Less than two weeks ago, many of us saw Apocalypse Now, shown by LSC. Many of us would agree that the best part of this film was very shocking and frightening. We all left 3e-100 quite diagnosed with the horrors we saw — but also quite ready to forget them, with the realization that Apocalypse Now was, after all, only a movie. Well, Apocalypse Now was just a film, but the suffering and fear portrayed have been all too real in the twentieth century. The mass atrocities committed in Stal- lin's Russia, Hitler's Germany, and Mao's China were astonishing in their brutality and totality. And although we have always wanted to believe otherwise, we have once again seen an entire nation engulfed by unspeakable terror.

The nation is Cambodia, one of the dominions in the much-mali- cioncountry. Among the accounts of refugees, government and United Nations studies, and investigative journalism, we have learned about the wretched fate of Cambodia.

Back in April of 1975, Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge Communist insurgents captured Phnom Penh and destroyed the remaining fragments of the Lon Nol regime. Then they turned Cambodia into Hell on Earth.

The Khmer Rouge "evacuated" all of Cambodia's cities, forcing everyone — including hospital patients — to march into the countryside. Those who resisted were shot. Phnom Penh, a city of three million, became a ghost town overnight. Many people died of illness, exhaustion, or starvation during the arduous march from city to countryside.

Once the people had reached the countryside, Angkor, the Cambodians, stripped them of their belongings — even their cooking utensils. They were forced to work on any job they had standing before the revo- lution. That job might be education, teachers, merchants, monks. They put everyone, children in- cluded, to work at forced labor, cutting down trees, sowing rice, (Please turn to page 6)
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Motivation. The word strikes fear in the hearts of those who practice it. "Controlled Ambition," — the philosophy that students begin to question sets the main topic of conversation in the alumni forum. Many students can save time by cramming later. It is the philosophy whose central tenet is "Don't do much today, because then you'll have nothing to do tomorrow." I have found many MIT stu- dents, myself included, succumb- ing to the practice of such an an- ti-work ethic. Why such a work- only-when-under-the-gun philos- phy? On the surface, it would seem that MIT students develop this masochistic attitude in response to severe pressures on their time — starting a problem set, due the day after tomorrow, is due tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow. There is more to "Controlled Ambition," however, than mere procrastination. It points to an inherent characteris- tic of an MIT undergraduate edu- cation.

Who among you are more satisfied with the student who learns his stuff but doesn't get good grades, the student who doesn't learn the material as well but manages to pull a 'B' on his or her grades? The freshman who asked me that question was perplexed.

"I hold a strange respect for the student who feels he would probably work harder than he did first term, but doesn't feel the need to take a night class. He feels he has an obligation to make prof- its, "I said.

"I don't take it that you did do well first term," I said.

"Right," he said, "but I thought, that was the main purpose behind freshman pass/ weekly bills don't have to worry about grades."

I agreed, but, to help answer the question, offered a simple, sim- plified analogy. "Which compa- ny do you admire more, "I asked, "the one that serves the clever customers by making a quality product, or one that maximizes its profits?"

He thought for a moment, and answered that while he character- ised both companies as having a single-minded pursuit of profits, the company that built the better product would probably work a bit more in the long run.

"Controlled Ambition," — the philosophy that entices students to begin problem sets the night before they are due and tempts them to think, "Why study now for the exam when you can save time by cramming later?
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