By Glenn Brownstone

Why are certain MIT athletic teams known as Engineers, some as Techmen (which used to be the worst possible insult to an MIT student), some as nothing particular? Most of the other teams have not been polled, and so they stay the same. The Engineers have, and it necessitates a discussion of their origin.

Dartmouth also had the name Indians (or "Big Green") until recently, but last year switched to "Woodsmen" as less offensive and still engineer-like. A surprising 62% of the student body approved of the change.

"Beavers" is a term that is used to refer to engineering types, but also to teams. However, it is not a name that is used at MIT. At least we don't have a perceived moral problem, like Stanford used to be the Indians, but the depiction of a savage on their logo is not a problem. The image of a green and white beaver1 dangling a basketball on the ring face? One way to solve the problem is to make him a brass beaver and give him a ring face coated with brass. Another would be to make him a brass beaver, indicating the only thing we have to fear is fear itself (or brass beavers). A distinct advantage the Engineers have, and it necessitates a change of color. Some may argue that a change of color is not sufficient, that "Brass Bird" should be changed—ideally to the original "Brass Bird," but if we continue to call MIT teams "Engineers," where's the little nurd punching his HP45 on the ring face? One way to solve the problem is to make Danielle C. Murphy through hell just for consistency. For example, how about the Engineers become the Silver Foxes or the Cardinals? Cardinals has one distinct advantage: it isn't a nickname for the sportswriting of the decisions of the engineers. Of course, recent events indicate that the change of color is not significant. The only thing we have to fear is fear itself (or brass beavers) and, though the names and philosophies of the parties have changed, he is essentially still concerned with the same. In his first Inaugural address, Jefferson asserted that "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." Lincoln's second Inaugural address is perhaps one of the most remembered. "With malice toward none," he said, "with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us the right, let us strive in finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds..." The date is March 4, 1865, and the speaker Thomas Jefferson.

More than 130 years later and the new president is Lyndon B. Johnson, taking office during the trauma which, viewed in a broader context, may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among all nations..."

The new president is immediately addressed his countrymen. He calls for "equal freedom for all, equality of the parties but a celebration of philosophy of the parties. It will be significant from the hundreds of ceremonies - the "mob," as the Jeffersonians considered them — for spoke for him by their mere presence. Jackson showed immediately that he was the first "president of the people.

President Carter's speech on Thursday may not differ significantly from the hundreds of election speeches he has made throughout the campaign. Even so, whatever he says will now be on a new meaning. His words are now entitled to rank not with those of candidates, but with those of Presidents.

The inauguration of an unknown "President of the people" speaks volumes about the nation, the South and the American political system as a whole. Perhaps, like Andrew Jackson, Carter will not appear in the sunlight in the sun with meaningless oratory.

Feedback

To The Editor:

For those just tuning in, Steven Shladover and I are locked in an altercation which, viewed in a larger context, is crucial to the future of art criticism. It began when President Carter, who blasted Tech back into the "transparent philosophy for their "ignorant" attitude, and who proceeded to indicate in two places that we local sculpture instructors were doing a lack of understanding.

Enter myself. Like a poker player sensing a bluff, I asked Mr. Shladover if he would perform a public service and enlighten us philistines about the positive aspects of "transparency art." Mr. Shladover has now responded. So far, after attacking me for failure to spell out my philosophy, he was unable to explain the sculptures as though I should have furnished this information before it was available.
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