

In Case of Insomnia —

UA Elections:

A personal opinion on why and who

By Storm Kauffman

Glory Hallelujah! It is UA Election Time again.

Big deal. If the UAP elected tomorrow follows the usual script, the average student won't even be aware of the existence of the UA.

So why bother to vote tomorrow? While you might feel that it doesn't make any difference now, the new UAP could become an important force in promoting student interests at MIT.

Of course, there is always the possibility (probability?) that the UAP will again become an invisible nonentity (as far as students are concerned). But on the off-chance that we may find some use for a UAP, every student should vote tomorrow, giving serious consideration to whom he or she thinks might do the best job.

Even in the past several years, the UAP has been more important than his (or her) seemingly innocuous position suggests. That importance lies in the fact that the administration views the UAP as the voice of the student body and listens to the UAP's opinions (though not necessarily paying any attention). Therefore, a strong and dedicated UAP will have the potential to get things accomplished for you, the average student (sorry, of course you're not average).

The basic idea is that it won't hurt you to take the time to pick the team you think will do the best job (not just the team whose guts you hate the least) and vote for them. It won't do anyone any good if you don't vote.

Given the assumption that someone is interested in voting, what choice do they have? Unfortunately, none of the teams represent both dorms and fraternities, a deficiency which could lead to the fear that the interests of one will be pushed to the exclusion of those of the other. However, all teams seem to intend to ignore such partisanship.

First, Zimmerman represents the least customary of the candidates. Although he claims to be truly interested in the revival of the UA and in "action," he does not have any experience with student government and associated red tape. He is not well known by the administration, and, while this lack of familiarity might help him if he decided to be obnoxious about pushing some point, it could also hinder efforts to come to reasoned agreements — the UAP only succeeds in give-and-take situations. As for streaking LSC movies, it may be an amusing way to gain attention and sympathy, but it hardly qualifies Zimmerman or offers any evidence that he will be an effective UAP. Additionally, Zimmerman is saddled with Appleman for his UAVP — in my opinion, Appleman hasn't been serious about accomplishing anything constructive since he's been at MIT.

While Zimmerman typifies the activist slates of the more politically active times of several years ago, Michel represents the standard in student government campaigns. He waves promises of more parties, more money, and a larger role for the UA — the same promises made by past UAPs who quickly faded into obscurity after their elections. Michel is also handicapped by lack of experience in student government, he and Jessich having become involved only during the past term. (Where do these people come from? Out of the woodwork? I have to follow MIT events during the year but don't remember hearing of either of them until this election.)

Wallman is often castigated for his extensive activity in student government (SCC, Nemcom, and R/O Committee chairman, besides participating in others), but it is just this experience that best qualifies him. He and Moody are realists they have learned how to get things accomplished the hard way, by getting them done. They have consistently demonstrated an interest in working for students, and such proven performance is the only basis on which to judge candidates in such a quickie election as this one. Wallman and Moody may not turn out to be as effective as they could be, but they represent the best odds of reviving student government at MIT and of getting things done.

Does the interest match the coverage?

By Mike McNamee
News Editor

What's a student to do?

Tomorrow, MIT's 3850 (or 3571) undergraduates will be faced with the choice of voting for one of two (or three, or more) candidates for Undergraduate Association President. The person they select will handle a budget of \$1500 (or of almost \$80,000), will be accepted (in 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 carries out half of his campaign promises (or miserly narrow if past experience is a guide). And I ask you, the student who owns roughly 0.025 per cent of the power to choose this leader of men (excuse me, people) do you care?

If an impartial, non-MIT observer was to try to answer that question, he/she might decide that yes, MIT students must care very much about the election. Reams of paper and yards of videotape have been used by *The Tech* and MITV (*Thursday* made good use of its lack of interest

in MIT news and only printed one article) to bring you the latest "news" as it happened, and to let the candidates tell you in great detail just what they stand for — motherhood, apple pie, and more and better parties.

As perpetrator of a large chunk of this non-event coverage I'm beginning to think that there has to be a better way to let students know how they are being "governed" than the current on-off blowing/infighting of/with the UA that *The Tech* currently carries on. I can't quite agree with the statement made by Professor Senturia to one of his classes last fall, when some mini-tempest was stirring the Student Center-fourth floor-teapot, to the effect that "if there wasn't a UA, *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 factions there are in agreement with the factions here. More

and better coverage of the nitty-gritty of what the UA does — if it does anything — is needed, along with detailed facts on where the money is going and who is greasing who for what awards.

The UAP who is elected tomorrow could make it a lot easier on us at *The Tech* if he would actually do something with the office besides move his books in for a convenient place to study. He could make the UA a viable organization, active as more than a booker of talent for beer-blasts, and maybe even make it meaningful for the average student. The rhetoric promises it, but we'll have to wait and see whether or not it happens.

Do you care? I don't know for sure — short of polling all of you I have no way of knowing for sure — but I have a gut feeling that you don't. The question that faces the "lucky" winner of tomorrow's election is whether or not undergraduates next year will care. Whoever he is, I wish him luck.

