



Homecoming/Senate-The Whole Story

Can somebody explain the word "ethics" to me? By definition ethics is "the standards of conduct and moral judgment". And unfortunately for us, we have all been affected by a poor code of ethics.

It is here that I would like to state that I in no way have any animosity towards Laura Crosby and her organization, The Student Nursing Association. As far as I am concerned they were the victims of a very poor code of ethics on the part of the student senate president and the student senate advisor.

The incident I am referring to is the manner in which the homecoming queen was determined. What really angers me is the ethics in determining who the homecoming queen would be. The whole situation began when I was appointed chairman of homecoming activities. When I was appointed chairman, all deadlines and arrangements were made subject to my discretion and approval.

What I later learned is that this is not necessarily true in certain people's minds.

Lawrence Stone, Professor of History at Princeton University, once wrote a treatise identifying the various stages and circumstances necessary for a revolution to occur within a political system. I thought it interesting at the time of reading though I'll admit being overwhelmed by the thoroughness with which Stone presented his case.

Nevertheless, it was required reading and for some reason, the very fact that such instances could be identified through analysis intrigued me to no end.

Of late, there has been enough dissention heard from the ACC Student Senate regarding their Senate, that for some reason I was prompted to rethink Stone's article.

He had stated that a Revolution is characterized by four distinct stages: 'mass unrest and dissatisfaction,' 'organized opposition with defined goals,' The third stage involves the building up of an organization in which objectives and motives are clarified. Then the conflicts occur and the radicals take over from the moderates. The fourth stage is the legalization of that revolution with the new administrators taking over and establishing government on essentially the same lines as before.

As I see it, the Student Senate at ACC is at about the third stage.

As Assistant Editor of the Lumberjack and outsider to the Student Senate, of late I have been privy to all of the complaints, errors, meeting, accusations and promised apologies being made by

I set a series of deadlines in order to preserve the continuity of these events, which included the Homecoming elections and dance. Obviously with pictures to be taken and flowers to be ordered some sense of order was needed. It is here that many complications erupted due to overzealous and pedjudiced individuals.

On January 20 a deadline for all nominating petitions was set. No exceptions for anyone was to be the case. At least that's what I thought; after all, I was the chairman. After three other clubs had passed on the opportunity to be in the court I knew for sure there could be no exceptions. Unfortunately, the president of the student senate didn't think so.

He brought to me a nominating petition, from The Student Nursing Association, on January 27, a full week late, and asked if they could be on the ballot. I said "absolutely not!" Upon explaining to me that they only wanted to be on the court just so that the students could hear that their organization was still active, I said that I would reconsider only if the other clubs

the body. Recently, I tried to make some sense out of it all at the request of my editor, Mary Bartz. I began to listen a little more critically, ask a few pointed questions and generally avail myself to what ever files, facts and information I could legally get my hands on. It was after doing this that I came up with Lawrence Stone.

There has of late been a conciously vocal group of Senate members who brought to my attention the fact they felt the Homecoming elections were conducted unfairly. I went to the next Senate meeting where this issue was brought to full light with John Pines, Chairman of the Homecoming Activities Committee and Mike Fournier President of the Student Senate both being given a chance to air their respective sides of the story. It is my considered opinion, and that of the Lumberjack, that Pines was right; that having been appointed Chairman of this committee responsible for setting application dates, ect., it was not the political privilage (at least not ethically) for Fournier to overstep these guidelines and admit other contestants past the stated deadline.

I want at this moment to take the time to state that Homecoming Queen Laura Crosby is not and should in no way be held responsible for the lack of organization within the Senate Governing Body. Laura Crosby and the Nursing organization which she represents had to my knowledge no idea that their application was submitted beyond

were notified of this and they were offered the same opportunity. I did state that any club that would accept this would not be eligible for the ballot. This was done in order to promote club participation, but yet to be fair to all other participants who had their materials in on time. After all it's not if you win, it's how you play the game.

The clubs that I managed to contact had declined, but they were offered the opportunity participate and I felt then that The Student Nursing Association could be in the court and not on the ballot.

Well February 3 came, election day, and we all were watching ballot boxes, when suddenly the president of the student senate came and demanded to know why the SNA was not on the ballot. I re-explained to him the condition I mentioned earlier and needless to say he was not happy. I feel it relevant to mention the fact that the president of student senate is also a member of the SNA. So it is here that I ask, do you think there was any prejudice involved?

After re-explaining to him that the SNA was not eligible for the

deadline. Even if they had, it would have been up to the President at this point to diplomatically decline it.

