**Opinion**

**Taking control**

Last Thursday, the General Assembly refused to grant itself additional oversight authority over its standing committees. The vote was a major defeat in the battle for increased accountability in student government.

Both opponents and proponents of the motion allowed egotism and misplaced concern for protecting their turf to intervene to the more important issue of improving student government. The standing committee chairmen who organized the successful opposition displayed an almost paranoid concern for preserving semantic issues. Those favoring the proposers refused to admit their desire for more control, claiming only to seek increased communication.

Improved communication between the GA and its standing committees is an important objective, but one that can be accomplished only through some measure of increased control. The committees must be responsive and responsible to the student body: the money, computer time, student Center space, and faculty committee positions allocated by the standing committees give the property of the undergraduates. It is completely reasonable and undeniably logical that the only organization on campus designed to be representative of the undergraduates, the GA, maintains control over these resources and their distribution.

The committee chairmen argued that they have carried out their responsibilities adequately without the aid of the GA. At best, this is only partly correct, as well-organized committees have been eliminated over the years. Those that remain exist because they control important assets, not because they are particularly competent.

The GA, as the representative body of the undergraduates, is analogous to Congress, and the standing committees analogous to the Senate. A reasonable assumption is that the GA must vote itself the authority to approve committee chairmen and to require appointees to submit written reports at least once a year. Committees will not necessarily be responsive to students unless they are responsible to the GA.

**Friday night furor**

The tentative decision by the Office of the Dean for Student Affairs to schedule a meeting designed to elicit student response to a rule that had been in effect for years and stultified the wide range of opportunities and the mentality of the typical student and the understanding of those administrators responsible for addressing student concerns.

"Administrators should recognize that there is more to an MIT campus designed to be representative of the undergraduates, the GA, maintains control over these resources and their distribution.

The committee chairmen argued that they have carried out their responsibilities adequately without the aid of the GA. At best, this is only partly correct, as well-organized committees have been eliminated over the years. Those that remain exist because they control important assets, not because they are particularly competent.

The GA, as the representative body of the undergraduates, is analogous to Congress, and the standing committees analogous to the Senate. A reasonable assumption is that the GA must vote itself the authority to approve committee chairmen and to require appointees to submit written reports at least once a year. Committees will not necessarily be responsive to students unless they are responsible to the GA.

**Affirmative action is not punishment**

To the Editor:

I was greatly dismayed by the letter to the editor in the March 30 issue of The Tech entitled, "Affirmative action is inherently unjust." It is true that MIT supports affirmative action. These programs have caused widespread controversy as to their moral and legal legitimacy. I offer my opinion to try and clear up misinterpretations concerning affirmative action programs.

The decision of "inherently unjust" means to intrinsically have the property of being unjust. Clearly this definition only applies when affirmative action programs are interpreted as being "reverse discrimination programs." We must be able to look at the situation in this way. The sole purpose of the program is to give qualified women and minorities a chance to participate in today's job markets. It would be ridiculous to try and interpret them in this way. The purpose of the program is to give women and minorities a chance to participate in today's job market.

While it is the duty of the intelligent employer to hire the best qualified candidate for a particular job, the program has not been the action in the past. There have been many qualified women and minorities seeking employment that have been discriminated against by the employer solely on the basis of race or sex. It goes without saying that this has been the attitude in the past and it continues even today.
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**Secretary again...**

The SUN is ready to rise whenever you are...