opinion

Choose UAP/UAVP wisely
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Michael Lopez has worked admirably on several UA projects, including a recent lobbying trip to Washington and the UA's Ski IAP program. While he has not been involved in student government, Lopez seems unwilling to fully utilize the power of the office of the President of UAP. He claims it unrealistic for a UAP to expect to effect change in the administration, Commons, educational policy, or tuition issues, and his platform dwells on projects which are, in comparison, trivial. Steve Barber, Lopez's running mate, is enthusiastic and experienced, but seems to have been relegated to an insignificant role in the campaign.

Ira Sumner and Shiva Ayaydari have recognized the lack of leadership which has rendered the UA and the General Assembly (GA) ineffective. Sumner has committed himself to need-blind admissions and protecting pass/fail, as well as to the campus shuttle which has promised last year by UAVP. Both Sumner and Ayaydari, however, lack experience. Sumner has been involved in the Technology Community Association, but has not previously been involved in student government. Freshman Ayaydari chairs the GA Committee on Admissions, Tuition, and Financial Aid, which has, in this year of financial concerns, done no more than mount an unsuccessful letter-writing campaign to Congressmen. It is doubtful that their leadership can match their campaign rhetoric.

Ken Segel and Ken Meltzner have presented a realistic view of the powers and limitations of the office of the President of UAP, but their seriousness of purpose is open to question. The Segel- Meltzner campaign began as a joke, but the team has since addressed important issues thoughtfully. Segel places his priorities on long-term issues of Institute policy and financial aid, recognizing the need for a UAP to delegate responsibility for special projects. He and Meltzner strongly oppose the recent actions of Course Six and Sixteen to look at hidden grades as an assault on the sanctity of pass/fail. They have not yet articulated a position on need-blind admissions, but claim they will seek opinions of the undergraduate community on the issue.

If Segel and Meltzner do not think the positions of UAP and UA VP seriously, they could be the worst UA leaders in the history of the Institute. In order for any UAP/UA VP team to have an opportunity to be effective, however, undergraduates must demonstrate their interest in election issues by casting their votes tomorrow.

CJAC should examine tuition
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The instrument for conducting such an investigation already exists: the Corporation Joint Advisory Committee on Institute-Wide Affairs. CJAC consists of student, faculty, and Corporation representatives, and ex-officio members include the president of the Undergraduate Association and Graduate Student Council. The Committee was created to provide "an additional means for bringing representatives of the student body, both undergraduate and graduate, and of the faculty into regular communication with the Corporation on matters which are of long-term importance to the entire Institute community. CJAC's membership and mission are therefore well-suited to an investigation of alternative revenue sources. The Committee is also in need of a new project: it has met only once since completing its selection of Paul Gray as President. Any serious attempt to seek proposals should produce a multitude of potentially viable ideas. Some will prove unfeasible, and it will be the job of the Committee's first meeting to evaluate these proposals. Any serious attempt to seek proposals should produce a multitude of potentially viable ideas. Some will prove unfeasible, and it will be the job of the Committee's first meeting to evaluate these proposals."

The principle underlying the investigation is that a simple one: MIT has acknowledged that it can no longer depend on the Federal government for increasing or even constant levels of funding for research and student aid. The Administration and Corporation must similarly concede that reliance on constantly increasing support from students and their parents is untenable and iniquitable.