The Tech should be a student who is vitally concerned about protecting and furthering the interests of students within the Institute community. Individuals are elected to the Board of Directors to face the issues that the Institute and its students share. It is incumbent upon the candidates to be ready to build a new student government which addresses itself to the issues at hand and implements the actions necessary to address those issues. They must be forceful and determined when they feel that he is in the right. In short, he must be prepared to make student government relevant and potent.

While we differ with him on some issues, we feel that of the candidates currently running, Mike Albert offers the best approximation to a UAP who has stated that he will act in behalf of the student body about decisions which affect them. He has stated that the appointments he will make, however, will come from a broad spectrum of the student body. He has also stated that he will not act in behalf of the student body in changing dogma unless it is clear that the student body as a whole supports the proposal in question. He has said that he would probably hold mass student meetings in difficult and controversial positions and to discuss the issues with the students.

We support Mike Albert for his demonstrated depth of concern and determination to get student government involved in the Institute. He has mentioned in his platform. His desire to appoint committees to examine areas such as the advisability of the current student affairs committee and a revision of the committee for change which examined the possibility of a revised system of Institutes. At last summer, he conducted a comprehensive study of the Institute in which he examined its job-training procedures and its relation to the community.

In trying to 'represent' students it polarizes the faculty by stratifying it into three divisions—students, faculty, and administration. No government, not even a 'student-only' one, as long as it admits these kinds of divisions will regards the university as really is—a body of people who work together, not form the usual little boxes and institutions. If a government—both horizontal divisions but instead would give a 100% chance for snow. Or an 80% chance of snow during the night last week at midnight. Wandering with his students, Enders hung up.
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