

Before I begin, I must preface my response with such,

Adults at this university and several students can attest to the machine's existence, or lack thereof, and influence over SGA, again or lack thereof, on this campus. I personally know individuals who are included in machine semantics, and I've had several conversations with them about it. It's real, but its ambiguous existence as an official campus organization is the root of the machine's power. I don't think anything can change that, but that does not mean it is not a functioning aspect of social life at the University of Alabama.

Well, there are quite a few comments I have on these posters. First and foremost, the person who created these signs is not bending the truth nor advertising false claims. When you first asked me this question, I figured I'd simply express my opinion and move on, but it is much deeper than that, especially at this point in the game. The flyers displayed in the social work student lounge are true, and I can explain why.

The six core values of social work are quite broad terms, and their definition can be altered by essentially anyone's own bias. So those are not adequate enough explanations for the unethicity of supporting the machine. One argument I can imagine from someone disagreeing with these flyer's claims is, "What someone believes in their personal life should not affect their ability to do their job." Maybe in regard to senators running from other colleges, this argument can rationalize various reasons behind organization affiliations. However, if one is studying to enter the social work profession and supports a political affiliated organization that influences campus politics and whose history, structure, and current actions contradict multiple aspects of the NASW Code of Ethics Standards, then something needs to be reevaluated. Misrepresentation is highlighted in the NASW code of ethics: the necessity that a social worker concisely distinguish private engagements from those that are representative of the social work profession (4.06, a). The race for the senate seat representing the School of Social Work is blatantly representative of the social work profession. Furthermore, in regard to employment, the code discusses various commitments to employers. More specifically, it defines how a social worker must ensure an employing organization's practice, regulations, etc. do not interfere with their ethical practice of social work—which is discussed in the NASW Code of Ethics Preamble—and such social worker's duty is to eliminate discrimination and even go as far to advising social workers to deny employment from organizations that contradict the code of ethics (3.09).

People who still disagree with the posters will also ask, "why is the machine unethical, anyway?" Well, there are multiple reasons. However, let's put aside the obvious history of the machine, which is known to have practiced oppressive, racist, and sexist actions in the last 60 years, at least. I want to put its unethicity in a financial perspective: Greek life is expensive. (And do I need to point out the machine's affiliation with Greek life at Alabama?) Panhellenic sorority and fraternity's semester dues almost equivocate to the national average in-state tuition rate for a semester, which is \$3,600. That's obviously a lot of money, and college tuition is already expensive as it is. When I reveal this information to other family members or just friends

who go to different schools, they all had the same response: that is absolutely insane, who pays for that? Well, I used to be one of those people. I had to drop my sorority on the decision that, this much money is not worth what I am getting in return. Not to say I was paying for nothing, but when you have financial limitations, pro/con lists on a commodity such as Greek life is a common phenomenon. Being associated with Greek is a priority in regard to affiliating with the machine, and with that standard, all persons on this university who cannot participate in Greek life for financial reasons are essentially pushed out by the machine. Pushed out by the machine? Well, good luck getting any point across, unless you want to feel intimidated and retaliated against for your outspokenness. Back on track, these standards also severely limit diversity within SGA—not just by race but by opinion, class, ethnic background, etc. Again, the code of ethics further goes on to describe social workers' ethical responsibilities to the broader society. To quote specifically from section 6.04, clause c, "Social workers should promote conditions that encourage respect for cultural and social diversity within the United States and globally. Social workers should promote policies and practices that demonstrate respect for difference." Another clause within that same section highlights the importance of working to expand opportunity. By supporting an organization that limits the opportunity for students to even participate in SGA, the code is violated once again.

I know this answer is like super long and drawn out, so I'll end here. But before I go, associating with the machine and denying it as well as denying its existence as an influence over SGA politics violates section 4.04: Social workers should not participate in, condone, or be associated with dishonesty, fraud, or deception.

Now by no means is this me stating students associated with the machine are bad people. Never once in here is that stated, and everyone is entitled to their own interpretation of my statements. Rather, I am just attested to the unethicity with a social workers' profession perspective.