Students Need to Work for Change in UA

A group of students took a UA ballot box. If there weren't any damage, I'd think it was just a lack. A copy of the Manifesto of the Student's Revolutionary Government appeared. If not for the stealing of the ballot box, I'd think this was a lack. Now I must conclude that these people are simply deluded.

The Manifesto accuses the UA of not act- ing as a government. The problem is that the UA was never meant to be a government in any real sense. A government is a structure intended to instill and enforce rules of con- duct, so that society can work together in ways people want. From that point of view, it's not surprising that governments derive their power from the people, and that the people retain the right to change their government when it does not function properly.

The UA does not institute nor enforce rules of conduct. The UA administration does that. The UA does not derive its power from the students. It derives its power from the UA. What does the UA do?

It has three main purposes: it is a lobbying group to the UA administration, intended to represent the general opinion of the under- graduate student body; it measures when the undergraduate student body wants certain services, and initiates them; and it provides an educational experience for council members in management and debate. The UA plays a crucial role as a lobbying group. The UA administration needs to cater to undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, staff, students, and the U.S. government and other funding sources. The UA admin- istration with some approximation of student opinion, which can otherwise be diffi- cult to estimate.

There is nothing requiring the UA admin- istration to respect this opinion, short of stu- dent pressure. But a significant number of students would like it to happen, and other sources of student input, into consideration when making decisions. This not only vali- dates the UA as a useful organization, but demonstrate why the UA derives its power from the UA, not the students. If the Student's Revolutionary Government were to overthrow the UA, the UA administration would first have to recognize it as a valid source of student opinion.

The role of the UA in student services is not as much in providing services to them, as it is in instilling them. At some time, the ser- vice becomes more and more independent of the student body. This is supposed to happen with the Information Processing Board (IPB) and A Safe Ride, and the Course Evaluation Guide (CEG) is less of an integral part of the UA than it used to be.

If enough students want to change the UA to warrant a revolution, it would be much eas- ier for all these people to become UA Council representatives and provide input. The, and other funding sources. The UA pro- vides the only means of accurately measuring what the student body wants. At the very least, they can storm a UA Council meeting and provide input. All under- graduates are members of the UA. They have the right to be heard at UA Council meetings, although they cannot vote there. And every- one has a UA Council representative. I find it hard to believe that it is difficult to get the UA to hear what the student body wants.

The Student's Revolutionary Government seems to be defeated in thinking the UA is a government, that they are not doing their "job," that the majority of the students are willing to change it, and that a revolution is the most effective way to do that change.

Kevin M. Iga '92

'Choice' Group's Name is Misleading, Wrong

I am writing this letter to question the motivation behind the new Students for Choice group at MIT. Are they really Students for Choice? Do they condemn an individual's right to choose in all situations? I don't believe they do. Perhaps a better name for their group would be "Students for Abortion." We probably all agree that we live in a democracy with a less than infinite money supply. I believe that these two facts alone are enough to undermine the Students for Choice group. As members of a democracy, we are supposed to allow ourselves to be governed by the will of the majority. Are the Students for Choice a majority? I don't believe that they are. Yet they advocate spending the money of the majority to fund an action that is condoned only by a minority. I am sure that the group will disagree when I say that they represent a minority opinion, but how can they? Because our country has never elected an ardently "pro-choice" President, and because the Senate has approved in the last decade so many nominations of "pro-Life" Justice is the Supreme Court, I find it diffi- cult to believe that the "pro-choice" platform represents a majority.

As a minority opinion, the group should not expect any money from the government. If the government allocates money to the minor- ity of "pro-choice" advocates, where can a little ever be drawn to guide government spending? If one minority system of people support a church in one form or another. Students for Choice has a right in our society to express its desire for government money, but it must also respect the right of the majority to choose how to spend it.

This brings into question the "pro-choice" stance. Do they support choice, or abortion and political correctness? If a woman chooses to have an abortion, the group supports her. Why do these students choose to kill people? What if a woman chooses to drug herself? Are these women supported by the group? I doubt it. Are women who choose to murder their month-old infants supported? I think the group would endanger themselves if they are not sup- ported to change these, but they do advocate abortion. As anyone, as they were when the "pro-life" group failed to clearly delineate its position when they were selling roses on Valentine's Day, maybe the Students for Choice should change their name to reflect their true platforms. They should be MIT Students for Abortion, not Students for Choice.

John Radlisk '95
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