Uphold the Honor Code

Although students appear to be more aware of the honor code, we often fail to challenge violations when we see them. Simply put, students must confront cheaters. The honor code relies on peer enforcement and without such intervention its benefits will never be fully realized. Honest students are penalized when cheaters break the curve.

Furthermore, many professors remain uninformed about honor code specifics. Students must take initiative and insist that professors provide sample questions for tests and quizzes. Greek organizations provide access to such “word” to their members, so the code’s stipulation gives all students an equal opportunity to excel. Most professors who fail to fulfill this obligation are not trying to shaft students in new and creative ways; they are simply ignorant of the requirement.

Students can no longer wait for professors to enforce the honor code. We need to hold our peers and our professors to a higher level of responsibility. Only then will Tech realize her full potential as a true academic community.

Social Greeks are held to a different standard when it comes to hazing violations as evidenced by recent proceedings against Pi Kappa Phi. Greeks receive a disproportionate amount of criticism and suspicion in regards to hazing simply because a sanctioning model exists within IFC but not for other organizations. Why is what is considered tradition and teambuilding discriminatory standards cannot continue—they need to be addressed. Hazing is a growing issue on campus that every student must contemplate. What do you consider hazing? Where do you draw the line? These questions have gone unanswered for too long—it’s time to take a stand.

What is hazing?

A freshman hall council’s recent initiative to distribute free condoms in Glenn and Cloudborn dorms deserves praise. While the Health Center and Women’s Resource Center currently provide free condoms, more convenient distribution centers will allow students to obtain them in the heat of the moment. The housing administration’s rotten attempt to stifle such creative problem solving is eclipsed only by its attempt to stonewall the Technique.

Give us condoms!

The SGA has recently approved funding for the Campus Crusade for Christ to host Jeff Foxworthy for a testimonial at the Fretz Center. This is a misuse of Student activity funds, and I want to encourage students and their elected representatives in SGA to oppose similar future efforts.

Mr. Foxworthy has been invited to campus to give this testimonial which is religious in nature. I do not have a problem with religion on campus, and in fact I encourage religion in general. However, I believe we should oppose using mandatory fees to promote religious views, especially at a public university. Even though the Supreme Court has affirmed the use of student fees to support political and religious campus organizations, we should say no. Separation of church and state was an integral issue to the founding fathers of the United States.

There are many worthy efforts that increase the intellectual climate on campus. This is not one. A testimonial for any religion (or political cause for that matter) is an inappropriate expenditure. Rather than offend one student through a provocative grant, SGA should carefully spend its budget, which is a budget that we all have to pay for in order to register for class. Our ever-increasing student fees are being wasted on inappropriate activities. I was unable to convince my colleagues in the Graduate Student Senate to vote against this bill.

Mr. Foxworthy speaks, raise money. The same should apply to every religious or political organization. But please do not use our fees to support an event that is obviously meant to promote religion.

Georgia Tech is not affiliated with any religion, and mandatory fees should never be used to promote it. The intelligent students here have many options of where to attend school, and there is no short-age of religiously affiliated institutions of higher learning they could have gone to if they wanted to pay for religious programs. We should strive not to exclude or alienate large groups of students.
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Georgia Tech is not affiliated with any religion, and mandatory fees should never be used to promote it. The intelligent students here have many options of where to attend school, and there is no short-age of religiously affiliated institutions of higher learning they could have gone to if they wanted to pay for religious programs. We should strive not to exclude or alienate large groups of students.

Dennis Balchin
gce841r@prism.gatech.edu

Condom Distribution

Sigh, condoms just down the hall now if I only had a girlfriend.

You know what'll cheer you up a nice game of Quake.

by Matt Norris / STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

Christy Wright
Campus Crusade for Christ
Christy.Wright@uscg.org

Says Jeff Foxworthy

FRIYDAY NIGHT AT GLENNDORM...
Pay teachers better to improve education profession

Low income of educators causes people to shy away from the field with less potential to improve the nation; increase pay to increase teacher quality and quantity

A recent local news headline pro-
claimed, “Raisest top group’s responses; ‘$1 billion plan’ revealed that the raises were ridiculously skewed to-
ward the top 1% and the lowest 20%,” the lowest category, the be-
ginners with an education degree received increases of 5% to 10% to $29,800 a year. Who’s looking for what’s best for the system in-
stead of their own best interest?

This is just the tip of the iceberg. Education is being treated as a third class makes no sense, and it’s a threat to the mental and physical health of the students. The problem is neglect. As pop-
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MORE VIEWS  Letters to the Editor

Keep consensus for serious issues, not fluff

"Jokes" do not belong on the Editorial page. Neither does your September 29 consensus opinion. Your personal lives should not be masquerading as the newspaper’s official opinion.

Furthermore, while the idea of running “reasons for dating” as editorial opinion is crass in itself, the Technique crossed the line into unprofessionalism by printing names as part of their consensus.

