

# Obey your beverage agreement!



JONN  
KMECH

“Still, I sympathize with supporters of SAKCoke for their noble fight against the corporation’s tyranny and extend my hand to them. And in that hand is a cold glass of The Real Thing. Seriously, have they tried it? Because if they did, they’d understand the savoury goodness that Coke Yes is so crazy about.”

In the midst of a debate that’s been weighed down by political mudslinging, bylaw malarkey and cartoon Colombian buoyancy, there’s one side of the Coke debate that students haven’t had a chance to consider—a choice that’s integral to their ability to make an educated, unbiased choice in the next two days. That is, the smooth, crystal-clear taste of an ice-cold Coca-Cola, and the image associated with drinking one. I urge the students of this University to vote with their taste buds and take an invigorating swig of Coke.

As students, we can’t just consume any run-of-the-mill carbonated liquid. Coke isn’t just some cold beverage at our University, it’s the cold beverage, as sanctioned by written decree and without question of any alleged human rights or environmental abuses. I highly doubt that a lesser corporate machine could deliver a more delicious perspiring bottle of flavoured sugar water to a student body eager to quench his or her powerful thirst for satisfying sales quotas.

I can’t worry about pesticides in Indian drinks if I myself am being violated by briefly having to consider consuming an inferior cold beverage. Still, I sympathize with supporters of SAKCoke for their noble fight against the corporation’s tyranny and extend

my hand to them. And in that hand is a cold glass of The Real Thing. Seriously, have they tried it? Because if they did, they’d understand the savoury goodness that Coke Yes is so crazy about—and what causes them feverishly to push their pro-Coke agenda without making an attempt to consider facts or opinions on their opponents’ side. Unfortunately, SAKCoke is the victim in that case, and not prone to such partisan shenanigans itself—and I respect them for that.

Their ability to inform students without bias by plastering our campus’ doors and bathroom walls with stickers is commendable, and will certainly drive a multi-billion dollar empire away from the University, as well as grant the Colombians the freedom to choose which of the many other death squads in Colombia gets to kidnap their families.

But I digress. If not Coke, then who would we consider to satisfy our liquid assets? Pepsi? Blind taste tests have shown that when compared, Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola are both syrup-based acidic brown beverages with no nutritional content whatsoever, offered by gigantic multinationals with a huge global reach and little concern for the little man. As such, I’m skeptical as to whether Pepsi has the potential to offer the same selection of cola, diet cola,

lemon-lime, assorted juice and filtered-water products to our campus, along with similarly questionable business practices in India and Myanmar.

Most criminally, Pepsi would probably lock the students into some oppressive binding contract where they’re forced to pay \$1.75 for water that bears an elegant, soothing name. And would you really want to see the day when your children attend a U of A campus that offers Dasani and Aquafina? I know I don’t.

Remember, the slogan is “Always Coca-Cola,” not “Probably Coca-Cola, as long as we can keep our scholarships” or “Stop Coca-Cola so we can stay on our moral high horse.” So the next time the heavenly aura of the red label lies vertical to your mouth, just remember that your vote for this non-binding plebiscite—which will likely be decided by just a fifth of the student population—matters.

So you can either pledge to keep the smooth taste of the drink associated with said label and its associates flowing down your throat for years to come, or demand that, in the future, you can buy virtually the same products with different labels from a different corporation for the same price. The choice truly is yours, in the sense that the University and SU will do whatever they want in the end anyways.

# This year’s SU election will be a joke indeed



MIKE  
SMITH

my belief that the state of student politics at our university is ludicrous. Equally as distressing is the very real cost we’re paying for these candidates’ campaigns. Each joke candidate, if they use up their allotted funding, will cost the students of this school \$350–375, meaning they could leave the SU on the hook for over \$1400.

Now, I know this question is probably asked a lot in regards to the SU, but is this really what my dues are going to? I mean, if we really want to throw away money so frivolously, just leave the Powerplant open another year—which, at this rate, is losing more than \$1400 every week.

