Physicists Spot Elusive Quark by Heide Li

At the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in Batavia, Illinois, scientists announced Tuesday that they may have found evidence for the existence of the long-sought quark. If confirmed, the discovery of this elusive subatomic particle would provide final experimental proof of the Standard Model, the theory upon which our modern understanding of atomic structure is based.

The international team of scientists from Canada, Italy, Japan, Taiwan, and the United States used the Tevatron particle accelerator at Fermilab to produce the immense energy needed to create the top quark, which is as heavy as an entire gold atom. To accomplish this, they decayed less than a trillionth of a second, and cannot be directly observed. Instead, the Fermilab team searched for the byproducts produced by the top quark as it decays into lighter particles. 15 such events have been detected, while the number of events expected from background noise is about six. The probability of the nine excess events occurring at a chance fluctuation in the background noise is fairly unlikely: about 0.26%. However, many scientists caution that evidence of top quark production is far from definitive.

Dr. Toby Barelis

The Caltech admissions office lost their second major committee member last week over the course of last night. Marcy Whaley joined Dr. Carole Snow, who had left a week earlier, at the Illinois Institute of Technology. According to Whaley, it was a "good career move." Dr. Snow had obtained a position as a dean at IIT and invited Whaley to join her when a second opening at IIT appeared. Whaley stated that neither she nor Dr. Snow was leaving because of any dissatisfaction with Caltech, but that both felt they could use the new experience.

Whaley said she was happy with the trend she had seen over her eight years at Caltech (Dr. Snow had been here for three years). When she came, Whaley, the admissions office had been taken seriously by the rest of the administration. She said admissions had largely been decided by faculty who were pressed for time, and the office was seen as merely clerical. Now, she is happy to see the full-time office staff taking the time load while the faculty is still heavily involved in the decision making process. Whaley also said she was happy that recruiting was seen as more important to Caltech.

Caltech is still less well-known nationally as other schools of its caliber, the trend is towards greater recognition because of more emphasis on recruiting. She was also pleased with Caltech's greater success at attracting women and hoped that similar success at attracting ethnic minorities will soon follow.

Public Policy as a Career by Mike Clemens

Careful observers note several long-term trends at Tech. The famed freshman ratio is evening out. The campus is being "softened" with a significant change from previous year's monotonous growth, and more students are interested in applying their technical skills to the study of public policy issues. Fewer students are satisfied with spending their lives in a laboratory, and more of us want to care about society. Perhaps you will find the world fascinating, and the job opportunities attractive. I believe that the world is a better place for it. Think about it. Although the following is by no means a comprehensive list of these graduate degree programs, it is a start. Don't know first hand that qualified Caltech graduates will receive very serious attention at all those listed below.

1) The Technology and Policy Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology "educates men and women for leadership in the important technological innovation systems of our society". It prepares its students to excel in their technical fields, and to excel at problem-solving in public policy. If you want to work on substantive issues, but don't know if you're cut out for the world of policy, you might want to take a look at this program.

2) The Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University "addresses problems in technology and policy in which technical issues are of central importance. Students enter the program with either doctoral or B.S. degrees. For more information contact the Department at (412) 268-2670."

3) The Department of Economics at Stanford University "is a problem-solving discipline applying engineer­ ing principles to the social sciences. It is an interdisciplinary program in which students work closely with both technical and social scientists to analyze policies that affect society "

4) The Center for Environmental Economics at Stanford University "addresses problems in technology and policy in which technical issues are of central importance. Students enter the program with either doctoral or B.S. degrees. For more information contact the Department at (412) 268-2670."

The program explicitly prepares students for leadership.

Note that the programs student concentrate on issues concerning the environment, energy production, manufacturing and international competitiveness, computers and telecommunications, bioengineering, commercial use of space, materials reduction, and automation. They offer both M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Technology and Policy.

For more information, contact the Department of Engineering and Public Policy by mail at Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890; or by telephone at (412) 268-2670.
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Top Two Admissions Spots Left Open as Directors Leave for Chicago

Carole Snow(left) and Marcy Whaley(right) will be sorely missed as the Admissions Office.

Interviews for those who would be replacing Snow and Whaley will probably take place over the summer, said Whaley. Until then, continuity in the admissions process will be pro­ vided by Bill Bridges, the faculty head of the admissions committee, as well as by the many staff members involved in the admissions process.

The ASCIT Formal is on!!!

All undergrads, grads, faculty, staff, and Alumni are invited.

