What is there to say about the Senate elections which has not al-
ready been said? I am well aware that the Democrats would reg-
ulate control of the upper chamber this year. That would not be very con-
structive, however. What one really wants to know is what ef-
facts this will have on the nation and on the world.

The effects will not be so mo-
momentous as one might expect. The Reagan administration will
spend the next two years battling with Congress, but it has spent
the last two years fighting a Democratic House and a Repub-
lican Senate. That was certainly more balanced than the ideologi-
cally off-center White House. Reagan’s powers will be reduced, but not so much as those of President Francois Mitterrand;
he have been curtailed by a hostile French parliament, since the US
president’s duties are better de-
fined.

Two years ago, when Demo-
crats were moping about the magnitude of Reagan’s electoral
victory, I was compelled to point out that things were not all that
bad. We all know in advance that he would be re-elected. Of more
interest to me on that election day were the three new Demo-

This week, faced with Demo-
crats jubilant about a ten seat
Senate majority, I have to
serve that things are not all that
good. We all knew that the
Democrats would seize control
of Congress. Less encouraging is
the fact that all the women running
for high office lost with the ex-
ception of cases in which their
opponents were also females.

Is there a trend, that the women candidates for Congress are un-
likely to be elected? We refer to
the fact that all the women running
for high office lost with the ex-
ception of cases in which their
opponents were also females.

To enable students to “think
globally, act locally,” we have
to examine what is happening in our
own back yard. SACC is current-
lly devoting most of its efforts to
studying the military ties at MIT
and organizing a series of events
under the title “MIT as a Political
Institution.”

Our letter to John Berlin stated
that we would be willing to de-
bate the issue at a later time. But
a debate organized just by both
our groups is less likely to attract
a highly polarized audience that
is interested in weighing both
sides than in being entertained by
a viewing match. However, we
are willing to cooperate in getting
the MIT-Renal debate off the
agenda.
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