A student Rep speaks out

To the Editor:

As a graduate student representative on the Student Senate Committee on Educational Policy, I found Chuck Markham’s letter in the April 10 edition of The Tech both interesting and provocative. I would like to respond to Mr. Markham’s request for comment and to respond to some of his statements and conclusions.

Mr. Markham suggests that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee consist of four students: the student chairperson, a faculty member who is a board member of the Committee, and two student members. Mr. Markham claims that this arrangement is not representative of the student body.

I believe that Mr. Markham’s statement lacks objectivity. As a student representative on the Admissions Committee, I believe that the composition of the Committee is representative of the student body. The Committee includes members from all different majors and classes, and I believe that the Committee represents the views of the student body.

Second, in Mr. Markham’s letter, he suggests that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are not representative of the student body. Mr. Markham claims that the student representatives are not representative of the student body because they are not involved in all aspects of student life.

I believe that Mr. Markham’s statement is not accurate. As a student representative on the Admissions Committee, I have been involved in all aspects of student life. I have been involved in the selection of faculty members, the selection of student representatives, and the selection of student representatives for the faculty. I believe that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are representative of the student body.

Third, Mr. Markham states that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are not qualified to make decisions on behalf of the student body. Mr. Markham claims that the student representatives are not qualified to make decisions because they do not have the necessary experience and education.

I believe that Mr. Markham’s statement is not accurate. As a student representative on the Admissions Committee, I have the necessary experience and education to make decisions on behalf of the student body. I have been involved in the selection of faculty members, the selection of student representatives, and the selection of student representatives for the faculty. I believe that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are qualified to make decisions on behalf of the student body.

In conclusion, I believe that Mr. Markham’s letter is not accurate. I believe that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are representative of the student body and are qualified to make decisions on behalf of the student body.

Matthew Newman '79

MIT Student Representative

Analysis slighted

To the Editor:

Steve Kirsch’s “Political Commentary” of April 10 is one of the least interesting and thought-provoking articles I have seen in The Tech in recent weeks. Mr. Kirsch’s article suggests that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are not representative of the student body. I believe that Mr. Kirsch’s article is not accurate.

I believe that Mr. Kirsch’s article is not accurate because he does not provide any evidence to support his claim. Mr. Kirsch’s article is not based on any research or data. Mr. Kirsch’s article is not based on any evidence to support his claim.

I believe that Mr. Kirsch’s article is not accurate because he does not provide any evidence to support his claim. Mr. Kirsch’s article is not based on any research or data. Mr. Kirsch’s article is not based on any evidence to support his claim.

In conclusion, I believe that Mr. Kirsch’s article is not accurate. I believe that the student representatives on the Admissions Committee are representative of the student body and are qualified to make decisions on behalf of the student body.

Matthew Newman '79

MIT Student Representative

Colby deserved better treatment

By Kenneth Hamilton

William Colby, the former director of the CIA, spoke Monday evening, April 10, on the subject of “Intelligence Out Of The Shadows.” The lecture and panel was primarily attended by MIT students, faculty, and the general public. Colby was introduced by Lisa Madigan, the student body president, and he was moderated by Stephen F. Frann ’80, the Tech’s managing editor.

Colby began his lecture by discussing his experiences as a young CIA officer during the Vietnam War. He explained how the agency was initially involved in the Vietnam War, but later became more focused on gathering intelligence about the war effort.

Colby then went on to discuss his time as the director of the CIA under President Jimmy Carter. He explained how the agency was involved in the Iran-Contra affair, and how this led to his eventual resignation.

Colby concluded his lecture by discussing his time as the director of the CIA under President Ronald Reagan. He explained how the agency was involved in the war in Afghanistan, and how this led to the fall of the Soviet Union.

Colby was followed by a panel discussion featuring several experts on intelligence and national security. The panelists included Lisa Madigan, the student body president, and she was moderated by Stephen F. Frann ’80, the Tech’s managing editor.

The panelists discussed a variety of topics, including the role of intelligence agencies in the modern world, and the challenges of gathering intelligence in a globalized world.

The panelists also discussed the future of the CIA, and the role of the agency in the Trump administration.

The panelists concluded by discussing the role of the media in covering intelligence agencies, and the challenges of maintaining the confidentiality of intelligence operations.

Overall, Colby’s lecture was informative and engaging. He provided a unique perspective on the role of intelligence agencies in modern history, and the challenges they face in an ever-changing world.

Brian Donovan ’80