

## Letter to the editor

by Elise Smith  
SGA Secretary

I felt a little misrepresented by your candidate table. You only put down one of my three goals for SGA and it made me sound stupid. Also, for the question, "why are you running" you wrote that I had no response and that is quite untrue. I specifically said 'refer to question 4' and you could have used any of that material. Instead, you made me look as if I had no purpose, no reason for running. I also found it very unfair that for Jess DesRochers you wrote all 'no response' when she most likely didn't receive the email and had no idea that you were publishing any material of the sort.

Next time you or any other writer decides to publish a candidate's stance, you should make sure to represent them accurately. If a candidate gives you a long answer (like me) you could simply write it in a simplified form (which is what I was expecting) using a few actual quotes. I suggest the Clarion not do anything like this again unless it serves its actual purpose: giving the students a clear idea of who the candidates are and what these persons stand for.

## A response to complaints

by Hall Penn  
Editor-in-Chief

We have received several complaints about the way *The Clarion*, and I, handled reporting the candidates' positions for the Student Government Association elections in our last issue. One candidate said that she never received the questions for response, and another said we misrepresented her responses. I want to take this opportunity to explain our side in this matter.

One candidate running for SGA secretary complained she did not receive an email sent out that asked for each candidate's position on a number of topics. She didn't receive this, she said, and in an email to the student body she stated she was "email challenged" and that was the reason she "did not send a response."

First off, I would like to say that the majority of candidates returned the email and had their positions published. Only two did not reply to the email, and so we had no answers to publish.

We made a mistake by not putting Ashley Curtis' name on the list, but this was merely an oversight and there was no intent on our part to leave her out. The other candidate who did not reply to the email, who publicly called herself "email challenged," was on our published list of candidates; however, we had to put "No Response" for each answer.

I would like to say that anyone running for the position of Secretary of the SGA should probably be up to date on how to use email, but this is beside the point. *The Clarion* gave each candidate an equal opportunity to respond and have their positions published in our piece.

The other complaint, by Elise Smith, was that *The Clarion* did not accurately represent her response and in so doing hurt her chances at being elected. Her response to the question "Why are you running" was "Refer to #5." In the email we sent to the candidates, there was a disclaimer that said "We reserve the right to edit the answers for length." In her response, Elise did not tell us what parts of her answer to "#5" were suitable for use, and the fear was that we would choose a part that might not agree with Elise and she would say that we were misrepresenting her. So we put "No Response" as her answer.

Elise complained that we put only one goal in her answer to the question "What are the top three issues that need to be addressed by the student government in the next year?" We did this because as much as we read through her answer, we could not find three different issues. Every candidate's responses were shortened for space as were Elise's.

Also in her complaint was the claim that she "found it very unfair that for Jess DesRochers you wrote all 'no response' when she most likely didn't receive the email and had no idea that you were publishing any material of the sort." The email, however, was sent to Jess DesRochers as it was to every other candidate.

While I don't want to say I am glad that there has been a complaint, I think it is promising that *The Clarion* is being read, and even being read somewhat critically. The best thing for this paper is for students (and faculty and staff) to check up on the reporting and information it presents.

If anything has been done with *The Clarion*, it should be that it is no longer a somewhat goofy afterthought of the Humanities Division. It should stand on its own and earn a name for itself, and to do that *The Clarion* needs your help. We encourage anyone to write in with complaints, recommendations, information and perhaps even encouragement.