Letters to The Tech

Two views of ‘Food’

(A copy of this letter was sent to The Tech. — Editor.)

Dear President Wiesner:

We are a concerned group of students at the MIT Student Center. We have been having some questions about the exhibit now being shown in Building 7, called “Food,” which is part of a larger exhibit, “Art ’77.” The exhibit is sponsored by MIT, and is open to the public through June 19. We are concerned that this exhibit, and the John Asinari Scholarship Fund exhibit, which is also open in the same building, do not reflect the true nature and conditions of the Third World, which are being shown in the exhibit.”

Edward J. Spradlin

(A copy of this letter was sent to The Tech Talk which it was not available to The Tech for publication. — Editor.)

Dear President Wiesner:

Today there were hundreds of apples hanging from a fishing line in Lobby 7 exhibits. The proposed Lobby 7 exhibits, the so-called “rebel exhibits,” are being held in the lobby. Today there were hundreds of mushrooms on the front steps of Lobby 7, crushed under hundreds of people walking.

Please, may I say:

1) That the exhibit is precious because millions of people do not have enough food, and because it is expensive, even for American people.

2) That we, parents and educators, want to show our young people how to respect other people and how to avoid sexual abuse. If that will not be spoiled or vandalized.

3) That we are proud of MIT, we do not want people making trouble because we feel bad about our government, and we want to show our children that we are not the same thing.

Thank you very much.

Micahel Havurton

Bi weekly employee

Editor’s Note: There is currently a petition drive being conducted to call a special referendum on the Food exhibit. One in several exhibits placed in the Lobby.

Commentary

Why a new UA constitution?

By Steve Wallman

A new UA constitution will be on the ballot tomorrow. Over the past six years, a UAP referendum calling for a general assembly was voted on in a UA referendum. Not long after that proposal passed, it became generally obvious that the going was not to work.

The General Assembly was set up in a purely democratic way, and in a way that would reflect the true interests of the student body.

The GA would truly represent the student views on all issues. Accordingly, it was given the power to control and decide on all issues related to undergraduate student government.

This included such things as the Finance Board allocations, the Student Center Committee appointments, student activities group allocations, the Student Center, student activities space allocation, and the fate of the dining hall and Lincoln Labs, and rush procedures.

So what happened? To begin with, the Editorial Board decided that it was not going to pay much attention to a GA resolution concerning war research, and the SCC decided not to endorse some rules concerning voter registration and admission procedures and walked out of the meeting, then one of Harvey Baker’s enemies (Harvey was a News Editor of The Tech at the time), decided to use the GA to keep Heyer all a committee, that Heyer Hall decided to elect a cat (actually a kitten, I believe) to the GA, that the GA then stopped calling meetings, so one complained of people trying to get to know about what else they could do. And since then, the various members of student government have all been working on new constitutions.

This constitution is nothing new. Last year a group of people met to come up with some constitutional work that would work. What came out of that meeting was almost a carbon copy of the UA constitution (the one we rejected the other way around). Some students who had been representative enough (they liked the GA idea) felt that this was functioning perfectly well the way it was, (they were good at finding the previous constitutional period). Before that, Curriculum Review was up with a three paragraph constitutiion that was held in The Tech, which gained absolutely no opponents, nor proponents (except opinion columns in the Harvard). There were meetings for now and one half years on “what should be done” and the answer has generally been “who cares?” So what do you want, ask what I am suggesting? I’ll tell you.

Right now we have a system that works generally well. Most of the operating groups are run by anybody who has the time to work on them. Most of the groups are run by themselves, taking care of whatever small pieces of the earth (or MIT) we set up to administer. But here lies the problem. Most of the proposals that students put forward are things that will require cooperation among student government and is not very high, that a great deal more can be done. Actually, of course, we have a lot more problems, set up joint programs and run much larger events, it is just that nobody has any formal mechanism for getting this done, and the informal ones have a habit of breaking down every so often.

So what do the new Constitution call for? To begin with, it redefines the Undergraduate Association to be the student government body, as opposed to all of the students. It means that when the UAP (which is any other office) talks he is not taking for everything, but simply for the student viewpoint, but he should make no mistake about it, he is not taking for everything, but simply for the student viewpoint. He may be providing a valuable student viewpoint, but he should make no mistake about it, he is not taking for everything, but simply for the student viewpoint. He may be providing a valuable student viewpoint, but he should make no mistake about it.

What then can it do? This is a faculty at large, and it is not working so well. This is a faculty at large, and it is not working so well. It is a faculty at large, and it is not working so well.

People have been talking about constitutions for over three years. Let’s pass one that can work, for now, for these times. That will encourage people to talk about something else. Let’s have a real constitution, and it is not working so well. Let’s have a real constitution, and it is not working so well. It is a faculty at large, and it is not working so well. It is a faculty at large, and it is not working so well.