Editorials

Defer changes in payment plan

While the idea of replacing the deferred payment plan with a monthly fee system may have been mentioned last July, students have not really had an opportunity to comment on the proposal. Director of Student Financial Services Jack Frailey should thoroughly consider the implementation of the new system at least until next fall, and take some time to examine thoroughly and alter appropriately the proposal.

Both Frailey and Dean of Student Affairs Shirley McBey are rightly concerned about the effects of the new system on needy students. Frailey’s finding that relatively few students on financial aid and who have been in The Tech in recent years are those receiving Institute grants have not use for such a program. The students who need the deferral option, and who will be hurt by the fee system, are those receive financial aid and pay for their own education, often by working during the term.

Now is the time to propose a specific method of accommodating these students. Offering a proposal before thoroughly examining the problems raised by the switch would echo the Administration’s error of acting without adequate forethought. The most equitable approach would probably involve retention of some form of deferred payment plan for students meeting a needs test, albeit different from that used in the regular financial aid process. The financial analysis would at least have to consider income from term-time jobs, benefits awarded on a fixed schedule, and actual — not expected — parents’ contributions.

Complete elimination of the deferred payment option will probably fulfill Frailey’s goal of increased cash flow for the Institute. A more equitable objective of treating students more equitably. If both goals are equally important, any change flow is premature.

Whitehead must be renegotiated

The time has come for the MIT Administration to concede that the relationship between MIT and Whitehead for research graduate cases cited by the 33 signers is quite realistic and somewhat joint appointments. Despite contentions by President Gray and President Whitten regarding the proposed affiliation are to be commended for their willingness to compromise on many of the issues. The MIT Administration must continue to seek changes which are in the best interests of academic integrity at MIT. While the Whitehead Institute is a fine idea, we also feel currently-nixed concerns are more serious enough to demand renegotiation of the proposed agreement.

To the Editor:

I am not was not the only one embroiled by Arnold Conteras’ letter (The Tech, November 4th), in which he praised former MIT President Jerome Wiesner for his exceptional wisdom and boldness. According to Conteras (later denied by Wiesner), Wiesner had refrained from applauding the Reagan Administration’s nuclear arms policy, as announced by George Bush during his brief visit here. “Even after working under the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations for nuclear disarmament, Dr. Wiesner continued to serve the country in his remarks and position of today,” Conteras tells us. “As a community we should be truly grateful to have such a bold leader among us.”

I too applaud Dr. Wiesner’s criticism of the Reagan policy and share his horror at the likely prospects of its continuing. For the record, thousands of other I stand that day to express my opposition. And I too am grateful to have Dr. Wiesner among us (does not in the street) not only for his behavior that day but for a different reason as well. Dr. Wiesner serves us all as a living example of how good men, scientific men, yes, even sometimes courageous and bold men can, out of deference, innocence, and an entanglement with power, go grievously wrong and do irreparable harm to all of us. It is precisely because I share Wiesner’s present concerns that I must insist that the record be set straight. I am sure that Dr. Wiesner would agree that we should all learn from his example, not alone from the example of his actions today but from the example of his entire career. Dr. Wiesner, as he himself would readily concede, was not a champion of nuclear disarmament under Eisenhower and Kennedy, but rather an ardent arms race enthusiast. In 1969 at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions he himself candidly acknowledged “our responsibility for contributing to the arms race” — meaning, more precisely, his own responsibility (Anti-Ballistic Missile: Yes or No? Hill and Wang, 1969, p. 51). “When I was a little boy and first began to play with these toys, working at the MIT Radiation Laboratory,” Wiesner recounted, “I believed everything I told. I spent the 1950’s working very hard on the defense of missiles, on a variety of things, because I was told by my superiors that the Russians were ahead of us. Then [some years later, after he had become a key science advisor to John F. Kennedy] I was sure I was not the only one who was taken in by this propaganda, a Big Lie (the notion that the Russians enjoyed missile superiority over the US when in reality they lagged woefully behind) that served to intended purpose of convincing the electorate that the young Kennedy was tough on defense — (please turn to page 5)
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MacGregor incident seems overblown

The MacGregor incident was one that brought to the surface many issues that had been simmering in the MIT community. The incident itself was a tragedy, and it highlighted the need for better communication and understanding between different groups on campus. The MIT Administration responded to the incident by pushi...