Editorial

Is anybody listening?

As President-elect Paul Gray '54 establishes the trends and organization of his upcoming administration, it is becoming increasingly clear that the only voices being heard is those making the decisions. From who is involved in the upcoming review of financial matters to the meteoric rise in the responsibilities of Simonides Without, one cannot help but look at the administration that controls personnel and see an attitude which belies an administrative act. The process is one which will make such thoughtful analysis of most of the matters relating to education and research. It must be noted, however, that Prof. Lo's long personal background in research administration makes us rather anxious that he give the proper attention to the serious questions of undergraduate educational policy which face this institution.

Those questions—such as whether MIT life is too fast paced—are currently under discussion in the Committee for Educational Policy. But, rather than consulting the most important student/faculty committee, Gray has gone on to structure an administration which will make such thoughtful analysis futile. The decisions that are made which may alter the basic educational philosophy of MIT must emerge as a cooperative effort between the educational and academic life. By constructing a two-pronged government, Gray will make the necessary intercommunication much more difficult. It cannot be denied that some of the new administration of the same administration that controls personnel belies an attitude which almost belittles the post. One cannot help but look at the motives behind the recent administration changes, calling them "the most irresponsible thing I've seen since I've been in the White House." The President then launched a one-man paper and magazine article headline, as a personal vendetta. Carter stepped wanting just to win in New Hampshire, he wanted to bury Kennedy.

This brings us to today. All the showings matches, political speeches, Rose Garden politicking, and even the rain are over. There are only a few things left for New Hampshire: the voting, the celebrating, the apologizing, and, oh yes, my, the analyzing...

Carter's attacks on Carter have been effective. People are now seriously questioning Carter's motives in his Rose Garden politics, and his treatment of the crisis in Iran. More important for Teddy is the dramatic shift back from foreign policy to domestic matters—perhaps his initial popularity, and hence his influence and energy, as the major concerns of the voters of New Hampshire. Kennedy wins votes when he talks about himself, clearly of people with Carter. But will Teddy's emphasis on initiatives now New Hampshire for him? It is very doubtful.

Carter clearly has last support since Iowa, but Kennedy has not regained tremendously on him. A poll in last Sunday's Boston Globe taken in New Hampshire showed Carter with 35 percent, people, '80, and Undecided 7. If this poll is to be believed, Carter still is maintaining a sizeable lead, but no one thinks Carter will "bury" Kennedy. By all indications, the
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Guesees for the Granite State

The day in finally, February 26.
From early morning to mid- evening voters will be voting places and marking their ballots in the first Presidential primary leading to the 1980 election. Yes, it is the New Hampshire primary.

It is true, you argue, that we have already gone through the trauma of sitting through the over-hyped primaries in Iowa and Maine, but those were just preliminaries. New Hampshire is the main event. It is the first big test of the rivalries created between Jimmy Carter and Ted Kennedy. It is the real test of whether George Bush can handle the pressure of being a front- runner. But most importantly, it is the first direct election of delegates to both the Republican and Democratic national conventions.

On the Democratic side we have a real battle. Ever since Iowa, Ted Kennedy has been blowing away in some of the most student-centered events used in a political campaign. He has appeared to be "stubbornly resisting" the International Commission of Inquiry into Iran's grievances against the US until Teddy himself proposed it, he denied him as being a self-appointed "high priest of patriotism" and strongly hinted that Afghanistan could have been avoided.

Carter stepped his back and perhaps his when he heard of Kennedy's statements. At the least, he has lost his cool. Carter leaked out at Kennedy's statements, calling them "the most irresponsible thing I've seen since I've been in the White House." The President then launched a one-man paper and magazine article headline, as a personal vendetta. Carter stepped wanting just to win in New Hampshire, he wanted to bury Kennedy.

This brings us to today. All the showings matches, political speeches, Rose Garden politicking, and even the rain are over. There are only a few things left for New Hampshire: the voting, the celebrating, the apologizing, and, oh yes, my, the analyzing...

Carter's attacks on Carter have been effective. People are now seriously questioning Carter's motives in his Rose Garden politics, and his treatment of the crisis in Iran. More important for Teddy is the dramatic shift back from foreign policy to domestic matters—perhaps his initial popularity, and hence his influence and energy, as the major concerns of the voters of New Hampshire. Kennedy wins votes when he talks about himself, clearly of people with Carter. But will Teddy's emphasis on initiatives now New Hampshire for him? It is very doubtful.

Carter clearly has lost support since Iowa, but Kennedy has not regained tremendously on him. A poll in last Sunday's Boston Globe taken in New Hampshire showed Carter with 35 percent, people, '80, and Undecided 7. If this poll is to be believed, Carter still is maintaining a sizeable lead, but no one thinks Carter will "bury" Kennedy. By all indications, the

Reader abused by draft endorsement

I found The Tech of 22 February quite amusing. First was the two page spread predicting that those "Guts" of Russian militarism and what nice guys we are. Indeed, SAU and all our friends are. These two military experts were published that the concern of young people impressed against their will would be "tougher" and "easier" than one composed of those who joined by choice, despite Secretary of Defense Brown's testimony to the contrary. We were told how America had no choice but to deploy the Pershing missiles in Europe since the West had no pact nations' arms out- number NATO armies, despite the fact the figure usually quoted for their armies includes a substantial percentage of support personnel who in NATO countries are counted as civilians and, more to the point, despite the fact that the Soviet Union had recently made significant troop withdrawals and announced they would continue withdrawals if we did not place these tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. We ignored the offer.

Other humorous moments in- cluded their commentaries that those who oppose the draft "condemn millions of other people around the world to life under totalitarian dictatorships." If we only had a draft, they suppose, American freedom-fighting commandoes would march toward the globe, liberating the oppressed and set-