Letters to The Tech

To the Editor:

Bruce Schwartz is probably correct when he says that admissions officers epitomize personaility characteristics and "get ting involved," yet one would hardly acquire a feeling for this new spirit at MIT from photos that grace the pages of the General Catalogue. Today's prospective student sees essentially the same pictures that I once did, pictures which only reinforce my "popular folk lore" conception of MIT when I was applying for admission.

Then flash to rush week when the number one question was "why did you come here?" Then move to the C-5A's. Because Lockheed could not produce the C-5A's in time, or for another $500 million each year, will receive approximately 36 C-5A's, because Lockheed is merely leased a facility by the government. The replicates projects are urgently required because the government another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government. In any case, the statement that Lockheed must be kept alive to justify some money to the first 40 aircraft was made in order to be able to fulfill the contract. Instead of giving money to Lockheed, the U.S. should allow our free enterprise system to take effect and let Lockheed go the way of all inefficient producers. Their productivity capacity would not be lost since the company would be either bought out by its competitors or become government property. As it is, most of the plants, equipment, and people employed by Lockheed are merely leased a facility by the government. If the government were simply to buy another firm capable of proper management or by the government.