Cowan disputes Kaliski's analysis of UA elections
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2. The Congress of the United States should in the interim refrain from appropriating funds for the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and of missiles and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons. (The action recommended in this clause is intended as an indication of U.S. good faith, and as a test of the good faith of other nuclear powers, during the negotiation specified in clause 1.)

3. The United States should join the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers in declaring a mutual policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons, in any circumstances and in any part of the world.

4. The United States should resume negotiations with other countries leading to a comprehensive nuclear test ban in accordance with the provisions previously agreed upon by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom.

SCC has no "courtesy"

To the Editor:

Why is the Student Center Committee (SCC) charging students for admission to the Battle of the Bands? Previous events were always free — even with SCC paying for bands, alcohol, and food. For the Battle of the Bands SCC is receiving about ten bands who will play their best material (remember, they're only given twenty minutes each). SCC will be receiving live music for FREE. Correction, SCC will be PAID to receive live music, since they actually have the nerve to charge the bands an admission fee. Granted, prizes will be awarded, but, it is unlikely that they will total more than the fees SCC usually pays to bands. So why is SCC charging us to hear our friends play? If SCC is trying to find ways to use their $100,000 budget to improve MIT social life it makes no sense to charge for what will be one of the most highly attended SCC parties ever. What do you mean it is a "courtesy" of nominating it to the "Big Screen"? Joseph P. Cernada '85
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Letters to Congress urges nuclear freeze
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Letters to Congress urges nuclear freeze

Urge immediate negotiations with the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers in a comprehensive nuclear test ban in accordance with the good faith of other nuclear powers, in any circumstances and in any part of the world.

1. The United States should immediately begin to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear test ban in accordance with the good faith of other nuclear powers, in any circumstances and in any part of the world.

2. The Congress of the United States should in the interim restrain from appropriating funds for the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and of missiles and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons. (The action recommended in this clause is intended as an indication of U.S. good faith, and as a test of the good faith of other nuclear powers, during the negotiation specified in clause 1.)

3. The United States should join the Soviet Union and other nuclear powers in declaring a mutual policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons, in any circumstances and in any part of the world.

4. The United States should resume negotiations with other countries leading to a comprehensive nuclear test ban in accordance with the provisions previously agreed upon by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom.

5. The United States and the Soviet Union should work vigorously with other nuclear powers to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to countries that do not now possess them.

Why does he also say, on the same page, that the Class of 1984 president race was decided "by but eleven votes." (Emphasis mine.) Few attended the election forum. Who cares? The campus media was there; that’s who matters. Most undergraduates have better things to do with their time, and I’d say that the 1984 who voted without the benefit of attending made an excellent decision, to elect Mike Witt and Inge Gredel.

No one ran for Class of 1984 treasurer, secretary, social chairperson, or publicity/newsletter chairperson. For one, Kaliski neglects the fact that 4 students who have held these, or other, positions since 1982 are now running for Undergraduate Association president, and were therefore unable to run for Class of 1984 posts.

"Only 52 votes" (emphasis mine) is quite impressive for a write-in candidate.

* The positions of social and publicity/newsletter chairperson are new. They replace the member at large offices which have historically been reserve positions. The new offices were intended not to attract many candidates, but to recruit those interested in accomplishing a specific, useful task. My personal philosophy is that it is better to have no one run for publicity/newsletter chairperson than to have someone become a member at large and do nothing all year.

Student government’s success should be measured by what it does, not just by how many candidates get their names on the ballot by the deadline. In the case of Undergraduate Association elections, The Tech has correctly identified the sad state of affairs; the Undergraduate Association has the potential to be effective and important if properly run, but now it is powerless. But in the case of class elections, I don’t know what Mr. Kaliski wants. Class government simply isn’t so important that three candidates should run for every office. And even if a candidate wins without opposition, who says he won’t be the best person ever to fill that position? Accomplishments are important; elections are unimportant. I would prefer that The Tech, instead of just bitching about election interest once a year, do an article each week criticizing what the Class of 1984 Council has done. In fact, I challenge The Tech to write one such article.

Rich Cowan
President, Class of 1984