SCC should fall under GA's control

The Student Center Committee (SCC) has again denied that it falls under the control of the Undergraduate Association (UA) General Assembly (GA), a claim it has made regularly since the GA was reconstituted by UA President Jonathan Haig in 1981. Assistant Professor of History Steve Thornton contends there are as many students active in SCC as in the GA, and that SCC has sponsored events and provided services "for over a decade, with little or no support from the GA."

Thomas' contention — true or untrue — is not really important in considering the relationship of his committee to the GA. What is important is that the General Assembly is the representative body of MIT's undergraduates. SCC is a General Committee with a General Assembly (UA) affiliated status passed by the undergraduates in 1969, and is legally countable to the General Assembly.

Admitting SCC to the General Assembly is an imperceived representative of MIT students, nevertheless, it is only an ignominious token. The United States Congress is an imperceived representative of US citizens, but it has no actual power. The GA is no better. Hence, the GA should have no power over SCC.

Now that SCC money has become well-known to the administration and the students, the Committee should attempt to spend its excess profits wisely. The planned $45,000 endowment to Killian Hall, for example, is a good use of SCC's funds, but the Committee must hold itself to frugal and sensible spending merely as a reaction to Dean's Office scrutiny.

Screening essential to exchange's future

The MIT-Wellesley residence exchange was designed to facilitate cross-registration and give participants a chance to live in a society quite different from their own.

The implementation of the exchange, however, has been less than up to its goal. The MIT and Wellesley Exchange Offices should have forethought in selecting, preparing, or placing students in the exchange. They did not even inform the residents of Wellesley's Halstead and Freeman Halls that their dormitories would be used for this term.

Next year the Exchange Offices will provide an orientation for each student that goes further. An applicant should be interviewed, and each application should be reviewed by the offices. Participants should be required to take at least one course at each school and a normal total course load, to prevent the educational exchange from lapsing into a mere recreational experience.

With the especially cramped facilities such as those at Bates Hall are difficult to predict, greater selectivity on the part of the two Exchange Offices could make the future of the residence exchange a success.
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Guest Column/Robert S. Lubarsky

Reagan's lies in El Salvador

The Reagan Administration is trying to sell to the American people the presence in El Salvador by raising the specter of a "Soviet" threat. Evidence, however, reveals our government has quite different interests in this "war on terror." Reagan and Secretary of State Alexander Haig claim that since the 1979 Nicaraguan revolution, the Sandinistas have become totalitarian Commnunists. Reagan asserts Cuba is just a Soviet puppet, and American control is also under Soviet control. The Sandinistas and the Salvadoran guerrillas (the FMLN) are presently controlled by Nicaragua and Cuba, citing evidence of purported arms supplies and training emanating from those countries.

Reagan's statements alone do not explain why the US cares about El Salvador. A Soviet "threat" is more in line with our idealistic self-satisfaction, since America has supported many client states murder and torture, to name only a few. Reagan's "threat" is a legitimate political force and have called "violent regimes"; however, Reagan and Haig ignore most of the Salvadoran story, since it violates their thesis of Soviet control. Their trick is working. A recent poll shows that half of the US believes there are Cuban or Soviet troops in El Salvador, even though no newspaper or government official has made that claim.

If evidence about El Salvador matters, then US motivations lie with the local population for legitimate reasons, and has supported the much of the non-Communist world. Furthermore, if it succeeds, the USSR could not gain control. Many administrations in the FDR administration, as the Sandinistas have become anti-Soviet. US military support, not just US, exporting to the USSR today. The US has no effective reasons for being there.

The US disagrees with its allies about internal causes, a fought by the local population for legitimate reasons, and its legitimate reasons, than it is to defend the Sandinistas has been gaining acceptance for the rebels. Mexico, Canada, several West European countries, and the international Sandinista movement. Although the Sandinistas have been described by the Latin American press as a legitimate political force and have called "violent regimes," Reagan and Haig ignore most of the Salvadoran story, since it violates their thesis of Soviet control.

Our interests may be in danger, not from the Soviet threat. Cuba's military partial support of the rebels does not imply control. No one seriously claims that Havana is influencing the Afghan guerrillas. Even so, the rebellion is not primarily CIA-sponsored. The population is trying to rid itself of a Soviet dictatorship. El Salvador is not the FDR administration. El Salvador makes several glaring admissions. El Salvador's history of wealthy oligarchs by the military to quiescent peasants is not far from the truth. Our government has its most likely candidates, with much bloodshed, to aid El Salvador's tradition of threats to the Catholic Church. Its new liberation theology, in connection with the Sandinista victory, is causing ideological conflict for the rebels. Many people in El Salvador that when they organize the poor, encourage their Sandinista friends, in 1972, support for the Sandinistas has been growing. Part of the revolution is political work. The political aim of the rebel organization, the FMLN, includes many moderate elements, such as the Social Christian party and former members of the ruling Christian Democratic party, that families of workers, peasants, and students. Working internationally, the FMLN has tried to gain support for the rebels. Today, the resistance movement includes more than a dozen countries, and the international Sandinista movement.

The US has no effective reasons for being there. A recent poll shows that half of the US believes there are Cuban or Soviet troops in El Salvador, even though no newspaper or government official has made that claim. Such a poll does not show that people are so incapable that decisions are best left to the experts (translate: the state). Instead, it shows the state's inability to mold our thinking. Every administration since World War II has emphasized "the Soviet threat" to justify any US military move. By now people expect to see the Soviet hand anywhere, regardless of how ineffective the move. By now people expect to see the US military move. By now people expect to see the Soviet hand anywhere, regardless of how ineffective the move.

If evidence about El Salvador matters, then US motivations lie with the local population for legitimate reasons, and its legitimate reason is to defend the Sandinistas. The US has no effective reasons for being there. As the Sandinistas have become anti-Soviet. US military support, not just US, exporting to the USSR today. The US has no effective reasons for being there. As the Sandinistas have become anti-Soviet. US military support, not just US, exporting to the USSR today. The US has no effective reasons for being there. As the Sandinistas have become anti-Soviet. US military support.