To the Editor:

In your issue of Friday, Oct. 7, there was an article headed "Crowded software lab drops all sophomores." Not only did it say that 6,170 is overcrowded, but also that 7,000 is overcrowded at the course in question, is a prerequisite for another required course, and that it is offered only one term a year. She neglected to mention, however, that the course will be offered again this spring, for the benefit of those who couldn't take it this fall. The faculty and administration of Course VI realize how bad it is for required courses to be overcrowded, and they are sympathetic to student concerns; therefore, the course is being offered twice this year. The sophomores who couldn't take it first term will not be behind schedule if they take it second term instead. 6,170 is not intended to be the first- term sophomore course anyway.

In the future, you will report on things that happen in any department, which are beyond the control of the faculty or administration of that department (e.g., overcrowding in a course), please report also on the things that are being done to remedy the problem.

Ondria G. Jaffe '85
ECCS Student-Faculty Committee

A poet also claims her, a sophomore in old VI-3

To the Editor:

This, in response to your dry wit, is my attempt to say
That not all those who can write poems you can see,
To the Editor:

Who spends his time each night prying to the MULTICS God
Because that's what he likes, do not deserve the scorn you give.
So, let's turn things around—How much credit do you want for putting others down?
I realize that I must not judge you.
But neither should you, me.
Everyone I know works hard at old good MIT.
Lauren Singer '86

Charles P. Brown

Attitudes, goals must change

Witt's proposals will be argued and forgotten

As a General Assembly representative for the past three years, I have sat through countless meetings, listening to myriad reorganization proposals and by-laws changes, with their sponsors saying the proposals would make student government effective. The proposals offered last week by Undergraduate Association President Michael P. Witt '84 to reorganize student government are but another recast of the same proposals and will meet the same fate. They will be argued about for a few weeks and will be forgotten.

Change is needed, but not the changes Witt proposed. Student government needs to work on things that are of interest and importance to the student body: commons, limited enrollment in departments, Institute budget cuts, financial aid and educational policy.

The current lack of respect for the General Assembly is due to the predominance of organizational problems on its agenda. Its meetings over the past several years have been filled with trivial and bureaucratic changes and other administrative nonsense. If Witt insists on pushing his reorganization plan in the General Assembly, he will destroy the body.

Does not deserve the scorn that not there are not problems with the Undergraduate Association's structure: There are many. The most crucial of these involve the relationships between the groups that comprise student government.

The primary problem lies in defining student government. Most undergraduates — even many of those inside student government — fail to consider the full specter of student government: other campus groups like the Inter-Fraternity Conference and the Dormitory Council, the Social Council and the Athletic Association, and the myriad student committees in academic departments.

The support organizations of student government should be accessible to — and their policy decisions should reflect the interests and concerns of — all these organizations.

The other crucial problem is the overiding concerns of accountability and control. The traditional fourth-floor government organizations have focused their attention on concerns which neither are in what is done. The result is endless feuding. Groups have concentrated on protecting their own interests, rather than on solving the real problems facing their organizations.

This defensive attitude was not generated by the current leaders of the organizations, but they must consciously work to eliminate it.

The issues facing organizations need to be discussed, but not in the forum of the General Assembly. Leaders of student groups need to sit down and talk about common problems and goals. This has been done before, but on a limited scale.

Leaders of the whole spectrum of student government — from the Inter-Fraternity Conference and the Dormitory Council to the Undergraduate Association's general committees — need to develop a consensus on how they interface, and how they can best serve the students.

Changing the structure of student government will not change its value to students; the value of student government can be increased only if the attitudes and goals of those involved change.