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against the Soviets, undermines America's image, and drives moderate factions into Moscow's crushing embrace. The lessons of Iran and Nicaragua must be learned: America must not abandon its commitment to human rights by backing every dictator who claims to be anti-Soviet.

Arms control and human rights are crucial importance, but aiding the faltering Soviet economy is not. A President willing to spend 2.6 trillion dollars in five years on the Strategic Defense Initiative should be willing to embark on all US grain to the Soviets. The Administration has squandered billions of dollars on destabilizing and unnecessary military items such as the MX missile, B-1 bomber, neutron bomb, increased warhead production, and civil defense dismantling. It has accelerated the trend towards costly, complex, and unsustainable weapons systems. According to a recent Army and Air National Guard report, the result of this practice has been "a fundamental contradiction between what we say and what we need. Consequently, there is not enough procurement to equip their total force." President Reagan has refused to face the politically difficult question of dealing with the Pentagon's manpower shortage. A program of voluntary national service, military or civilian, in exchange for funding of a college education would not only demonstrate American determination but also allow many people the opportunity to serve their country and earn an education.

The Soviet threat is very real. Reagan Administration policies have only aggravated tensions without coping with the problem. By selling arms everywhere and supporting tyrants, Ronald Reagan has undermined one of America's greatest strengths: its tradition of support of individual liberty. If the US does not stand for freedom, what does it stand for? The Reagan Administration should ponder this question as it formulates US security policy.
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The purpose of all these complaints is to help employers identify MIT students they would like to hire. Employees generally have two reasons for wanting the lists. One is that they have large numbers of candidates and they are anxious about getting enough good candidates. The other is that they are not getting the range of candidates they would like - not enough mechanical engineers, not enough blacks, not enough women, etc. In short, the lists allow employers to make a wider selection. There is nothing in this that is least bit discriminatory.

Most of the employers come on campus recruiting and any student, whether he or she is on a list or not, is welcome to have an interview with any employer looking for candidates in his discipline and at his degree level. Indeed we often introduce to recruiters students and employers who have not previously thought of each other. We respect restricts an employer imposes lightly, for example, if he requires a candidate to be a United States citizen or a permanent resident - but otherwise we insist on the recruiting process being as open as possible.

I think anyone who has used the office and not simply come to the office "to meet someone" - without hesitation says he did not know how open we are. We will even do all we can for someone who thinks we are racist and lists do so in an anonymous letter to The Tech. We will be generous and assume that he has not thought matters through. Does he realize what the letter writer seems to say about his own behavior? To call our list of minority students "racist", without bothering to ask how it is made, sounds pretty racist itself. Would he have been equally upset if the list he had seen had been our list of women students? And I won't call it cowardly - but it is certainly unreasoned, and unstate of courage - if he cannot discuss his concern with us directly or prefers the safety of an anonymous letter to The Tech.

Robert K. Weatherall 
Director, Career Planning and Placement

Students unhappy

To the Editor:

After approximately one year at MIT, I've made many observations which I now feel obligated to make public since I am unquestionably not the sole bearer of these thoughts.

MIT, like virtually all communities, is plagued with disatisfaction. Although some complaints may be valid and warranted, the vast majority are ridiculous and merely express the inability of individuals to display gratitude and happiness.

One obvious example is the incessant flogging that pervades lectures and LSC moves. Now we all realize that 8.02 lectures are not necessarily filled with humor, that we have our clothes on but the professors are up there working hard and can do without the smirk impersonations. If lectures are not exactly sources of laughter for you, then stay home in bed and watch Flipper or game shows.

The situation with LSC moves is a little different. LSC moves are instigated by human error but the vast majority are due to film defects and therefore do not require any response from the audience. LSC has its problems but it does not suck. Lines across the film as well as most frame losses are unwarranted cries of protest and complaint. MIT students should be proud of the unparalleled status of their movie system and not denigrate its existence.

Another source of complaint is the unsuccessful work load that deluges the MIT student's time. Granted, MIT is faithfully devoted to its work load as much as for its reputation and extent of the research conducted under its purview but we do have a lot of money. Any of us could have gone to RPI or some other high-quality engineering school but it is almost unthinkable for the best, our desire to attend the number one engineering school in the country (the world) that brought us here. Most of us fully understand before arriving quickly learned that here are extremely demanding the academic environment is. Our strength and reputation rely on this status and the awareness of this situation is...