StLldents against Reagan cuts

Congress should soon begin deliberating on President Reagan's proposed education budget, and this would be a drastic curtailment of the nation's commitment to open higher education. Reagan has proposed eliminating National Direct Student Loans, the College Work Study program, and graduate student eligibility for Guaranteed Student Loans, and also wants to cut other student aid programs, such as Pell Grants.

Many have decried the cuts, including Paul E. Gray '34 and other university presidents. The Undergraduate Association and Graduate Student Council sent five students to lobby Congress against these proposals. However, more can and should be done.

Students should follow exhortations from the UA and many others and write their Congressmen not to accept these cuts. As the time of congressional debate nears, these comments will be influential.

Student voices should also be heard collectively. Well-organized protests and rallies could easily and quickly make student opinions known. If enough MIT students realized the seriousness of Reagan's proposals and devoted an hour or two of their time to hearing about the damage they would cause in Washington and the rest of the country, we would notice.

It is imperative that college-educated, a Boston, rallying involving students from many universities be arranged. A large protest, held perhaps at the Federal building downtown, would notify Congress what these proposed cuts mean.

Organizing a Boston-wide student rally against the financial aid cuts is a needed and worthy project for the UA. Such a protest would be an excellent display of student participation in national politics, and would belies reports of student apathy.

The proposed student cuts would help make MIT a school only for the wealthy; students need to take a stand, both individually and en masse, against the Administration's plans to cut financial aid.

Retain flexibility in School of Science

MIT has recently abolished the Course XXV — Interdisciplinary Science Program. Dean of the School of Science John M. Deutch '61 announced that the program was folding due to the lack of undergraduates enrolled.

As more MIT students opt for engineering instead of science programs, it is essential that School of Science programs have sufficient flexibility to attract students. Though the demise of course XXV may be warranted, the School of Science should develop options within established programs similar to Engineering's C, III-A, and II-B. These options allow students with needs parallel but necessarily coincident with established programs to develop their interests and earn a degree.

The School of Science should explore ways of encouraging diversity in undergraduate education so that it does not lose all students to engineering fields.

Malchman criticism misplaced

To the Editor:

We would like to respond to Mr. Malchman's column of 3/12, entitled "Grease and Frothing on the UA trail.''

We take exception to Mr. Malchman's obvious enjoyment of the antics of the diverse candidates. His opinion seems to be that we are not really trying to help students (i.e., by promoting realistically feasible projects through the UA) to get by, mind and not worth considering.

We wonder whether Mr. Malchman hates all people, or the concerned ones only.

Furthermore, what's wrong with a Homecoming King and Queen? Does he prefer to see our spirit killed off? From the inchoate point of view: thank goodness most of you out there cared enough at least to take that issue seriously.

As for kicking people when they're down, Mr. Malchman, on whom do you plan to rag now that Segel and Melshner — like the greasers — are taking student voice away? (And did you vote for yourself dead, ya')? Since you're such a nice guy, Mr. Malchman, you should probably just not publish this op-ed.

Steve Barter

Tech coverage of 1982 UA elections shallow

To the Editor:

I'd like to point out a number of inaccuracies and omissions which appeared in the Tech's recent coverage of the UA elections. First of all, the selection of the Queen and King option in the Homecoming referendum does not mean MIT will have a Homecoming Queen next year, as reported by Barry Sarfian in Friday's Tech. The MIT Social Council may still decide to have no Queen at all: it only if it decides to have one need the Council follow the referendum.

The UA Committee on Housing, Campus and Campus Environment also drafted an amendment to the Bylaws of the Social Council which will affect any future Queen & Queen elections. The amendment, which passed 32-2 at the February 4 GA meeting, reads as follows: 37:44 If this Council wishes to conduct a campus-wide election, the procedure for the election and the counting of ballots must be brought up and approved at a regular General Assembly meeting. The election, if approved by the General Assembly, must be conducted by the Election Commission of the Undergraduate Association. At least a motion is passed in the General Assembly to have the Election Commission supervise.

The second difference I have is with The Tech's suggestion that the UA elections last Wednesday had poor turnout because of apathy, as in Tony Zampurari's front-page "analysis" last Friday. Last year, when turnout was highest in over ten years, only 2 more students voted than last Wednesday. Had the East Campus voting booths been properly restocked, turnout would surely broken 1980. The Baker voting booth only registered 9 voters (from 8:30 to 10:15, when it was behind in KA), by contrast, the booth was moved to its usual location, over 400 students voted there. Concerning the Tech's coverage of UA elections, it's obviously unfair you're not in student government.

Steve Barter

Manchester, President-elect, class of '83

M. Kem Frondel '83

The Tech's page layout turned second highest ever

To the Editor:

We wish to thank the students who took part in the 1982 Undergraduate Association elections and express our gratitude and pride in taking a role in the second highest voter turnout, approxi- mately by 42 percent in UA history. Last year approximately 5 percent of the undergraduate population voted. We especially wish to thank those who were actively involved in our bid for UA President and Vice President. In each of them there was a sincere desire to get involved and make a difference.

Now that the results of the election are final we should work to answer the issues raised during the campaign. We wish Segel and Melshner the best of luck in meeting up to the demands of their new offices. As we believe there are beneficial essential student needs lurking, we will continue to work in these areas.

Steve Barter '83