Editorial

UA Council must justify existence

The UA Council devoted its last meeting to reassignments of the administration's committee on alcohol abuse. Instead of treating the Council as a strong and independent undergraduate forum, they moved away from the concrete and into par- liamentary abstractions by passing a motion recommending student representation on the new committee, and then quibbled about whether the IFC should be represented separately. The Council's inability to resolve the question of whether the IFC was part of the UA Council further confused the issue.

With most of their appointments and budget cut complete and little left to face after the end of their term in office, Libby and Scheidler might have seized the chance to make themselves heard on more substantial issues. Administra- tion action on course VI overcrowding, for example, Institute budget cuts will affect the average student much more severely than any attempts at an alcohol policy, yet their defense was made by no consideration by membership of the student government. Nor, to our knowledge, has the chief officers of that government, Libby, made himself heard at fac- ulty meetings, where he is one of a handful of students granted speaking privileges.

Libby and Scheidler are yet to make good on even their campaign promises. These promises included "projects and -services that directly affect and benefit the students," "ins- truction, communication between the students, the student gov- ernment, and the administration," and "going out and talking to people." Yet they have failed to make public their widely praised, Walker outdoor cafe and Asian language courses since the elec- tion, and the UA Council seems as dedicated to insulating itself from the student body as the last administration. The UA Council might have seized the opportunity to meet in 10-250.

Instead, the UA Council chose to apply itself to the cause of canonizing former Assistant Dean for Student Affairs Robert Hendrick. But it is hardly deserving of these premature eulogies. His fulfillment of "the highest ideals of the Office of the Dean for Student Af- fairs," as stated in the resolution, was proof of that. In par- ticular, Immerman was instrumental in blocking student-governed office, Libby and Scheidler might have seized the chance to make themselves heard on more substantial issues. Administra- tion action on course VI overcrowding, for example, Institute budget cuts will affect the average student much more severely than any attempts at an alcohol policy, yet their defense was made by no consideration by membership of the student government. Nor, to our knowledge, has the chief officers of that government, Libby, made himself heard at fac- ulty meetings, where he is one of a handful of students granted speaking privileges.
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