Drinking bill no solution

Last week, Governor Ed King proposed a bill to the Massachusetts legislature that would have immediately raised the legal drinking age in this state to 19 and six months later raise the age to 21. The bill seeks to address a real problem of drunk driving, but we think it goes about this in the wrong way. In fact, King’s solution creates more problems than it solves. Massachusetts

First, there is no indication the new bill will do anything. Nobody has proven that legal drinking age and drunk driving have any effect on drunk driving. A popular quote in the debate on the drinking age is “You’ve given me a lot of figures, but they do not mean anything to me.” Students drink in junior high school even though they are well below the legal drinking age. Marijuana has been tried by 42 million Americans even though it is illegal. If people want something, which is one of the biggest obstacles, they get it; one more obstacle doesn’t make much difference.

Second, the new bill will encourage students to drive into states with a higher drinking age in order to obtain alcoholic beverages. Students will then drink in other states and drive back to Massachusetts. Contrary to its purpose, the bill may thus result in an increase in teenage drunk driving.

We believe the answer to the drunk driving problem lies in education and rehabilitation, not in drinking ages. Only by attacking the problem at its root will there be any positive results. Prohibitions have not worked in the past; there are indications they will not work in the future.

8½ percent is too damn much

By Tom Curtis

The Institute has struck back again. While our parents accept seven per cent wage increases under President Carter’s guidelines, MIT has raised tuition by 8½ percent and onethird and one-half per cent.

MIT administration officials point out the tuition increase is believed to be critically necessary at this time. Furthermore, they emphasize that MIT is not unique in this respect, that many programs have already been cut as far as they can, that many students who were originally well below the legal drinking age have now grown older and thereby increase tuition revenues without actually increasing tuition. The fact is this tuition increase will be an added burden on all students, but the families whose children have financial aid. It could also hurt students on financial aid if the equity level is increased by more than seven per cent. Certainly, MIT is a less attractive school because of the seven per cent.

No easy solution to revenue problem

But, MIT argues, a tuition increase is the only way to raise the necessary revenue. There is some truth to this. Ever since the Snark scandal and the federal government’s decision not to fund research projects, which are an important source of revenue for schools like MIT, Senator William Proxmire hasn’t helped either. His Golden Hammer award, which has been given to MIT every year since it was started, is an indication of this. The fact is this tuition increase will be an added burden on all students, but the families whose children have financial aid. It could also hurt students on financial aid if the equity level is increased by more than seven per cent. Certainly, MIT is a less attractive school because of the seven per cent.

An easy solution to this problem would be to increase enrollment and thereby increase tuition revenues with actually increasing tuition. The experiences of the last several years has shown that this doesn’t work, however. Increased class size means increased difficulties of instruction. Furthermore, it’s no solution.

Thus, MIT does face genuine problems in raising revenue. However, I doubt MIT has done all it can to raise necessary revenues from elsewhere. For instance, the Leadership Campaign has been very successful in raising money for non-essential programs, such as the two new Colloquia. It could be more successful in raising revenue for projects which are badly needed. The effort should be redirected towards raising funds for those things which are needed now; the other programs can wait a while.

Find creative ways to cut expenses

MIT also claims it cannot cut any more programs without hurting educational quality. True, many programs have already been cut as far as they can be. Already, labs courses are overcrowded and understocked. But MIT must look for creative ways to cut its expenses without cutting quality. Here are two suggestions:

1. Discontinue purchases of modern art. A large segment of the MIT community is offended by this type of art and would be glad to see it go. Those who prefer modern art already have plenty to see.

2. Cut thermatans a few degrees. My room is MIT’s warming station. Everyone goes in and out of that room, and I can’t find a place to wear sweaters. Besides, this measure would not only save tuition but also conserve energy.

This is just two ways MIT might cut expenses. I’m sure there are many others could be found.

Something definitely must be done. This tuition increase is truly too damn much. If MIT wants to increase tuition faster than wages, it will lose many top quality students to lower-priced state-supported schools. But it is a sure thing that MIT continues to cut programs as it has done for the last several years, educational quality will be just as severely damaged. Creative management is critically necessary to Mit.

It could have been worse

Finally, take heart in the news that MIT has the lowest tuition increases of any major private school in the greater Boston area. Boston University is up 12%, Northeastern is up 10%, Tufts up 8½%. What a wonderful state it is to be in tuition by a whopping 70%. Student protests eventually knocked the increase down to a mere 5%, however.

Even the rich kids up the river will have to live with a bigger increase. Harvard upped its tuition by $450, but as a consolation, students did win a concession of free toilet paper.

Local music thrives on some stations

To the editor:
The “Flip Side” column which appeared in your January 31 issue showed a lack a broad perspective of the Boston radio market when it mentioned “no local music performed by local musicians is available on radio in the Boston area.” It may be that true local music is available on some of the non-commercial radio stations, and that this is not true for Boston area non-commercial radio stations.

First, let me define commercial and non-commercial radio stations. Commercial stations include all AM stations operating from 535 to 1560 kHz carrier frequency, and all FM stations operating from 87.5 to 108 mhz carrier frequency. Non-commercial stations are restricted to the frequency range of 535 to 1560 kHz carrier frequency, and the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) requires the holders of licenses for non-commercial stations be non-profit organizations (for example, the WGBH foundation in the case of WGBH). Boston has two non-commercial stations outside the “radio marketplace.” (For example, the WGBH foundation, the WGBH Educational Foundation, the Boston Symphony Orchestra, Boston Television and the Tapestry Group in the case of WGBH, and the WGBH Educational Foundation, WGBH, and the WGBH Educational Foundation, WGBH in the case of WGBH). WGBH, WGBH, and WGBH are the only non-commercial stations in the Boston area.

Third, there is an abundance of local music, and WGBH stations. WGBH stations is the only non-commercial station in the Boston area. For example, WGBH’s performance of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, from Boston in the winter and Tanglewood in the summer, and almost weekly live performances from their local music, and WGBH stations. WGBH stations is the only non-commercial station in the Boston area. For example, WGBH’s performance of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, from Boston in the winter and Tanglewood in the summer, and almost weekly live performances from their

WGBH stations, WGBH stations, and WGBH stations are the only non-commercial stations in the Boston area. For example, WGBH’s performance of the Boston Symphony Orchestra, from Boston in the winter and Tanglewood in the summer, and almost weekly live performances from their
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