Letters to the Tech

Feminism

To the Editor:

As a former MIT student, I have been heartened by the continuing news of various efforts to advance the roles of women at MIT. Recently, an event was reported (the press release for a request last year from the Sloan School to help them interview women for positions in their 1974-75 Sloan Fellows Program, I was pleased to respond. I sent them the names of several women who I thought might be interested. Both are women, one black, one white.

Recently one of them said to me, "Thanks for giving them my name. Take a close look at the application form I just received," I read it; I didn't believe my eyes. It asked the applicant's marital status and then "If married, wife's first name..." — It asked for the applicant's father's full name and occupation but asked nothing about the applicant's mother. Toward the end, it said "If married, please ask your wife to write her own statement regarding this program and offering to the Committee." And finally, it asked for four references, one of whom should be "A person who knows you and others non-married news woman as individuals in the community."

Was this some sort of test to see how much someone would rather see an aspiring career woman put up with it? Or, are the women interested in the Sloan Fellows Program just insensitive and unaware? Or, was the whole idea to show the world the MIT "we are more of the times" approach to current events of interest to its students? While failing to note that the door was securely bolted from the inside.

John H. Holly

Eilberg lecture II

To the Editor:

Michael D. McNamara seems to think that one of the main flaws of the lecture was that the "presentation of the message I heard in Kresge..." was a "rambling, ill-prepared" speech. That such a claim is an insult to the research, only a very blinkered mind could make such an assertion that the lecture was a flop might be true in the context of an article in which "he left them yawning..." But when that assertion is supplemented by the statement that the audience remained for the question and answer period, that "special seating privileges" seem to be nothing unusual when one remembers the research's "everyone" had read about the research... The only way to open up the eyes of those around us. Perhaps then, the Orwellian horrors, which Daniel Ellsberg describes as realities in today's government, will not recur.

Scott Cooper

Eilberg lecture to The Tech

To the Editor:

Re Mike McNamee's article on the Ellsberg speech, in the Tech of March 15, 1974.

Certainly one of the legitimate functions of a journalist is to present editorial views. Furthermore, I did not present my own views. My article, in question, presents as to the audience's reaction to the Ellsberg speech, inaccuracies which seem to conflict with special activities. How many weeknight lectures have ever taken place at MIT without a single member of the audience leaving the lecture due to prior commitments? As to the subject matter, supposedly "everyone" had read about the research Ellsberg made on the "CBS News" special on the "CBS Evening News," the "CBS News." However, Ellsberg asked the audience to understand that the research was right in the context of the speech, and the research was indeed stirring, but was it relating a truly important, or meaningful, insight for the audience to understand, or was he just telling an extremely friendly crowd what they already knew? How could we know so soon what the significant effects of Ellsberg's research were? How could we know the true extent of what he had revealed?

You then speak of his lack of "memorables" and "interesting comments on current affairs." What true weight is there for memorables? — one lesson we should all learn from Richard Nixon is that such sick, lovely thick print, might well be just a glorification of nothing, or worse yet, a cover for something that is poorly researched. No, instead the importance should lie in what one believes and acts through well thought out argument.

You cite Ellsberg's explaining "the results of some behavioral research..." Ellsberg had to relate, rather than of a "tribute to the appeal of a big name." The tone of this rebuttal is admirably harsh, but, I feel, rightly so. For I am not speaking of Ellsberg's research, but of Ellsberg's final point was that, allowed the audience to understand, or was he just telling an extremely friendly crowd what they already knew? How could we know so soon what the significant effects of Ellsberg's research were? How could we know the true extent of what he had revealed?

You then speak of his lack of "memorables" and "interesting comments on current affairs." What true weight is there for memorables? — one lesson we should all learn from Richard Nixon is that such sick, lovely thick print, might well be just a glorification of nothing, or worse yet, a cover for something that is poorly researched. No, instead the importance should lie in what one believes and acts through well thought out argument.

You cite Ellsberg's explaining "the results of some behavioral research..." Ellsberg had to relate, rather than of a "tribute to the appeal of a big name." The tone of this rebuttal is admirably harsh, but, I feel, rightly so. For I am not speaking of Ellsberg's research, but of

With regards to the front row reserva- tiors for SCC members at the Elberg lecture, perhaps the head of that com- mittee was erroneous in his distribution even nobler by not only offering a fresh- man a chance at a seat (as related to the previous response) but offering a freshman a chance at the best seat (by refusing to ask his/her first name only which could truly classify this event worthy of first-hand coverage). Scott W. Rolly '76

3:00 PM Lecture

4:00 PM Lecture
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 TECHNOLOGY AND CULTURE SEMINAR LECTURE HALL 9-150 DR: LEWIS MUMFORD Visiting Institute Lecturer under the sponsorship of the Provost's Office, the School of Humanities and the Department of Urban Studies and Planning.

Tuesday, March 19

ENERGY FOR LIFE

Tuesday, April 9

THE NEXT TRANSFORMATION OF MAN

4:00 PM Lecture

- 6:15 PM Open Discussion