Did the Editorial Board really have nothing else to consense about? Your definition of what is worthy to appear as your editorial opinion makes me question the credibility of your editorial opinion. I would have much preferred to read the Technique’s thoughts on a bus to Buckhead (article on page 13 of the same issue) than the phone numbers of the unattached members of the Editorial Board.

I could even have stood to read a consensus about dating had it been handled in a mature, professional manner. The Technique is not a high school publication, so please don’t treat it like one.

As part of the student newspaper, you are in an incredible position to influence changes on campus and bring important issues to light. You really can serve as the voice of the student body. Instead, you chose to reduce the heart of your newspaper to something cheap.

Please take your responsibility as Georgia Tech journalists seriously. Please use the Editorial page for its expressed purpose and leave your inside jokes, your love lives, and your slams at exes to your sliver boxes.

Huda Kazi
gt1176b@prism.gatech.edu

Send letters to the editor to opinions@technique.gatech.edu

Pay from page 11

professions since 1995, even as the results of this neglect were increasing at an alarming rate. With already below-par salaries, we are worsening the problem by allowing the pay discrepancy with other fields to widen. This money would be a fine investment as well. More educated adults will lower unemployment and decrease the need for entitlement programs, as a greater percent of the population is enabled to provide for themselves and even plan for their own medical care and retirement, without the assistance of the government.

Let me sum it up. We are doing our nation an inexcusable disservice by allowing our education system to falter. Effective teachers should be our most valuable commodity, as their impact on today’s youth drastically affects the potential of an entire generation. We should make the field so appealing that there are more qualified, aspiring educators than there are jobs to fill. Industry should be filled with the leftovers, after education has hired away all of the top students. Facilities and curricula should be supplemented similarly, providing educators with top-rate equipment and facilities to work their craft. Until the ignorance and neglect are peeled back, our future will continue to slip downwards, further and further from our amazing potential.

As a future teacher, the Opinion Editor totally agrees.

Free Pizza.

Tuesdays, 7 pm
Student Services Building, Room 137.
Depart from the norm, carefully

Just say "yes" to unconventional consensus editorials. I say bravo to the intrepid editors who chose to depart from the standard commentary on Tech administration and politics, often beyond the comprehension and cares of us students. Now, daring (or the absence thereof) is something to which I can relate!

However, the execution of last week’s editorial leaves much to be desired. When I do something risky, I am more careful to do it well, so as to avoid disaster. Before taking the risk of skydiving, I would put tremendous effort into doing it well because the consequence of sloppy execution could be fatal. Likewise, before diving into an offbeat editorial for the first time, you should have simply done a more solid and creative job in writing it well. In this case, the consequence is nowhere near fatal, but your reputation is on the line.

I suspect many Technique fans were disappointed in last week’s consensus opinion. After all the yelling and screaming has stopped, you are still a well-written and knowledgeable voice of the students. Yet, like you said, you are a school publication. And school publications, especially editorials, have the obligation to break the mold.

During my five-year tenure here, the Technique has gone from a lighthearted, shallow newspaper to a respectable, but serious publication. On that note, perhaps a happy medium would be to weave some fun, yet true social commentary into your standard editorials.

Steve Slawsky
gt7878a@prism.gatech.edu
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Foxworthy “performance” misleading

I was mildly interested upon seeing the flyers advertising Brett Butler and Jeff Foxworthy. It seemed that they’d paid two talented comedians to perform at Tech. I was obviously not alone in my interest as the advertising campaign managed to fill up most of the Ferst Center.

Then I was blindsided; it seems that whole part about “sharing talent and lives” actually meant preaching for Jesus and God. The Campus Crusade for Christ had just pulled a fast one on an entire auditorium of people, and they’d done it using SGA funding.

Not that it was vitally important to use SGA funding, part of the performers’ before mentioned “talent” was to point out frequently that it was by mission of God, and not pay, that they were there. But thank goodness! They were quick to let us know all that personal doubt and insecurity we felt was not normal teenage angst, but lack of Jesus Christ in our lives. Well this must have come as quite a shock to all of the non-Christian students who had come out to enjoy a night of comedy.

Jeff Foxworthy was still hilarious for the 20 minutes he actually performed, even though I kept hoping he wouldn’t break into the religious message that he ultimately did. He at least seemed considerably more down to Earth than the previous speakers.

I’m not protesting the message sent by the presenters, but it was offensively misplaced. This event was very directly about religion, and was not at all considerate of students with different beliefs. The presenters addressed us like we’d answered a “save-my-soul” hotline when in actuality a great deal of us had just been tricked into attending via clever marketing. My objection is that the Student Government funded presentation insulted a large part of the student body while trying to recruit any that weren’t disgusted right. It was a school sponsored event with a direct message about why each and every one of us should heed this “divine appointment” and “take Christ into our lives.”

I thought that funding from the Student Government wouldn’t be used to masquerade something onto campus as potentially offensive as a Klan rally. But what’s worse is that by virtue of being school endorsed it appeared as something intended for general consumption. Georgia Tech has been commended many times for its minority relations, but it’s a shame that religious minorities can’t get the same respect.

James Hays
hays@cc.gatech.edu
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