This Just In:

The cost is $50 per student couple and $100 per faculty, staff, and alumni. The formal is at the Ritz-Carlton Huntington Hotel on Friday, May 13th from 6-12 pm. Interested parties should RSVP to Chris Marsh at socdil@ascit or at x1601.
Y News
by Sam Webb
Welcome back to the Y News! After a short recess, it’s back, new and improved. Well, at least it’s back. Coming up next month on May 15th is International Day. 1-Day is an afternoon dedicated to help culture us Tibetans about the customs and foods of other culture. As always, there will be plenty of food and entertainment. If you missed this week’s planning meeting and want to help out or participate, be sure to drop by the Y lounge at noon on May 4th. The Y will also be sponsoring a backpacking trip in mid-May. The destination will be determined—depending on the weather—either the mountains this week—but is sure to be a blast. If you enjoy getting out of Tech and the sting of the cold gets to be tiresome. This trip would be too hard, so even if you’re uninterested, don’t miss it.

And to wrap up the News this week, we’d end on my personal favorite. Y. Boffo Bonecrusher Broomball X is back for the 25th time and ringer-ups will go up on the 9th. Don’t forget to sign up early since space is limited and guaranteed to sell out. If you have any questions, don’t hesitate to stop by the Y or call Chris at 651-74.

A Liberal’s View on Homosexuality
by Vicki Brown
The reaction to Patricia Schwartz’s article of two weeks ago was very interesting. It made me re-
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PlaySPORTS*
Win $25,000
Trade imaginary shares of major league baseball
teams over the Internet using
the exciting new
*Sports Online Remote Trading System
Only $9.00 for a Seat on the SPORTS* Exchange
No Brokerage Fees
$88 Cash Prizes for 25 Winners !!!
For more info send e mail to: sports@panix.com and include "sports" in the body of the message.
A Proposal to Change ASCIT

by Steven Fought

There has recently been a lot of discussion on what roles ASCIT and the IHC should play in student govern­ment at Caltech. Some people have been saying that ASCIT should lose its power because it is biased and ineffec­tive. Others say that ASCIT should be left as it is. I would like to suggest a third solution. Let's change ASCIT to address the real problems and concerns of students. I will try in this ar­ticle to outline what those problems are, and then suggest how we can make ASCIT do what we need it to do.

During the time that I have been a student here, most of the people I have discussed student government issues with have traced the current problems back to one of two incidents. Older Ricketts House members cite the garter contest at Apache in 1989. Most other people who have been around long enough to remember point to the "Dabney Incident" or the "FIPI" of the fall of the same year. Both of these incidents involved an unsatisfactory situation, and student alike, a general decrease in the confidence of students. I will try in this article to outline what those problems are, and then suggest how we can make ASCIT do what we need it to do.

The Dabney Incident occurred in the fall of 1989, the new class that fall saw a dramatic increase in the percentage of undergraduate women on campus, and in the opinion of many faculty and student alike, a general decrease in the "quality" of the student body. The historical interpretation of this opinion is that it is simply sexism. I don't agree. When I look around at the student body after that first class and compare it to the people I know who came before, there was a dramatic change. However, as far as I can tell, there is no detectable difference in the quality of men and women. What happened? Well, the increase in the percent­age coincided, rather unfortunately, with other changes in the Admissions Office, including the elimination of interviews. The reasons for this par­ticular change have been explained over and over. There was, apparently, a combination of a lack of interest on the part of the faculty in doing inter­views, and a concern over fairness be­cause better spoken faculty interview­ers could be better advocates, etc. Fair­ness, in this case, is a euphemism for "immunity to liability." Using quantifiable data such as test scores and grades is more clear-cut than subjectively and unreliable interviews.

Using quantifiable data has not, however, removed subjective informa­tion from the process. The students who fail in the middle (the ones you actually have to decide to accept or reject) look remarkably still similar to one another. But since these students are "equivalent" in the quantitative analysis, the Admissions Committee now feels safe introducing subjective information into the discussion. So the only students who would have been questioned under an selected using subjective criteria in either system.

What criteria are now used? Lacking an interview, they use what they have. Whether you can play the trombone, do work in your commu­nity, or study the Mayan calendar in your spare time (my own hook) isn't really going to affect your academic life at Caltech, but this information is used none-the-less. Recently, the Admissions Committee has been trying to "reform" itself because of the perceived, if not admitted, decline in the quality of the student body. The latest method involves application essays pertaining to science research and ethics. Not only is the type of student who used to attend Caltech unlikely to write an insightful essay on why they should be a scientist, but there is little to be ve­rify students will be honest in what they write. It is comical that the stu­dents being trusted in this sense are the same ones the admissions commit­tee is so convinced will see Caltech if given the slightest opportunity.

