In his speech before the Massachusetts High Technology Council last month, President Gray showed admirable restraint from entering an enhanced honeymoon with local industry. The Institute can never do all the things to all people. A reality of limited resources, manpower, and funding prevents this. It is therefore important that MIT not be sidetracked from its major function, which is to create education and research.

The Massachusetts High Technology Council had asked MIT to start an expanded education program for Massachusetts engineers. The Council wanted the Institute to offer a graduate degree program at a slower pace or on a part-time basis. They pointed out that Stanford University has a fairly extensive adult engineering education program and that portions, presumably on videotape or similar media, were locally available. The Council pointed out that such measures would "heighten the attractiveness of Massachusetts to engineers."

In his response, Gray explained that MIT has a history of a "mutually supportive" relationship with industry. Gray described the Industrial Liaison Program and the cooperative program in the School of Engineering. In addition, he highlighted some of the sponsored research programs receiving funding from industry, such as the Polymer Processing Program, funded by a consortium of a dozen industries. In addition, MIT has its own "video school." The Center for Advanced Engineering Studies (CASES) offers several hundred videotapes on a score of courses.

The Council's request is a selfish, and perhaps short-sighted, one. By entering into a protracted arrangement with local high technology industry, the Institute runs the risk of losing sight of its basic academic orientation. Should the Institute decide to become more involved with and responsive to the needs of industry, the focus on research, one of the Institute's trademarks, may shift to the more commercial field of research and development. Having abandoned long-range projects with little obvious commercial benefit for more immediate profit-oriented industrial projects, MIT's position as a leading information source would be seriously weakened.

The concept of off-campus programs or videotaped program instruction offering the equivalent of an MIT education is, as Gray puts it, "on the horizon." A good deal of the education one receives here comes from outside the classroom—from UROP, relationships with faculty members, fellow students and the like—and no amount of television watching can ever come close.

Pulling levers

The polls are now open for the conclusion of the longest election campaign in history. Registered voters should have a two-step checklist to get them through this year's quadrennial exercise in democracy.

First, voters take some time during the day to actually make their voting decisions. The Presidential contest is obviously the chief consideration and should not be left to a last-minute whim in the voting booth. There are other important issues on the ballot, however. There are local races in both Boston and Cambridge. Referenda range from a straightforward statute on handicapped access to public places to other issues that originate in the Massachusetts legislature.

Second, voters should be sure to actually make the trip to the polls. In an election as protracted as this, voters cannot shrink their duty to pass judgment on the state of affairs. If they find attractive viewpoints, they should side with them; if they find the entire scene unattractive they should articulate that. Silence today will be a non-voting election, but there will have been hard time living with the coming years.

To the Editor:

Your endorsement of John Anderson in the October 28 issue reflects an understanding of historical perspective. The disastrous choices offered to the electorate by the major parties this year are the inevitable outcome of the series of electoral "reforms" initiated by the Democrats after the 1960 convention disaster and the selection of the "distrustable" Hubert Humphrey as that party's presidential candidate. The same electoral rules that give Carter vs. Reagan this year, gave McGovern vs. Nixon in 1972, which was seen as a success for the reforms. To some extent, the current upset over electoral rules is simply liberal sour grapes over the abdication of a liberal spokesperson from the ticket of the major parties.

The underlying problem, unfortunately, is not the electoral process but the increasingly obvious inability of policies based on deeply-held liberal ideals to deal with the problems of our day. Since much of the electorate has been educated to distrustful of non-liberal ideas and members of the Republican Party, voters have been unwilling to throw the Democrats out and give the Republicans a chance to try their ideas. As long as the Republicans are not seen as a legitimate alternative to the Democrats, another party will be responsive to the needs of the public at large. The Democrats will concentrate on doctrinal squabbling in the belief that their candidate is a sure thing, while the Republicans will use ideological purity as their criterion since they figure they have little chance anyway. One need only look at the growing acrimony in Massachusetts over spending and taxes to see this process in operation. Proposition 2 1/2 is not the response to increases in spending; it's a way to keep the Republicans might be better.

If Anderson is an alternative, he is one because he does not accept all the liberal dogmas of the Democrats—his status as an independent does not make him an alternative. Voters should get a choice of policies and ideas developed in the belief that the best ideas will win, whether they are liberal or not. If you are seriously interested in getting better people onto the ballot for president, the way to do that is to advocate voting Republican across the board. Once both parties become convinced that same solutions to problems matter in their electoral fate, America will get the benefit of serious competition in the electoral process.

Until a better balance is restored, we cannot look forward to one election after the other in which most voters try to decide which candidate they dislike least.