The Op-Ed Page

Letters to The Tech

Ergo: controversy continues?

That there are several members more income than the amount for programs "that will bring in budgetary cuts" could be seen as a victory. The Institution has been forced to achieve this cut, looking at its financial crisis. To the Editor:

Holden.)

The Committee also charges that there are non-MIT officers on the faculty. According to Gray, this will have to be reviewed. The appropriate response to "expected changes." The

As for room 7-402, I can say that while it is hardly the frozen, uninspired engineers seem to be bored, and Gray still be expected to the Environment, The School of Engineering, however, is conducting a review of its operations in a number of areas. The school is looking for ways to do so, that is, ways to save money, and Gray still be expected to other Schools to make similar reviews this year or next. The second part of the attack is in academic expenses. Each academic dean has been instructed to cut his School's expenditures by 1.7 percent this year. Gray said, "Most deans are using 'hobbling' techniques to achieve this cut, looking at payroll and looking for ways to do so." Gray said, "That will help his paper be worth any less than a similar one produced somewhere else. We simply can't know for sure what it is that the staff is too small for Ergo to be a viable organi- zation. It is true that Ergo has a small staff in comparison to the ASA Committee, but that doesn't mean it is less effective than it should be.

Ergo's great- est value lies in the voice of its ideas. The newspaper of ideas performs a function analogous to that of an adviser or a teacher. A reader follows the aid of an ad- visor, not necessarily because he fully agrees with him, but because he thinks the advisor can present a viable alternative and that something can be learned by considering his opin- ion. I am an undergraduate at MIT. I worked for Ergo last spring, but I quit at the begin- ning of the fall term. Although I agreed then, as I do now, with the philosophy held by the editors of Ergo, I severely criticized certain policies which I thought were not effective as they are today.

The main reason to consider the architectural profession, are

The Institute will neither gain nor lose financial- ly from the proposed program. There is nothing in the pro- posed Nuclear Engineering Education Center which relates to the design of plants for producing nuclear weapons material or to the de- sign of nuclear weapons.

Robert H. Kell
Dean of Engineering
William F. Proctor
Dean, Sloan School

The Tech will stand behind the contents of its Editorial - Editor.

Irresponsible or Iran?

To the Editor:

I want to call your attention to a letter in Lacy Ferranti's article entitled "IPS to Terminate Multics," that appears in your March 4, 1975 issue.

In the article, Mr. Everett states: "Most of the low which has been harvested, spent, can be attributed to higher salaries and to rising paper and telephone rates. This situation is inaccurate. Rising salaries, paper, telephone, and telephone rates are the major items that cause pressure to increase the costs for Multics is revenue from year to year, but they are, in total, small relative to the current 2.5 million dollar total expense budget.

The real problems which we face - and this is true for our current loss position on Multics - is a far more fundamental one: namely that the funds generated by the Multics user community are not enough to meet its cost. Revenue will decline from $5,900,000 to $1,700,000 in Fiscal 1974 to $1,700,000 in Fiscal 1975; the projection for Fiscal 1976 is $1,300,000. From small users for Multics services, it is expected that the next fiscal year period but, unfortunately, major reductions by two or three large users would make this whole business impossible. 

Robert H. Scott
Director, IPS

Implied facts wrong?

To the Editor:

I would like to amplify slightly on the article in The Tech last Friday (March 7) dealing with the athletic card requirement for intramural sports. Although the facts and figures presented in the article are substantially correct, a bit of perspective seems to be missing. First of all, when we added the athletic requirement to the general Intramural Rules last spring, the hope was that this would be the first step in a long process which would include several changes in the athletic card itself. This was not simply the result of a backlash from the Athletic Department, but rather on various expressions of concern from the Engineers. I strongly suspect that no such changes as the one in the wind, and to this extent we are disappointed, but this does not constitute lack of Athletic Department response to "expected changes." The changes were simply hoped-for. Secondly, it is a fact that most intramural sports use Ath- letic Department facilities. To recognize this.

Intramural sports such as the ones by-

Robert H. Scott,
Director, IPS

Inappropriate or Multics?

To the Editor:

I want to call your attention to a letter in Lacy Ferranti's article entitled "IPS to Terminate Multics," that appears in your March 4, 1975 issue.

In the article, Mr. Everett states: "Most of the low which has been harvested, spent, can be attributed to higher salaries and to rising paper and telephone rates. This situation is inaccurate. Rising salaries, paper, telephone, and telephone rates are the major items that cause pressure to increase the costs for Multics is revenue from year to year, but they are, in total, small relative to the current 2.5 million dollar total expense budget.

The real problems which we face - and this is true for our current loss position on Multics - is a far more fundamental one: namely that the funds generated by the Multics user community are not enough to meet its cost. Revenue will decline from $5,900,000 to $1,700,000 in Fiscal 1974 to $1,700,000 in Fiscal 1975; the projection for Fiscal 1976 is $1,300,000. From small users for Multics services, it is expected that the next fiscal year period but, unfortunately, major reductions by two or three large users would make this whole business impossible. 

Robert H. Scott
Director, IPS

Implied facts wrong?

To the Editor:

I would like to amplify slightly on the article in The Tech last Friday (March 7) dealing with the athletic card requirement for intramural sports. Although the facts and figures presented in the article are substantially correct, a bit of perspective seems to be missing. First of all, when we added the athletic requirement to the general Intramural Rules last spring, the hope was that this would be the first step in a long process which would include several changes in the athletic card itself. This was not simply the result of a backlash from the Athletic Department, but rather on various expressions of concern from the Engineers. I strongly suspect that no such changes as the one in the wind, and to this extent we are disappointed, but this does not constitute lack of Athletic Department response to "expected changes." The changes were simply hoped-for. Secondly, it is a fact that most intramural sports use Ath- letic Department facilities. To recognize this.

Intramural sports such as the ones by-