I suspect what happened in the late eighties, either consciously or sub­consciously, was that when the Insti­tute decided to admit more women there was a realization that finding women who had a character similar to that of Caltech students at the time (not feeling, mind you, but character) would be very difficult and cost a sig­nificant amount of money so instead they simply modified the criteria for admission. The result was that, over a shockingly short period of time, we went from targeting people whom the faculty thought would make good sci­entists, to admitting the traditional Stanford/Harvard set. Are these stu­dents "worse" than those who were ad­mitted before? Probably not. Are they as interested in being scientists? Prob­ably not. What's wrong with this? Well, what's wrong with this is that the Caltech faculty is unprepared to educate these new students. The professors I have spoken to are usually willing to admit that most members of the faculty heretofore do not teach classes seri­ously. Caltech is a Research Insti­tute, and the advantage of getting a degree from here is that you can do undergraduate research. This is cer­tainly not a secret. But the students we are admitting now don't necessar­ily want to live a monastic life, spend­ing all of their spare time between classes doing research. Hence SURE which creates ten week summer re­search programs (many professors expect the first full year of the research of group members to be unproductive), many of which are only research in the sense that you are doing work for a faculty member (examples on re­quest). The result of all this is that much of the faculty hate last what re­spect they had for undergraduates, and the students have, in general, retreated into the safe structure of the houses. Remember that the Dabney In­cident occurred at the start of this iso­lation. This was a many coincidence that led to an unfortunate decision.

The Dabney Incident, for one reason or another, caused or justified a turning point in the philosophy of the Student Affairs office. Historically, the faculty, represented by the MOSH, have had direct interactions with stu­dents. This was the most important check on the actions of the faculty with respect to students at Caltech. The faculty board could disagree with the MOSH, but his opinion could not be dis­missed because he was tenured. It was an extremely hard job, probably too hard, but the way in which it was modified was a mistake. Rather than adjusting the amount of work, the po­sition was eliminated. There could have been a good solu­tion to this problem. The Director of Residence Life could have been an assistant to the MOSH, an advisor on what was illegal, a facilitator of day-to­day operations. Instead, Kim West is the MOSH, except she is a suffroner with a very different job description, which seems to be minimizing trouble."Which, of course, means limiting liability. Whether or not you like Ms. West per­sonally is irrelevant, as she is effectively a representative of the Pasadena, Califor­
subjected to laws that would probably from the affected people. So we are in our well-being. The government is now in charge because it's easy to the same under similar circumstances.

I asked him whether he would go to the meeting to see the fire safety video, I brought this up. He made it clear he thought it was an extremely bad idea, and we should ask the Physics department to stop. I asked him whether he would go to Physics department and tell them himself. He repeated his previous statement. He wasn't willing to tell the faculty they couldn't do something, even though he didn't think it was safe.

This example shows two things. First, laws can and are disobeyed at Caltech, and the sky does not fall. Second, the faculty and administration are willing to break laws for their convenience, and not willing to let us do the same under similar circumstances. Contrary to current public opinion, many other universities have made a science out of looking the other way and the MOSH used to bail students out of jail to protect them. What has changed is not just the increase in litigation, but also the decrease in interest in our well-being. The government is not interested in what’s happening, but it’s easy to put them there when you are distant from the affected people. So we are subjected to laws that would probably have been ignored in the past. This is not just a matter. If the government had made a law Caltech disagreed with concerning how grant money could be spent (as it did recently), Caltech would actively fight it (it did). One gets the impression that if the government decided it was healthy for students to stand on their heads for 15 minutes before bed, the DRL would hire someone to make sure students were doing so.

The students' response to all this has been to direct more energy into the houses, which have become the social totality of many student's lives. I have been outspoken about the house system in the past and work better here, except to note that some of the energy directed towards the houses could be better used elsewhere. The problem much larger than the houses is the glorious efflorescence of the dy's. Yes, it is hard to get the administration and faculty to improve things, but it is not impossible, and each attempt increases their knowledge of our concerns, and our knowledge of theirs.

We have fallen into a pattern at Caltech. Things students were free to do before are being taken away because of concern over litigation, and no new activities or interactions are replacing them because Caltech disintermediates or inability in listening to students. There are positive measures that could be taken that would not even affect the Faculty, but that would still require permission from the them or from the administration, and will thus never happen without an unreasonable amount of effort on our part, because the faculty doesn't listen.

