chose to provide fatuous and impotent suggestions. The Dean's Office specify exactly what the steps should be. 

dents, but it would be far more useful for the committee to suggest: Student government as presently incarnated is an excellent activities record, but it also has the arrogance to claim that it's the only way to improve Dean's Office contacts with students. Even here, however, the committee suffers from its obsession with bureaucracy, -exacerbating the chronic shortage of student participation in extracurricular activities. Even intelligent changes; it chose instead to routinely endorse the actions of the Dean's Office and to proffer a few inept recommendations. The committee correctly identified the reasons behind the chronic shortage of student participation in extracurricular activities as increasing financial burdens due to skyrocketing tuition and pervasive student perception of such participation as worthless. The Visiting Committee, however, makes absolutely no relevant suggestions about curing these problems. The committee justifiably states that students should receive neither financial nor financial support for their participation, but it provides no viable alternative to these proposals.

Rather, the committee lamely claims students should believe companies "will tend to select candidates with a good activities record." This is a barren suggestion at best. Not only does the committee overlook the general predominance - appeal to any senior interviewing for jobs - of a good grade point average over an excellent activities record, but it also has the arrogance to conclude that students will naively accept their unemployment and rush to join activities. Merely saying something is true does not make it so. Worse yet, the Visiting Committee, concerned with the most distant past, is determined to provide nothing more for the committee to do than to figure out what it did in the sixty's, but we decided a more constructive approach. Our first thought was a war, since that did it in the sixties, but a more constructive catalyst would be preferable. We may have no choice, though, since our nation is already at war in Nicaragua, but that's another column. I want to pursue our answer from the other night: jobs.

I have never quite understood how many people can be unemployed when there is so much work to be done. Our roads and bridges, our sewers and other facilities are falling apart. Gasoline prices are falling, making it easy to forget our long-term problem of reliance on fossil fuels and to abandon our programs in conservation and in developing renewable energy sources. Much could be done to make facilities accessible to handicapped people and to develop tools to help them become fully functioning members of society. There is much more work to be done and many people who need to work. The problem lies in matching them up.

Some sort of national service program similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps comes to mind. This is not a new idea; the US Congress is already considering aponce plan as part of the new jobs program. Certainly such a program could accomplish a great deal.

Another possibility is a mandatory national service program. It could include some basic military training and the option of continuing in the military for a year or two, or just civilian work. Many young people support this idea, at least in the abstract; they would like to give something back to a country and a planet which have given so much to them. Such a program could strengthen national security by creating a militia to defend the United States in case of attack, by breaking down prejudices by forcing people from different racial and social backgrounds to work together, and by strengthening our physical plant. If a candidate for national office grabbed on to it, he might find a great deal of support from all sectors of the population.

There are, however, all sorts of political and practical obstacles to a plan like this. Of course, to implement it would require the creation of a whole new federal bureaucracy, exacerbating the problem of an already swollen government. The program would take several years to fully implement, and the end result would likely be much less desirable than the vision. Forcing people into public service may conflict with many of our basic national values. As much good as such a program might do, I'm not sure I could support its implementation.

If something related to jobs is to bring the youth of America together, I think it has to be something they can do themselves. It is very difficult to get excited over a government program in which you are a mere peon. Perhaps it would be possible to organize a nationwide network of groups of young people, such working to solve the most pressing problems of their communitie. It would be an easy task to organize even one such group, and after that, the problems of funding for working materials and subsistence would be great. These ideas seem to breed as many problems as they solve. That is not to say they should be canned (Please turn to page 5).