Increasing student views; Does the CVA really care?

By Glenn Brownstein

Art is the purest expression of human emotion — a thought process that envelops not only the work itself, but any and all who later come to experience the visual and auditory evocation of such emotion — to low and nature, toward man, toward our environment.

Therefore — the art students of MIT is the most tainted human emotion. It is an expression of intensity, of thoughtless and biased decisions. It is the seed from which human conflict results, from which families break apart.

It is ironic, then, that these two diametrically opposed notions are pitted against another in the latest in a long line of open meetings and confrontations on the campus. The student-administration conflict should have a seat in the Great Court, and, more importantly, must MIT students be given any say at all in future institutional reforms.

In fact, let's examine the situation. The Great (or Killian) court is populated by a number of students, an intense group of researchers or recreation place to forget about the many worries that MIT places upon its community members.

It is then, a perfect place for a sculpture that includes in its set- ting, that has the support of all its viewers, and that can grow to be as natural a part of the Court as the grass.

When there is significant disagreement about a controversial issue, it is natural to attempt to reach an understanding, not to make excuses for our views.

This, then, is the nature of the student complaint about the way the CVA is being handled. MIT has chosen the CVA to staff, to staff, and, tacitly, to treat their opinions with a grain of salt or not at all, on the highly dubious ground that it is difficult to utilize com- munity planners during the budgeting season. Controversy is not intended, however, to be avoided in a matter of high importance, and the one-relevant views may no longer be representative at a later time.

By using that criterion, it would therefore no longer be necessary to consult students about any issue that con- fronted the CVA and involves students. I feel that the CVA, due to the short time that it was installed near tangled and Westgate last month, and 2) "Open meetings are being planned to discuss the sculpture plans", referred to The Tech, 4, 10, 1978.

Then again, Andersen also said that the Smith sculpture would be in- stalled immediately. In case of student feedback, the CVA decided not to have open meetings on the sculpture, probably because it anticipated (and rightly so) extremely negative student opinions.

I find it hard to believe that community opinions change so drastically in two years that they must be discounted. I find it much easier to believe that Wayne Anderson and all of the other supposedly well-meaning purveyors of culture around here simply do not consider our "play" opinions valid.

I wish I could say that I don't get more positive comments; it is an inquiry, with such a demonstrably gross lack of sensitivity, that so many choose to disregard its dictates.

A museum has the art to display to the knowable public and to show the Institute's understanding of the importance of culture on the minds of the campus community. Meeting and caring for its students, staff, and faculty, without whom there would be no MIT at all. Future art acquisitions should be approved, or at least discussed by committee members.

The CVA's announcement referred to next month's installation, the parallel is clear. I propose a referendum to be held next March with the UA vote on whether the sculpture should be moved. I am sure that the UA would be behind any attempt to bring the views of the community representatives to bear on the issue and to be representative of the diverse interests of its members.

The CVA plans to go back in on word again, which would be surprising. I have said my piece. To the CVA, to UAP Phil Morewe, and to the rest of the Institute members of the class.

Carter's momentum: a dramatic shift

By William Lasser

The events of the past two weeks have confirmed that this election campaign of one of the most promising - and a moment of crisis for the American liberal establishment - has shifted dramatically from President Ford to President Carter.

The Carter White House feel they have the momentum of their campaign and that the Ford White House is on the defensive. How strong is the Ford White House's case, and how likely is the Carter White House to be able to hold on to its advantage?

The Ford campaign's strategy has been to focus on the issue of the economy, particularly the high rate of inflation. The Ford campaign has argued that the economy is in better shape than it was a year ago, when Carter campaigned on the issue of inflation.

The Carter campaign has focused on the issue of the economy as well, but has also emphasized the issue of taxes and the need for a more progressive tax system. Carter has argued that the economy is in better shape than it was a year ago, but that more needs to be done to help the average American family.

The Ford campaign has also tried to portray Carter as a weak leader, who cannot handle the job of being President. The Ford campaign has argued that Carter is too inexperienced to handle the presidency, and that his policies are not sound.

The Carter campaign has tried to portray Ford as a weak leader, who is out of touch with the American people. The Carter campaign has argued that Ford is too老 to handle the presidency, and that his policies are not sound.

In the end, it will be up to the American people to decide who they want as President. The election is not over yet, and both candidates still have a chance to win.

It is important to remember that the election is not just about who will be the next President, but also about what kind of country we want to live in. Both candidates have different visions for the future of America, and we need to carefully consider which candidate best represents our values.

Ultimately, it is up to each individual voter to decide who they trust and who they believe will make the best President. The election is about more than just choosing a candidate; it is about choosing a direction for our country.