Does the interest match the coverage?

By Mike McNamara

What's a student to do?

Tomorrow, MIT's Student Senate will face the choice of voting for one of three (or more, as tradition would have it) candidates for Undergraduate Association President. The person they select will handle a budget of $1,500 (or $1,500 a day), will be responsible for a multitude of varying degrees, depending on who you listen to) as the voice of the students in dealings with the administration, and will have a hand in a range of activities that will be staggeringly broad if he or she is to fulfill half of his campaign promises (or merely half of the campaign hype). If past experience is any guide to the effect that "if there wasn't a UAP, The Tech would have nothing to write about," since, as I pointed out at the time, paper could always print articles about men in McCormick, but if there is a point to this glib criticism, it is the fact that the only things that students are ever told about their government are the time and place of parties that it has scheduled, and whether or not the facts are in agreement with the facts here.

We are not going to let this place waste space limitations require that I point out the differences between the various candidates' platforms. One calls for the abolition of "the same old thing" through a combination of immediate reform and self-determination, responsibility, and experience. Another asks for "holistic making" to achieve his ends, as well as self-determination of the undergraduate body. Each is meritorious in its own way and is therefore, as the stand in fact. What is necessary, however, is a combination of the two. Dick Michael, and Jim Moody, have learned how to get things done.

Dick Michael, UAP

Steve Wallman, UAVP

By now, everyone has to begin to become familiar with at least the fundamentals of the new administration, as well as the candidates. It helps to have a little bit of an idea of what the other people have to say, and what their platform is. Dick Michael's campaign promises is in essence worded as the UA is presently standing, rather than with the undergraduate body. If nothing else, I consider this campaign to be an exercise in macho cancer to try to get the UA to do anything effective in possible order that the same thing can be done in the future for the better.
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