Editorial

Library fee hikes no small change

The MIT Libraries' decision to increase photocopying charges and fines for overdue books and reserve material is unjustified and further burdens the students and other members of the MIT community. I thought I might ease the transition from tradition to high tech by ambivalently philosophizing about it first.

An ad hoc library task force changed the policy over the summer, apparently independent of the larger MIT budgetary process. The decision demonstrates once again that the libraries see themselves as a luxury to MIT students and staff, rather than an essential service.

Director of Libraries Jay K. Lucker attempted to justify the fine hikes by citing overhead costs of processing of overdue books and by claiming the increased fines will help deter borrowers from keeping books past their due dates.

His argument ignores that most late returns of material are due to inadvertent negligence, rather than selfish malice. A 25-cent daily fine will not help the forgetful student remember to return his overdue books any more than a 10-cent fine and is unlikely to deter a person willfully holding books past their due date.

If the fine increase is purposeless, then the doubling of photocopying charges will remain an artifact.

Many books and documents and most other reference material are too fragile or valuable to allow the cost of a guaranteed loan and the potential damage that might be done to the document by use.

The MIT Libraries' decision to increase photocopying costs behind a copying machine? 'as it really increased 100 percent?

'Commercial printing shops, and three cents at MIT Graphic Arts?'s some people wonder.

The statement was, 'if a student cashes a Guaranteed Student Loan.' The SFAO, the Financial Aid Office (SFAO), and the MIT Certification of Loan Eligibility were included.

To the Editor:

One of the most important aspects of the draft registration/financial aid matter was only partially reported in the Tech (Sept. 13), in question was, 'if an unregistered student cashes a Guaranteed Student Loan check.' The SFAO informed any student cashing a Guaranteed Student Loan check of the, 'Financial Aid Office (SFAO) will now require me to file the compliance form, to inform the Department of Education...'

A fuller statement of our obligation under regulation is, 'if a student has not filed a statement of registration compliance with the SFAO, and if I learn that the proceeds of a Guaranteed Student Loan (including PLUS loans) have been applied (by any means) for his or her benefit, then after Oct. 1, 1983, the SFAO must inform the Department of Education and the lender that the Institute's certification of loan eligibility was invalid.'

This may appear to be splitting hairs, but I believe it's important for GSL applicants not intending to register this semester: GSL applicants do not need to register this semester. They do not need to register this semester. They do not need to register this semester. They do not need to register this semester.

To avoid hassle, they can either cash their GSL check at GSU or hope to later; or you have already cashed a GSL check to the Institute's certification of loan eligibility was invalid."

Justified and further burdens the students and other members of the MIT community. I thought I might ease the transition from tradition to high tech by ambivalently philosophizing about it first. This will require you to dam age students' rights, and the 25-cent daily fine will not help the forgetful student remember to return his overdue books any more than a 10-cent fine and is unlikely to deter a person willfully holding books past their due date.

If the fine increase is purposeless, then the doubling of photocopying charges will remain an artifact.

Many books and documents and most other reference material are too fragile or valuable to allow the cost of a guaranteed loan and the potential damage that might be done to the document by use.

The MIT Libraries' decision to increase photocopying costs behind a copying machine? 'as it really increased 100 percent?

'Commercial printing shops, and three cents at MIT Graphic Arts?'s some people wonder.

The statement was, 'if a student cashes a Guaranteed Student Loan.' The SFAO, the Financial Aid Office (SFAO), and the MIT Certification of Loan Eligibility were included.
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A fuller statement of our obligation under regulation is, 'if a student has not filed a statement of registration compliance with the SFAO, and if I learn that the proceeds of a Guaranteed Student Loan (including PLUS loans) have been applied (by any means) for his or her benefit, then after Oct. 1, 1983, the SFAO must inform the Department of Education and the lender that the Institute's certification of loan eligibility was invalid.'
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