It is entirely appropriate that the most notable aspect of Thursday's Ford-Carter presidential debate may have been the 28-minute audio loss during the televised telecast, not anything either candidate said.

We are all used to candidates, for any office, hemming and hawing around key issues during campaign. The hope is that make the specific promises don't always win—these promises have cost them various valuable segments of their normal constituency—and that those that do are not usually missed when the campaign is over. If promises are not kept, then the new office-holder discovers that the present bureaucracy will not permit him to keep them.

More importantly, what are we to read, and were not, say 20 years ago, is the incredible impact of television. The minute or so that Jimmy Carter spoke while the sound was out was heard by maybe 500 people. His words were not any less important, but the lack of audio made it difficult to follow and was a clear contrast to the just-passed presidential nomination campaign, in which television, consciously or otherwise, dictated which candidates received the most publicity or exposure, and enhanced the image of the Democratic and Republican hopefuls.

Television's role has grown ever since a Columbia-Princeton baseball telecast nearly forty years ago. From Edward R. Murrow's courageous stand against McCarthy 23 years ago to television Watergate hearings, the medium has shaped American and world opinion. It has dictated which candidates received the most publicity or exposure, and enhanced the image of the Democratic and Republican hopefuls. Those Americans who spent childhoods and adulthoods listening to radio now find their children, and themselves, spending endless hours in front of the "boob tube"—the average set is tuned in six hours a day and a large viewer audience watches nearly three hours daily. What ex-Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newman pointed out last week is still a very captivating entertainment medium. There are very few complaints when a debate is postponed—"I Love Lucy" reruns, for those who are very much allied with the medium's influence on us. For the "The Mary Tyler Moore Show," although the reverse policy was tried, there were no complaints. CBS refused to show "The Senator Foreign Relations Committee hearings 15 years ago, preferring to show "I Love Lucy" reruns; that decision caused the resignation of Fred Friendly, producer of the Murrow-McCarthy telecasts, as well as the "See It Now." "Person to Person," "You Are There," and "CBS Reports" were dropped.

While newspapers continue to fold and consolidate, while radio stations, except for a select few, offer varying types of music or news programs, television has grown and become more powerful. Voting projections in the East on Election Day may well determine the death of voting in the West, when the Carter-Ford battle reaches its climax. Clearly television has made a significant impact, both on the viewer and on every important happening in this country. It may determine our presidential, just as it helped elect John F. Kennedy in 1960 (radio listeners believed Nixon had won those debates, although TV watchers clearly chose Kennedy).

What we may expect from television in the future? I'll examine it in a later column.

To the Editor:

Many will read this and ask, "What do you want for seventy-five cents?"

Anyone who ever sat through an LSC movie will know immediately what I am talking about; i.e., the very rude and childish habit which so many students have adopted of making their own "personal statements" by whistling, breaking, and applauding or just sitting in silence.

On Saturday night the Exorcist was shown to an enthusiastic and oddly appreciative audience. On numerous occasions the dialogue was completely drowned out by those who felt it necessary to make their own comments on, the efficiency of brain surgeons and psychiatrists, the Catholic church, a certain neighborhood university authority figures in general, and student revolutions and administrative reactions to them. As usual, such frequent outbursts made it difficult for viewers even to follow the story line. A student who had no conception of what was going on in the film. If this is what the Institute wants to do at each of the Sunday movies, I am concerned for the success of LSC's noble intentions; and I suspect that MIT's audience will prove true what the Ely Landaus organization must have feared if they had not adopted the familiar "inappropriate behavior" rules. That is, that the "common man" is not prepared to give his full attention even to the most deserving playwrights of our day, and that a truly ordinary play is not the basis of an intellectual challenge of suitable characterization and word play. Mel Brooks is shown to him for his own genius—has done his work, and the Three Stooges reign supreme. I do not fault an audience's policy to use a certain "tactic" and hope whether it be in Blazing Saddles or Play, it again, Sam or Strike; or any other in the long list of comedies we have to choose from. We all go to the movies, in part, to escape; to get away from problems and problems, in general. But one can "escape" into a simple melodrama, or a mystery, or a musical as well. If it is necessary to make every movie we see's private and personal comedy is interposing our prejudices, and dislikes into the dialogue. Can't we recognize that for his own genius—has done his work, and the Three Stooges reign supreme.

If you want to express your personal disdain, do it: let people know whether it be in Blazing Saddles or Play, it again, Sam or Strike; or any other in the long list of comedies we have to choose from. We all go to the movies, in part, to escape; to get away from problems and problems, in general. But one can "escape" into a simple melodrama, or a mystery, or a musical as well. If it is necessary to make every movie we see's private and personal comedy is interposing our prejudices, and dislikes into the dialogue. Can't we recognize that for his own genius—has done his work, and the Three Stooges reign supreme.