Eighteen months ago we expressed the opinion that the light poles then being erected in front of the Student Center were ugly. Our comment then seems to have had little effect, however. Recently, a new and improved version of the "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Environment" is taking a large fraction of this creative endeavor and has, in my opinion, in front of the door of Prof. Wayne Anderson, who is allegedly responsible for its presence here. Prof. Anderson's efforts to date have been most successful. As chairman of Committee on Visual Arts, he has succeeded in brightening the campus considerably, though largely with non-traditional works. However, two recent examples of his endeavors have left me wondering if, perhaps, this trend might not be reversing itself. The students in architecture who put together the abortion in the basement of building 7 had to go through both the activities executive board, and also the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Environment. Therefore, we must applaud the actions of the "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Environment." They are as follows:

1. Forgery

Forgery

For the Editor: I wish to make a few remarks in regard to the letter from the "Chicanes" which was published in The Tech for April 30, 1968. That letter was one of the most absurd things I have ever seen in print. However, there is one group whose presence is sorely missed in the selection process: the students themselves. This lack was never felt more than at this year's awards Convocation. Several students commented to me that too little of the Committee on Student Employment Awards were "completely random." The reason for this can, perhaps, be found above. It is clear that a structure such as that under which the Compton winners are selected leads to a type of log-rolling operation. These students, regardless of the process of selection, are aware of the process and are much more sensitive to the need for promotion. This, in turn, makes the process of selecting students more difficult. In any case, it is not a healthy sign, at least for the time being, to see students being left out of the student body of the MIT community.

3. Nepotism

Nepotism

This issue's front-page article on the organizational structure of the student library staffs has revealed some things which we have suspected for several years, but which have never been confirmed. However, it has brought an even more interesting problem into the open. Student employees are watched closely by the Activities Executive Board, as any member of Technology Student Enterprises will attest. We search out and root out nepotism within the staffs of the various student employment organizations.

At the moment, the answer is no one. Further, there is more need for a judicial body here than elsewhere, simply because the jobs are not of a creative nature. In the large majority of this work, the only rewards one employee can obtain are the money in- tism within the staffs of the various student employment areas, to determine whether the highest award an undergraduate can achieve within the MIT community is the "outstanding contribution in promoting high standards of achievement and good citizenship within the MIT community." There is one group whose presence is sorely missed in the selection process: the students themselves. This lack was never felt more than at this year's awards Convocation. Several students commented to me that too little of the Committee on Student Employment Awards were "completely random." The reason for this can, perhaps, be found above. It is clear that a structure such as that under which the Compton winners are selected leads to a type of log-rolling operation. These students, regardless of the process of selection, are aware of the process and are much more sensitive to the need for promotion. This, in turn, makes the process of selecting students more difficult. In any case, it is not a healthy sign, at least for the time being, to see students being left out of the student body of the MIT community.
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