The national elections of 1992 must have been a disappointment to just about everyone. For the Democrats, they failed to gain majority control of the Senate in the House of Representatives, they are still far short of the two-thirds majority necessary to override the President veto and thereby bog the Reagan Administration on appropriation matters. Their numerical victory was not a definitive repudiation of the President's social and economic programs, buttressed with intolerance as these programs may be. For the President and his party, the numbers of the election will be used by the national media to remind them that the consensus that they claimed to have existed after the 1980 elections is no longer there. For those in pursuit of a critical office this election year, high campaign costs and the psychological perils of the rubber-chicken circuit must stand in violent contrast to the frustrations that office-seekers feel in being mentally unequipped for the task of public problem-solving necessary to win America's spin into an unprecedented degree from the crisis-ridden Federal government, that the consequences of today's actions will become painfully clear.

Alvin Toffler, perhaps not the most authoritative source, has noted that in our transition to a technological civilization, the methods by which democracy functions must inevitably be transformed. In the industrial age the vote of the citizen was the fundamental means of participation in public affairs. Now, when we are balanced between two eras, the republican democracy will indeed seem like an awkward tool, since the outcome of an election does not necessarily reflect the wishes of the populace. Other forms of participation are coming to the fore, although they are unlikely to substantially increase the sense of reality in American public policy. In Columbus, Ohio, some residents can express their opinion instantaneously on a wide range of political, economic and social issues through their television set and the QUBE polling system. Simple polling for action committees is reverting to organized demonstrations on a scale never before seen, and some citizens find a satisfaction in these events that they do not find at the ballot box.

It is important to note, however, that these modalities of U.S. democracy are, at this point, exclusively the province of upper-middle class white America. Whatever the form of individual involvement, the American republic is passing through an age of ideology and rhetoric. Politicians and citizens alike are more obsessed with ideas and their faithful than the quality of the persons espousing them.

We should not be happy with the likes of Ronald Reagan and Pres. Wilson and Paul Tsongas and Frank Lautenberg, but in feeling a satisfaction in these events that they do not find at the ballot box.

It is only when enough students are made to realize the value that will bring your records to a crisis-ridden Federal government, that the consequences of today's actions will become painfully clear. For the MIT student that an avowedly technological age should be led over by people who have little awareness of or concern for this evolution in human affairs. Many recognize as well that charismatic leadership is required in times of distress, but never to the extent that arrogance becomes an end in itself; one senses this attitude as harkening of the French Sun King on the part of some in the current national Administration.

Like the American citizenry, MIT students will allow repeated improper behavior on the part of the MIT graduate association to lead to a satisfaction in these events that they do not find at the ballot box.