We mustn’t be too quick to blame any one person or organization, however. It’s not really the joke candidates’ faults—they’re just operating under the system stated in the electoral regulations for their own amusement and the amusement of their fellow students. Rather, it’s the fault of people not taking elections seriously—and who can blame them? The joke candidates ultimately aren’t funny in terms of how we view our student elections; at least, I’m not laughing.

The only positive thing I can think of for this many joke candidates is that it allows us to delude ourselves into thinking this is an effective part of the democratic process. Last year, two candidates—Amanda Henry and Chris Samuel—ran completely unopposed, which didn’t feel very democratic at all. And we wouldn’t want to make our student electorate feel disillusioned or apathetic about the system, would we?

Many university students are keen to ridicule the Students’ Union elections, and with the minimal voter turnout among students in the elections process, it’s hardly a wonder why. A particularly good example of the mockery comes from so-called joke candidates. But joke candidates can have a positive effect, helping promote debate and raise awareness about the elections process. And sometimes they’re actually funny.

Joke candidates are an official part of our electoral process and are regulated by the same bylaws and rules that other candidates must abide by, even if they cannot be elected. But this year, the elections are bordering on the ridiculous. Of the 17 candidates running in this election, five are joke candidates—and that’s just the official ones. Even worse, the positions of Vice-President (External) and VP (Student Life) really only have one candidate each, as the second candidate is a joke candidate.

As much as I think Soundwave would make an effective VP given his experience under Megatron, these candidates don’t raise awareness of elections for me in any positive manner. Instead, it merely reinforces

## gateway literary contest

### categories:

- 1 Short Fiction (under 1500 words)
- 2 Really Short Fiction (under 150 words)
- 3 Haiku
- 4 Sonnet
- 5 Limerick
- 6 Photography

**\* Deadline Extended to Sunday 11 March at 6pm**

Have you always wanted to see your ramblings published on newsprint? Twelve thousand pieces of newsprint? Well, friends, you’re in luck—the *Gateway* has a circulation of 12 000, is totally printed on newsprint and wants to publish your writing.

This contest is open to any U of A student who can string a sentence together or snap a picture, and who isn’t currently a *Gateway* volunteer. Winners will have their writing published, and we’ll even throw in some fantastic prizes.

Entries will be judged on creativity and style. Submissions must be original, cannot have been published previously, and will not be considered if they are hateful in nature. Submit your entries to [managing@gateway.ualberta.ca](mailto:managing@gateway.ualberta.ca) or bring them to 3-04 SUB by 4 March, 2007. Contestants may only enter once per category. Please include your name, program and year, and e-mail address. Unfortunately, entries will not be returned.

# THE GATEWAY



### LINE EDITORS

The *Gateway* is accepting applications for the following line editor positions\*\* for the 2007/2008 publishing year:

- MANAGING EDITOR
- SENIOR NEWS EDITOR
- DEPUTY NEWS EDITOR
- OPINION EDITOR
- SPORTS EDITOR
- ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR
- PHOTO EDITOR
- DESIGN & PRODUCTION EDITOR

All terms run from 1 May 2007 to 30 April 2008. The full-time paid portion of the job runs from mid-August to the end of April. Six issues of the *Gateway* will be produced over the summer months. All line editors will be expected to train on at least three of the six summer issues (unless granted leave by the hiring committee) for an honorarium of \$100/issue. In their full-time capacities, the salaries for each position are as follows: Managing and Senior News will receive \$1549.50\* per month; all other line editors will receive \$1222.00\* per month. Please note that candidates may apply for no more than two (2) positions, except by special dispensation of the Line Editor Selection Committee. Applicants should submit a covering letter, resumé and portfolio to **Gateway Business Manager (Steve Smith, 492-6669, [biz@gateway.ualberta.ca](mailto:biz@gateway.ualberta.ca)) by noon on Friday, 9 March 2007**. Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted for interviews.

\* Pay will be adjusted for CPI over the summer and may increase.

\*\* Complete job descriptions (subject to change) are available at [www.gateway.ualberta.ca/gjs](http://www.gateway.ualberta.ca/gjs)

# THE GATEWAY