Moribund fallacies

To the Editor.

Three hundred years of practice I have become reasonably adept incountering repetitive and reactionary rhetoric耳边 from the lips of folk on a variety of grounds. I am capable of arguing on moral, religious, biological, psychological, philosophical, legal, social, political, literary, artistic, sociological principles. I remain, however, thoroughly revolted by the face of their stupidity and ignorance.

Mel Suarez enumerates a few moribund fallacies which deserve to be buried summarily; their rotting corpus exude an unsharable and galling stench. It appears that h o m o n g i d r i n k ' s "natural obligations," include the propagation of children, with the implication that sexual, energy should be allocated to procreation. "Obligations" include the procreation of children, and the implication that sexual energy should be allocated to procreation. The weakening, decadence, and decline of post-industrial capitalist America is not the fault of gay people but an escape-group present. It is weak gay people who have spoiled the brat of the world for too long. This Disneyland society of heterosexuality, where nobody acknowledges sexual deviance, or sex itself, is coming open and open society is trying to force its artificial virility down gay folk. They can not understand that gay people are human. They make a mean gongt and Bloomingdale's and Betty Miller. This society obviously does not experience, enjoyment, masturbation, foreclosure, summary execution, homoerotic pleasure, or freedom. Here is truly a man beyond freedom and to open up new worlds that such people can lead.
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To the Editor.

As a member of the AAI-Hoc Committee on the Evaluation and Selection of Missions (CICH), appointed by President Weinman, and on my own initiative, I wish to inform the MIT community of some evidence on the nature of the Technology Training Program (TTP), which has been presented to the CICH.

The evidence is based on my general observation of the full MIT community. It may be freely quoted, but is not subject to the usual restrictions on the transfer of this technical information to the public domain. This evidence may be used by the MIT Committee for TTP. Two of the members of the TTP committee are returning to MIT and are returning to work in the United States. The program was submitted by the MIT Committee for TTP. This program was submitted by the MIT Committee for TTP. This program is not subject to the usual restrictions on the transfer of this technical information to the public domain. This evidence may be used by the MIT Committee for TTP. Two of the members of the TTP committee are returning to MIT and are returning to work in the United States.
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To the Editor.

Soon, our house masters and tutors may have prizes put on their heads. Last fall, with no apparent publicity, the Administration quietly decided to tack a new fee onto individual housing bills, specifically designated for the support of the house master/tutor system. Residents were to be able to evaluate the worth and utility of their house masters and tutors in a new more personal light: am I getting that fee's worth (about $30 per resident per year) out of these people? If I individually docked for these services, students could come to feel that it wasn't worth paying the "extra" fee to keep house masters/tutors for each resident's own benefit, especially since many of the services and functions performed by house masters/tutors are not visible to the average individual. Even at present there is not at most dormitories, "a house tax" separated from the general fund. The reasons for this separation are fourfold: (1) to benefit the students who are there-in-case-you-need-them, so to speak. (2) The proposed fee would strain house master/tutor-student relationships and endanger the house master/tutor system itself. These people should not have to be directly dependent upon students for financial support. If the administration needs more money than they should raise tuition by the needed amount, and continue to take house master/tutor support out of general funds rather than put the responsibility for support on the individual.

The internal destruction of the house master/tutor system would be a stupid unfortunate. If the administration really wants to cut corners by doing away with the house master/tutor system itself, and continue to take house master/tutor support out of general funds rather than put the responsibility for support on the individual, they do the job cleanly without leaving a lot of hard feelings behind.
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To the Editor.

Prof. Hill's position is that either the Taiwanese are "foolish", or that they hoped to get valuable general experience with electronic equipment, computers, and rotating machinery. At $9,000,000 for 15 students for two years, this (admitted) a m a t e u r ' s knowledge of electronics and computers judges this to be an extraordinarily bad deal. A more suspicious mind might seek alternative explanations for the program. Unfortunately, one does not have to search far before discovering a number of military connections to this program. For example, the students come from, and are returning to, an institution run by the Taiwanese government.

(To be continued to page 5)

To the Editor.

$30 per resident next year) out of these people? If I individually docked for these services, students could come to feel that it wasn't worth paying the "extra" fee to keep house masters/tutors for each resident's own benefit, especially since many of the services and functions performed by house masters/tutors are not visible to the average individual. Even at present there is not at most dormitories, "a house tax" separated from the general fund. The reasons for this separation are fourfold: (1) to benefit the students who are there-in-case-you-need-them, so to speak. (2) The proposed fee would strain house master/tutor-student relationships and endanger the house master/tutor system itself. These people should not have to be directly dependent upon students for financial support. If the administration needs more money than they should raise tuition by the needed amount, and continue to take house master/tutor support out of general funds rather than put the responsibility for support on the individual. The internal destruction of the house master/tutor system would be a stupid unfortunate. If the administration really wants to cut corners by doing away with the house master/tutor system itself, and continue to take house master/tutor support out of general funds rather than put the responsibility for support on the individual, they do the job cleanly without leaving a lot of hard feelings behind.
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