In essence, the problem is that no one is charged with listening to our concerns and reporting them without interpretation, and thus our concerns are being minimized or avoided by the administration. The last office the concern is out for everybody, and students who want change must tram from office to office for literally years (examples on request). Going to the Dean does not help. Going to the "New MOSH" certainly doesn't help (my experience with Dr. Wales is that he will very patiently explain to you why you are wrong and the faculty is right, and then do nothing). In order to change to occur more easily and on a more regular basis, the undergraduates at Caltech must gain a voice that can represent them effectively, and construct a relationship with the faculty and administration that involves hearing a "yes" or a "no" to our proposals in some finite, reasonable period of time.

Without such a forum, where do we go to cause improvement? When I was on the Student/Faculty Conference Follow Up Committee my freshman year, we did a large amount of work to try to distill the conference into a set of proposals, and I think we succeeded. There are two people as long as our ideas. It was presented to the faculty through the Faculty Board, and as far as I can tell it fell unread from our copies. The failure was not in the conference itself, but in the lack of a structure that allows change at Caltech. Unless there is some dramatic alteration in Student Affairs here, the current conference will suffer the same fate.

Most of the recent talk of changing ASCIT has involved making it do almost nothing. The objection is that the money we give them is not being allocated fairly. I understand why people are concerned, but personally I don't care if the BOD is using my $25 to have group sex in a jacuzzi filled with cocaine. The real issue is what they have not done to fix the student problems, and the minutes of inner house politics pale in comparison.

I have tried to demonstrate that there is currently a fundamental problem with the interactions between undergraduates and house faculty. I've also tried to show that the solution is not further isolation in the houses, or hoping things will get better. The way to is to allow ASCIT into a student government that represents us as students to the rest of campus. Let's do it.

To date, no student I've talked to really cares about preserving ASCIT in its present form. It's clear that it doesn't do much. Further, I think even students dissatisfied in student government wouldn't particularly mind someone else doing it for them, and I think if there are enough interested people here to support an effective student government.

How do you conquer apathy? You make an office with a responsibility, and someone will want to fill it. A person reigns on undergraduates, but the duty isn't too odious. In his section "The Honor System," he repeats the same line I've always heard here. "Turtles are special. We're tenacious, creative, and curious." The only thing I strongly disagree with in his document is that "because we're charging things it doesn't matter we need to throw everything away and start from scratch." I think that's exactly what we need to do. Let's not use our own example any more than that of other school's student governments. If we're intelligent, creative, and curious, it's time to put our intellects where our mouths are and fix our problems.

I am finished my coursework at Caltech and am not currently registered, but I would like to help in this process in any way I can. I will start by offering up to $1000 in support money towards the development of a new Caltech ASCIT. I will use the money to hire experts, if they are needed, and almost anything else that I feel is necessary. The important people are those who will answer these questions differently, and my opinions here are no more relevant than anyone else's. Instead of providing my ivory tower view of what ASCIT should become, I would like to suggest an organized way in which the opinions of many individuals could be discussed, evaluated, and proposed, resulting in a new ASCIT that could start to deal with the important problems.

First off upon reading this, an interested undergraduate should put a sign-up on the window of the ASCIT meeting room for people who want a new ASCIT. After a few days, as many of you as have time should get together and get enough names on a petition supporting a conference to decide how ASCIT should be changed. You should also think about how that conference should be handled. Here is my suggestion:

Each house selects some members to represent it. There should also be enough at-large representatives, volunteers selected by the organizing group, to allow opinions from groups unrepresented in the houses. These representatives should discuss what should be done with the student body, and then there should be a large weekend meeting to follow up on a plan (I think Capra would be the perfect place for such a meeting). Then, with plan in hand, the students should return to campus and present it for discussion. After the problems have been hatched out, there should be another weekend meeting to address the concerns raised. Based on the revised plan, the members of the conference should elect an appropriate subset of themselves to finalize and complete the new bylaws. Finally, there should be provisions to allow changes to be made easily if there are problems.

