Student government has two responsibilities. It must represent the students and communicate their interests to the administration, and it must provide visible benefits to the student. The Undergraduate Association (UA), however, has failed on both accounts. It has not taken the initiative on important issues such as the dormitory system, Course VI oversubscription and mandatory commons. It often does not achieve a quorum. Public acts as much as official statements are the exceptions, not the rule.

The government has failed to provide any benefits to the students it is supposed to represent and serve. The last two UA administrations have taken office with promises of great events and projects. Promises have been rubber-stamped to pass.

The government's failures lie both with the elected officials and the students. Former UA presidents and vice presidents have shown little understanding of what student government should be. They have suffered from a chronic inability to achieve their minimal goals. Cynicism and apathy among students of UA government have been superfluous. The UA Council is as ineffective as was the General Assembly. The government has failed to provide any benefits to the student body. Yet they continue to control student resources.

Students must take the responsibility for improving their lot. An effective representative government could achieve this improvement. Someone must be responsible for the allocation of student funds, space and other resources. Somebody must have the power to tax and spend student funds. If the UA does not take on these responsibilities, the Dean's Office will. The ODS has repeatedly shown that it will do so. The penny pinching is a prime example. Until student government takes a strong, united stance on important issues will the ODS let student governments govern themselves.

The UA will become a power campus only when students take an active interest in their representative body. Students have no interest in the UA. They neither respect nor need the ineffective structure that exists.

There are several ways to increase students' interest in their government. UA government should have the power to levy an activities fee in place of the current tuition-based Dean's Office funding. An activities fee would make students realize that their money is being spent on student activities.

Students would be more interested in what the UA does with their money if they were informed as to how their money is being spent on student activities. They have no interest in the UA. They neither respect nor need the ineffective structure that exists.

The ticket of Bryan R. Moser '87 and Mary S. Tai '87 is not better. They have demonstrated concern for student interests, but they have not offered any specific solutions to cure the rampant apathy. Their proposals are examples of the same projects and support the same workable goals that more experienced previous UA administrations could not effect. Students must decide for themselves which team, either on the basis of policy or the issues, will best serve their interests.

One team will win. That team should choose concrete, attainable goals to achieve that one project that benefits student's needs, no matter how small. Only then will it gain student support. Only then can it increase the effectiveness of the UA.

The UA should also distribute the spatial resources of the Student Activities and the Dean's Office self-perpetuating. The board also provides the annual opportunity to examine and reverse those policies.

The new Nominations Committee would be the same as the current Nomination Committee. The Finance Committee would remain as the primary committee to approve activities fee and funding allocations. The UA Council would make recommendations of student events, student social events, financial matters and any other concerns that do not interfere with their function.

The government has failed to provide any benefits to the student body. Yet they continue to control student resources. Students would be more interested in what the UA does with their money if they were informed as to how their money is being spent on student activities. They have no interest in the UA. They neither respect nor need the ineffective structure that exists.

The ticket of Bryan R. Moser '87 and Mary S. Tai '87 is not better. They have demonstrated concern for student interests, but they have not offered any specific solutions to cure the rampant apathy. Their proposals are examples of the same projects and support the same workable goals that more experienced previous UA administrations could not effect. Students must decide for themselves which team, either on the basis of policy or the issues, will best serve their interests.

One team will win. That team should choose concrete, attainable goals to achieve that one project that benefits student's needs, no matter how small. Only then will it gain student support. Only then can it increase the effectiveness of the UA.

The UA should also distribute the spatial resources of the Student Activities and the Dean's Office self-perpetuating. The board also provides the annual opportunity to examine and reverse those policies.