UA candidates ramble on

Dick Michel/ Dave Jessich

Dick Michel, UAP
Dave Jessich, UAVP

By now you probably have begun to become familiar with at least the fundamentals of the UA organization, as well as the basic platforms of the three UAP tickets. It's a shame that your awareness is just now getting started. Yet this fault lies mainly with the UA as it presently stands, rather than with the undergraduate body. If nothing else, I consider this campaign to be an exercise in reaching as many undergrads as quickly and effectively as possible in order that the same thing can be done in the future for even more significant purposes.

Space limitations require that I point up the differences between the various

candidates' platforms. One calls for the abolition of "the same old thing" through a combination of immediate action, responsibility, and experience. Another asks for "noisemaking" to achieve his ends, as well as self-determination of the undergraduate body. Each is meritorious when viewed separately, as they presently stand in fact. What is necessary, however, is a combination of the two. Dick Michel and Dave Jessich are the only candidates who can offer this uniquely dichotomous approach. That which can easily be accomplished is already happening, including some very successful social events. More must follow. Simply maintaining the status quo by retaining exist-

(Continued on next page)

Steve Wallman/ Jim Moody

Steve Wallman, UAP
Jim Moody, UAVP

People have asked us why we are running for UAP/UAVP? We are running because we've done things in the past (Chairman of the Student Center Committee, Nominations Committee, and the R/O Committee; President of Baker House, Sha-Na-Na Concert, upcoming Aerosmith concert), and we know what the UA can do in the future. We want to show that the UA can accomplish its goals. We will work hard, and we have the knowledge to pull things off. We listen to people. We feel that our real experience in doing things is what will finally make the UA work.

These will be some of our goals, if elected

1. COORDINATION — We will get the UA and all of its diverse parts and committees talking to each other and working together toward our common goal of making MIT a better place in which to live and work.

2. COMMUNICATION — We will publicize the efforts of the 130 activities, 65 students on student faculty committees, and 6 UA committees to stimulate more interest, more involvement, more action, and a greater spirit of community. We will reestablish a representative government, dead for 4 years. The UA gov-

(Continued on next page)

Bob Zimmerman/ Larry Appleman

Bob Zimmerman, UAP
Larry Appleman, UAVP

Why streaking?

Despite the requirement of 10% of the undergraduate student body, we are still, as of Sunday night, being denied a spot on Wednesday's ballot. Even though Stephen Shagoury, the election official, admitted that only 385 signatures were needed (we have 393), he still will not let us on the ballot. This malfunction of justice and the ominous omission of our pictures in *The Tech* on last Tuesday, led us to take an incisive look at what was happening here. One candidate, already a major part of the present administration, promises a revitalization of the very thing he has molded. His only action since

registration day, was a dance held the weekend before the election (also during a major religious holiday for a substantial segment of the MIT population). As for the planning for this social event, he neglected to advertise at any of the girls' schools in the area. The other accredited candidate, promises new ideas, etc. (Yawn), but the only thing new about him is his name — his platform has been said a million times by past candidates. We are not going to let this place waste away. Before the UAP sat in His/her office and waited for the people who needed him/her to come to him/her. If I have to run through the halls, lectures, movies, and mixers naked, to get people

(Continued on next page)

Continuous News Service

The Tech

Since 1881

Vol. XCIV No. 16 Tuesday, April 9, 1974

Barb Moore '76; Chairperson
Storm Kauffman '75; Editor-in-Chief
John Hanzel '76; Managing Editor
Norman Sandler '75; Executive Editor
Stephen Shagoury '76; Business Manager

Ken Isaacson '75, Steve Wallman '75,
Robert Nilsson '76, Julia Malakie '77;
Night Editors
Michael McNamee '76; News Editor
Neal Vitale '75; Arts Editor
Tom Vidic '76; Photography Editor
Dan Gantt '75; Sports Editor
Len Tower; Advertising Manager

Paul Schindler '74, David Tenenbaum '74,
Mark Astolfi, John Kavazanjian,
Tim Kiorpes;
Contributing Editors

Margaret Brandeau '77, Bill Conklin '77;
Associate News Editors
Glenn Brownstein '77;
Associate Sports Editor
Mark Suchon '76; Assoc. Ad Manager
Doug McLoed '77; Asst. Ad Manager

Robert Elkin, Managerial Consultant
Liz Wise, Anwer Hussain '74;
Accounts Receivable
David Lee '74; Circulation Manager
Thomas Leise '74; Circulation Staff

News Staff:
David Danford '74, Ralph Nauman '74,
Ken Davis '76, Michael Garry '76,
Greg Saltzman '76, Stephen Blatt '77,
Henry Frechter '77, Steve Keith '77,
Stephen Mallenbaum '77, Jules Mollere '77,
Curtis Reeves
Production Staff:
Beth Karpf '75, Frank McGrath '75,
Tom Birney '76, Michael Graves '76,
Mindy Lipson '76, Cathy Medich '77,
Russel Nevins '77, Vincent Richman '77,
Gayanne Gray

Second Class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts. *The Tech* is published twice a week during the college year (except during college vacations) and once during the first week of August, by *The Tech*, Room W20-483, MIT Student Center, 84 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139. Telephone: Area Code 617, 253-1541. United States Mail subscription rates: \$5.00 for one year, \$9.00 for two years.

