any controversial opportunity with questionable cultural and educational value would not by any means earn a university top status. I don’t believe UGA’s stature, to cite one example, got any higher among universities as a result of doing this play no matter how many times they deemed it necessary to repeat the show.

The failure of this production to meet its claimed goal of fighting violence against women, the play does not attract the targeted audience. Georgia Tech’s audience confirmed the nationalistic paradigm of predominantly women spectators. If effective at all, we would have to believe now that the great many overzealous fans, the root of the problem, have been rehabilitated. Secondly, the monologue devoted to the issue of rape and violence within the play are mi-nuscule, at best. I am still waiting to see one piece of statistical data showing a drop in the num-
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ber of rape and violence cases on those hundreds of campuses that joined the bandwagon in producing “The Vagina Monologues.” Why should any reasonable person expect it? The play’s main focus is not rape and violence against women. Or is it?

The Technique’s overrated, cast-focused, one-page account eloquently proves this point. Did I miss the section of the article featuring testimony indicating how the play changed any member of the audience’s mind regarding rape and violence against women?

The budget for the performance was about $5000, funded by the GT Student Foundation ($2500), Drama Tech ($1500) and SGAm ($1000). Is this the best use of our resources? I am quite surprised to learn that students’ fees were used to support a fundraiser benefiting two organizations outside the community, the Grady Rape Crisis Center and Men Stopping Violence.

So please drop the claim that the play is fighting rape and violence against women, and let’s train to be the elusive and critically needed celebration of sexuality. If it takes the elusive and critically needed celebration of sexuality, the play is laughable at best.

Dr. Mimi Philobos
Director, Women in Engineering Program

“Claiming that such a production fosters inclusiveness and support for women on campus is laughable at best.”

Dr. Mimi Philobos
Director, Women in Engineering Program

It is obvious to me that Tony Kluemper, author of the editorial “Movie lawsuit frivolous, ridiculous” in last week’s issue of the Technique, has no real concept of law, commerce or art. As such, perhaps we should have been spared the embarrassment of his foolishly written article. The argument put forth in the lawsuit is that if a patron is personally subsidizing the showing of a film by buying a ticket, that patron has the right to expect the film to begin at the printed and scheduled time. To say a film begins at 2:00 when it doesn’t begin until 2:20 is called a false business practice.

To then use the audience as a source of commercial revenue for those 20 minutes is manipulative and unethical. The theater is then taking, from a packed theater, 6000 minutes of time. This is the argument put forth by the lawsuit. It is valid and reasonable, unlike Mr. Kluemper’s absurd comparison to a late teacher. Imagine if that teacher was not late but instead spent the first ten minutes of class time trying to sell his students Amway products before class started. That would be unethical. That would be a theft of time in the same manner of a movie theater showing commercials.

Finally, in response to the movie-tickets argument, ticket prices arguably have gone up 30% in the last several years, generating more than enough revenue to keep the theaters afloat.

Commercial revenue is simply icing on the cake to these complexes. Next time he writes, Mr. Kluemper should probably either do some research, some serious thinking, or at least write something about which he’s qualified to write.

Matthias Shapiro
gte944w@prism.gatech.edu

“Imagine if a teacher spent the first ten minutes of class time trying to sell his students Amway products.”

Matthias Shapiro
techstudent
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