The Presidency

President Howard Johnson's plans to move to the post of MIT Corporation Chairman have provoked a spate of arguments over how well he did, who his successor should be, and how this next leader should be chosen.

These are certainly important issues, but too much of the current debate ignores a crucial question: what should the job itself be structured? Only after carefully defining the responsibilities of MIT's chief executive can we properly select his replacement.

What are the duties of a President? Clearly, he must provide effective leadership for the faculty and represent their interests within the Corporation Executive Committee. He should set general goals and trends for both long-range planning and educational policy. He should be highly visible to students — capable of achieving a certain degree of empathy. Finally, the president will have to act as spokesman for the campus when raising funds, or to sit on an advisory committee to an advisory board. He should be highly visible to faculty, MIT's professors are more qualified to select Johnson's replacement.

The Tech urges that MIT's next president be someone oriented academically, rather than corporately. Certainly an administrative assistant will be needed, but the chief executive could better meet the task of communicating with faculty and students from a background of many years in academic life. Much of the groundwork for effective leadership would then be available.

For the selection process itself, we find no indication that the Corporation chose to emphasize the possible contribution that faculty and students could make both in restructuring the office and in picking a new president. No matter how liberal, the alumni effort on the selection committee possibly will not duplicate the perspective a faculty and student member could provide.

On an issue so important as selecting MIT's leader for the next several years, the Corporation could have done better than to ask us to sit on an advisory committee to an advisory committee.

Identity Crisis

By Harold Fedorov

MIT is a strange institution. Many people say it hate it. Others say they are there. Yet it is no old joke that students graduate, they just change status from undergraduate to graduate, from graduate to post-doc to faculty or administrator.

For all that, many people do come to hate it. MIT is, after all, a question: does MIT have a top-ranked graduate program? Is it a top-ranked undergraduate school? Is it a top-ranked PhD program? In the midst of all of America's largest cultural centers, one has to ask about MIT's place among its peers. Instead of brilliant minds, one hears a monotone and sees a bore. The Bunting gymnasium walls and the eternal night-time hissing of the pipes, as if a tire was slowly losing air, combine to produce an atmosphere of unbearable pressure.

Folk wisdom

When I came to MIT, part of the folk wisdom had it that MIT had one of the highest suicide rates in the history of the university. There have been very few in the past couple of decades. Seeing the psychiatrists has been heavily pushed as an aid for those with problems. But they can only treat the symptoms; the underlying causes are far more difficult.

It would be quite true to say that the MIT mentality is that we are all suffering from the malaise of American society. But it is also true that it has its own set of problems, different from those of the larger society.

Some common class of mine recently pointed out that Wellesley students are referred to in this case for their ability to bring themselves into the world of the larger society. Some students lack the social skills to make MIT's students in faculty or industrial-like terms. The point of the statement is that the malaise is now, and the question is what to do about it. It is not that the use of such terms can reflect the real world of looking at the students that can be self-defeating.

There is no question that MIT students this year are more apt to think about it than they have been in the past two years. The past two years were quite exciting times for MIT. Sanctuary, the Pound, campus disruptions and takes all combined to give an air of great issues to the present. This is simply too short a time, and all MIT students are not all seen it that way, but it is an important point as has been perceived by the faculty and students.

To the Editors:

There has been a question over the last several years as to why MIT cannot support weekend concerts and dorms for all the dorms in the area have been able to do. The truth is that a large part of the blame must fall on the Corporation. MIT has been, an increasingly significant portion must be placed with those who memrobly run the corporation and not MIT campus. The latest show of interest only serves to further prove the point.

THE WIZARD OF ID

To the Editor:

Last year, the Finance Board included in its budget a subsidy fund for entertainment on campus, designed to show events which would lose nominal amounts. The total amount ($5000) was lost on the Mouton concert in October — a real loss of $17,000. The advertising and lack of drawing power. Now, the classes of '71, '72, and '73 have seen a Tom Rush concert on campus, as a concert ($3) by the Grateful Dead at Boston University and one by Jaime Braddock at Jordan Hall. It is not so much that I would like MIT to stop having events of this type — I think that they can be a very significant contribu-

The key thing that MIT lacks that is a sense of what people do — that they can do. Perhaps the reason is that MIT has expressed a frustration and lack of interest in being a place where there is simply nothing to do at all. The paper in the symptoms that they are not at the doorstep. They have only comers with being comfortable or secure in order to do what they do have to take time seriously.
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