

Letter to the Editor

BEN DAVIS

First of all, this letter is meant in no way to be disrespectful. However, I have a number of problems with the "Gay Marriage in the USA?" article in the previous issue of The Stentorian, listed below.

1. Are newspapers not supposed to be unbiased? How can this publication "inform and empower the student body" if it is biased to one side? This article is clearly biased, and not even in accordance with popular opinion, as admitted internally.

2. Next, the statement "...because the majority of Americans are opposed to same-sex marriages does not warrant the prevention of it." WHAT?!?!?!?!?! This statement directly contradicts the entire principle upon which this nation was founded, the

"power of the people" our government is supposed to be based on. That is, what the people want, not specifically what a select few consider to be the best thing for the people; this is probably the most despotic statement I have ever been subjected to, this violates every fundamental principle of democratic or republican government, as well as many others.

3. Marriage is a religious practice, it is in no way related to government, and as such, marriage should not be associated with the government either. However, the simple fact is that it is, and there is no way that deregulating it would go over very well. Besides, many government regulations depend upon marriage to function, and as such, it would not be practicable to allow anybody who wants to suddenly be able to marry people legal-

ly, so they regulate it.

4. Also, the extent to which "individuals can practice their own beliefs" is ideally upheld only to the extent to which it does not interfere with the safety of the public, and can you imagine the condition of the future of our country if all couples were homosexual? Within 80 years, our population would be virtually depleted (I realize that an argument for forced copulation and reproduction, could be based upon this same idea, but that is not applicable because the majority of Americans would be against such an act, and it would not pass; this however, is supported by the majority and can therefore be argued. Also, that is not the issue at hand, it takes more justification to change something than to leave it alone, forced reproduction does not need to be

denounced, it already is; Gay Marriage, however, needs to be vindicated). To further elaborate, an analogy is required. Say for instance that I form a religion requiring me to murder 100 people per day. Can I follow this doctrine pleading religious freedom? NO!! Only if it does not interfere in any way with the future of the country, and it has already been established that both practices are detrimental to this future.

Thank you for your time in reading this, and please take none of this as an assault against homosexuality, only against legal recognition of homosexual marriage. We should not hate people because of their beliefs, and try our best not to discriminate (which is an entire different question requiring the defining of discrimination, and I will avoid, but suffice to say that we all

discriminate against all in some degree) against others due to these same beliefs. I realize that some of these statements are biased, and forgive me, but as I am not writing in an official capacity, I feel that the same restrictions do not apply to me. Also, if I am incorrect on some point, please hunt me down and remedy my ignorance, saving me the embarrassment which follows from spouting pointless as well as incorrect drivel.

Have something to say to the editors? Send your emails to hawkinsl@ncssm.edu, butlerb@ncssm.edu, or stentorian@ncssm.edu

To: All Students; Subject: All Student Emails

AMY JICHA

To say that all student emails were out of control would be an understatement. There is no good explanation for the excess of all-student emails: both venues of item-retrieval are in full operation. To end the ridiculous amount of "All Student Emails" a change was needed, threats of revoked privileges were no longer enough. SGA claimed that their "primary concern with all student emails was that the emails that were flooding everyone's inbox did not pertain to the whole student body and, in some cases, were detrimental to the positive environment that [they] are trying to maintain at Science and Math." It seems this year has been a bad one for abusing the all-student system, from summer flames to school-year inanities.

A single email titled "Lost Respect" launched a failed personal attack on SGA and its president, Jeff Sibrack. Multiple other emails were also directed at individuals, but how does the rest of the student body feel about the new policy? Of those surveyed, more than half were satisfied with the old policy, and less than ten percent responded that they hated the old policy and prefer that SGA sends out all-student emails. So is the new policy neces-

sary? Imagine a line drawn directly across the middle of the student body, separating those who approve of the new policy and those who do not.

Is the updated procedure for sending all student emails objectionable? The majority of those who participated in the survey do not find the new policy efficient or accessible and less than 14% of them have attempted to use it. So is there a better way to fix the problem? Of course, returning to the original policy is an option, but other possibilities would be verbal permission from SGA or an enforcement of individual loss of privileges. With the current policy, instantaneous announcements for Hill mixers via all student are a thing of the past and clubs can't fire off a last minute reminder for meetings or events. Meeting times and event notices have two ways of gaining student attention: the SGA all student email procedure, or at-a-glance. Neither method is as sure or as quick as the open all student email system.

The new system is reducing unwanted emails, but is it also restricting an important mode of communication? SGA is willing to hear your concerns, so please contact them with any comments or suggestions at SGA@ncssm.edu

YING LIU AND YUAN YANG

Alright, 9:30, you guys are free to go. I hope you enjoyed the last night of Super Study." The words I had waited to hear all quarter had finally been said. As I joined the rush to reach the free ice cream and donuts in the ETC, I reflected on my time in Super Study.

All quarter I had heard complaints from my hall, friends, and classmates about Super Study, and I have agreed with most of them. Super Study has given most juniors a headache from the very beginning. It required us to study in a room with the distraction of 30 of our peers and their idiosyncrasies for an hour and a half. Everyone studies best under different conditions. Some people like music and others need complete silence. I remember one Super Study group was composed of all boys with the exception of one girl. For some students, this is not a good studying environment. Some students need a balance between members of the opposite sex. Super Study does not take these factors into account.

Additionally, all quarter I had been distracted by sneezes, coughs, and shuffling that could have easily been avoided in my room. Music that isn't heard by the supervi-

sor is often heard by the students and creates a disturbance. I had also heard of spitball wars and fights breaking out in Super Study. These distractions were not conducive to studying and defeated the purpose of Super Study.



Super study 2nd quarter gets a little less occupied.

Logan Couce

The number one complaint about Super Study was that it was a waste of time. Some people just didn't have that much homework and could have spent their time doing better things. Others couldn't study in Super Study and would rather have been somewhere else. For me, my main complaint with Super Study was that I couldn't do any of my homework that required the computer or the Internet. On nights when I had two papers, webassign, and a project due the next day, Super Study was wasted because I couldn't accomplish any of those things without a computer. My time would have been better spent in the library or in my room. The result of the forced Super Study was that I

was up very late and was a zombie the next day. This policy was the worst aspect of Super Study. Also, Super Study left little time in the day to complete group work and work that required the use of a school computer lab. For those students who needed to play sports, Super Study made it especially hard to meet with other group members and to seek help.

The aim of Super Study was to focus students on studying and to get them into a habit of studying. True, Super Study did force students to attend and pretend to study, but many students just slept or did other things. A few students, however, did find this program useful. They liked having a set time to do work where it would be quiet. Super Study helped to structure their day. I admit, it did give me a set time each day where I was forced to study and could not procrastinate. It also kept me away from AIM and other distractions. Overall though, it was a waste of time. There were too many distractions and no computers. After looking back at the quarter, I for one am glad that Super Study is over. Now I'm free to study when and where I want. For those students who have another quarter of Super Study, good luck.