The opposite occurred, and that occurrence did not go unnoticed.

If it had, if this had not been the proverbial straw that broke the Senate's back open, we would not have also heard of the other shortcomings within the Senate. (Stone, second stage) For example, it is also probably not common knowledge, that the expenses involved in last years Senate Washinton trip exceeded the Senate allocated funds by \$467.15. That money was then removed from the general student activities fund which each and every student contributes to when they pay their tuition at ACC. Not that the Washinton trip wouldn't be considered a Student activity, it would-if every student at ACC was going.

These questionable decisions made by the Executive Board, and understood by its advisor, are precisely why the concious element within the body is making such an uproar. As well they should. Responsibly, they've also begun the process of change with in the Executive Board positions. (Stone, third stage)

Of the most recent elections, we now find Chuck Witt, having been voted Vice President of the Student Senate. Also John Pines is secretary to the Students Activites Board as well as secretary for the whole Senate Governing Body. In the past few weeks, we at the Lumberjack have heard more of the Student Senate with their

ballot he then posted a write-in sign and picked up a handful of ballots and took them off campus to the Holiday Inn where the SNA was meeting. I immediately objected to these actions and told him not to do this - especially since the ballots were going to a stacked meeting. We all knew who they were going to vote for. I said no! my co-chair, Chuck Witt, said no!, but he did it any way.

Finally pm came and it was time to count the ballots. Assembled in the room a member of the administration the student senate advisor two senate members and myself, once assembled we proceeded to count the ballots. Upon finding votes for the invalidated candidate we all agreed that this candidate was to be considered ineligible.

Now we, the students, immediately said no based on two things, one being that we had set earlier conditions and, two, that there was a sign-up sheet that was supposed to accompany these ballots and to this day, almost a full two weeks has passed and I have not seen the signatures. Would you say yes? When we left

arrival in the form of open debate of the existing administration than any media has a right to.

But it worked, as this article shows and it continues to work. At the Feb. 13 Senate meeting, they also voted out, for the 89-90 school year, the present advisor the the Senate, Bob Fournier and they are awaiting a letter of public apology from the President, one of last years Washington candidates and Bob Fournier's son, Mike Fournier.

I don't know if this upheavel would qualify as a revolution proper, but I would guess it comes close. Further, it seems founded on a wave of honest debate with alternative ideas also being offered by Chuck Witt and his collective board.

It is refreshing to see this dedication to change and commitment to ACC integrity being made by the Senate. I only have the slightest reservation when I re-read the conclusion to Stone's comparative study of revolutions. I quote:

"The fourth...stage sees the legalization of the revolution. It is a product of psychological exhaustion, as the reforming drive burns itself out, moral enthusiasm wanes and economic distress increases...The administrators takeover, strong central government is established and society is reconstructed on lines that embody substancial elements of the old system."

Perhaps that is why I have any reservations at all about the newly found conscience within ACC. Though the sweeping

this meeting it was decided that the ineligible candidate would not win, based on the afore-mentioned criteria. It was further decided that the next eligible candidate with the most votes would win. Unfortunately this is not where the story ends.

That same night I got a phone call from the Student Senate Advisor saying that a list of signatures had appeared. It was then brought up about reconsidering our earlier decision. I still said no, because it was determined right from the beginning that she was not to be on the ballot. Rules are rules and I along with my fellow students still said no.

Problem solved, of course not. It is here that I am the most upset. The Student Senate Advisor, against the wishes of all concerned, submitted the name of the ineligible candidate to be named as queen. This was done without even showing us the sign-up which I must restate has not been seen as of this date. The rest, I guess, is history.



John Pines

changes are breathtaking, I only wonder what happens next. And perhaps so should the rest of the students here. It will take a supportive effort on behalf of all ACC's students to ensure that when the moral enthusiasm wanes, there will be a collective fresh breath of attention to refuel the fire of ACC integrity.

Trina Redding

President's Reply

I am the Student Senate President of ACC. When we are successful, I look good. When we flounder, I take the heat. Mr. Truman said, "If you can't take the heat, get out of the kitchen." I'm here to take the heat this time. Mistakes in communication were made and I'm prepared to take responsibility for these mistakes. Now we must move forever forward and turn those mistakes into positive change.

My philosophy is, "Ask not what you can do for yourself but, what you can do for your community college." This is national community college month which makes it a good opportunity to tell everyone how good our college is. Our college is good but everything can be improved through involvement, positive thinking, and teamwork. The foundation has been established, now lets accomplish our goal.

Michael Fournier
President Student Senate