Michael R. Evans '95 has two strengths that I can see: (1) They have not been involved in the administration of the UA (the Class Council is a subsidiary government under the UA Council). As a consequence, we cannot make any judgments concerning their ability to serve at UA and UA VP. They may have hidden potential that these offices will bring to light. (2) They can bring fresh insight and energy into this organization.

Page and Evans' disadvantages are as follows: (1) They live off-campus in the same house. And thus, they do not have as much direct contact as Vijay P. Sankaran '95 and Carrie R. Muh '95 have with other sectors of the MIT community. (2) Since they have not been involved in the UA Executive Branch, many of their ideas that they raise in their concerns about placing victims of drunk driving and sexual harassment in their office and the inner workings of the bureaucracy. They have had the funds available, but not the space or the need to perform this function. (3) If Page and Evans are so concerned with walkie-talkies on campus and maintain contact with the campus police to report crimes and the status of areas of the MIT community, why have they not participated in the projects that they say they want to accomplish in their administrative term? Why haven't they attended the recent GSC forum on sexual harassment and why haven't they been involved in any of the numerous organizations on campus (both Dean's office- and student-originated) that deal with this issue? These groups have much experience with this topic and have been fighting for stricter laws on sexual harassment on MIT's campus. They know what MIT has said its limitations are and they are pushing to raise awareness and gain support for their projects to improve MIT's standards.
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