Michael Brundage's "A New Student Government" should be kept around for reference. In his section under "The Honor System," he repeats the same line I've always heard here. "Turtles are special. We're tenacious, creative, and curious."
Keys and Locks by Wei-Hwa Huang

Say you decide to open a business with two other people. All three people have an equal share, and you decide to put your money in a safe. Let us assume for the moment that all the safes we are talking about are equipped with simple lock-and-key design; that is, the safe has some number of locks on it and all of them needed to be unlocked to open the safe. Multiple copies of lock keys can exist. Back to our situation. There are two typical scenarios. First, you could have one lock on the safe and give everyone a key; this way, any person could open the safe. Alternatively, you might have three locks on the safe, a different key to each person, and therefore, a requirement that all three people must be present to unlock the door. The former is a more trusting relationship, while the latter is a bit more conservative. How about a happy medium? Most people don’t think of this, but if we made two copies of each of the three keys in the last problem (call them a, b, and c), we could distribute them, a, ac, and bc, creating a situation where any two of our people could open the safe without needing the third. Needless to say we can’t do this with less locks. With the locks we supposed to also have a company with one president, one vice-president, and two secretaries, where the only allowed combinations are: [President and vice-president] or [President and both secretaries] and [President and vice-president and one secretary].

Puzzle 1: How do we distribute the keys? A more complicated situation is for seven equal shareholders, any three of which should be able to open the safe. A solution is:

\[ \text{ARDGHJLMOQPSTUWYZ} \]
\[ \text{BDEFLGMNSRTUVWYZ} \]
\[ \text{CEFJKLOQRSTWXZ} \]

However, this int he minimum solution. Puzzle 2: What’s the longest word with no duplicating letters that could get its keys eliminated from the previous answer and still satisfy the conditions? Puzzle 3: How about a scenario with three presidents and seven vice-presidents with these constraints: (i) Any two presidents can open the safe; (ii) any four vice-presidents can open the safe; (iii) any single president can open the safe with the help of any two vice-presidents; and (iv) no smaller group can open the safe. What’s the minimum number of keys needed?

Last Week’s Answers: Ten-digit Numbers
1. 6,171,215,160 is the largest number that can be formed by multiplying the ten digits in groups of three, five, and four; that is, 94108*527*63.
2. (818)-395-6153 is the phone number of The Tech office.
3. The number is 6,210,001,000, with 6 zeros, 2 ones, 1 two, and 1 six. Can you find the solutions for other digits?

This Week’s $10 Contest
Answer the three puzzles in this week’s column. The submission with the largest number of puzzles solved is the winner; in case of a tie, the one who solves the most higher numbered puzzles wins. Any further ties will be broken by random draw.

Reward Yourself!
Let us know that you’re a Caltech student for remarkable savings on all our new and used vehicles!

Contact John Zachman at Acura of Pasadena
1285 E. Colorado Blvd. Pasadena 91106
818-792-7979

The California Tech
IHC is made up of representatives from the student body. This cross-section results from the IHC having representatives from a wide cross-section of opinions, experiences, and views of the Caltech student body. This cross-section results in faire appointments.

The IHC is made up of representatives of the Houses and acts collectively for the good of the community and the student body as a whole.

The Presidents are directly responsible to the faculty. Due to technical problems with the IHC, the Presidents are directly responsible for their actions on a daily basis. Thus, everyone has some responsibility to their constituents and are held accountable for their actions.

The members of the IHC are directly responsible to the faculty because we have certain unique attributes:

- The IHC and the ASCIT are members of the IHC.
- The IHC and ASCIT are responsible for making decisions for the IHC.
- The IHC and ASCIT are responsible for the good of the community.

These means that the IHC will not act on the job because we have certain unique attributes:

- The IHC and ASCIT are responsible for their actions on a daily basis. Thus, everyone has some responsibility to their constituents and are held accountable for their actions.

In their arguments, ASCIT will bring up points that are grounded in the proposal rather than who can better appoint to the IHC, and which apply to both the IHC and ASCIT. Remember that the proposal does not ask which group can better communicate with members of the committees but rather who can better appoint to the job because we want the best representative of the student body to the faculty.

Sincerely,

The IHC
**Events and Notices**

**Medical Seminar**

- **Date**: Monday, April 25, 1994, at 4 p.m.
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Poetry Contest**

- **Deadline**: July 15, 1994
- **Eligibility**: Open to all undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students
- **Prize**: $300

**Career Fair**

- **Date**: Monday, April 25, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Poetry Reading**

- **Date**: April 25, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Career Seminar**

- **Date**: April 26, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Film Series**

- **Date**: Fridays, starting April 29, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Free Service**

- **Details**: Save up to 35% on your official and personal travel needs.

**Career Fair**

- **Date**: Monday, April 25, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Music Concert**

- **Date**: Thursday, May 5, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus

**Film Series**

- **Date**: Fridays, starting April 29, 1994
- **Location**: Beckman Auditorium, Caltech Campus
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- **Details**: Save up to 35% on your official and personal travel needs.
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